

gear which pertained to the rebel the time of his decease and rebellion, and the decret of declarator bore all goods and gear which pertained to the rebel, or should accresce or be acquired by him during the rebellion, and which pertained to him the time of the gift. The Lords found the conclusion of the summons should be astricted to the words of the gift.—*Vide Ker against Limpidlaw, 2d February, 1630.*

*Page 59.*

---

1630. *February 20.* KER *against* The LAIRD of LIMPIDLAW.

IN an action of reduction of a tenement of land comprised by the Laird Limpidlaw, at the instance of one called Ker, by reason that the said Laird had given a discharge, to one of the cautioners, of 2000 merks of the sum for the which the comprising was deduced, albeit he had received no sums of money;—the Lords would not reduce the comprising, but ordained the same to stand for the rest of the sum, and reserved action to the party, obtainer of the discharge, to seek the restitution of the money discharged, *via ordinaria.*

*Page 37.*

---

1630. *February 20.* The EARL of EGLINTON *against* JAMES HAY of TOURLANDS.

THE Earl of Eglinton gives a bond to the Laird of Capringtoun, submitting to him to decern what right his Lordship should give to James Hay of Tourlands for his teinds. The Laird of Capringtoun, five years after the giving of the bond, gives out his decret, making mention therein, that, upon the very day the bond was made, he pronounced his decret, in presence of the said Earl and other witnesses, contained in the decret. The Earl alleges this decret was null, as not pronounced and put in writ year and day after the submission. It was answered by Tourlands, That this practique anent expiring of submissions, within year and day, was only in submissions where a blank day was left in the submission, which was not in this bond, and that the judge might pronounce his decret when he pleased; which the Lords sustained, but pronounced not their interlocutor, but agreed the parties by submission.

*Page 59.*

---

1629. *July 30; and 1630, February 23.* RITCHIE *against* PATERSON.

A CAUTIONER for a common factor, that he shall discharge his duty, cannot be pursued for the factor's debt, at the instance of a merchant that employed him, till first the factor himself be discussed, *viz.* count and reckoning be made with him, and he found not *solvendo*, as is used in cautioners for executors, messengers, tutors, and curators.—*30th July 1629.*