No 8.
party to fome
of his creditors, though
it was urged
by other creditors purfuers, that he
was bankrupt
at the time.

all his effects and effate could pay. 2do, He was then lunking and concealing fome of his moveables. 3tio, He was treating with his creditors, offering them a disposition omnium bonorum, upon their granting him a personal protection. Several creditors had proceeded to diligence by charging, inhibiting, and arresting.—Answered to the first, Fama is not nomen juris, but oft a great liar. 2do, A rigid creditor may force a very responsal person to abscond for a time, and yet not be bankrupt. To the third, The defenders knew nothing of any fuch treaty, and so were in bona fide to take and infestment from him. To the fourth, The creditors who had done diligence, may, on the last clause of the act of Parliament 1621, quarrel the defenders rights, but that cannot operate for the rest of the ereditors who had done none; yea, in 1627, Scougal contra Binny, No 1. p. 870. the Lords preferred an affignee by a bankrupt who had timeoufly intimate his right, and that before his other creditors. THE LORDS having weighed this condescendence, found the articles did not amount to what was alleged in Sir Thomas Moncrieff's case against Lanton;\* and though there was a standard set now for knowing bankrupts, after which they could do no voluntary deed to the prejudice of the rest of their creditors, yet that only took place pro futuro, and could not regulate this case; and therefore affoilzied Newbyth and Calander from the reduction. And as to Sir Francis Kinloch, the Lords found the transaction made by Alexander Chaplain, his agent, about lending the creditors his caption. could not oblige him, unless it was done by his order and mandate: But if Sir Francis was in the possession of these house rents, and yet dismissed the tenant after he was in the messenger's hands, he must be liable to compt for his rent, as if he had received it; because by a fact and deed of his it comes to be loft, and he debarred the other creditors from those house mails by his prior right, and so was liable in diligence; and it is more reasonable it should perish to him and not to them.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 66. Fountainball, v. 1. p. 736.

1698. July 13.

SIR THOMAS MONCRIEFF against George Lockhart of Carnwath, and other Creditors of Cockburn of Lanton.

No 9.
An eldent fon in fee of an estate, granted a bond of corroboration to sown and his father's creditors. In a reduction it was found, that although oberatus and insolvent, as

In the debate betwixt Sir Thomas Moncrieff, and George Lockhart of Carnwath, and other creditors of Cockburn of Lanton; Sir Thomas feeking to reduce an heritable bond of corroboration granted by young Lanton, to fundry of his own and father's creditors, in regard he could not instruct him notour bankrupt at the time, he having neither retired to the Abbey, nor being under diligence, he recurred to this ground, that he was then materially bankrupt, in so far as he was insolvent and oberatus above the value of his estate; after which he could do no deed in prejudice of his creditors.—Answered, This fell under no part of the act of Parliament 1621, for it was not a gratuitous deed in favours of a consident

person, nor was it in prejudice of creditors their anterior diligence against him: and fo being against no law, his disponing cannot be quarrelled, and consequently the right and conveyance he made to Sir Thomas stands good, though it was gratuitous quoad young Lanton, who got nothing for it. Sir George M'Kenzie, in his Observes on that act of Parliament 1621, thinks a gratuitous disposition granted by an infolvent person, falls under that act; and Stair, in his Institutions, p. 81.\* declares such dispositions quarrelable.—Yet the Lords, by plurality, (fundry differting) found Sir Thomas not being a confident person to Lanton, that the disposition and right he received from him could not be reduced on the head of mere infolvency, where he was not under diligence nor had retired; nor had the other marks now contained in the flandard made for bankrupts by the late act of Parliament. (Vide infra Div. 2. Sect. 5. inter eosdem.)

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 66. Fountainhall, v. 2. p. 11.

June 25. ALEXANDER CORSAN against Campbell of Shawfield. 1751.

Sir Thomson Gordon of Earliton disponed his estate to his son Thomas Gordon, under the burden of debts contained in a lift, in which the purfuer's in this case was not insert.

Sir Thomas and Thomas Gordon disponed the estate to Daniel Campbell of Shawfield, whose daughter Mr Gordon had married; on this narrative, 'That " they were owing certain great debts to different persons their creditors; and

- ' that he, for payment of the faid debts, had advanced and paid to the faid
- ' Thomas Gordon a certain fum of money, as the agreed price of the lands and

' estate; whereof Thomas Gordon granted the receipt.'

A contract had been drawn up, purporting, That Sir Thomas and his fon should dispone the estate; that Shawfield should therefore pay to the creditors ten shillings in the pound; and that they should accept thereof; providing, that if any of them should not subscribe, the subscribers should be free: But this was not figned by Sir Thomas, nor by many of the creditors.

Shawfield paid to most of the creditors this composition; and had their debts made over to kim.

Alexander Corfan merchant in Hamilton, who had been cautioner for Sir Thomas for 1000 merks Scots, and creditor by bond for L. 60 Sterling, infifted in a reduction of both dispositions.

Pleaded for the pursuer, The disposition by Sir Thomas to his son is reducible, in fo far as the value of the effate exceeded the fum of the debts undertaken by him: And the disposition to Shawfield is reducible, as, contrary to the narrative thereof, he paid no money for the fame: And the purfuer is not concerned with any alleged concert of paying to the creditors ten shillings in the pound, as he was no party to any fuch concert, nor figned the contract: The purfuer is not concerned to plead against the disposition's being sustained to Shawfield, for the

No o. he was not bankrupt in terms of the act 1696, and the perfons favoured were not confident, the bond was good.

No 10. A debtor fold his estate at an agreed price. The disponee, inflead of advancing the fum, became bound to pay sos. per pound to the granter's creditors. The fale reduced upon the statute 1621. at the instance of a creditor not acceding; referving the disponee's claim for what he had actually paid to any credi-