1664. December 9.

John Veitch, younger of Dawick, against Alexander Williamson.

No 346. Found that minority does not interrupt the running of the legal,

John Veitch pursues Williamson upon the act betwixt debitor and creditor, for paying to him of his proportional part of the mails and duties of apprised lands, as coming in pari passu with the defender, by an apprising within a year of his. The defender alleged absolvitor, because he has right to the first apprising, led before the act of Parliament betwixt debitor and creditor; and therefore he has the benefit of the 21st act of the last session of Parliament, declaring, that where an appriser, for his own security had redeemed a prior apprising, and gotten right thereto before the act betwixt debitor and creditor, the said first apprising should have the same effect it would have had before the act debitor and creditor, and should not come in pari passu. The pursuer answered, That behoved only to be understood, where the second appriser had upon necessity to shun the expiring of the legal redeemed, and gotten right to the first apprising, which could not be said here, because the debitor being minor the legal had and has a long course to run.

THE LORDS sustained the defence without any such limitation, in respect of the express tenor of the act of Parliament.

Stair, v. 1. p. 237.

1671. June 30. BEADMEN of the Magdalen Chapel against GAVIN DRYSDALE.

No 347. Prescription runs against the poor and things mortified for pious uses.

Janet Rud having mortified an yearly annualrent of a merk Scots, out of a tenement of hers to the poor Beadmen of the Magdalen Chapel, they pursue Gavin Drysdale, now heritor of the tenement, for poinding of the ground; who alleged absolvitor, because he has bruiked the tenement free of that annualrent for more than 40 years, so that the right thereof is prescribed. It was answered, That prescription runs not against the poor and things mortified for pious uses. 2dly, They are in the same condition with minors, having overseers chosen yearly, 3dly, The years of prescription must be accounted, abating the times of pestilence and war, when there was no session. It was answered, That prescription was the great security of the leiges, and hath no exception by the act of Parliament, but only minority, and neither by the civil law or our custom, is the time of prescription counted per tempus utile, but per tempus continuum, in regard of the length of the long prescription.

The Lords sustained the defence of prescription, and repelled the replies.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 122. Stair, v. 1. p. 746.