

1751. *January 10.* CLAIM ON THE ESTATE OF KINLOCH.

No. 17.

No less than three claims were entered for the estate of Sir James Kinloch Nevay, all founded on a strict entail in 1686, completed by charter and sasine, but which had never been recorded in the register of tailzies; one by his son and next heir of tailzie; another by his brother, because the forfeiting person had incurred an irritancy, and by the tailzie had thereby forfeited for all his descendants; another by Kinloch of Kilrie, as heir in remainder to the maker of the tailzie; but because the tailzie was not recorded in the register of tailzies, they were all dismissed.

---

1751. *January 11.* CLAIM ON DUNIPACE.

No. 18.

A CLAIM being entered for the estate of Dunipace by the forfeiting person's brother upon an entail duly completed by charter and sasine, and though not recorded in terms of the act 1685, yet it was itself as old as 1677, and therefore the not recording was not thought a defect; but the tailzie contained no irritancy of debts contracted or other acts of contravention; and for that reason the Court had in a question with this very claimant in the year 1744, (*voce TAILZIE*.) found that the forfeiting person's debts and deeds were effectual against the estate;—and therefore we dismissed the claim.

---

1751. *July 16.*

CLAIMS ON LOVAT, for BAILIES KINCAID, STEWART, and DUNBAR.

No. 19.

IN claims of merchant goods furnished to Lord Lovat, partly before and partly after 24th June 1745; from which time the estate was vested in the Crown; we rejected the claims to all goods furnished after that time, and likewise the claim of annualrents for furnishings before.

---

1752. *February 8.* CLAIMANTS ON M'INTOSH'S ESTATE.

No. 20.

CLAIMANTS on forfeited estates found not entitled to any expenses of diligence on bonds or bills, though incurred before 24th June 1745, from