SECT. IV.

Gift of Recognition.

1635. November 27.

BLACK against PITMAIN.

No 12.

A GIFT or recognition without declarator, although the donatar of recognition obtain possession, cannot take away a feu infeftment, whereof the feuar was in possession.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 229. Auchinleck, MS. p. 180.

No 13.

1699. November 24. BALMERINO against Town of Edinburgh.

THE master of Balmerino, as baron of Restalrig, pursues a reduction and improbation against the Town of Edinburgh, of their right to the mills on the Water of Leith. Alleged, The active title is not valid to force a production, being only a charter and sasine flowing upon a gift of recognition from the King, and the gift never yet declared. Answered, No necessity of a declarator, because he was in peaceable possession. 2do, It contained a novodamus. Replied, If the recognition should be found not incurred, the novodamus would fall in consequence; and one might as well pursue a special declarator of escheat without first obtaining a general. The Lords refused to sustain process on this title.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 229. Fountainhall, v. 2. p. 69.

SECT. V.

Divorce.—Failzie.—Redemption.—Extinction by Intromission.—Gift of Forfeiture.

1579. February 6. LADY RESTAURIG against THE LAIRD.

No 14.
Aftersentence of divorce pronounced propter culpam mariti the wife may immediately enter to the pos-

The Lady Restalrig wairnit the laird of Restalrig, some time her husband, she being divorced fra him ex culpa viri, to flit and remove fra certain lands. The laird answerit, that albeit he was divorced, yet there was no declarator given, wherefor he should not bruik the lands that she was in; and of the practick that had passed before, ay after the sentence of divorsement pronounced and