1751. July 3.

CREDITORS of COCKBURN of Langtown, Competing, viz. ALEXANDER COUTTS, and HEIRS of PROVOST COUTTS, against Dr Scott and James Scott.

No. 16. Though inhibition affects annualrent-rights, that is the stock, yet it does not affect the bygones fallen due before inhibition.

In the same process, we thought an inhibition proceeding not on the bond or ground of debt, but on the horning, (i, e. bearing, because the Lords have seen the horning,) was void and null, but superseded, because it was said that the universal practice some years ago was otherways. Afterwards they gave us a list of 176 inhibitions since 1692, and we unanimously repelled the objection. (See Dict. No. 58. p. 6993. and No. 55. p. 6988.)

1751. July 3.

CREDITORS of WILLIAM M'KAY, Competing, viz. GABRIEL NAPIER against CAMPBELL of Dalness.

No. 17. Inhibition found to annul a bond granted in payment of a writer's account, both as to annualrents upon the bond, and as to all articles of the account after the inhibition.

An inhibition being raised on a depending process, which was afterwards terminated by submission and decreet-arbitral, whereupon diligence followed, we sustained the objection to the inhibition, that no sentence followed on the dependence, and found the decreet-arbitral not secured by the inhibition. And being executed against a man and his wife in these words; "whereof I delivered to the said Elizabeth Fowler and William M'Kay personally apprehended a just and authentic copy,"—objected, that only one copy was delivered for both. But as the execution bore that both were personally apprehended, we thought it behoved to mean a copy to each; and therefore repelled the objection. (See Dict. No. 57. p. 6998.)

1752. June 5.

CREDITORS of Sir George Hamilton, Competing, i. e. Blackwood of Pittreavie against Boyes and Others.

No. 18.

Two inhibitions, at the instance of different creditors, but against the same person, being executed the same day, but one of them supposing him