1674. December 11. Home and Elphingston against Murray of Stenhope.

In a competition betwixt an affignee and an arrefter, it was alleged, That the affignee should be preferred, because the affignation was anterior to the arrestment; and, though it was not intimate, yet the equivalent was done, in so far as, the debtor being desired to make payment to the assignee, and shewing his affignation, did promise to pay the same; which, upon the matter, was like a bond of corroboration, which certainly would prefer the assignee, notwithstanding he had not intimate his assignation.

The Lords found, That if the faid promife were verified by writ, it should exclude the arrefter; but that it could not be proven by the debtor's oath, in prejudice of the arrefter: And even as to the debtor, the faid promife could not bind him, being made in contemplation of a right supposed to be in the person of the affigure; which being found not to be a valid right, there were no reason that the debtor should pay twice.

And whereas it was pretended, That if the debtor had not accepted the debt, and promifed payment, the affignee would have done diligence, so that he would have been preferable to the arrester:——The Lords thought, that sibi imputet that he had not perfected his right, as was found before in the case of Pitsoddel's contra Donaldson.

Reporter, Forret.

Clerk, Gilson.

Fel. Dic. v. 1. p. 64. Dirleton, No 201. p. 89.

1679. November 29.

Mr John Bain of Pitcairley against Cunningham M'Millan, &c.

Found the writing a letter to the debtor not a fufficient intimation of an affignation.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 64. Fountainhall, MS.

No 67.

1681. December.

OGILVIE against OGILVIE.

THE Lady Airly having disponed her liferent to Sir David Ogilvie her son, and he thereupon having taken out an decreet against the tenants in an Baron Court; which being suspended upon double poinding, there was compearance made for Thomas Ogilvie of Logie, who craved to be preferred upon the ground, That he having pursued the Lady for a sum due by her, he did arrest the rents in the tenants hands upon the dependence; which having taken effect by a sentence, he had raised a summons to make arrested goods surthcoming. Answered for Sir

No 68.

A disposition to a Lady's jointure, found sufficiently intimated, so as to exclude an arrester, that either the tenants were cited at the

No 66. It was alleged that the debtor had promifed payment to the affignee. Found that this promife, if proven feripto, but not otherwise, could be equivalent

to intimation.