ADJUDICATION AND APPRISING.

1623. December 13. L. LEY against STUART.

IN an action, L. Ley againft Alexander Stuart and Forfyth of Dykes, the LORDS fuffained a comprifing, which was quarrelled, and alleged to be null; becaufe it bore not, that the officer fearched and fought for the moveable goods pertaining to the party, whofe lands were comprifed, at his dwelling place; and, that the fearching upon the ground of the lands comprifed, was not enough, except that execution had been alfo ufed at the dwelling place of the party, as faid is, albeit he dwelt off the ground of the lands comprifed :—Which allegeance was repelled; for the LORDS found it not neceffary to feek at the dwelling place; which was not upon the ground of the lands comprifed, but diftant therefrom. This was proponed as an objection againft the comprifing, and not ufed in an action of reduction intented upon that ground.

Act. Hope and Mowat. Alt. Nicolfon younger. Clerk, Scot.

Nota.—A fentence of comprising will not have all the executions and the acts of the procefs, *fpecifice*, infert in the fentence; as they were executed and done punctually in all circumstances; but only will make a compendious relation thereof: As, for example, the fame will not make mention, if the party was fummoned perforally, or at his dwelling place, but only that the officer cited him lawfully; and therefore comprifings, when they are questioned by reductions, the whole procefs and executions, and warrants thereof, are called to be produced, which will largely purport the manner and form of all the particular proceedings therein.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 5. Durie, p. 92.

No 5.

1624.

January 29.

A previous fearch for moveables is unneceffary incomprifungs of fuperiorities.— It is not fufficient to fearch at the principal place of diverfe lands, although unnited into a barony. In an action, Hop-Pringle againft Mark Ker and L. Borthwick, the LORDS found, That where fuperiority of lands are comprifed from the fuperior, there is no neceffity to use any execution of fearching and feeking; but that these comprisings fhall be fustained, although that execution be not used; feeing it is not probable, that the fuperior could have any goods upon that land, whereof he was naked fuperior only, and whereof the property pertained to another; and also they found, That in all other comprisings of the property of lands, where diverse lands were comprised, notwithstanding that the diverse lands were valued in one barony or tennandry; yet, that the execution of fearching of the moveable goods, should be used upon the ground of every land, denounced to be comprised; and that, where the forefaid union was, it was not fufficient, to fearch at the principal place, and upon the ground of that land, to the which the

HOP-PRINGLE against KER.

No 4.

An apprifing was fuftained,

though no

fearch for moveables

was made at the dwelling

houfe, which

was diftant from the

lands.

ADJUDICATION AND APPRISING.

reft of the lands comprised, were united, and where the fasine was appointed to be taken; but that the fearching should be at all the lands, otherways the comprising to be null.

> Act. Hope. Alt. Nicolfon and Oliphant. Gibson, Clerk. Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 5. Durie, p. 103.

1624. July Moncrieff against Tenants of Lawes.

IN an action between Mr Archibald Moncrieff, and the tenants of Lawes, in Rofs, the LORDS fuftamed the comprising, albeit there was no fearching and feeking of moveables, at the dwelling house of him against whom the comprising was led, but only upon the ground of the lands comprised; which they found fufficient.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 5. Spottifwood (COMPRISING) p. 42.

1624. November 20. Forsyth against L. SMEITON.

In an action betwixt Marion Forfyth and L. Smeiton, the LORDS found, a comprifing fufficient; whereby two lands being comprifed upon two denunciations, made at two feveral times; to wit, a denunciation for the one land, done at one time, after fearching for poindable goods, was ufed first upon the ground of that land; and the other denunciation, made for the other lands, after fearching was made upon the ground of that other land denounced: Which fearching, at the fecond land denounced, being made after the denunciation of the first land, the defender *alleged*, rendered the comprifing altogether null; feeing he alleged, that the fearching ought to have been made upon all the lands comprifed, and every one of them, before denunciation could be made, for comprifing of any of the lands; and that he alleged that it was not fufficient, that the fearching preceded the denunciation of each feveral land; but there behoved to have been fearching at all the lands, before any denunciation could be made at all, of any land: Which allegeance was repelled, and the comprifing fuftained; for it was found fufficient, that the fearching preceded each denunciation.

Durie, p. 150.

1627. July II. WALLACE against HARVEY.

IN a fufpenfion betwixt Wallace and Harvey, Harvey having comprised certain lands from Wallace, his debtor, and being therein feafed, obtained decreet of removing; which being defired to be fufpended, and reduced upon this reafon by Adam Wallace; becaufe the faid Adam had obtained tack of the fame lands,

12

No 8. A tack is granted be-

fore lands are denounced to

be comprifed.

If the tackf-

denunciation for it. This found fufficient; and that it was not neceffary to fearch on

No 6.

No 7.

A comprising

land. Search for moveables

was made on

nunciation for it; and on the

other, before

both, before

denouncing for either.

the one parcel, before de-

contained two parcels of

No 5.1

67