No 9. fame being only deduced, for the principal and penalty; and which penalty extended not to fo many annuals, as the creditor wanted unpaid to him.

Act. Advocatus and Mowat.

Alt. Nicolfon, Burnet and Nairn.

Clerk, Hay.

Durie, p. 460.

1665. December 2.

M'Culloch against CRAIG.

No 10. A comprising found null, fubscribed only by the clerk, and not by the mesterner who was judge.

In a pursuit, at the instance of Sir Hugh M'Culloch against Mr John Craig, as representing his father, Mr Robert Craig, by progress; which Mr Robert, was debtor by bend to Patrick Wood, and which bend was comprised; the right whereof, came in the person of the said Hugh M'Culloch; whereupon he pursued the said Mr John:—There being nothing produced, but a comprising, subscribed by James Allan, who was clerk to the comprising, and not by the messenger who was judge; the Lords would find no process thereon.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 5. Newbyth MS. p. 42.

1670. July 21.

LADY LUCY HAMILTON against the CREDITORS of MONCASTLE.

No 11. A warrant, upon a bill to lead a comprifing at another head burgh, than that of the fhire where the lands lay, was found null, fince it was not at Edinburgh, which is communis patria.

In the reduction, at Lady Lucy's instance, against the Creditors of Moncastle, it being alleged for Pitroan, one of the trustees, that he himself being a creditor, and inferted in the disposition ab initio, the same could not be taken away, but fcripto vel juramento.—It was replied, That he ought to condefcend and instruct in quantum he was creditor; specially, he being Moncastle's brother-in-law, and so a confident person.—The Lords did ordain him to condescend and instruct, otherwise they declared they would reduce his right as simulate. -2de, The defenders offered to purge the pursuer's comprising, she assigning them thereto.—To this it was replied, That the reversion of the comprising being expired, and the right thereby become irredeemable, she was not obliged to affign: but declared that the was content to discharge the comprising upon payment.— THE LORDS found the offer to discharge the comprising sufficient, and that she was not obliged to affign.—3tio, It was alleged for Kelburn, who was likewise compriser, That his right could not be reduced upon these libelled reasons: That the lands were denounced at the head burgh of the regality; and that the comprifing was led in Glasgow, which is not the head burgh of the shire; because, albeit regalities were suppressed at that time by the usurpers; yet quoad doing of legal diligence at the head burghs of regalities, there was no discharge thereof in their act and proclamation. And as to the fecond, the comprising was led at Glafgow, upon a special warrant from the English judges.

It was replied to the first, That by act and proclamation of the usurpers, all jurisdictions of Lords of regalities were discharged and suppressed; and these

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.