

son, the matter being upon two voluntary infeftments, whereof one was prior, *sed post inhibitionem*, and the other posterior *quoad sasinam*, but had inhibition of before.

Kerse, MS. fol. 59.

No 5.

1612. June 30. JOHN PYRIE *against* ———

IN an action of reduction pursued by John Pyrie *ex capite inhibitionis*, the LORDS found, That the inhibition executed against the father could not stop the lieges to buy from the son, except the inhibition had been renewed against the son.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 473. — Kerse, MS. fol. 59.

No 6.

*** Haddington reports this case :

INHIBITIONS are personal, and being served against any man not to annalzie his lands, the same will not be a ground to reduce any alienation made by the heir of the party inhibited, of any of the lands which pertained to the party inhibited, to whom the said heir succeeded.

Haddington, MS. No 2475.

1613. December 14. NAIR *against* NAIR.

IN an action of reduction of an inhibition used by Mr Thomas Nair *contra* Mr Walter his brother, the LORDS found the inhibition null, because it was raised upon a bond of tailzie.

Kerse, MS. fol. 59.

No 7.

1614. March 8. SYME *against* LAIRD of COLDINGKNOWS.

IN an action of reduction *ex capite inhibitionis* pursued by Mr Alexander Syme *contra* the Laird of Coldingknows, the LORDS found, That the inhibition was null, except the party had also been inhibited ; and found, if Coldingknows improved that part of the inhibition whereby the party is inhibited he should prevail.

Kerse, MS. fol. 60.

No 8.