1748. July 14. M'Vicar against Cochran and Ker.

No. 97.
A superior cannot pursue both for payment of by-gone feu-duties, and a declarator of irritancy ob non solutum canonem, but must be content with the one or the other.

Fol. Dic. v. 4. p. 316. Kilkerran, No. 7. p. 531.
** D. Falconer's report of this case is No. 9. p. 4180. voce Feu.

## SECT. XXIII.

Act anent Annexations of Crown Property.-Grant from the Crown of the Casualities on the Estates of its Vassals.
1665. February 22. Marquis of Huntty against Gordon of Lesmort.

In a process at the Marquis of Huntly's instance, as donatar to the forefaulture of the Marquis of Argyle against the Laird of Lessmore, for removing from certain lands disponed to him by Argyle, and which lands were old wadsets of the Marquis of Huntly's estate ; the Loords decerned in the removing against Lessmore, because the wadsets were not confirmed by the King before Argyle's forefaulture.

Nerwbyth MS. p. 27.
** Stair reports this case:
The Marquis of Huntly, as donatar to the forefaulture of the Marquis of Argyle, as to the estate of Huntly, obtained decreet of Parliament against Gordon of Lesmore, for payment of the mails and duties of certain lands, and for removing therefrom. He suspends, on these reasons, $1 s t$, That the decreet was null, not proceeding upon lawful citation, but far fewer days than are appointed by law, and that he was absent, and now alleges, that his right to the lands in question was by excambion with the Marquis of Argyle, for larids holden of the Marquis of Huntly, which he had possessed thirty or forty years before, and therefore, if the pursuer were dispossessed of the lands in question, he behoved to possess him in other lands; $2 d l y$, The decreet is null, as not proceeding upon trial of an inquest, cognoscing the Marquis of Argyle heritable possessor five years before, conform to the act of Parliament; nor could that be cognosced, because the defender himself was heritable possessor these years; $3 d l y$, The defender's right from the

