1685. March 13. Mr. Alexander Ferguson against Robert Ferguson.

No. 67. Where eviction is imminent.

The case of Mr. Alexander Ferguson of Isle against Robert Ferguson of Hallhill, his uncle, was debated and advised: Hallhill by his bond is obliged to pay Isle the annual-rent of 2,000 merks, so long as he shall bruik the peaceable possession of these lands of Halhill; and he being pursued therefore, alleged, The condition of the bond had failed, for John Bannatine having a prior inhibition, raised a reduction, and obtained a decreet. Answered, This decreet was no sufficient eviction nor distress, because it was only a decreet of certification for not producing his writs, which he should not have suffered to pass; 2do, He had gotten a ratification from the reducer, which must accresce. Replied, A certification was all one in this case, because, though he had produced his writs, he would certainly have succumbed; 2do, Though the ratification bore gratis, yet he offered to prove it stood him 700 merks. The Lords, after a hearing in presence, found that decreet of certification was no sufficient distress, but that he should have defended, seeing there might be nullities in the execution of the inhibition; and there was probable ground to think the inhibition was paid, by his transacting with others, whose rights he had reduced.

Fountainhall, v. 1. p. 352.

1686. January.

MAJOR BUNTIN and DRUMMELZIER against MURRAY of Stanhope.

No. 68.

The casualty of marriage never understood to be warranted against; and therefore a feu vassal, whose right was after the act 16th Parl. 1633, being poinded for the avail of his superior's marriage, was found entitled to no relief.

Harcarse.

** This case is No. 16. p. 7763. voce Jus Superveniens, &c.

1687. January 18.

Smith against Ross.

No. 69. Double alienation. See No. 51. p. 16596.

David Ross of Balnagoun being pursued by Patrick Smith of Braco, on the warrandice of his father's disposition; and the process having slept thirteen years, and a wakening being now raised, the clerk-register, to whose behoof it was, got it to be summarily called without its being seen or inrolled in communi forma; whereon Balnagown gave in a bill, representing this was contrary to the regulations, whereby the clerks are discharged to write upon any such process, &c.