

subject can make, but only a place designed for taking of sasine of a jurisdiction granted by the bishop, and which the bishop might appoint; and many thought that no sasine in such cases is requisite.

*Vid.* 10th February 1631, E. Galloway.

*Page 482.*

---

1630. *January 29.* SIR JAMES SCOT *against* The FEUARS of KINGS-BARNS.

SIR James Scot having a pension from the king, of the victual paid by the feuars of Kings-barns, and charging therefore; and the feuars suspending, that they had never been in use to pay the bolls to the king's chamberlain, nor his officers, at no time preceding, but only the prices modified by the Lords of Exchequer, which they were still content to pay to the pensioner, as they should modify the same;—the Lords found that the feuars were not holden to do to the pensioner but as they were in use before to pay to the king's treasurers and officers, and therefore that they were only subject to him to pay such prices as the Lords of Exchequer should modify for the feu-farm-duties.

*Act.* Primrose. *Alt.* ———. Scot, *Clerk.*

*Page 487.*

---

1630. *February 9.* The COMMISSARY of DUNKELD *against* Mr PATRICK MURRAY.

THE commissary pursuing his creditor, and also the donatar to his escheat, to produce the horning, and to hear it reduced; it being questioned betwixt the pursuer and the donatar, (the creditor being absent in the process,) if the pursuer be holden to produce the horning himself to the defender; the donatar alleged he ought to do it, seeing the same was registered in a public register, and so could not be reduced for not production, albeit the defender should not produce the same. The Lords repelled the allegiance, and found that there was no necessity that the pursuer should produce the same; but found that if the donatar who compeared did not produce the same, that they would reduce it for not production.

Hay, *Clerk.*

*Page 490.*

---

1630. *March 5.* CAMPBEL and ORE *against* SALMOND.

UMQUHILE John Ore being infest in an annual-rent out of an house in Edinburgh, redeemable, and thereafter he resigning in his daughter's favours, who was infest with reservation of her father's liferent, the father, thereafter, tochers that daughter with a greater sum than that sum whereon the annual-rent was redeemable; and divers years thereafter, upon payment made by the granter

of the right of the annual-rent to the father, he grants the right of the annual-rent lawfully redeemed by the heritor: after the decease of her father, the daughter and her husband pursuing to poind the ground for that annual-rent, by virtue of the said sasine passed upon the father's resignation, and the defender opposing the father's renunciation and the father's giving of a greater sum to the daughter in tocher with her husband, who pursued;—the Lords repelled the allegiance, and sustained the pursuit; for the father being denuded of the heritable right of the annual-rent, with reservation only of his own liferent, it was found that he could not prejudice the heritor thereby: albeit the right made to his daughter was under reversion to himself of 40 shillings, the same not being redeemed by him: and albeit upon his death-bed he willed that right made to his daughter to be cancelled, which was not respected, not being *habilis modus*, and the contract of marriage, bearing the tocher-good, had neither relation to this annual-rent nor to any provision made by her father, but had relation to her portion fallen by her mother, which she discharged.

Gibson, *Clerk*.

Page 501.

---

1630. *March 11.* THE LAIRD OF LOCHMABONY *against* ROLLOCK.

THE Lords having, *ex officio*, for their better information and trial of the cause betwixt the parties, ordained some witnesses to be examined, found, that albeit the said witnesses might be declined in law from being witnesses against the party who opposed to the receiving of them, yet that they ought to be received; but declared, that, in the advising of the cause, they would not only consider of their declaration, but also that they were such persons as in law were declinable.

Hay, *Clerk*.

Page 506.

---

1630. *March 18.* The LAIRD OF HORSEBURGH *against* FRANK.

FRANK, upon his infeftment, having obtained decret against the possessors of a tenement in Peebles, for payment of the mails thereof to him of the year 1627; in the which decret the Laird of Horseburgh compearing, and admitted for his interest, proponed defences, which were discussed, and sentence given, he compearing; and this decret being suspended upon double poinding against the obtainer and the Laird of Horseburgh, who proponed other defences, and produced other rights to the lands than these which were proponed and produced for him in that other process; and the other party, opposing his decret given against him, compearing;—the Lords found, in respect of the foresaid decret given against him compearing, at the which time the defences upon the right now produced were then competent, and were not then proponed; therefore being then competent, and omitted, that it ought not now to be received. Therefore repelled the same, and ordained the obtainer of the sentence to be answered and obeyed.