

November 7 and 8.—Fetternier and Robert Semple, mentioned 4th November, give in two petitions to the Lords: One craving that the rents of the estate of Semple may be sequestrated during the dependance against Cathcart. The 2d, That the writs and charter-chest of that estate may be secured or sequestrated, till it be found who has best right.

As to the 1st, The Lords appointed two factors for uplifting the rents lying in two shires, they finding caution to make the same forthcoming to any who, *ex eventu*, shall prevail. But refused the 2d, anent securing the writs, in regard there was a process of exhibition of them raised and depending at Cathcart's instance.

Vol. I. Page 307.

1684. *November 8.*

GEORGE COCKBURN.

IN the case between George Cockburn, bailie of Haddington, and
;—The Lords found, That a bill of exchange being drawn upon one in Holland, and protested for not payment, though it was not returned to the party-drawer for many months thereafter, yet he was obliged to accept the same back again, if he had the value in his hands, and had received the money at the giving of the bill; but that he would not be liable for exchange or re-exchange: though the bill bore upon eight days' sight to pay the sum drawn; and so it was not *debito tempore* to offer it back a month after it was refused, allowing a competent time to send it to Holland, and to return it again protested.

Yet it was thought, if I, upon a design to go to London, take a bill of exchange, and afterwards think fit to alter my journey, and not go, I may give back the bill to the merchant-drawer; and if he had received of me the value, he was bound to return me back my money. Others doubted of this.

Vol. I. Page 307.

1684. *November 11.* ——— WALLACE of WOLMET and HUGH WALLACE
against WILLIAM DUNDAS.

WOLMET, and his father Hugh Wallace, pursuing an improbation of an adjudication led by Mr William Dundas, and they having taken terms to produce it; when he comes to seek certification, it was ALLEGED he could not; because, it being a decret of Session, all he was bound to do, was to condescend on the date; likeas the pursuer knew that, for his own reduction libelled the date of it. ANSWERED,—This was not competent now, after all the terms were run, but should have been proponed *in initio* before the taking a term to produce.

This being reported by Redford, the Lords found, even *in hoc statu*, it was proponable; and therefore ordained the pursuer to extract it himself, if he insisted. Who then alleged that he needed not, because he craved the grounds of the said adjudication with Mr William's authors' rights to be only produced; and they being reduced, he declared, he only insisted against Mr William Dundas's adjudication, that it might fall *in consequentiam*.

Vol. I. Page 308.