## RECOGNITION.

No 21. pected out of the other lands; 5to, The Lords repelled the allegeance, that the refeftments were in trust, as it was qualified, viz. that they were in the vassal's charter-chest, and that he detained the possession, except that the vassal's fraud or dole were instructed, or that the gift were to the vassal's behoof; 6to, The Lords repelled the defence founded upon the resignation made by old Cromarty in favours of his son, albeit bearing a confirmation of what relates to rights made to the vassal, and not to rights made by the vassal; 7 mo , Repelled the defences founded upon the inhibition, which was prior to the deeds made use of for making up the recognition; $8 v 0$, Found, that the infeftments that were habili modo extinguished, before the concourse of the major part, cannot come in computo ; 9no, That sasines which are intrinsically null are not to be respected as grounds of recognition.

$$
\text { Sir P. Home, MS. v. ェ. No } 473
$$

1683. March. Earl of Aberdeen, Lord Chancellor, against ——_

Found that a wadset of ward lands for a small sum, under the value of the half of these lands, inferred recognition, though it was redeemable upon payment of a referable sum, in respect the property of the whole was disponed; and it was not like an annualrent, which (as but a servitude out of lands) is only considered with respect to the value and burden on the lands.

$$
\text { Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. } 3^{14} \text {. Harcarse, (Recognition.) No 827. p. } 235 .
$$

1685. March 17. Thoirs against Forbes.

In a declarator of recognition upon a base infeftment; it being alleged, That a father had conveyed his estate to the son of the eldest of his three daughters, who was therefore alioqui successurus; the Lords found this sufficient to as. soilzie from the recognition in toto, notwithstanding the existence of the two other sisters.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 315. Fountainball.
*** This case is No 94. p. 2754., doce Competent.
1686. February 3, and 4, and 1687 . July.

Earl of Lauderdale against Vassals of Dundee.
No 24 .
In a question, whether base infeftments, long since prescribed, so that the debt could not be exacted, might, nevertheless, concur with others which were

