

The Lords adhered, but explained the last point of the interlocutor thus, viz. that Mrs Falconer's adjudication in implement against Sir Robert Sibbald's heirs, and infestment thereon, give her no preference to her husband's other creditors.—27th June 1734.

No. 2. 1735, Feb. 13. AITKEN *against* BALLANTINE.

THE Lords found Ballantine's adjudication void and null *in toto*.  
(The Editor has not been able to discover the particular cause of the fate of this adjudication.)

No. 3. 1735, Feb. 21. SUTHERLAND *against* DUFF.

THE Lords refused to add to the adjudication either the L.50 sterling decerned in the suspension and reduction, or the expense of the adjudication.

No. 4. 1735, June 11. MONTEITH *against* HOGG.

AN extracted decret of adjudication, which was L.20 too much in the calculation, having been recorded *privata auctoritate* even after the abbreviate, which was also recorded, the Lords found the adjudication void and null, and would not sustain it as a security for principal and annualrents in competition with the other creditors.

No. 5. 1735, June 26. WATSON *against* MR JAMES BAILLIE.

THE Lords found that the creditor behoved to prove the rental and value, but that he might possess the hail subjects adjudged, and could not be restricted to his annualrents.—N. B. Both parties seemed much to mistake the act 1672; for these special adjudications are just of the nature of a voluntary sale under an equity of redemption for five years, but the creditor has no power of requisition.

No. 6. 1736, Jan. 16. HORSEBURGH, &c. *against* HOPE.

THE Lords seemed to have no difficulty to restrict the creditors to possess for their current annualrents, had there not been so many bygone annualrents, which could not remain as a dead stock, and therefore remitted to the Ordinary to enquire into the matter.

No. 7. 1736, Jan. 28. CREDITORS of FALAHILL, *Competing*.

THE Lords adhered, but added the reason, because the other creditors did not insist to have the adjudication annulled, but only that they should be brought in *pari passu*. Otherwise I and many others thought it would have been very dangerous to make it an arbitrary question, whether adjudgers should be preferred *pari passu* or not? and that if it had not been the creditors' concession, the adjudication must either have been found totally void and null, or otherwise it must have the preference the act of Parliament gave it.

No. 8. 1736, Dec. 7. RAMSAY of Williecleugh *against* BROWNLIE.

THE Lords unanimously found, that the extension of the legal reversion in the act 1661, whether the extension from seven to ten years, or the extension of legals run be-

fore the date of the act, but after 1652 to the year 1664, did not run against minors;— only the Ordinary seemed to doubt. But they demurred greatly as to the other points, viz. Whether the bygone rents or annualrents of the apprising before the appriser's death, divide between his heir and executor, or if the whole went to the heir? 2do, If they divide, Whether the apprising could be declared satisfied even against the heir unless the bygoners were also paid to the executor? They therefore remitted to the Ordinary to hear parties further to the end they might search into precedents; when poor Lord Newhall, Reporter, before he left the table, was seized with a fit of sickness, whereof he died the 14th.

No. 9. 1737, June 30. *WATSON against MR JAMES BAILLIE.*

THE Lords found this special adjudication only redeemable on payment of principal, annualrents, and one-fifth part more; though several of us had great difficulty upon the words of the act 1672; and indeed we rather inclined to think, that by these words there could be no accumulation in the adjudication of a fifth part more; but what determined us was the act of sederunt 26th February 1684, determining the meaning of that clause in the act.

No. 10. 1737, July 15. *AITCHISON'S ASSIGNEES against DRUMMOND.*

THE Lords were clear that the contract 1675 was good against Brown and Miln, the onerous singular successors; also that it is not prescribed. They likewise agreed that Stewart's intromissions, (though he was one of James Pollock's successors) yet having right only to the half of the adjudication, could only be imputed to that half, and that the case had been the same though he had intromitted as pro-tutor to his sister-in-law, afterwards Aitchison's wife, unless he had truly been her tutor. They found also that Miln and Brown's own intromissions must impute to Pollock's adjudication, and not to Pott's apprising, not only because as early as 1724, Sir Gilbert Elliot and Baird's rights to Pott's apprising, were preferred to Aitchison's; but likewise because the contract 1675 was effectual against them. But the greatest difficulty was, Whether Aitchison's oath was competent against them, the onerous assignees of William Murray, since his right from Aitchison bore to be love and favour. The Lords demurred upon this point, and delayed giving any interlocutor till next day, when they generally inclined to find it not competent on that ground; but then they found the subject had been litigious before Brown and Miln's purchase; upon that ground they found Aitchison's oath competent; and though at first I thought it competent on the other ground, yet when I considered the first decision, finding a cedent's oath competent against a gratuitous assignee, which Stair observes in 1665, I doubted whether the reasons of that decision would extend to an onerous purchaser from that gratuitous assignee.—15th July the Lords adhered, but remitted the point of collusion.—June 23-4, 1737.

No. 11. 1737, July 22. *MR FREEBAIRN against BLAIR and NAIRN.*

THE Lords repelled the defence, and adjudged the office of printer. They would not give their interlocutor that the subject was adjudgable, since the Crown, which had