ARRESTMENT.

1733. January. M'INTOSH against FARQUHARSON of Achreachin.

A first arrester, who forbore to proceed in diligence, because he obtained from the common debtor affignation to the debt arrested, was not excluded upon the pretence of *mora*, but preferred to a posterior arrester who had done exact diligence. See No 159. p. 812.

1738. November 8. Laird of Dundas against Anthony Murray.

WHERE the executions of different arreftments are on the fame day, and at the diffance of little time, it is usual to bring them in *pari passu*, and not to allow a proof by witneffes to determine the priority. Yet, where any flrong circumflance is expressed in the executions that may be a clear mark to the witneffes, such proof may be allowed.

Thus, where two executions were on the fame day in the month of December, one whereof bore to have been at three o'clock afternoon, which was fuch a time of the day as must have been in full light, and the other to have been at five o'clock, which was fuch a time as day-light must have been gone, a proof, before answer, was granted.

Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 45. Kilkerran, (ARRESTMENT.) No 2. p. 36.

1772. February 28. JEAN CAMERON against THOMAS BOSWELL.

THESE parties being feverally creditors to Nifbet, used arrefiments on the fame day, viz. 20th February 1771; Mifs Cameron in the hands of Alexander Hart fingly, and Mr Bofwell in the hands of Hart, and of feveral other perfons as debtors to Nifbet.

Hart brought a multiple poinding, wherein Miß Cameron claimed a preferenceupon her execution of arreftment, which bore, that it was laid on between the hours of fix and feven, whereas the execution of her competitor's arreftment bore, that all the arreftments at his inflance were laid on between the hours of feven and eight afternoon.

Mr Bofwell, on the other hand, contended for a pari passu preference; for, that there was not a fufficient interval between the two arreftments to alcertain the priority of Mifs Cameron's.

THE LORD ORDINARY at first preferred Miss Cameron, but afterwards gave this interlocutor: 'December 11. 1771. Finds that there is not a fufficient diffance of time mentioned in the executions of arrestments, for showing, with precision.

No 1745 In a competition betwixt two arreftments ufed on the fame day, one execution bearing, that the arreftment was laid. on | etween the hours of fix and feven 2. the other exccution, that the arreftment was laid on between the hours of feven and eight afternoon; the priority found i fufficiently afcertained to decide the preference.

No 173. A proof by witneffes of the hour of arrefting allowed, where fome clear mark of difmark of diftinction is condefcended:

on.

No 172.

821

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 61.