him that used the order of redemption, he may consign such sums as he can get knowledge of; and, at the pursuing of a declarator of redemption, the comprisers will be forced to produce the haill comprisings, whereby the sums therein contained may be known, and then the user of the order of redemption will get declarator of redemption by paying or consigning the sums contained in the comprisings produced.

Page 207.

## 1631. March 2. DAVID MURRAY OF HALMYRE against The LORD YESTER.

In the improbation of the executions of a horning, if the messenger be lawfully summoned, and compears not to design the witnesses contained in the executions, or, if the messenger be dead,—the defender of the improbation may design the witnesses upon his own peril.

Page 87.

1631 [or 1630.] March 8. The LAIRD of CLACKMANNAN against The LAIRD of ALLARDYCE.

THE Laird of Clackmannan is infeft in an annualrent of 600 merks, forth of all and haill the lands and barony of Bonnymoon, or any part thereof, lying within the parish of Menmure: He craves pointing of the ground. Compears the Laird of Allardyce, and alleges, No poinding of certain roums wherein he stands infeft by comprising; because the pursuer is only infeft and seased in the lands and barony of Bonnymoon. But so it is, that the granter of Clackmannan's infeftment has no such barony called the barony of Bonnymoon; but the true denomination of the granter's barony is called the barony of Menmure; so the pursuer can have no pointing but of the lands of Bonnymoon, and no farther can his infeftment be extended. To the which it was replied, That the said denomination cannot vitiate the infeftment, cum constat de subjecto; and that the granter of the annualrent has no other barony lying within the parish of Menmure; as also, his seasine is taken at the place of Bonnymoon, which is the place designed for the seasing of the barony of Menmure. The Lords repelled the exception in respect of the reply, except the defender will allege that the Laird of Bonnymoon had another place designed in his infeftment, to take seasine of his barony of Bonnymoon nor at the place of Bonnymoon.

Page 106.

## 1631. March 8. The Laird of Clackmannan against Fairweather.

The Laird of Clackmannan, being infeft in an annualrent out of the barony of Bonnymoon, pursues Fairweather, occupier of a toun of the said barony, for poinding of the ground. It is alleged for the defender, That his ground could not be poinded, because he stood infeft in the property of the said toun. It was replied, That, notwithstanding of his infeftment, yet he had set

a back-tack to the Laird of Bonnymoon, for payment of a greater duty nor ten for the hundred, and so his infeftment, being usurary, was null by Act of Parliament. The Lords restricted his infeftment for time coming, to ten for the hundred, and decerned poinding of the ground for the superplus of the duty of the lands. To the which it was duplied, No poinding for any part of the duty; because the Laird of Bonnymoon had renounced the back-tack before the intenting of Clackmannan's pursuit, and so his infeftment entitled him to the property of the lands aye and while the redemption. Which duply the Lords found relevant.

Page 107.

## 1631. March 8. SIR ARCHIBALD ACHIESON against The Earl of Annandale.

In the action betwixt the Earl of Annandale and Sir Archibald Achieson, secretary, wherein Sir Archibald, upon a bond made to him by the said Earl, bound and obliged him to satisfy Sir Archibald for his right of certain lands in Ireland, at the sight of certain arbiters chosen by them, and, in the mean time, not to dispossess the said Sir Archibald, nor to move any question, petitory or possessory, against him, while he was satisfied therefor;—this bond, bearing a consent to be registered in the Books of Council and Session, is registered, and, thereupon, Sir Archibald charges the Earl. He suspends. The first reason is a declinature of the judgment, both in respect that the Earl, long before the bond, and sinsyne, has been in England, residing with his house and family. Secundo, That the subject being concerning the right and possession of lands in Ireland, the same cannot be judged here; and alleged a practique decerned in anno 1614, betwixt Boyd of Arbrock and Sir Hugh Montgomerie, where a bond, betwixt them, being pursued before the Lords, was remitted to be judged in England. To the which it was replied, Although the Earl was resident in England, yet both he and the defender were Scotsmen, and the defender had an estate in Scotland, whereunto the pursuer restricts his execution; to the second reason, it was answered and replied, That he pursued not here for the discussing of the right of his lands, but allenarly for his interest; in so far as, against his bond, he dispossessed the pursuer, and uplifted the duties to these lands, wherein the pursuer was in peaceable possession the time of the bond and divers years before; and, as for the practique, it meits not, for the bond alleged betwixt Arbrock and Sir Hugh, was a bond made in Ireland, and bore no registration in the Books of Council; whereas this bond was ordained to be registered in the Books of Council, and so both parties had consented that the Lords should be judges thereto. In respect whereof the Lords repelled the declinature.

Page 114.

## 1631. March 10. Francis Stewart of Cunningham against The Lady Sanderson.

UMQUHILE Hercules Stewart had a tack of the teinds of Swinton set to him for the lifetimes of him and his spouse, and heirs to be gotten betwixt them,