1737. *December* 23. KERR *against* BRIGHTON. No. 17.

ADJUDICATION against one as heir to a predecessor who died 100 years ago, and whose propinquity is denied, is not sufficient to prove the propinquity, and it must be otherways proven.

1738. *February* 14. ELIZABETH BALFOUR *against* WILKIESON.

No. 18.

ADJUDICATION for more than was due restricted to a security; but sustained the principal sum, annualrents, and necessary expences, as accumulated at the date of the adjudication, and annualrents of the whole, because it appeared to be *bona fide* led. (See DICT. No. 18. p. 107.)

1738. *July* 27. AINSLIE *against* WATSON.

No. 19.

NULLITIES both appearing *ex facie,* and depending on proof, competent to be proponed after 40 years.

1738. *December* 1. RAMSAY of Williecleugh *against* BROWNLIE.

No. 20.

APPRISER dying within the legal, the apprising and whole sums in it, annualrents as well as principal, go to the heir, and no part to the executor; and it is considered not as a security for money, but as a right of lands redeemable in a limited time. *Quid juris,* if the apprising or adjudication be reduced to a security? See No. 8.

1739. *January* 9.
YORK-BUILDING COMPANY'S CREDITORS viz. DUKE of NORFOLK, &c. *against* Sir WILLIAM BILLERS.

DISPOSITION granted after an act in an adjudication for producing a progress reduced, though granted in implement of a former obligement, though that was found sufficient to sustain it against a prior inhibition. No. 21.