No 337.

tion of damages, and granting warrant to and ordaining the keeper of the record to transmit the warrants of the extracted decree to the clerk of the process.

Lord Ordinary, Craig. Alt, H. Erskine. Act. Solicitor-General Blair.
Agent, H. Davidsen, W. S.

Agent, J. Keap, W. S. Cherk, Home.

F.

Fue. Col. No 162. p. 365.

\*\*\* It was found, (Douglas petitioner, March 7: 1753.) that informations must be engrossed in the extracted decree. The case is No 86. p. 12020.

## SECT. XVIII.

## Decrees in Absence.

1681. January 22.

The Earl of Dundonald against The Laird of Dunlop and his Creditors.

No 338.

The Earl of Dundonnald being infeft in an annualrent out of the Laird of Dunlop's estate, raises a summons of poinding of the ground, which being called in the Outer-house, in presence of the Ordinary, Dunlop opposed not, but consented to a decreet; but his Creditors alleged, That they ought to see the process, and it ought to be seen, and returned, and enrolled; and that any party may stop a decreet in absence, and crave to see it. It was answered, That albeit decreets passing in course by the clerk may be stopped by any desiring to see, yet this decreet was pronounced by the Ordinary, and therefore none but a party called can stop the same, unless they produce an interest, upon which the Ordinary must hear that party, if it be a competent interest, whereby the producer is found legitimus contradictor.

Which the Lords sustained.

Stair, v. 2. p. 840.

1692. December 29.

PHILP of Almerycloss against OGILVY of Innerquharity.

No 339. The Lords were divided on this question, if it was to be reputed a decreet in foro where a pary appeared, and produced an interest, as a ground of competition on the subject in controversy, but afterwards was absent, and proponed nothing upon his inserest; so that compearing in this manner, and finding his