## FORMALITIES of the DILIGENCE.

1629. November 25. Dickson against Ker and Young.

A CREDITOR comprising from his debtor land pertaining to him, and contending to be preferred to another creditor, who had also comprised, but after him; and the fecond compriser alleging, albeit he was last in comprising, yet he ought to be preferred; feeing the first comprising was deduced against one as infest, who was never infeft; and he ought to have comprifed against him, as charged to enter heir to his predecessor last infest; whereas he had not so charged his debtor to enter heir, before the comprising, as is appointed by act of Parliament 1621; whereas the fecond compriser had charged his debtor to enter heir, and thereafter had deduced his comprising; and so the said comprising was null;—and the other answering, That there needed no charge to precede his comprising, seeing the debtor was retoured heir, and charged the superior to enter him, who had sufpended; likeas this first compriser had charged the superior to receive him, upon his comprising; who had also suspended against him, that he could not inseft him, the debtor not being infeft; and there it was found in that suspension, that the fuperior could not allege, that which was his own fault; -- which being confidered, the Lords found, That the first compriser should be preferred, albeit the debtor was not infeft in the lands comprised, and albeit no special charge was used before the comprising; which the Lords found to be supplied by the debtor's retour, and charge against the superior, which was found to be equivalent to a fafine; albeit that fuspension stood undiscust, and that another creditor opponed against the comprising, and not the superior, nor the common debtor, (to either of whom it was not competent); and it was found to militate against the faid other compriser; it being alleged, that the compriser was paid off a part of the fums for which he comprised, before the comprising, and so it was null; also that he was paid off a part, fince the comprising, and so could not have the whole lands comprised: This was found relevant, and found admissable by way of exception, without necessity to reduce thereupon.

Act. Stuart & Aiton.

Alt. Nicolfon & Craig.

Clerk, Scot.

Durie, p. 469.

Vol. I.

Y

The want of a fpecial charge, before comprifing; fupplied by the circumfrance of debtor being retoured heir, though not infeft.

No 1.