

No. 152. There can be no doubt that a landlord, without any reservation in a lease, is entitled to cut trees,—to dig for coal, lime or marl,—to work mines,—and to fish in the rivers that run through his estate. Many of these rights must occasion much greater inconvenience to the tenant than a right of hunting for game; yet the landlord is entitled to exercise them, upon indemnifying the tenant for the injury done to the surface; and he is equally entitled to enjoy the amusement of hunting upon the same conditions.

An interdict is unnecessary, while a tenant has ample security for any damages he may sustain by retention of his rent. Neither is it at all difficult to ascertain the amount of such damage, by the inspection of impartial persons qualified to determine. The defender has all along been willing to pay any damage that may be competently instructed; and as the sheriff has reserved all such claim, the present advocacy was altogether unnecessary.

The Lord Ordinary pronounced to following interlocutor: Finds, that as to what may have happened in time past, the defender pointedly denies, that he, or any person by his permission, have occasioned damage of any sort by hunting on the said lands; and that the Sheriff has reserved action to the pursuer for any damage which he can shew that he has sustained; and as to what may happen in time to come, the Ordinary is of opinion, that the interdict craved is unnecessary, in respect the defender does not pretend that he himself, or others by his permission, have a right to destroy the fences, hedges, and grounds, by hunting thereon; and therefore repels the reasons of advocacy, and remits the cause to the Sheriff *simpliciter*."

To which interlocutor, the Court unanimously adhered, upon advising a petition with answers.

Lord Ordinary, *Glenlee*.

Act. *Maconochie*.

Agent, *Jo. Taylor, W. S.*

Alt. *Cathcart*.

Agent, *Jo. Hunter, W. S.*

Clerk, *Home*.

J.

Fac. Coll. No. 182. p. 407.

SECT. X.

Clauses respecting Assignees and Sub-Tenants.

1785. *January*.

MAXWELL *against* ———.

No. 153.

There was one Maxwell that warned a woman to flit and remove. Answered, That her umquhile husband had tacks for him and his heirs, and his assignee, and before his decease made her assignee, and there was terms to run. Answered,

That he could not make her assignee, quia fuit inter virum et uxorem quod prohibitum est de jure. It was answered, That quamvis donatio inter virum et uxorem prohibita sit de jure, tamen morte confirmatur; and so was found by the Lords.

No. 153.

Colvil MS. p. 420.

1615. *January 25.* LA. of ELPHINSTON *against* _____.

No. 154.

In an action pursued by the Laird of Elphinston as donatar to the escheat of one Russel, who had tack set to him of certain lands by the Laird of Airth, which tack was set to himself, excluding assignees of any higher degree than himself;—the Lords found, that the tack ought to pertain to the donatar, notwithstanding that he was of higher degree.

Kerse MS. p. 103.

1626. *July 8.* TURNBULL *against* SCOT.

No. 155.

Turnbull of Howdon annailzies his lands of Howdon to Turnbull of Philiphaugh, under reversion, and receives back again a tack from him for payment of a duty, and retains thereby the possession of the land wadset. After that the said Turnbull of Howdon dispones the said lands to Scot of Hartwood-myres and Scot of Aikwood, who receives also possession of the said lands from their said author; and they being pursued by the said Turnbull of Philiphaugh, for payment of the fore-said tack-duty of certain by-gone years, and to find caution to pay the same in time coming; the Lords sustained the action against the said two Scots, albeit they alleged that they were not bound to pay the said tack-duty, and that they were singular successors to the alleged tacksman, and who could not be subject in that, wherein he was obliged, by the tacksman's self; and his heirs were only astricted thereto, and not they; especially seeing they bruiked not the said lands by virtue of that tack, but by virtue of their heritable right acquired from their author; which allegiance was repelled by the Lords, and they were found to be debtors to the pursuer, seeing their common author could give to these defenders no other right nor possession than he had himself; and he being denuded in favours of the pursuer, of his heritable right, and accepting a tack, by virtue whereof he might only bruik, seeing no other right consisted in his person, he could not thereafter do any deed in prejudice of the pursuer, to invert the right of that tack, and duty thereof; and the defenders could not be in any better case than their said author, and so could not ascribe their possession to any other right, than that by virtue whereof their said author could only lawfully bruik; and so the action was sustained against them, albeit they were singular successors to the tacksman.

An assignee to a tack is personally liable to pay the by-gone tack duties due by his cedent, which is founded upon the general principle of mutual contracts, that the tacksman or his assignee cannot take the benefit of the contract without performing on their part.

Act. *Stuart.*Alt. *Cunninghame & Scot.*Clerk, *Gibson.**Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 424. Durie, p. 212.*