

hath possessed 7 years after the Pursuer's Possession Star Lib. 1. Tit. 26  
§. 10. Ver. Seventhly, 'Tis true that any having Right by Infestment,  
may remove a naked Possessor; but not a Possessor infest, tho' his Infestment  
be posterior to the Pursuer's, unless he the Pursuer instruct a Progess  
from the Sovereign, or from a common Author to the Pursuer and De-  
fender whose Right neither Party can quarrel; or at least instruct a  
Right perfected by Prescription, or fortified by a Proscriptory Judgement;  
And even then the Defender will exclude him by a proscriptory judgement,  
tho' the Defender's Possession be posterior to his; for any Man may infest  
another. Star Ibid. §. 15. 2. The Defender may plead against Removing  
upon a preferable Right by Virtue whereof he attained Possession: But  
if the Possession followed not upon the Defender's Right but upon the  
Pursuer's, the Defender must restore the Possession, and be left to pursue  
upon his own Right as records Star Lib. 2. Tit. 9. §. 43. Ver. The Ex-  
ception against Removing upon the Defender. As one entering  
Possession upon a temporary Right, cannot after Redemption defend  
himself upon another Right against a Removing at the instance of his  
or his Successors from whom he had Possession 22 November 1677. Newca-  
contra D. Hamilton. 3. The Exception pro indiviso that is, the Defender  
cannot be compelled to remove from the Pursuer's Part of such Lands,  
because he brings the same pro indiviso with other Parts thereto to  
which the Pursuer has no Right, and he cannot know the Pursuer's  
Part to remove herefrom; takes place not only in solemn Removing,  
but also in the Action to find Caution for Mails and Duties, or to remov-  
6 December 1623. contra Carmichael Star Ibid. But it is no

6 December 1623.  
a relevant Plea against removing from any Subject, whereof there  
are daily divisible Profits, as a Captain or Fishing Spots vnde Pratt.  
It. Colleagues Hair Lib. & Lib. 4. Tit. 26. §. 30. Vers. Sixthly. Nor  
is it sufficient to maintain a Widow in Possession by her Tenure of a  
House tho' an invisible Tenement, against the Friar, who was preferre  
to the Possession for his two Thirds, he paying to her a Third of the  
Rent: Because magis habit nimis, the Person having the greatest  
Interest carries the natural Possession, and is habell to be Master of the  
lesser Interest for his Share. But if the Friar do not chuse to dwell  
the House himself, the Lady Tener is preferable to the Possessor;  
she paying as much Rent as any other Tenant, and finding security  
for the two Years 26 January 1655 Logan contra Galbraith Slave Lib.  
2. Tit. 9. §. 43. Vers. The Exception pro me wife Lib. 4. Tit. 26. §. 30  
Vers

Ver. 5. Sixthly. Again, Possession of a Tenement pro indiviso by several Tenants having different Houses, would not be sustained to hinder a Removal of any of these Tenants. And one possessing by a Right coming in pari passu with another greater Right has it frequent in the case of adjudications within Year and Day of one another) mustcede and give Way to the Master of the more considerable interest. Stair Lib. 2. By the Canon Law, a Student or Scholar cannot even after his Term is expired be removed to make Way for another unless by his Consent Arg. c. 5. x. de locat. conduct. If a Tenant's voluntary Obedience to a Warning, by freely removing himself his Family Subtenants and Servants, and leaving the Land void and ris at the Term, and offering the Possession to the Purfuer, is relevant to absolve the Tenant from subsequent Mails and Dilect, without Verdict of a written Renunciation 2. March 1637 Ruth contra Simpson. 30 January 1629 from law contra Adamson. But a Tenant's actual removing conform to a Warning is not sufficient, without renouncing, or offering the void Possession, that the Owner may enter 23 July 1753 Blaize contra Sinclair Stair Lib. 2. Tit. 9. §. 43. Verdict the last Exception against A. moving Lib. 4. Tit. 9. b. §. 10. in fin. For otherwise, if upon a Tenant's removing clandestinely another intrude in his Vicie and sweep point the Warning, the Tenant removed is liable tanguam postea. Seeing the User of the Warning may pass from and not insist in it. And Tenant's actual removing without giving over and offering the void Possession, doth not secure the Master from another's Intrusion, and another in the Vicie, who may put him to a new Riving. ~~But if the Lands be waz'd to remove & the Tenant abiding in obdience to the warning, removed and left the Lands void and ris, was found not liable to the next year's Dilect.~~ The Warning was disorderly, and the Tenant hath no colourable Title to maintain his Possession longer; he will be debarred to remove himself Wife Bairns Tenant's and Servants and to pay to the Purfuer violent Profits of the Land from the Warning till he give Obedience Stair Lib. 2. Tit. 9. §. 43. in his a Decret of Removing against a Relict to remove herself Bairns etc. was found not to extend as a sufficient Warrant to remove her children in familiarie who were not called in the Process 19 Feb. 1663 Scot contra E. Glume. The Purfuer is also ordained to get Possession of the Same itself, and sometimes (as against a violent Relict) to get Possession of the Corns growing thereon Hope May Pratt Tit. 1. Sprinlie Elliot contra L. Bulleugh Yea' even of Kyn of that Crop tho' separated from the ground and stacked by the Person removed Hope Lib. Balmuir contra Williamson. But where the Defender in a Removing hath a probable ground to keep Possession, he is debarred to remove only without being liable to violent Profits Stair Lib. 2. Tit. 9. §. 45. Lib. 4. Tit. 26. §. 17. For the Lords modify these violent Profits in so far as they exceed the ordinary Profits 16 July 1674. E. Argyle contra Mcnaught.

Action for violent Profits is mostly raised after Decree of Removing is obtained: wherein that Decree is both a sufficient Title and Proof against the Parties removed. But it may be also carried on with the Process of Removing. Stair Lib. 4. Tit. 29. S. 3. A Summons for violent Profits runs thus