

John of L.1000 for the said bear. John Byres confirms himself as executor creditor and intromitter with the defunct's goods and gear; other creditors pursue him, as executor, for the debt owing to them by the defunct, and allege the bond on deathbed to be null, at the least not valid to exclude them from getting payment of their debt *pro rata*. He alleged, he has most cause of retention, because of the bond given to him for his just debt. The Lords sustained the bond and clause of retention.

*Page 73.*

---

1628. *February 16.* JOHN ARCHIBALD'S CREDITORS *against* His RELICT.

UMQUHILE Mr John Archibald his wife is pursued by certain of her husband his creditors, for certain household gear arrested in her hands, pertaining to her umquhile spouse;—she alleges, That, by her contract of marriage, her husband was bound to lay out 2000 merks, wherein he was obliged to infest her in conjunct fee, which was not done; and that she had transferred this contract against her husband's executors; and so had just cause of detention of her domiciles for implement of a part of her said contract of marriage. Which exception the Lords found relevant.

*Page 260.*

---

1628. *February 21.* CONSTABLE of DUNDEE *against* DR BLAIR.

AN assignation to a bond made by a superior to infest the cedent, will not defend the assignee in a removing pursued by the said superior against the assignee's tenants.

*Page 13.*

---

1628. *February 21.* The LAIRD of MONIMUSK *against* The LAIRD of PITTARRO.

THE Laird of Monimusk pursues the Laird of Pittarro to exhibit and redeliver to him certain bonds in favour of his own bairns, which he delivered to the said Laird of Pittarro in keeping. The defender alleges that the summons was not relevant: Seeing the bonds were made in favour of bairns, they ought not to be redelivered back again, to their prejudice. The Lords found the summons relevant for exhibition, reserving defences against the delivery.

*Page 70.*

---