1771. FRASER, &c.

an attainted party, whom failing, "to any other son or sons " of the body of the said John Mackinnon, the father, (at-" tainted person,) according to their seniorities; whom fail-sinclair, &c. "ing, to John Mackinnon of Missinish." The eldest son died without issue, and the attainted person, although then alive, having then no other sons in existence to take the estate in virtue of the above destination, Mackinnon of Missinish, as specially substituted therein, served heir, was infeft, and took possession. Some time thereafter, the attainted father married a young lady, and had two sons by the marriage, who were nearer heirs; but, in the interval, Mackinnon of Missinish had sold the estate. The question of law, in these circumstances, for the decision of the Court was, Whether an heir-substitute in possession of, and infeft in, the estate, but whose title was defeasible or determinable by the birth of a nearer heir, could sell the estate, and so disappoint his succession? Held, by the whole Court of Session, that as he was the nearest heir in existence at the time of the succession opening, he was entitled to be served heir of provision, and to take possession of the estate, and this absolutely, without any restraint against selling, unless such restraint were imposed by the deed; and sustained the defences against reducing the sale.

Against, this judgment appeal was taken to the House of Lords.

After hearing counsel, it was

Ordered and adjudged that the appeal be dismissed, and that the interlocutors therein complained of be, and the same are hereby affirmed.

For Appellants, Ja. Montgomery, Al. Forrester. For Respondents, Al. Wedderburn, Tho. Lockhart, Ar. Macdonald.

· (M. 4542.)

Archibald Sinclair, Esq. and William Su- Appellants; THERLAND, his Attorney,

ALEXANDER FRASER, Esq. and JANE, his Wife, Respondents.

House of Lords, 4th March 1771.

Foreign Decree.—Effect of a Foreign decree, when founded on in the Courts of Scotland.

For Report of this Case, Vide Morison, 4542.

The appellant Sinclair having, as attorney in Jamaica,

1771.

Ross, &c.

v.

Ross.

made large advances for his constituent, in Scotland, on being superseded in his office, raised action before the supreme court of Jamaica, and, after appearance made, obtained decree against him.

Dec. 12, 1767.

In an action brought against him in the courts of Scotland, founding upon the decree, the Court of Session held that the foreign decree was not conclusive evidence of the debt, and ordered him to produce the vouchers of his claim.

Against this judgment the present appeal was brought.

After hearing counsel, it was

Ordered and declared that the judgment of the supreme court of Jamaica ought to be received as evidence prima facie of the debt; and that it lies upon the defendant to impeach the justice thereof, or to show the same to have been irregularly obtained. It is therefore ordered and adjudged that the said several interlocutors complained of be, and the same are hereby reversed.

For Appellants, Al. Wedderburn. H. Dalrymple. For Respondents, Ja. Montgomery, John Dalrymple.

Hugh Ross, Esq. and Wife,

David Ross, Esq.,

- Respondent.

House of Lords, 10th April 1771.

Clause—Whether a certain clause in a deed carried heritable debts.

Vide Morison, 5019, for a full report of this case.

In a conveyance of an estate, particularly described in the deed, there was adjected the following clause: "All my "goods, gear, debts, sums of money, corn, cattle, and all "other effects, which shall belong to him at the time of his "decease, of what nature or kind soever they are." It was held by the Court of Session that this clause did not carry heritable debts secured by adjudication or heritable bonds; and that these fell to the heir at law, although he was expressly cut off from the succession by the deed with a shilling.

On appeal to the House of Lords the judgment was affirmed.

For Appellants, J. Dunning, Al. Forrester.

For Respondent, Ja. Montgomery, Al. Wedderburn.