No 86.

\*\*\* Dirleton in his report of this case, No 21. p. 5453. says, the Lords came to the following resolutions, 1mo, That it was consistent that a sum should be moveable, and yet that it should be heritably secured, as in the case of bygone annualrents due upon infeftment of annualrents, bygone feu-duties, for which real action is competent even to executors, wadsets loosed by requisition, &c.; 2do, That as to these qualities of moveable or heritable, in relation to succession, the animus of the creditor was principally to be considered; so that if an heritable security were afterwards taken for a debt moveable ab initio, it is presumed the creditor intended that the sum should belong to his heirs; secus, if his intention appeared to be otherwise, v. g. if a debtor should dispone his estate in favour of a confident person, with the burden of his debts; 3tio, Bonds being taken after a general security, in the terms aforesaid, for debts to be advanced, may be moveable, notwithstanding such security, if it appear that the creditor intended it should be such; v. g. if the supervenient bond should be taken to executors, secluding heirs, &c.

1683. March 6.

ROLLOCK against GRANT.

No. 87.
A moveable bond, though eiked to a reversion of wadset, but not registered in the register of reversions, was found to belong to the executor.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 371. P. Falconer, No 55. p. 36.