

back to the Chancery, a third precept is given only called & Sifin feoff from these words leisir and also termed Furehe or Friseas from the French Frouiche after, perhaps for that as a fond call the grains in this precept in alternative term Commands the Superior to give Sifin, or else an order will go to the Sheriff to give the same. The Superior being Required upon this precept at his command his performance will be oblige Report to the Chancery; the Director, without any mention or precept, shall forth a forth precept Relative to the three former precepts of Pistooyd, to the Sheriff Steward or Baillie of the jurisdiction where the lands by of the Contumacious Superior be their lying. Sealed ale Vafal, or to his Immediate Superior, if he hold of another Superior Interjected between him and the King, and upon that supersubdience to the Judge of the proper Jurisdiction Commanding him to give Suffitment to the Clerk in respect of the Summable Superior, Contingent, & Corp Minus Rato. etc. Precept directed to the Superior, 133 and so forth till the King arrived at the King who Parker Refused to enter any person. The question whether a Contumacious Superior by suffering his Vafal to be entered by the Sheriff, Steward, his Superior during his own or his Vafals lifetime or before his death and the Reasons on all sides set forth by Sir Thomas Hope (Min. Rato, 142 & Seqq.) But that great Lawyer (ibid.) in his precept of Sifin to Clare Constat n. 137) says that the Contumacious Superior by suffering his Vafal to be Entred by the Sheriff, Steward & so forth the Sifin or; and notwithstanding thereof Remains Superior as before.

The Contumacious Superior by suffering his Vafal to be Entred by the King or another Mediate Superior Loses the Superior non entry duties during that Vafals life; being the Contumacy was purged by the King or other Mediate Superior Supplying the Vice of the Immediate Superior; But is that Excepted from the Benefit of other Causes alias as Senior Blenched Duties, ward and different Escheats or from non entry Duties anterior to the Vafals life in obtained from the Mediate Superior 18 Decem. 1630 Starke contract. Birth 29 June 1632 contract Acknowledges. Blair lib. 3 fol. 3 5 4 6. &c. 48 M. Kenzie lib. 3 fol. 8 & 34. Because quod hys Anterior non entry duties or other Causes alias of Superiority he was not Culpable, but to accute to him this the Vafals own fault which brought not to the Superior. But the lord Blair (ibid.) is not so Cleary that such an Eschewal will not be left to the Contumacious Superior during his life and belong to the Mediate Superior, during his life of the Contumacious Superior life. Because other wise the Particular against him signifies nothing.

For preventing this forfeiture of the Contumacy of non entry, the lessor, before Directing the fourth and last precept to the Sheriff &c. where the land by for giving a fief, uses to suspend the precept to himself against him out of the Chancery, upon the Reasons following. 1. That the precepts are fundamental, the vassal doing the like to his Superior which he is obliged to do by Law; and he hath not paid the Reliefs and non entry duties from the time that it appears from the Colour that the lands are held rents &c. fell in non entry which is sustained, 1 July 1623 L. Covington contra Captain Crawford 29 July 1624 L. Caprington contra R. K. 12 March 1630 Somervel contra L. Brown of Highmonbury Duties he liquid Spotswood Rato. etc. Entry to lands. But where the Contumacy Duties are not Confiteate nor liquid, the Superior is bound to enter his Vafal tho they be not paid Craig Head lib. 2 fol. 17 & D. Spotswood lib. A Superior of Ward lands was ordained to enter his Vafal. L. R. without getting payment or the full Rent of the Lands for three terms sufficient to the Ward, as the Non entry duties, without prejudice to his right there to prout de jure. Seeing the Superior was not in possession of the Lands, and those Duties were not liquid 23 January 1630 Peebles contra Lord Leslie 2^o Another Relies and he for of a Suspension of a charge to enter an heir, is his not producing to the Superior (technical Evidents of the Lands &c.) that the precept of Sifin might be made Conform thereto. Because the precept and Suffitment blenched would be a sufficient title without producing an older, whereby the provisions with which the ancient rights were perhaps Clogged, might be rendered Ineffectual. Besides it is the Vafals Duty to Show his hold ing to the Superior, that can never be more properly done them at the Vafal's entry Starke lib. 3 fol. 5 8 49. Nor is a Superior bound to Renue the fee in other terms than those Contained in the first Investiture, which is Regula Regularis of the Renovation, and to which in case of Doubt or Difficulty Recourse is to be had: for all the conditions and qualitatis of the first Investiture, are understood to be repeated in the Subsequent, unless it appear to have been agreed between the Superior and Vafal, to Depart from the tenor of the first Investiture; Craig Head. lib. 2 fol. 12 § 4 ver. Siendum est 3^o A third Reason of Suspension may be founded on the Superior's right to the property, by appropriating or adjudication worn Deceit of Declaration of Recognition or other Primitivus of the Feofor by a Decret of Improvement of the Land Retours But a Defendant professeth his Infrance against the King's precept or upon any such ground will not stop his entry; and the Superior shall in that case will be Relieved only as heards Starke lib. 3 fol. 5. 8 49. So a Superior was found obliged to Receive his Subvafal upon his Vafal's Reprise