## ADJUDICATION AND APPRISING.

## (FORMALITIES OF the DILIGENCE.)

No 9.

perfon, and

the heirs of his body, whom

failing, to his fifter. An ad-

judication led

by her, without a fervice

to alcertain

that her brother had left

no heirs of his body, is re-

No 10.

fricted.

A bond is granted to a

rating it to be produced, and fo a complete diligence by itfelf; and the purfuer is not obliged, *post tantum temporis*, to produce the letters of special charge.

THE LORDS fuftained the nullity, in fo far as to void the adjudication as to the accumulations and expiry of the legal, referving to be heard, whether it is void in toto.

Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 7. C. Home, No 174. p. 290.

MAXWELL against MAXWELL. 1743. February 4.

MAXWELL of Friarscarfe, granted bond to Stephen Irvine, and the heirs of his body; whom failing, to Margaret, his eldeft fifter. She, upon the death of her brother, affigned the bond to one Bentruck; Bentruck conveyed it to Maxwell of Barncleuch, fon to the faid Margaret. Maxwell of Barncleuch, led an adjudication upon this bond, against the lands of Friarscarfe. It was objected, in an after question concerning the rights of these lands, that the adjudication was null, 1mo, because it bore date 21st January 1693, and yet interest was accumulated at Candlemas 1693; 2do, That no fervice appeared of Margaret to her brother to afcertain the tailure of iffue of his body.

THE LORDS reftricted the adjudication to a fecurity for principal, intereft, and neceffary expences.

Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 8. from MS.

## 1751. December 10. Sir THOMAS MAXWELL against JAMES PATERSON.

JAMES PATERSON of Whitefide, purfued Alexander Murray of Drumstenchall, for two bonds granted by his predeceffor, for which he obtained decreet before the flewart of Kirkcudbright; and charged him to enter heir in fpecial, narrating in the letters the bonds, but omitting to mention the decreet : And afterwards led an adjudication, founding on the decreet and fpecial charge.

Objected for Sir Thomas Maxwell of Orchardtoun, a postponed adjudger, the adjudication is null; the fpecial charge, which was the ground of it, proceeding only on the bonds, and not on the decreet, whereby the defender became liable therein : It is not enough a perfon have in him proper titles to fupport his diligence, if he do not found it upon them.

The Lord Ordinary, 26th November, 'Having confidered the objection, together, with the letters of fpecial charge objected against, and the decreet of constitution ; repelled the objection, that the faid decreet of conflitution was not narrated in the letters of fpecial charge, in refpect that the fame was obtained prior to the date of the faid letters.

And the LORDS refufed a bill, and adhered.

Pet. A. Pringle.

Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 7. D. Falconer, v. 2. No 246. p. 301.

A party obtained decree for two bonds. In a fpecial charge, he narrated the bonds, and not the decree. Adjudication notwithftanding fuftained; the decree having been prior to the charge.

176