ADJUDICATION AND APPRISING.

1705. June 21.

The LADY INNERLEITH and Mr JAMES CATHCART, her Affignee, against Sir WIL-LIAM COCKBURN, and JOHN RENTON of Lamerton, and his Tenants.

IN an action of mails and duties, against John Renton of Lamerton, and his tenants, at the instance of the Lady Innerleith, as deriving right from the deceased Sir James Rochead, her husband, to an adjudication led upon bonds, granted to him by the Lairds of Langton and Cockburn, as principals, and Lamerton and the Lord Sinclair, as cautioners.

Alleged for the defenders: The adjudication is null, being led for more than was due; in fo far as the fum adjudged for, is accumulated at a term prior to the date of the adjudication; and the annualrents thereof, till that time, are a clear overcharge, and the fame thing upon the matter, as if the lands were decerned to belong to the adjudger, at a term preceding the adjudication.

Anfwered for the purfuer: If accumulating the fums, at a term preceding the date of an adjudication, were fuftained as a nullity, few adjudications in Scotland would be unquarrelable, and fafe from overturning; for nothing is more ordinary. But here annualrents are only decerned from the date of the adjudication; fo that the debtor has no prejudice; and the *pana plus petitionis*, which is the legal foundation of the objected nullity, cannot take place. Again, though the fum be accumulated at a preceding term, the lands are only adjudged from the date of the decreet; and the adjudication contains no legal affignation to mails and duties with a retrofpect.

THE LORDS found no nullity or ground of reftriction in the adjudication; for they made a diffinction betwixt adjudications accumulating at a preceding term, without decerning for annualrents from that term; and fuch as decern for annualrents from the date of the accumulation: Holding, that the first fort ought to be fustained, and the latter annulled or reftricted.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 8. Forbes, p. 7.

1707. March 25.

WILLIAM INNES, Writer to the Signet, against The EARL of BREADALBANE.

WILLIAM INNES, writer to the fignet, having purfued a declarator of expiration of the legal, of an adjudication, upon the effate of Breadalbane, to which he had right: It was objected for the Earl of Breadalbane, That the legal could not expire; because the adjudication was null; at least, could only fubfish as a fecurity for principal fum and annualrent, in the bond it was led upon, and for the neceffary charges :---In regard the annualrent and penalty were accumulated in a principal fum, at a term preceding the date of the adjudication, and made to bear

No 14. In a declarator of expiry of the legal; *Objected*, that the accumulation had been made at a term prior to the date of the adjudica-

No 13. A fum adjudged for, was accumulatedataterm, prior to the date of the adjudication. This no nulli- . ty; as the annualrent of the accumulated fum was decerned for, only from the date of the diligence

103

No 14. tion .- Found nottobea nullity; annualrent not being charged on the accumulated fum. This, therefore, left to the operation of the law, became due only from the date of the adjudication.

annualrent from that term ; whereas, annualrent of the accumulated fum, fhould only run from the date of the decreet, by virtue whereof it bears annualrent.

Anfwered for the purfuer: The decreet of adjudication is dated the 11th of March, and the annualrent and penalties are only accumulated at the Candlemas preceding, which is but a flort fpace; and it has been the cuftom, till of late, to accumulate at a term preceding the decreet. 2do, Though the fums are accumulated at the term of Candlemas, it doth not follow that the accumulated fum was to bear annualrent from that term; fince the decreet mentions not when the annualrent flould commence, nor decerns for any annualrents at all, but leaves them in indefinite terms to the regulation of law; which imports annualrent only from the date of the adjudication.

Replied for the defender: The fmallnefs of the interval betwixt the preceding term, and the date of the decreet, is not the question, but the legality and method of proceeding: And though, perhaps, feveral adjudications be led the fame way, that is but corruptela, non con/uetudo; and communis error non facit jus. And the accumulating of annualrents and penalties, from a term preceding the adjudication, was found fufficient to reftrict the adjudger, in the cafe betwixt the Children of Preston, against Mr Thomas Lermont; because, till the date of the adjudication, there was no warrant for the accumulation, and the exacting annualrent of annualrent without law, is usury. 2do, It is evident, from the decreet, That accumulating at a preceding term could be for no other end, than to make these accumulations bear annualrent.

Duplied for the purfuer: The accumulating at the preceding term, was for the adjudger's own fecurity, and to free him from the hazard of adjudging for more than was due; and from the trouble of counting broken terms, in which he might eafily err. As to the decifion in the cafe of the Creditors of Pretton, it does not meet; for there the fums were accumulated a confiderable time before the adjudication, and decerned to bear annualrent from the date of the accumulation, which cannot be pretended in this cafe. And it was decided in the cafes of the Lady Innerleith against the Laird of Cockburn; (No 13. b. t.) and of the Seamen of Prestonpans against Doctor Smelholm; That, where annualrents and penalties, accumulated at a term preceding the decreet of adjudication, are not decerned to bear annualrent from the date of the accumulation, that is no nullity or ground for restricting the decreet.

THE LORDS repelled the nullity, proponed against the adjudication, and found it no ground of restriction; for they thought, that fince the decreet mentioned not from what time the accumulated fum should bear annualment, the term of its commencement was left to the regulation of law; which imports annualment only from the date of the adjudication.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 8. Forbes, p. 161.