No 66.

In an action to have the Magistrates liable for a debt, it was found, that the horning, as well as the caption, must be produced. 1624. July 6. Bailies of Kilrinny against ———.

The Bailies of Kilrinny being pursued at ones instance for not taking of a rebel, conform to letters of caption directed against them, whereby they were charged to take the rebel, he being in their company for the time, and therefore they were pursued for payment of the sum for which the rebel was denounced; in this process, the Lords found, That they would not sustain this action, by the production of the letters of caption against the Bailies, except the letters of horning were also produced and shown, which was the warrant whereupon the caption was directed; albeit the pursuer alleged and answered, That he ought not to be compelled to produce the horning, seeing the disobedience of the charge of caption was the foundation of this action, and was sufficient against them, who ought to dispute if there was horning or not, seeing the Judge saw the horning before he granted caption thereupon, and it was not their part to inquire any further, but to obey. Which was repelled, and the horning ordained to be produced to the pursuer.

Clerk, Scott.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 181. Durie, p. 137.

1627. February 10.

DONATAR of STUART'S Liferent against DEBTOR.

No 67.

In a special declarator of a donatar to the liferent of John Stuart of Colding-hame, against a debtor, the Lords found no necessity to produce the horning in the said declarator, after the general declarator, albeit the debtor was not called, and that he *alleged*, that the horning ought now to be produced to him, that he might see the same, and oppone against it; which allegeance was repelled.

Act. Craig.

Alt. Belshes.

Clerk, Gibson.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 181. Durie, p. 271.

1627. June 16.

DICKSON against ACHANAY.

No 68.

In an action betwixt Dickson and Achanay, the Lords astricted the charger to produce the decreet whereupon the charge was executed, and found, that the precept directed by the inferior Judge, giver of the decreet, against the suspender, satisfied not the production in the suspension, albeit the sum therein contained was but fifty pounds, or thereby; and albeit there was no reason libelled against the decreet, but only that the suspender alleged, that if the