

2^o. A Grant or Gift may be base and unlawful only on the part of him who receives: As if a Depository demands Money for the Thing deposited with him, or a Thief for goods which he has stolen, or any Person exalts Money to hinder him from committing Theft or Murder. In which case he who has given Money on such Account, may recover it again altho' the Receiver pr. & s. f. de cond. ob turp. caus. Where a Cauditor took Bond from the principal Debtor for a Sum of Money, as a Reward of becoming his son-in-law to him, the Bond was annulled as contra bonos mores 24 January 1711 King contra her. A Bond granted by me in Suit of a Woman to her step-father for interposing and promoting the Marriage was not sustained as contra bonos mores 23 June 1680 Hamilton contra Barthwick. Because it is not lawful for one who is in place of a Parent and oblig'd to do for the Son what he ought to do for his Father, forming a gratification without betraying his Trust by matching his Reward to an undeserving Person.

3^o. Money may be base and unlawful both on the part of the Giver and Receiver: As when a Person receives Money from another either by himself or by a third Hand, to commit some Crime some Offence or Vice; or when a Woman bargains with a Man to let him have the use of her Body for a sum of Money; or when one who has a Law suit depends upon Money to the Judge to engage him to give Judgment in his favor; ie who has given the Money is pretty stripped of what he had not to so bad a Man as he cannot recover it P.3. l. 3. f. de cond. Stagg. Aus. Nor can the Receiver reap the Profit of the Bribe of his master, altho' he had executed the unlawful Engagement for which he received the Money, but it becomes odious in itself; Les Lois Civiles c. Tom. I. Part. I. Liv. I. Tit. 10. Sect. 4. Part. 27 Cyprian Regnier longior. Belgae ad d. l. 3. Stair Lib. I. Tit. 7. §. 8. It is true, according to some Texts in the Civil Law in the Code where a contract is less than that of the giver by the Receiver's not being made to restore what he has received l. 3. in fin. f. de cond. ob turp. caus. l. 2. l. cod. But on the supposing him of such a fault, but likewise by the other Punishments which he may have deserved. And the Roman Law in another case enacts that those who receive Money to create Trouble to one, to bring an Action against him or to accuse him of a Crime, or to desist from so doing, shall be made to restore four fold what they have received l. 3. pr. ff. de by a Man to a Woman he had committed Adultery with and had two Children by, was sustained 25 June 1692 Ross contra Robertson. Because Meritrix turpiter fecit quod sit meritorum, non turpiter accepit cum sit meritorum. l. 3. f. de cond. ob turp. caus. But this Reason is not sure and sound, because both Giver and Receiver were alike base, and so the Decision clashed with the Principle formerly laid down, and is contrary to the opinion of the best

best Lawyers des Lois civiles & Ad. fo. Voel imm. ad art. f. de cond. ob turp. caus. n. 2. Stair lib. The Action which lies for Restitution of Money or other Things given for a Base and Unlawful Cause, is termed *condicione turpem causam* Restitution of things, or Money given as due by Mistake.

He who receives Payment of what is not due to him, thro' the Majoris Mistake, lies under an Obligation to restore the Money, as in the following By an implied Contract as if he had actually received the Money, such some Lawyers therefore call *presumptio* or *quasi mutatio*. Two things are required to create this obligation. 1. The Thing given will not belong to the Receiver nor the Money paid is due. 2. The Payment must be made thro' Ignorance of Mistake, not only in the Dower as Sir George M' Donal is (not Lib. 3. Tit. 3. §. 15) insinuate, but in both Lawyer and Receiver who are of the same Mind. The former must suppose that he was truly debtor in that he gave, and the latter shall be received what was due to him. For one who takes Payment of what he knows not to be due, is guilty of Theft l. 44. §. 15. art. 1st. But Error in sale, Purchase and marriage contracts, who paying what he knew to be due not in due gold or Repetition P.3. §. 3. l. 30. f. de cond. in Causa contra praesul et lib. 55. f. de reg. quis. L. postea. Ignorance in the due other will cause Ignorance of the Law as well as of the due to make the obligation of restoration But then held more probably not to. This is not a case of Fact, for ignorance of the Law exculps the Man but it is just & due. If you l. 3. i. ad L. Tullie. l. 6. l. 7. C. de lice. incid. fo. Voel Contra. et lib. 3. in fin. inde.

3. Thing is not due either *ex re* or *ex persona*. A Debt is not due *ex re*, when either Nothing is due at all, or not so much as is paid. If nothing was due, Restitution certainly lies l. 3. l. 8. C. de cond. indeb. If what is paid was partly due, partly only so much as was not due, can be sought back, so be it is a Function, or at least such as admits of partial Restitution, without detriment to either Party. If any Thing of any individual Nature more valuable than the real Debt, is given by Mistake, the whole may be recalled, the former obligation remaining always in force. l. 26. §. 4. §. 6. l. 34. f. de Reg. p. 1. If a Debtor pays before the Term, even altho' the Thing were not due till after his Death, the Money is not to be restored, as if plus tempore were paid and the Debtor who receives the Payment, altho' he had no Right to demand it, may nevertheless retain it l. 3. l. 17. f. de cond. indeb. For the Debtor might if he thought fit, pay before it was due, and he has paid only what he owed. Nor can Interest for the Money during the Interval be claimed, Art. l. 26. C. de Usu. Because Unnatural as *Interest* follows the Principal. But if it was a conditional Debt depending on the Event of something which had not happened, and which might perhaps never happen he who had received payment of it thro' Mistake would not obtain it.