

1777. *July 2.* M'LEAN of DRUMNIN *against* The DUKE of ARGYLE.

IN the question betwixt M'Lean of Drumnin against the Duke of Argyle, it was objected to a sasine taken in the year 1702, that the witnesses signed only the last page, and that the number of pages were not mentioned in the docquet of the notary, the sasine consisting of several pages. The Lords repelled both objections.

See *Douglas of Douglas against Earl of Selkirk.*

M'LEAN *against* The DUKE of ARGYLE.

A BARONY, though consisting of lands, teinds, fishings, &c. is an *universitas*, and a sasine, by the symbols of earth and stone, will carry it, if taken at the place where so appointed. Dispensation, as to the separate symbols, follows the Union, and dispensation as to the place where probably the separate symbols could not be had.

M'LEAN *against* The DUKE of ARGYLE.

IN the process M'Lean against Duke of Argyle, it was objected to a sasine in the year 1679 in favour of the Earl of Argyle, That the charter contained a dispensation to take infestment at _____ or upon any part of the ground of the lands; whereas, in fact, the sasine was given not at one, but at different places: in a word, the dispensation was not made use of. The Lords disregarded the objection. It was further objected that the sasine was incorrect, as it mentioned that infestment had been given in certain of the lands upon the 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th days of November, without specifying the particular parcels in which infestment was given each day. The Lords also disregarded this objection.

SEQUESTRATION.

1776. *July 20.* JOHNSTON of LAIRDHOLM, Petitioner.

A SALE having been raised at the instance of an apparent heir, the heir peti-

tioned for a sequestration of the estate. The Lords refused *hoc statu* to sequester, in regard the summons of sale was not brought into Court. The *induciae* were not run. They did not, however, refuse the petition, but they superseded it for a fortnight ; before which time the *induciae* would be run.

1776. July 25.

BEVERIDGE, Petitioner.

A PERSON, failing in his circumstances, applied, 20th July 1776, for sequestration of his personal estate, on the late statute ; and, subsuming that he was apprehensive that his effects would be poided, prayed that any poiding might be stopped. The Lords sequestered, and prohibited any poiding ; or, if his effects were poided, prohibited the disposal of them till further orders of Court, 25th July 1776. They named a factor.

1776. August 3.

Certain CREDITORS of ———

PETITIONED for a sequestration of his estate in terms of the late Act of Parliament. They set forth that their debtor had fallen under the description of the Act, by allowing his effects to be poided ; and that, though at present the petitioners could not produce legal evidence of the poiding, yet they prayed for warrant to cite the debtor, to show cause why sequestration should not be awarded,—or at least craved a diligence against havers for recovering the documents or other sufficient evidence of the poiding. The Lords granted the last, before answer ; and superseded further procedure until the diligence should be reported : and this day, 3d August 1776, upon reporting a certificate of the poiding, the Lords granted the sequestration.

1776. July 25.

SEQUESTRATION OF PITTENCREIF.

This day, the Lords, upon the petition of the Creditors of George Chalmers, sequestered the lands and estate of Pittencreif, and other subjects belonging to him, under judicial sale ; and, at their desire, appointed Mr Chalmers himself to be factor thereon, with the usual powers.
