BANKRUPT.

Creditors, that ' the Lords were unanimoufly of opinion in Barclay's cafe, upon ' the general point, that it being an ufelefs diligence ought to be flopped; and ' that though adjudication paffed, it was purely upon account of this fpecialty: ' That Bell was a creditor of Robert M'Lellan's, who had difponed his effate to ' Samuel (Barclay) with the burden of his debts; and Samuel being bankrupt, ' difponed that effate to his creditors, without faving the preference of Robert's ' creditors, and brought them in only with his own, and obliged them all to fub-' mit to arbiters of his chufing. Mr Bell being a creditor of Robert's, and hav-' ing ufed inhibition, was preferable to the creditors of Samuel, whofe very right ' was burdened with Robert's debts. It was purely on that account that the ad-' judication was allowed to pafs. The difpofition by Samuel was reducible, at ' Bell's inftance, as cutting off his certain preference. Had it not been for this ' *specialty*, the Lords were unanimoufly inclined to refufe the adjudication.' In the anfwers for Cheyne, it is faid, ' The fpecialties mentioned in the peti-

In the allivers for Cheyne, it is laid, "The ipecialities mentioned in the petition are nothing to the purpole; for albeit Bell, who craved the adjudication, was a creditor of Robert M'Clellan's, who had difponed his effate to Samuel (Barclay) with the burden of his debts; and that Samuel being bankrupt, conveyed the effate to his creditors, without giving a particular preference to Robert's creditors; yet ftill it was open to Robert's creditors, in the ranking before the arbiters, to claim their preference upon their rights, as much as it was competent, to any other creditor, to claim his preference according to the nature of his right and diligence; fo that here there was no iniquitous condition imposed upon the creditors of Robert, more than what arose from the general nature of the thing, and the law of the land, in denying a perfon access to a diligence authorifed by public law, in which he confided more than in the deed of a bankrupt, which may be subject to many objections, besides that found on the act 1696.'

> See The Session Papers for 1729, in the case of Cheyne against Creditors of Merchieston, in Advocates' Library.

1729. January.

MR JAMES CHEYNE against The TRUSTEES of MERCHIESTON'S CREDITORS.

No 240. The Lords refused to ftop an adjudication, purfued by a creditor chuing to take feparate meafures, in oppolition to a difpolition omnium bonorum, to truftees for the whole creditors.

A BANKRUPT having granted a difposition omnium bonorum to his creditors, for their fecurity and payment, one of them not fatisfied with the common fate, infifted in an adjudication against the bankrupt; which was strenuously opposed by the others, forefeeing this adjudication would be used as a foundation for pushing on a fale of the debtor's estate, which would heap a multitude of expences upon them, and tend, in general, to render of no effect, the method that has been of late fallen upon of granting dispositions omnium bonorum: They pleaded, that this was an invidious diligence, and, in all events, their disposition must be preferable; whereby it will be impossible for him to make more by the adjudication than he

1204

BANKRUPT.

Fol. Dic v. 1. p. 85. Session Papers in Advocate's Library.

1729. July. FARQUHARSON against Creditors of Cumming.

MR ALEXANDER FARQUHARSON, writer to the fignet, held in truft, for others, various debts due by George Cumming, Vintner in Edinburgh. He executed a horning against Cumming, and thereupon used arrestments in the hands of Douglas.

Douglas purfued a multiple-poinding, and condescended, that he held the price of goods which had belonged to Cumming, and had been fold by public roup, by truftees to whom Cumming had difponed his whole effects for behoof of his creditors.

The difposition to the trustees was intimated before Farquharson's arrestment; but his horning was executed a day before the date of the disposition.

THE LORD ORDINARY had ' preferred the truftees.'

Pleaded for Farquharfon, in a reclaiming petition :—The difposition in favour of trustees was fraudulent, as being obtained without an onerous cause, and granted in security of antecedent debts, in prejudice of prior diligence. It tended to give a partial preference. If such dispositions were allowed, diligence would no longer be of any avail. The recent decisions tending to support dispositions omnium bonorum, had respect to the act 1696, which annulled only dispositions granted by one creditor in preference of other creditors: But this case depended on the act 1621, which provides, That the creditor using the first lawful diligence by horning, shall be preferred to voluntary rights granted by the bankrupt.

Answered for the truftees :--The fcope of the flatute 1621, and that of 1696, was the fame. No more was intended than to difappoint partial preferences, by voluntary deeds, to fome creditors in prejudice of others. But rights, equal and impartial, in favour of all the creditors, were not meant to be prevented. The petitioner can have no benefit from his diligence, as a charge of horning can, of itfelf, attach no particular fubject. There is no iniquity in a debtor doing what is to benefit, and fave expence to his whole creditors. Diligence ought never to be ufed, but as an extraordinary remedy : Here it is unneceffary, and would be vexatious. The debtor has voluntarily done what diligence would have effected.

An arreftment, prior to the disposition, might perhaps have frustrated it as to moveables, or an inhibition as to real rights; but a fimple charge of horning can have no fuch strong effect.

A difposition by a bankrupt to truftees for his whole creditors, was fuftained, notwithstanding of a prior charge of horning, and the truftees preferred to the charger.

No 241.

No 240.

1205

702