alleges, That, by the same contract of marriage, his father was infeft in fee by his goodsire, and so is not obliged to perform any part of that contract which his goodsire was obliged particularly to perform himself, and that his father could not be thought successor to his goodsire, titulo lucrativo, because he got the fee of the land with a great burden, and so had the fee titulo oneroso. The Lords repelled the allegeance.

2d MS. Page 7.

## February 22. ALEXANDER HOME against JAMES RULE. 1637.

James Rule, having comprised certain lands pertaining to Alexander Home, son to the Laird of Aytoun, a declarator of redemption is pursued by the said Alexander against the said James Rule, who had intromitted with the duties of the lands comprised, certain years; which duties, it was alleged, paid a great part of the sum for the which the lands were comprised. The parties being ordained to count and reckon, the compriser gives in, for his charge, the principal sum of £1904, contained in his bond, with £200 of penalty, for the which he had comprised; item, £116 of sheriff-fee; item, £200 for expeding the comprising: which above written sums he craved to be his principal. Item, He craved the ordinary annual rent for the said sums, and annual for annual. Item, He craved £1000 of expenses for prosecuting his actions against the tenants for their duties yearly. The Lords decerned him payment of his principal sum of £1904, and annualrent for the same, but refused to give annual for annual; and, for his sheriff-fee and expenses, decerned him to have £200, which was the penalty contained in his bond, but no annualrent for the same.

2d MS. Page 37.

## 1637. February 24. NICOL CAIRNCROSE against PILMURE.

In an action of double poinding, raised by Nicol Cairnerose, debtor to a rebel. against Pilmure, creditor to the rebel, on the one part; and Alexander Guthrie, donatar to the rebel's escheat, on the other part: Pilmure contends that he should be preferred to the donatar; by reason he both arrested and obtained decreet thereupon, before the donatar obtained the gift of the rebel's escheat. The donatar contended, that, from the time of the rebellion, jus erat acquisitum domino regi; and no posterior diligence done by a creditor can prejudge the king of his casuality. The Lords preferred the arrester, in respect of his diligence.

2d MS. Page 16.

1637. February 28. Mr John Weymes's Creditors against John Weymes. his Son.

Affirmation of a minor, that he was major when he knew himself to be minor.