

fore Sir Patrick's confirmation ; but he, being superior himself, did put in a date posterior to the confirmation which he gave to his son ;)—or the time of the delivery of the said confirmation, ought to be respected : which delivery was after his son's confirmation some days ; and he ought not to have gratified and preferred so conjunct a person as his son, to the prejudice of the poor.

But they had not required him, or taken instruments against him, on the true date of their requisition ; because they were to get it gratis from him, and he might have demanded a composition. *Vide infra*, 18th Jan. and 18th Feb. 1682.

*Vol. I. Page 165.*

1682. *January 18.*—The case betwixt Nisbet and the Poor of St Cuthbert's Parish, (9th December 1681,) being reported by Pitmedden ; the Lords sustained the Poor's condescendance, and, before answer, admitted it to probation by the oaths of the elders and others.

*Vol. I. Page 170.*

*February 18.*—Between the Poor of the West-Kirk Parish and Sir Patrick Nisbet, (9th December 1681 ;) the Lords having advised the depositions of the witnesses for proving the condescendance, with Sir Patrick's oath, they found he used indiscreet means for getting himself preferred to the Poor of the West-kirk in diligence, though an elder ; and therefore, though his right and confirmation was prior in date to the Poor's, yet they ordained the Poor to come in *pari passu* with him, and the maills and duties to be divided equally betwixt them, conform to their several rights and infeftments upon Alexander Sked's lands on the Water of Leith.

*Vol. I. Page 175.*

1682. *February 21.* PATRICK CADDEL *against* JOHN HALL.

PATRICK Caddel against John Hall, late bailie in Edinburgh. The Lords, on Saline's report, ordained, before answer, the disposition founded on by John Hall, and granted by Mrs Caddel to her son Patrick the pursuer, for relief of his becoming cautioner for her to John Hall, to be produced, before they determine if it was a ratification or homologation of this debt, (contracted in his minority,) after his majority : and grant diligence against all havers for recovery thereof.

*Vol. I. Page 175.*

1682. *February 21.* The LADY PITCAIRLIE *against* Sir DONALD BAIN of TULLOCH.

The Lords, upon Halton's report, find that umquhile Mr John Bain of Pitcairlie, his writing chamber in Edinburgh, ought not to be sold for the payment of his debts ; but that the same belongs to John M'Farlane and Rorie Bain, in terms of the bond of tailyie ; and that they may presently enter to and possess the said chamber. And find that Pitcairlie's relict, by his destination, is liable to the whole debts, and to relieve the heirs of tailyie thereof. And, in order to the satisfying the said debts and relieving the heirs, they decern her presently