No 11.

being taken away, legal executions ought to have been done at the head burghs of the shires where the registers were kept, likeas it was their cuftom to do fo.—To the fecond it was replied, That any warrant to lead an apprifing at Glasgow, was periculo petentis, and contrary to the general practice, and reason; seeing denunciations are used at the head burghs of the shires where the tands ly, as being the only places where the lieges may have notice thereof.— THE LORDS did fustain the reduction, notwithstanding of the answers; upon this ground: That Kelburn's comprising was not led according to the laws, for the time then in being; and that Kelburn ought to have observed the same, as to the denunciation at the head burgh of the shire; which was hard, seeing he had done according to a flanding act of Parliament; and that the usurper's act and proclamation was not special as to legal executions, which had no relation to processes; but only did discharge the Courts of regalities, and the service and vasfalage due to the Lords of regalities.—The cause for which the Lords sustained the fecond reason was; that albeit they grant warrants to lead comprisings at Edinburgh, because it is communis patria, where all public records are kept, and notice may be had of legal diligences; yet they found, that, upon a naked bill, no fuch warrant ought to be granted for leading of comprisings, at any other

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 4. Gosford, MS. No 311.

1671. July 12.

The HEIRS of Mr Thomas Lundy against The Earl of Southesk, and Others.

head burgh, but that of the shire where the lands ly.

THE effate of Sir James Keith of Powburn, being apprifed by feveral of his creditors, they now compete for preference. Mr Thomas Lundy, who led the first apprising; was more than year and day before the rest; and thereupon his heir craved preference.—It was alleged, the apprifing was null: 1mo, Because it proceeded upon a bond, carrying a clause of requisition, and the claim of the apprifing, did not libel thereupon; so that, albeit it be now produced and done, debito tempore, yet the claim was not sufficiently instructed without it. The messenger did unwarrantably continue the court of apprising, till another diet, without any necessary cause, which was never accustomed before, and is of very evil confequence; for thereby messengers, at their pleasure, may continue; and weary out the persons concerned; who might propone defences, or produce fuspensions; and are not obliged to attend the pleasure of the messenger. atio, The apprifing was at the Beitch-hill of Cupar, which is not within the shire where the lands lie; and, albeit there be a dispensation in the letters; that ought not to have been granted; because apprisings should only be in the head burgh of the shire, or, in commun patria, at Edinburgh; but especially, seeing the warrant was obtained from the Lords of course, among the common bills: without being read or confidered, and so, is periculo petentis, and cannot prejudge

No 12.
Upon any urgent occasion, the messens, who is judge in the apprising, may continue the court of apprising, till another diet.

No 12.

the more formal diligence of other comprisers; especially, seeing Lundy apprised of new for the same sums, which will come in pari passu with the rest, being within year and day.—It was answered, That it is inherent in all jurisdictions, to continue processes to new diets, having kept the first diet; and that the messenger, by the letters, is constituted sheriss; and there is no question but sheriss might, and did, prorogate diets in apprisings; and the letters bear warrant to fix courts, one or more: And for the continuation, it was but to the next day, in regard of a great speat, the apprising being upon the hill in the open field, during rain; and it being modica mora, to the next day; which will give no warrant to an arbitrary continuation by messengers, to what interval they please: And as for the place, the Lords, by dispensation, may appoint what place they see convenient; and albeit the dispensation had been of course, and that therein the clerks had failed; yet the parties, obtainers of such dispensations, are secure thereby, and ought not to be prejudged.

The Lords furtained the appriting; and found the requisition now produced furticient; and found, that the continuing of the diet for so short a time, to be no ground of nullity; unless the competitors could allege a special cause, which they did, or might have alleged, whereby they were prejudged, by leading the apprising the second day, rather than the first. The Lords did also suffain the dispensation of the place; and having perused the practice, produced at the instance of the Lady Lucia Hamilton, anent an apprising, led at Glasgow by dispensation; They sound, that the Lords did not annul the apprising on that ground; but the Lords ordained, That no bill, bearing dispensation, should pass of course in time coming; but upon special reasons, to be considered by the Lords, or the Ordinary upon the bills; and that messengers should not continue the diets in apprisings, but upon necessary causes; and ordained an act to be insert in the books of sederunt to that effect.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 4. and 5. Stair, v. 1. p. 752.

1675. February 3. OLIPHANT of Provostmains against —

A BILL was given in, desiring, that a comprising being deduced, and the messenger having deceased in the interim, before he subscribed the same; therefore, another messenger, who was his colleague, might be allowed and warranted

to subscribe the said comprising.

THE LORDS confidered, that the messenger that was in life, though he had been employed to execute the letters of the comprising, by denouncing and citing; yet he did not sit, nor was colleague to the deceased messenger, or was judge with him, the day and time of the deducing of the said comprising; and that a comprising being processure executivus, consisting of the executions, and of the process and sentence of comprising, upon the day that the debtor was cited thereto; though divers messengers may act severally as to citation and denuncia-

No 13. A meffenger dying after deducing comprising, but before he fubscribed it. the Lords refused to allow another messenger, who only had executed the letters, but had not fat as judge, to fub. icribe it.