thereof, more than the registers, or the protocals brought into the clerk-register.—It was replied, That other instruments of importance were never extended further than to real rights of land or annualrent.

ere not

THE LORDS found, That inftruments of intimations of affignations were not accustomed to be insert in protocals; and therefore found notaries not obliged to bring in their protocals to give private parties inspection; but ordained the defender to depone, whether these instruments were insert in his protocal, and to produce what he acknowledged upon oath. See Public Officer.

Stair, v. 2. p. 826.

1696. June 17.

LAWRIE against HAY.

THE LORDS decided the competition between Thomas Lawrie and Doctor Hay, two affignees, to one fum. Sir David Hay had perfected his by his first intimation. Thomas objected feveral nullities and informalities against it; such as, that it differed from the affignation in the fum, the one making it L. 2082, and the other L. 2000. 2do, That it made no mention of the cedent, nor of the date of the affignation, nor of the causa debendi, whether by decreet or bond, and only related to the letters of supplement in general; so it might be applicable to any other right as well as this; not being wrote on the back of the affignation, but on a paper apart. Answered, Law had introduced no effential requifite folemnities to an intimation, (as it had done to instruments of sasine) but any certification, putting the debtor in mala fide, is fufficient; and though the act of Parliament 1672, required the execution of all summonses to express the names both of purfuer and defender, and not generally to refer to the fummons, under the pain of nullity; yet that being a correctory law, could not be extended beyond its own case; and there was neither law nor practice, obliging them to write the intimation on the back of the aflignation or letters of supplement, or declaring any fuch intimations, contained in a feparate paper, null; and here copies were affixed at the market-crofs, and intimation personally made to the Lord Napier, debtor, his curators and factors, which were more than fufficient to fupply the defects of this intimation, if any were.—The Lords found, whatever this intimation might operate against the common debtor, yet now in a competition with a co-creditor, co-aflignee for onerous causes, it was too general and uncertain, feeing it might ferve for intimation of another debt of the like fum, as well They preferred Thomas Lawrie to the fum in question.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 63. Fountainball, v. 1. p. 721.

No 49. In a competition, an intimation on a paper apart, not being fo fpecific, as necessarily to have reference to a certain affignation and no other, was postponed to one more particular.

No 48.