No 27.

persewit also to have an declarator upon his gift.—It was alleged be Gavin, who had the second gift, That the hornings, and executions thereof that were produced for the Commendator's son were null, because the letters and charges whairupon the executions of horning passed, were for the payment of ane minister's stipend, the whilk stipend was paid, and for that cause acquittance being produced, the letters were suspended, and so the cause being taken away whairupon the horning proceeded, the horning behaved to fall and be declared null.—To this was answered, That albeit the letters were suspended, yet there was no relaxation frae the horning standing. The King's Majesty had ay good cause to dispone the escheat to the donatar, and the horning could never be tane away without a relaxation, but be way of action or reduction. The other party alleged, That the same in respect of the suspension might be taken away be exception.—The Lords found, That they would not take away the horning be way of exception.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 171. Maitland, MS.

## 1621. December 14. E. WINTOUN against —.

Act. Hope. Alt. ---. Clerk, Gibson. Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 171. Durie, p. 7.

1625. June 23. Sommervill against Grant.

HORNING found null upon an act of kirk-session for contribution to the school-master, because the party was not cited, nor consented not. This found by way of exception.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 171. Kerse, MS. fol. 220.

Vol. VII.

No 28. In a declarator of escheat, the Lords refused to receive, by way of exception, an allegeance, that the party dwelt alibi at the time of the charge, than where the execution expressed; but it was reserved to reduce the horning.

No 29: A horning found null by exception.