

the king, by a letter, discharged further procedure. The reduction being insisted in in the winter session 1691, the Lords opposed the decret upon this nullity, That it was not exactly conform to the interlocutor and warrant thereof; and the foresaid grounds of reduction and answers being resumed, and the probation taken upon the act before answer advised, the Lords reduced the decret and the bonds, and repelled the allegiance of transaction and homologation.—13th January 1692.

The Earl of Aberdeen conceiving himself injured by the sentence, he appealed to the Parliament; *February* 1692.—*Vide* No. 557, [*Gray* against *Lauderdale*, *February* 1685;] 578, [*Crichtie* against *Lauderdale*, 22d *February* 1688.]

*Page* 154, No. 556.

1692. *February*. ROLLO of WOODSIDE *against* The CREDITORS of COCKBURN of LANGTOUN.

FOUND, in Rollo of Woodside's case, That his infestment of property, in security, could not be clothed by Langtoun the debtor's paying annualrent, but only by payment made by the tenants, possessors of the lands infest, in or by a decret, or a depending process against them; *February* 3, 1692. Thereafter,—upon a bill given in, representing a distinction between wadsets and infestments for security, which, like infestments of annualrent, may be clothed by any payments,—2. That Langtoun was in the natural possession of the lands the time of the payment; and, therefore, payment by him was equivalent as if it had been made by tenants. The Lords found the last representation in the bill relevant.—*February* 1692.

*Page* 172, No. 627.