

tioned for a sequestration of the estate. The Lords refused *hoc statu* to sequester, in regard the summons of sale was not brought into Court. The *induciae* were not run. They did not, however, refuse the petition, but they superseded it for a fortnight; before which time the *induciae* would be run.

---

1776. July 25.

BEVERIDGE, Petitioner.

A PERSON, failing in his circumstances, applied, 20th July 1776, for sequestration of his personal estate, on the late statute; and, subsuming that he was apprehensive that his effects would be poided, prayed that any poiding might be stopped. The Lords sequestered, and prohibited any poiding; or, if his effects were poided, prohibited the disposal of them till further orders of Court, 25th July 1776. They named a factor.

---

1776. August 3.

Certain CREDITORS of ———

PETITIONED for a sequestration of his estate in terms of the late Act of Parliament. They set forth that their debtor had fallen under the description of the Act, by allowing his effects to be poided; and that, though at present the petitioners could not produce legal evidence of the poiding, yet they prayed for warrant to cite the debtor, to show cause why sequestration should not be awarded,—or at least craved a diligence against havers for recovering the documents or other sufficient evidence of the poiding. The Lords granted the last, before answer; and superseded further procedure until the diligence should be reported: and this day, 3d August 1776, upon reporting a certificate of the poiding, the Lords granted the sequestration.

---

1776. July 25.

SEQUESTRATION OF PITTENCREIF.

This day, the Lords, upon the petition of the Creditors of George Chalmers, sequestered the lands and estate of Pittencreif, and other subjects belonging to him, under judicial sale; and, at their desire, appointed Mr Chalmers himself to be factor thereon, with the usual powers.

---