rent, with deduction of the retention: The Magistrates contending, they being but consignatarii, and noways in mora, they could be no farther liable than in the terms of the said Act; and not for ordinary annualrent, seeing per eos non stetit, that they did not pay at Whitsunday; for these previous questions behoved to be cleared: which is but done this session.

Answered,—After the charge of horning, ye were constituted in mora; and it had no qualities, but was simple; and ye should have at least offered to consign the money, which ye did not, but made use of it; which differences the case from a consignation in the Clerk of the Bills' hands.

The Lords found the Town liable for the full annualrent after Whitsunday last.

Vol. II. Page 76.

1700. January 2. Mell against James Graham.

MR Mell, the French merchant, gave in his protestation for remeid of law to the Parliament, for absolving James Graham, merchant, from his reduction of the decreet-arbitral pronounced betwixt them; which he quarrelled on this ground, That the arbiters had not cognosced nor noticed his claim: which, being a reason of iniquity, the Lords found themselves not empowered to sustain; because, by the late regulations 1695, no decreet-arbitral may be reduced, save on the head of corruption, bribery, or falsehood: and he contended it was falsehood in the decreet, to bear they had considered his claim, when they had refused to take it in: which is not the falsehood meant by that article of the regulations now turned into a law: which will not exclude nullities, such as the decreet is ultra vires compromissi, and the like; for these may be still proponed as formerly.

Vol. II. Page 77.

1700. January 4. SIR Andrew Ramsay of Waughton against David Ogilvie of Popilhall.

THERE being mutual declarators of property, as to a piece of ground in Popill, between Sir Andrew Ramsay of Waughton and Mr David Ogilvie of Popilhall, who founded on a decreet-arbitral, by which that ground controverted was, in 1647, adjudged to belong to the said Mr David's father:

Alleged for Sir Andrew, 1mo. A decreet-arbitral, being only a personal right, can never be obligatory against him, who is a singular successor to John Hepburn of Waughton, the submitter, especially being infeft. 2do. The said decreet is prescribed; nothing following on it by the space of forty years.

Answered,—Waughton never claimed more, save a commonty and servitude of pasturage; and therefore his apprisers from him can never be in a better condition, nor crave the property. 2do. The prescription was interrupted by the pursuer's minority.

Replied,—He having renounced to be heir to his father, and only bruiking