No. 16.

Pollock alone of L.150 Scots, upon the narrative that the creditor had at their desire superseded payment to the term underwritten, therefore binding them conjunctly and severally. James Pollock paid the debt, and his relict and executrix sued Sir Robert for re-payment of the L.1000; (for the note for the L.150 was lost;) and the Lords found him bound to relieve James Pollock of the whole L.1000, and that he was not to be considered as a cocautioner with him; and they distinguished this case from that of Murray of Broughton and Orchardton in 1722, where the new cautioner acceded in a corroboration with the principal debtor; and from the case Lockhart against Lord Semple, (No. 9.) where the new cautioner acceded in a corroboration by himself alone, and had a bond of relief from the principal debtor; whereas here the new cautioner acceded in a correboration with the first cautioner, whom therefore they considered as principal in the corroboration; though certainly he could not be so as to the debt of L.150; and it had influence that his cautionry was near expiring, and therefore his first bond registrated, when the corroboration was granted. Vide No. 23. infra. (See Dict. No. 58. p. 2125.)

1747. June 5.

Mr Robert Blackwood of Pittreavie against James Haliburton.

No. 17. Declarator of expiration of cautionry.

The principal debtor giving his brother-in-law money to pay a bond by him and cautioner, but taking his brother-in-law's bill for the money, who took assignation to the bond, to keep up the debt against the cautioner; which bill was afterwards pledged to the Bank, and thereafter renewed from time to time by both, and at last paid by the brother-in-law after the death of the other; the cautioner pursued declarator of extinction of the bond wherein he was bound, as paid with the money of the principal debtor; and we sustained the declarator, and declared it extinguished quoad the cautioner. (See Dict. No. 27. p. 10015.)

1749. June 2. BARBARA ANGUS against DR COULT.

No. 18.

A BOND of corroboration, with caution, reciting the principal bond and sum fully, but omitting by oversight to repeat the principal sum in the obliging clause, and containing the usual penalty corresponding to one-fifth of the principal sum and annualrent, was notwithstanding that omission found binding on the cautioner for the principal sum: Altered, and the cautioner found not bound. (See Dict. No. 324. p. 17040.)