1796. December 7.

GAVIN HADDOW against Archigald Campbell and Company.

DANIEL MACINTOSH of Antigua, remitted to Allans and Gow of Glafgow, to whom he owed L. 38: 12s. a bill for L. 200 on Drummond and Company of London. The bill was inclosed in a letter, which mentioned that he meant foon to draw on them in favour of his other creditors.

The bill was received by Allans and Gow on the 2d January, and was payable on the 10th March 1794. On the 25th February 1794, after the bill had been accepted, an arreftment was used by Andrew Pitcairn in the hands of Allans and Gow, on a debt due by Macintosh, which was afterwards acquired by Gavin Haddow.

Macintosh, on the 30th January 1794, drew a bill on Allans and Gow, in favour of Archibald Campbell and Company, for L. 89: 158. payable thirty days after fight. This bill was protested for non-acceptance on the 12th April, and for non-payment on the 15th May 1794, before which time the bill on Drummond and Company was paid.

On the 9th December 1794, Gavin Haddow executed a fecond arreftment in his own name. He afterwards infifted in a process of furthcoming, which was conjoined with a multiple-poinding on the part of the arreftees.

Archibald Campbell and Company objected to the validity of the original arrefiment. Gavin Haddow in fupport of it,

Pleaded; An accepted bill is, in law, confidered not merely as a document of debt, but as equivalent to goods or money; and, accordingly, no extrinsic exception can be stated against payment of it. At the date of the arrestment, therefore. Allans and Gow were in the fame fituation as if they had held money belonging to Macintosh equal to the amount of the bill. Its acceptance by Drommond and Company laid them under the neceffity of paying it to Allans and Gow, who therefore became the fole creditors in it, fo much fo, that an arrefiment could not have been used by a creditor of Macintosh in the hands of the Drummonds; and the claim which Macintofh had against Allans and Gow from that period, was merely to account for the furplus, after payment of their own debt. They were his truftees quoad ultra; and it is a fettled point, that the intereft of the truffer may be attached by arreftment in the hands of the truffee. whatever be the nature of the truft effate, Erfk. B. 3. T. 6. § 5. and 6.; Kilk. v. Arreftment, No 8. 10. No 51. p. 715. and No 52. p. 721. of this Dictionary; 25th February 1780, Grierfon against Ramfay, No 84. p. 759.; 14th January 1770, Macleod against Crichton, Fac. Col. No 53. p. 94. voce VIRTUAL.

Nor does it make any difference that the term of payment had not arrived at the date of the arreftment. The acceptance of the bill had transferred the debt to Allans and Gow, and the eventual claim which Macintosh had against them could only be attached by arreftment.

No 87. A merchant abroad having remitted a bill to a company in Scotland, to whom he owed part of its amount. in a letter, which mentioned that he meant foon to draw on them, in favour of his other creditors; an arreftment, uled by one of them, in the hands of the confignee, before the bill was paid, but after it was accepted, was found to be incompetent.

ARRESTMENT.

No 87.

Answered, 1mo, A bill of exchange, notwithftanding its ftatutable privileges, is a mere nomen debiti. When Allans and Gow received the bill in queftion, they were creditors of Macintofh. The receipt of it made no alteration on their fituation, except giving them additional fecurity for payment; and it is incompetent to arreft a fecurity in the hands of a creditor of the common debtor; 22d June 1742, Carmichael againft Mofman, No 72. p. 740.; 5th March 1767 and 14th July 1768, Creditors of Thomfon and Tabor, No 81. p. 753. A creditor holding a fecurity is in a very different fituation from a truftee. He is neither liable in diligence, nor can he be forced to denude; and had Drummond and Company been fubject to the jurifdiction of the Court, an arreftment would have been competent in their hands. While, therefore, the arreftment by Haddow is ineffectual, the draught in favour of the refpondents, with the proteft taken on it, after Allans and Gow had received payment of the bill, muft be confidered as a completed affignation to the fund *in medio*, to the extent of the debt.

2do, As the bill was deposited with Allans and Gow, for the purpose of enabling Macintosh to draw on them in favour of his other creditors, the bill granted to the respondents, and which was prior in date to the arrestment, is to be confidered as an affignation intimated before the former was executed; Erskine, b. 3. tit. 6. § 7. 23d January 1756, Souper against Creditors of Smith, No 76. p. 744. 9th February 1759, Stalker against Aiton, No 77. p. 745.

THE LORD ORDINARY, 'in refpect the fund in medio was a nomen debiti, and ' that the arreftment fhould have been laid in the hands of the debtor, found the ' arreftment at Andrew Pitcairn's inftance, when the arreftee was only in poffeffion ' of the inftruction of debt, was inept, and therefore preferred Archibald Camp-' bell and Company to the fund in medio, upon the intereft produced for them.'

On advifing a petition and answers, the competency of an arrestment by Macintosh's creditors in the hands of Drummond and Company, was doubted, the *jus exigendi* being invested in Allans and Gow; and it was stated, that the decisions of the Court had gone to establish the competency of an arrestment, in all cases of vested rights, where an adjudication could not be led.

But, on the other hand, it was observed, The fund *in medio*, at the date of Pitcairn's arreftment, might have been competently arrefted by the creditors of Macintofh, in the hands of Drummond and Company, had they refided in Scotland, though the arreftment fo used would have been defeasible by an onerous indorfation. A bill of exchange cannot be attached by arreftment as a *corpus* more than a bond or other obligation, in the hands of a truftee, before he has received payment of it. The terms of the letter inclosing the bill do not affect the question, as it did not specify in whose favour the draughts were afterwards to be granted.

THE LORDS adhered. (See BILL of EXCHANGE.)

Lord Ordinary, Justice-Clerk Braxfield. Alt. Cranston. For Haddow, Dav. Williamson. Clerk, Gordon. Fac. Col. No 6. p. 15.

Douglas.