No 43.

made moveable; but jus fuit fundatum, and the superveniency accresces. So Stair, Instit. lib. 3. tit. 1. § 29. observes out of Hope, that an arrestment of the price of lands only verbally sold, from which there was locus penitentiæ (room to resile) was sustained, if a written agreement afterwards sollowed; and even so of arrestments eurrente termino.—The Lords sound the company not personally liable, but that the arrestment affected the subject tanquam nexus realis; and though they could decern in the furthcoming, yet they decerned in the declarator, that the share due to Crawford sell to Alison, his creditor, who had arrested it, and that the directors ought to transfer it over to him; and when the commissioners of the equivalent got the African money paid in to them, Alison had right to claim Crawford's share and proportion thereof.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 55. Fount. v. 2. p. 361.

1712. June 11.

ROBERTSON against ROBERTSON.

No 44. A tocher deftined by contract, to the Lady in liferent, and the heirs of the marriage in fee, found arrestable, as well principal as interest, during the marriage; but under burden of the liferent, if it fhould exift.

DUNCAN ROBERTSON, brother to Strowan, having married Mr William Robertfon of Inche's daughter, there is 6000 merks of tocher conditioned; but it is expressly destinate by the contract, to her in liferent, and the heirs of the marriage in fee. Dean of Guild Robertson in Perth being creditor to Duncan, the husband, in L. 900 or thereby, he arrests the tocher in Robertson of Inche's hands, and refers the debt to his oath; who compears, and depones that he was debtor by the contract; but it was by an express clause affected with his daughter's liferent: the husband was obliged to provide the like sum with the same destination; which he was fo far from doing, that he had deferted his wife and children, and gone abroad to be a foldier: And that these fixteen months bygone, he had alimented his daughter, and her bairns, and so was creditor in their aliment; and behoved to do fo ftill, the husband having left no stock to subsist them, and no probability of his return. This oath coming to be advised, with the contract of marriage produced, feveral questions occurred; as, 1mo, Whether a creditor of the husband's could legally affect the sum by arrestment, in prejudice of the specific destination in favours of the wife; especially where the prestations on the husband's part were not implemented, nor offered by the arrefter to be performed? For whom it was contended, That he was not concerned in these mutual prestations, but it was incumbent on Inches, the father, to have feen to their performance; and if he has neglected sibi imputet; neither do these clauses divest the husband of the fee, but he still retains the right and power of uplifting and dispo-Likeas it was an event very uncertain if the wife should ever come to her jointure by the husband's dying before her; and if that should not exist, then the creditor's arrestment was infallibly good. It was remembered by some of the LORDS, that, in a late case of the Earl of Bute's affignee to a tocher so qualified. it was found, that he had the jus exigendi, but upon caution to pay the annualrent to the wife, in case she outlived her husband. The 2d doubt was, what this

No 44.

arrestment affected? Whether only the bygone annualrents, and the current term in which it was laid on, or the fubfequent annualrents, during the standing of the marriage, which, jure mariti, were the husband's? It was acknowledged, in: rents of lands and other debts, where the flock was not arreftable, the arreftment only reached bygones and the current term; but here the principal fum was as capable of arrestment as the annualrent; and therefore the arrestment would affect the whole annualrents, stante matrimonio. The 3d difficulty arose from that part of the oath, bearing he had taken home his daughter and her children to his own house, and still must keep them, or else let them starve, and craved retention of the annualrent for their aliment, which refolved in a compensation. Against which it was alleged, That it was no way liquid, and fo not receivable boc loco. but behoved to be conflitute in a process where the alimenting and quantity must be proven.—The Lords found the principal fum of the tocher, as well arrestable as the annualrents, and behoved to be made forthcoming to the arrefter, as well as the interest, but always with the burden of the liferent in case it exist; and found, where the flock was arrestable as well as the interest, there the arrestment affected in time coming, as well as bygones; and fuftained the compensation as to the aliment already furnished; but that if he continued to entertain, the same behoved to be liquidate in a process of aliment, ere he could have retention in time coming; for, though jure natura, the husband and his means are bound to aliment the wife, which his creditors could not hinder, yet that required a cognition and legal trial, to determine the quota and time it lasts; and if he had not deferted, but flayed with his family, the tocher, though given ad sustinenda onera matrimonii, especially as to its annualrents, yet that could not stop creditors to affect it by legal diligence: but a third party, debtor in the tocher, having alimented them on the husband's failing to do the natural duty incumbent on him. it was thought but reasonable he should have retention of the annualrent, to reimburfe him of the aliment afforded to his daughter and grandchildren, the husband having deferted them, and run abroad to the army, because of his great debts. (See Huseand and Wife. See Mutual Contract.)

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 55. Fount. v. 2. p. 736.

1715. January 26:

CAPTAIN JOHN BRODIE against Mr Patrick Campbell of Munzie.

Captain Brodie having commenced a process against Lieutenant-Colonel Hay, of the Earl of Tullibarden's regiment; during the dependency, arrests in Munzie (who had been paymaster to the regiment while it stood) his hands, some arrears due to Hay; and after decreet obtained against the Lieutenant-Colonel, having insisted in a forthcoming against Munzie: The question came to be discuss, How far an arrestment in the hands of the paymaster could affect money belonging to the officers?

No 45.
The arrears of an officer's half-pay found to be arrestable; in the hands of the paymaster, who was held to be factor, not of