

Some times a simple Reduction only is sought, some times a Reduction and Imprisonment, and some times a Declarator is chosen either. Because a persons right may be reduced by another having one. Thus formal or superior, or else own right may be liable to question at a third parties instance: so hence the said next right at all but a Declarator thereof is liable to be decimated in the same manner as the Deductions. Then all having Interest must be cited at the Masters Pleas. Law Lib. 4 Feb. 20. And no law and right can be declared absolutely hence and unquarrelable, without first being a Clear quest from the King who is Supreme Superior, or a forty Year Act and an interrupted progress. For albeit the pursuer will may on left ground be declared propable to any rights produced by the Defendants: no less than a progress from the Sovereign, or one found with prescription, can found are straightly liable deced of Decimation.

By our former Custom, the pursuers of Reduction or a Reduction and Imprisonment, behave to Cite the Defendants (either or their heirs) of time usual or apparent. Several Injunctions primarily contain clauses of Joist hands, and the authors are bound to defend rights granted by them. Law Lib. 17. But the pursuer was not obliged to be a heir of Calise or provision alone. In June 1672. Caddison of C. Gray contra Thorsbot of Lands. And if the Defendant hath not we are not liable to be in any manner, the pursuer was under no necessity to be contra Hamilton. It is thought because of the great and various delays occasioned by obliging pursuers to Cite the Defendants, that the pursuers of Reduction or of Imprisonment and Imprisonment, the pursuers of such processes are Exempted from the trouble of Citing the authors of the Defendants, leaving it to the Defendants to Cite their authors, or to Fulminate to them their distress as they think fit. Dec. 16 Feb. 1723.

### §. 1. A simple Reductions.

A single Reduction contains an order to Cite persons or services in the writ to be reduced, to compare the instances of the pursuer, as leaving rights and settling further upon the writs upon which he found his title. Dec. 31 Decem. 1725. §. 3. And to bring with them certain writs to be reduced for such and such reasons, with specification that if the writs called for be not produced, they shall be cited as null till they be produced. No person Registrar can sue Reduction of Injunctions, unless he himself be Injunct upon his behalf.

the Decem. 1630 Ramsay of Cochrane contra. Con. Leath. Law Lib. 4. Feb. 20. §. 14. Conform to the Scots, Numm. quodque Dispoluerit. Eodem modo quo Coligatur. etc. because a personal creditor having priority to the subject whereof the conveyance is quarrelled, the conditional title of mine would be lost upon Robert. If the right were, then it should be Dominium sine Domine, the property of the creditor would hang in suspense, or pass into not be better, or the superior would want a Regaly, and the land be either laid waste, or the title be supposed to pass in the tenants hands, for want of one to buy off them: being the Pursuer would have no title to possess, the person whose Right is denied is caused by the condition, and the common Debtor Swelter in his favour could not be born to possess. These fore personal bonds were found not to be a sufficient title to be fore brought to reduce upon the Act of Parliament of 12. January. And notwithstanding a Disposition of lands granted by the Debtor, and but no Injunction had followed thereon. As in 1709 Brown contra Brown, but a Charge against the Superior upon a typical declaration, with the title the Supp. to be a real right, & called with Injunction, 24 June 1691. Rival contra Douglas & Stearns 25 January 1713. Myerson contra Myerson. because as a Reduction upon a Charge to enter his writ, no less especially among the right of the creditor, than of the heir or debtor being Injunct had Disposed the facts: but to a Charge against the Superior in order to Injunct an adversary or otherwise, with the same effect in order to alter in possession and to raise all sort, Law Lib. 25. §. 2. §. 3. Feb. 2. §. 27. Jan. 1709. Operatur. In the case of a charge, quantum veniat in paper next: being the Judge who shall change the Superior with done and endeavour to have his right made complete. There is the farther Reason for not charging a Charge without Injunct as a good title within the Legality that the obliging title goes to take Injunct would add to the debt a Year only, and so not only the best more difficult for the Debtor to Redem, but also the Expense the Debtor to face left trouble and expense, before the show by Calling for production of other Rights granted by the Common Debtor, whether they will find their account in taking Injunct. Again, a charge against the Superior upon an Injunction, cited for the behoof of an Apparent, their upon his own bond, and he not Injunct was but tamed as a good title to receive real rights. Cited with Injunct 20 January 1665. Little contra E. Withdale 25 January 1713. Myerson contra Myerson. seeing the Apparent, their by the Injunction on his own bond, subjects himself prone to the debts of the deced as especially, as if he were found heirs and in some cases an active title by Injunct, or a charge.