

1725. December 17. TAYLOR *against* CREDITORS of WATSON.

No 89.

IN a competition betwixt Taylor and the other Creditors of Mr David Watson, the LORDS found, that inhibition is not a habile diligence for affecting the emoluments or price of any office. See APPENDIX.

Fol. Dic. v. I. p. 473.

S E C T. IV.

Inhibition has Effect only against Voluntary Rights.

1592. July.

CULLERNY *against* SIBBALD.

No 90.

THE Laird of Cullerny pursued Sibbald, Lady Pitblado, to hear and see certain infestments made to her of the lands of Pitblado by her husband to be reduced and declared null. The reason of the summons was, his father obtained a decree of warrandice against the Laird of Pitblado, husband to the defender, to warrant to him certain assignations of reversions, and therefore, to put himself *in tuto*, caused serve inhibitions publickly; and so the infestments made after to his wife *stante inhibitione* ought to be reduced as done *in fraudem creditoris*. It was *answered*, That the infestments of conjunct fee made to his wife could not be reduced notwithstanding of the said inhibition, because it was given *intuitu matrimonii*; and as it was leisom to the Laird of Pitblado, *non obstante prohibitione judicis*, so there behoved, and it was leisom to give the wife a conjunct fee *ad sustinenda onera matrimonii*, the which was not perpetual, but suspended the action during the wife's lifetime. THE LORDS, for the most part, found the exception relevant, and that the person who was inhibited might thereafter marry, and give conjunct fee to his spouse, notwithstanding of the inhibition.

Found that a person inhibited, may, if he marry, dispone in conjunct fee and liferent to his wife *ad sustinenda onera matrimonii*, such a right not being perpetual.

Fol. Dic. v. I. p. 474. Colvil, MS. p. 474.

1614. March 4.

OLIPHANT *against* KEITH.

No 91.

IN an action of reduction at the instance of Henry Oliphant *contra* John Keith for reducing of an infestment *ex capite inhibitionis*, the LORDS found, that the infestment of property which proceeded upon a contract which was

An infestment of property was reduced *ex capite inhibitionis*, al-

No 91.
 though refer-
 ring to a pri-
 or obligation
 to infeft in an
 annualrent ;
 because this
 last is differ-
 ent from infeftment
 of property,
 and the right
 must either
 stand or fall
in toto.

posterior to the inhibition, albeit the contract made relation to a former contract which buir the sum of merks, for the which James Black was obliged to infeft John Kello in an annualrent of 70 merks, which contract was anterior to the inhibition, fell within the compass of the inhibition ; and that because the first contract was of an annualrent whereupon nothing followed, neither charter nor sasine ; and the other contract, albeit it made relation thereto, and added 5 merks more, making in the whole contained in the alienation of the property, which could not cohere with the first contract of the annualrent, and also because the infeftment of property behoved either to stand or fall *in toto*, and could not subsist *pro parte*. *Item*, the LORDS reduced the infeftments *a tempore litis contestatae tantum*.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 474. Kerse, MS. fol. 60.

* * * Haddington reports this case.

HENRY OLIPHANT pursued Kelly and others for reduction of their infeftments of lands pertaining to one called Black, because they were all granted after his inhibition. It was *alleged* by Kelly, that, before Oliphant's inhibition, he had Black bound by contract to infeft him in an annualrent of fourscore merks redeemable upon seven hundred merks ; and therefore, he having a bond anterior to Oliphant's inhibition, it was lawful to Black to give him infeftment in satisfaction of his inhibition. It was *answered*, That if he had taken infeftment of an annualrent of fourscore merks for fulfilling of his contract preceding the inhibition, it had been lawful ; but because he received not the implement of his bond, according to the tenor thereof, but had taken an infeftment of the property of the land for greater sums, it could not subsist. In respect whereof, the LORDS repelled the allegiance, and reduced the defender's infeftments.

Haddington, MS. No 2553.

1617. *January 31.* STIRLING *against* TENANTS of Lethindy.

No 92.

IN an action of removing pursued by Patrick Stirling *contra* the Tenants of Lethindy upon a comprising, the LORDS found, an exception upon an infeftment of lands relevant, notwithstanding it was after the inhibition, because it was *replied*, that the infeftment was relative to a bond, whereby he was obliged to infeft the defender in an annualrent of 200 merks out of any of his lands, and that the lands disposed were only worth a chalder of victual.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 474. Kerse, MS. fol. 60.