No 7. never modify penalties, unlefs there be defects in the apprifing. For though the act of Parliament forefaid, as to the fatisfaction of apprifings, mentions not penalties, but principal fums and annualrents, Eec.; yet thereby principal fums are meant, as they are accumulated in the apprifing, wherein the penalties are comprehended.

The Lords found the reafon of reduction relevant to be proven by Francis's. oath, that the apprifing quoad Charles's fum was for Charles's behoof, to reduce the fame, as to Charles's part, to his principal fums, and annualrents thereof, without penalties or accumulation ; in refpect of his bond, containing the claufe of retention; and of Mowat's diftrefs, by apprifing. after the decreet of apprifing; in which Drum failed to produce the back-bond; which could not then have been. effectual: But in cafe it be not proven, that the apprifing was for Charles's behoof, found, That the fame ought not only to be retained, with the abatement of Mowat's fum, but they reduced the fame as to the penalties, and termly failzies; and fuftained the fame, as a redeemable fecurity for the remainder of Charles's principal fum, and annualrents thereof; due at the time of the apprifing; being thereby accumulated into one principal; and thereby reduced, as to the whole penalties, and failzies in the apprifing. And, as to the fecond reafon; if, by Charles's bond, it appear, that the firft term of his annualrent was only Martitimas 1662 ; that the purfuer had apprifed for a term more than was due knowingly, after his. affignation by Charles, found, ad bunc effeclum, To reduce the fums to the principal and current annualrents only, without penalties, failzies, or accumulation of the annualrents. *

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 7. Stair, v. 1.p. 684 .
1680. Fune 22. Grant against Grant.

No 8.
An apprifing valid, notwithft anding of articles of compenfation againft the apprifer, who is not bound to propone compenfation againft herfelf.

William Grant having adjudged the wadfet-right of the Bridge-town of Spey, from one Barclay, purfues for maiks and duties. Patrick Grant compears, who alleges, That he has a potterior adjudication, which is preferable, becaufe the firft proceeds on a fum contracted by a father to his fon, in his contract or marriage, by which the tocher is alfo payable to the fon; fo that, though the contract be onerous as to the wife, yet it is merely gratuitous as to the fon.-It was anfwered, That, at the time of the contract, the father had a fufficient eftate to pay his debt ${ }_{\text {, }}$ befide this fmall provifion of 1000 merks,-Which the Lords found relevant. It

[^0]Eountainball, v. 1. p.39..
was further allegen, That, though the father's folvency fhould not be proven, yet Grant's adjudication cannot be preferred; becaufe it is null, being for the Laird of Grant's behoof; who, before deducing thereof, had entered to poffeffion of the wadfet, and thereby was fatisfied : At the leaft, he ought to have compenfated, and deduced the rents of the wadfet lands.-It was anfreered, That Grant had entered to the void poffeffon, relinquifhed by the wadfetter's herr'; which he might do, both becaufe the wadfet was in non entry, and becaufe, by the late dat of Parliament, $166_{1}$, between debtor and creditor, he might enter into the wadfet. $2 d 0$, No man is obliged to compenfate againft himfelf; nor can compenfauton take effect, but when it is proponed; and; though compenfation might now be allowed againft the adjudication, yet it will not amnul the fame; nor can it be fuftained ${ }_{2}$ further than what is liquid, and inftantly verified; which is the annualrent of the wadfet fum, and not of the wadfet land, which muft abide probation.

The Lorps found the adjudication valid; and that the adjudger was not abliged. to deduce, upon fums compenfible, unlefs compenfation had been proponed; but fuftained the compenfation, now to reftrict the adjudication, for the annualrent of the wadfet fum, and for the remainder of the rent of the wadfet lands; if it were inftantly verified and liquidated by writ, or the adjudger's oath; but found, That Grant had no right to the furplus-duty, nor to the non-entry, without declarator, or by the act of Parliament; without a fentence upon offer of caution to the wadfetters.

$$
\text { Eul. Dic. v. . . p. 9. Stair, v. 2. p. } 773 .
$$

## 1683. Fanuary: Mr Edward Wright against The Earl of AnNandale.

Found, That a comprifing, led for a principal fum, and fome bygone annialrents thereof, which had been paid, was not fimply null.; (though it could not expire, and the accumulation of annualrents, or neceffary expences fall,) but did fubfilt, as a real fecurity, for the principal, and current annualrents; and found, That though gronuds of compenfation, exifting before leading of the apprifing, and not applied, did leffon fo much of the fums therein-contained; yet the apprifing did fubfift for the remainder, both quoad accumulations and expiring:

Fol. Dic.v. 1.p.9. Harcarfe, (Comprising.) No 283. p. 66..
5683. March.

Bailllie of Torwoodhead against Florence Ģairdner and his Son:
AN apprifing, led by a father in his own name, for a fum payable to him in liferent, and to his children in fee; which he was empowered to uplift, and re-employ for their ufe, being quarrelled as null, upon thefe grounds : i mo, Twenty-nine

No 8.

No 9. An apprifing: valid, notwithltanding of grounds of compenfation againtt the. apprifer..

No 10
An apprifing was led by a. father, for fums due to: himfelf, in.


[^0]:    * Lord Fountainhall thus mentions the fame cafe:-In the attion betwixt Francis Irvine, and his brother, the Laird of Dium, the Lords reduced Francis's comprifing to the principal fum and annualrents, and lopt off the Sheriff-fees, and penalties, becaufe it was deduced for greater fums than were truly refting owing at the time of the leading thereof; though it was only 2 quarter, or half a year's annualrent more, and Francis was only affgnee, and fo could not know of it. The Lords, in fome fuch cafes, only reftriat the comprifing, but do not annul it.

