conform to the said decreet obtained in the baron court. Alleged, That the decreet in the baron court was null, because there was confusion of diets in it; the day of compearance, litiscontestation, and sentence, being all in one day. The Lords repelled the exception; for the formalities used in other judicatories are not used in baron courts, where it is proceeded more summarily, specially when the parties are compearing.

Page 25.

1629. February 11. Alexander Fraser, Petitioner.

Margaret Hay, having led a comprising of certain lands against Alexander Fraser of Philorth; before her comprising was allowed by the Lords she died; and her son, Alexander Fraser, being served and retoured heir to her, gave in a supplication to the Lords, desiring that the same comprising, led at his mother's instance, should be allowed in his name, and that he might have a warrant to the director of the chancery to direct out precepts for infefting of him, as if the comprising had been deduced by himself. Some were of opinion that he behoved to transfer the comprising in his own person first; but, by the most part, the desire of the bill was granted.

Page 51.

1629. February 11. GILBERT WILSON against MARGARET STUART.

In an action pursued by Mr Gilbert Wilson against Margaret Stuart; Alleged, No process at the pursuer's instance, because he pursued as son and heir served and retoured to his father, and the retour was not produced to verify his interest. Replied, The defender could not be heard, because she had herself obtained decreets against the pursuer as heir to his father, and so had acknowledged him to be heir. Duplied, Albeit she had gotten decreets against him as heir, yet that will not furnish him action against her, because he may be heir passive, and yet not active, as by a service not retoured. The Lords found the exception relevant.

Page 140.

1629. February 14. Grant against Innes of Balveny.

Grant having comprised certain lands from N. charged Innes of Balveny, superior thereof, to infeft him. He suspended upon this reason, That he from whom he had comprised was not infeft. The charger Alledged, That the suspender acknowledged N. to be his vassal, in respect that he had received from him a resignation ad remanentiam; and likewise had taken from him the feuduties of the same lands divers years, and given him discharges thereof. The