No. 61. reason, that the warrandice could import no more but repetition of what Gordonston received, which was only £80. It was replied, That Clerk was seeking no benefit by the warrandice, but to be relieved of the distress, which he was specially obliged to warrant. It was duplied, That no intimation was made to Gordonston of the process inferring the distress.

The Lords found Gordonston liable to relieve Clerk of the whole distress, albeit the plea was not intimated to him, unless he can allege or instruct a relevant defence, that could have defended Clerk in whole or in part.

Stair, v. 2. p. 882.

1682. January 6. Lumsden against Gordon of Tarpersie.

No. 62.

Found that absolute warrandice in an assignation to a tack of teinds, did not make the disponer liable to a supervenient burden of augmentation to the Minister of the parish by act of Parliament.

Harcarse, No. 963. p. 274.

1682. March. GORDONSTON and NICOLSON against GEORGE PATON.

No. 63.

One who had disponed lands with absolute warrandice, being quarrelled for a liberty and servitude of casting some peats in a moss, granted by his authors in anno 1625, the Lords assoilzied the defender, in respect the servitude was so old, and notourly known, and so inconsiderable in these parts.

Harcarse, No. 1013. p. 288.

** Sir P. Home's report of this case is No. 12. p. 14170. voce SALE.

1683. February 20. Bonar against Lyon of Brigtoun.

No. 64.

Some acres of kirk-lands formerly disponed with absolute and real warrandice, being designed for a glebe, the party recurred upon his warrandice against the disponer.

For whom it was alleged: That this eviction happening by virtue of a public law, cannot fall under the warrandice, especially considering, that though his danger might have been foreseen, as arising from the nature of church-lands, yet the same is not expressly provided against in the clause of warrandice.

Answered for the pursuer: The clause of warrandice secures from all evictions, dangers, and inconveniencies; 2do, The present eviction doth not occur from any

supervenient law, but from the ancient laws of the kingdom, whereby church-lands are naturally liable to be designed for glebes.

No. 64.

The Lords decerned in the declarator of eviction.

Harcarse, No. 1014. p. 288.

** P. Falconer's report of this case is No. 50. p. 9099. voce Minor non Tenetur, &c.

1683. March.

MR. NATHANIEL FYFE against WHITE, DEACON of the SHOEMAKERS in PERTH.

No. 65.

No. 66.

One having, for onerous causes, assigned a sum contained in a bond, and disponed an apprising that had followed thereon, with absolute warrandice, and pursued the receiver for the sum agreed to be given for the disposition and assignation.

Alleged for the defender: That the apprising was not a profitable right, the worth of the lands apprised being exhausted by preferable rights and diligences.

Answered: The warrandice, though absolute, can import no more, save that debitum subest.

Replied: Though absolute warrandice in the transmission of nomina debitorum imports only debitum subesse, yet it operates a full security and responsableness of the debtor, when rights and diligences of lands are disponed.

The Lords sustained the reply.

Harcarse, No. 1015. p. 288.

1683. November:

WHITE against Mr. NATHANIEL FYFE.

The above cause being again called, and it appearing from the assignation produced, that the bond was principally disponed and assigned, and the apprising consequentially, and that the apprised lands were not disponed, and that the clause of warrandice, though in the terms of absolute, did not warrant the apprising in special, but only the assignation in general. The Lords found, that the warrandice did import only debitum subesse.

It was informed, That the defender got a great ease of the apprising. It may be debated, That though the apprising, which is but a diligence, had been principally disponed, the warrandice should import no more; though aliter if the lands be disponed principally, and all the diligences in consequentiam.

Harcarse, No. 1016. p. 288.