

to an order of Redemption 2 July 1625 Doctor Linnard contra Ralphy  
 Stair lib. 2 fol. 10 § 15 lib. 4 fol. 5 § 10 because a Previous Counting was  
 Necessary to know what sums were to be offered and assigned. But the  
 Count and Accounting may be Elided by a Protest taken for not insistent  
 or sentence upon a Summons to insist with Certification not to be heard  
 thereafter, or by an opposite declaration of right upon the apprising  
 Because the process of Counting for Intromission doth not always render the  
 apprising Redeemable. In which case the Lord assigns a Short time to  
 produce the Remainder of the sum at the Bar. Stair lib. 4 fol. 5 § 10  
 Signation by a singular Successor of a sum for Redeeming apprising  
 only led by him against whom the order was used, by all which one  
 requires from others, was sustained. In respect the Reverser or heres  
 the process of Redemption to Assign Instantly all sums in any  
 apprising Established in the Defences for so, if Exceeding the sum  
 and the pursuer being a singular Successor in the Reverser, might not  
 know them all 12 Feb. 1631 Murray contra Lord Gester. When  
 order of Redemption before Enquiring of the legal, doth keep it open  
 as the apprising or adjudication will be Extinguished by the  
 Intromissions after the time it would have otherwise Expired  
 1676 Dyar contra Miles. An apprising was found satisfied in  
 posterior Intromissions, in respect of an order used within the legal  
 a second appriser without Capacity to Deliver the sum Postquam  
 for Redemption in part payment whereof the posterior Intromission  
 was Enquired: Albeit the first appriser had acquired Right to  
 order used against the second appriser, which was not sufficient  
 to Exclude Declarator of Redemption of the first apprising, and  
 out prejudice to the user of the second order to Redeem from  
 user of the first 18 July 1676 Gordon contra Walsan, Geas, and  
 used by two Correi Debandi whose estates were appraised, was found  
 to hinder the apprising to Expire as to the others estates so far  
 1678 Lady Gordon contra the Gardeners as payment by either  
 of them would Extinguish it as to both. An order used by  
 second against a first appriser within the legal was found  
 Intill a third appriser to Redeem both apprisings, while  
 Legal of the second was Current 20 Feb. 1679 Genants of Mor  
 contra E. Queensberry. A second appriser Redeeming the first  
 apprising must if he be not already Insult, pay a Composition  
 to the Superior Stewarts answers to Diblets Doublets etc. Composit  
 Expired Apprisings in the persons of Apparent heirs may  
 get Redeemed from them Summarily by an ordinary action

out any previous order of Redemption Reduction or Declarator 26  
 June 1677 Lindard contra Gordon 22 Feb. 1671 Dunbar of Baldoon  
 contra Dick and others 4 July 1671 L. Balfour contra Douglas Stair  
 lib. 3 fol. 2 § 40 M. Kenzie offers. on Act 62 Par. 1 § 1. Cr. 2 The  
 Legal of Apprisings or adjudications doth not Run against Minors,  
 whom Law supposes to want Judgement to know their hazard. For a  
 Minor against whom an Apprising or adjudication is obtained, or having  
 Right to the Reversion of it by being a posterior appriser, may Redeem  
 any time before he is 25 years of age. A major Successor to a sum  
 against whom the Legal of an Apprising is Expired, with year and day  
 to Redeem; and succeeding to a minor while the Legal is Current, may  
 Redeem at any time before he is 25 years of age. If a Minor Redeem to a Minor  
 whose lands are appraised, he hath Right to Redeem at any time in his Minor  
 rity, as if the apprising had been taken against himself all 6 Par. 2 § 6.  
 The legal Reversion should not Run against a Minor whether he be  
 the first Minor of Decemb. 1677 Bliphant contra Stewart. For the  
 suffering it to Run is a manifest Lesion to the Minor, against which  
 it should be halted: Tho' it be true that the Doctor is a Major man,  
 by assigning his legal Reversion to a Minor, provoke the same  
 Stuart Wagners to Diblets Doublets etc. Legal Reversion § 1. but in p<sup>o</sup>tion  
 But it is not so clear, that a limited Conventional Reversion should  
 not Run against a Minor, again, an acquirial bond against an Apparent  
 heir whose Minor, tho' he hath Renounced to be heir, would not Expire  
 ere against the apparent heir till he be 25 years of age. And upon  
 his being Reported a Creditor adjudging the Reversion from him will  
 have the benefit of it Stuart ibid. fol. Reversions of Conventional Reversion against  
 appar. heirs. Having shewed how an Apprising or adjudication is  
 Redeemable by the deeds of the Debtor or posterior apprisers or  
 adjudgers of the Superior: It Remains to let see how it may be  
 Extinguished by the deed of the Creditor.  
 Apprisings or adjudications within the legal being only  
 Legal Diligence for security of Debt, are the Clothed with Insult  
 ment affected and Qualified (tho' personal Rights) with assignments  
 and black bonds Restrictions or discharges granted by the appri  
 ers to the prejudice even of singular Successors after Expiring of  
 the legal, if the Granters right was there upon tendered Dilig  
 :ous by process Prohibition or other Diligence within the legal albeit  
 the singular Successors be Insult before their Authors right is ques  
 tioned 31 July 1666 E. South esk contra M. of Huntley Stair lib. 3