No 102.

and omitted was always sufficient against any suspension or reduction thereof; and therefore the common course was to be absent in the first decreet, and to suspend as oft as particular reasons could be founded on, to the great vexation of the people, and delay of justice, which therefore is well remedied by the late act of regulation, declaring, That whatsoever was competent and omitted against any decreet principal, or decreet of suspension in foro, shall not be received thereafter; and therefore the excluding of compensation post sententiam by this statute, is chiefly in relation to decreets in absence, for if the decreet was in foro, the common exception of competent and omitted, which was always in vigour against the first decreet, would have excluded compensation, yea payment itself, and so the statute was needless, unless it had been to exclude compensation against decreets in absence.

THE LORDS found that compensation was not receivable against decreets in absence by the foresaid statute, unless the decreet were made null, and turned into a libel by improbation of the executions, or by fraudulent and clandestine taking away of the executions, or any other nullity.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 165. Stair, v. 2. p. 456.

1678. February 5.

LOGAN against Cours.

Cours having obtained decreet before the Magistrates of Aberdeen against Logan, he suspends on compensation, alleging, though the decreet bears compensation, it bears no mandate, and that the suspender was out of the country at that time.

THE LORDS found, That the compensation was not relevant post sententiam, though the decreet had been in absence, unless the decreet were annulled by improbation of the executions, or otherwise, in respect the act of Parliament anent compensation allows the same only ante sententiam, and not thereafter.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 165. Stair, v. 2. p. 608.

No 103. Compensation not receivable against the decreet of an inferior court.

1683. January. NICOLAS BARCLAY against ALEXANDER CLERK.

A party against whom a decreet in absence in his minority, was recovered by an assignee, raised suspension and reduction upon a reason of compensation on a debt due by the cedent; it was alleged, That, by act of Parliament, compensation is not receivable after sentence, and the act making no exception of minors, the suspender's omission to propone compensation debito tempore, must cut him off from the benefit thereof; as the short prescriptions, where law doth not expressly except minors, such as possessory judgements, creditors not pursuing within three years after the debtor's death, run against minors.

Vol. VII.

15 L

No 104. Compensation allowed even after decree, when the charger is vergens ad inopiam. No 104.

The Lords, in respect the cedent was now absolutely bankrupt, sustained the reason of compensation, proponed after sentence by the minor. See The case following.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 165. Harcase, (Compensation.) No 255. p. 60.

No 105. A party in a suspension of a decree in fero, propon-

a decree in fero, proponed compensation, which had emerged after the decree; so that here it was not industriously omitted to be proponed prima instantia, animo protelanai litem. The Lords, nevertheless, found the statute general, and repelled the

compensation. 1637. July 9. John Gordon elder of Fechil against Captain Melvil.

In a suspension given in by John Gordon elder of Fechil, against Captain Melvil, of a decreet in foro; one of the reasons was founded on a compensation emergent after the decreet; it was acknowledged that any ground of debt standing in his person before the decreet could not be obtruded by way of compensation, because it was competent and omitted, and presumed to have been omitted purposely to procure a new delay by suspension; but this was a debt Fechil had purchased an assignation to after the decreet, and was not fraudulently omitted and kept up. Answered. The act of Parliament discharging compensations to be received in the second instance, makes no distinction when it was acquired; and the buying in of debts is no very favourable thing; and the Lords have found even compensation unreceivable in the second instance, though the decreet was in absence, Wright contra Sheill, No 102. p. 2640. THE LORDS repelled the compensation, reserving his action thereon against Melvil, as accords; whereby Fechil was at this disadvantage, that he was forced to pay, and Melvil was vergens ad inopiam, and so had little hopes of recovering what he now claimed to compense him with.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 165. Fountainhall, v. 1. p. 784.

1707. March 20.

HUGH CORBET OF Hardgray against WILLIAM HAMILTON OF Wishaw.

HARDGRAY, as assignee to a decreet of the Commissaries of Glasgow, against Wishaw for 400 merks, contained in a ticket granted by him to the deceast William Anderson, Provost of Glasgow, pursued Wishaw for payment.

Alleged for the defender; Absolvitor, because, 1mo, The decreet was in absence, and intrinsically null for being pronounced in vacation time without a dispensation, by a commissary who is not competent to judge in actions above L. 40 Scots, except where the libel is referred to oath, and the ticket was prescribed. 2do, Compensation upon a bill drawn by Patrick Murray, clerk to the Fishery company upon Provost Anderson for 1200 merks payable to Wishaw, which the Provost, by a letter under his hand to Wishaw, acknowledged and promised to pay.

Replied for the pursuer; Compensation upon the bill and letters cannot be sustained, because both being holograph were prescribed by the elapsing of 20

No 106. Compensation being proponed after a decree in absence, the decree being against the party among many others, the Lords found, that a decree in absence against debtors excludes not compensation.