SECT. 9. IMPLIED DISCHARGE AND RENUNCIATION.

6461

at the horn long before, and so the King had right to the same by the liferent long before the comprising. In a cause of Sir Patrick Murray's it was found otherwise in my opinion.

No 54.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 435. Spottiswood, (Escheat & Liferent.) p. 99.

1629. Fuly 1.

LA. CATHCART against VASSALS.

No 55.

Found that the King's confirmation of a ward or blench holding to be holden of the Lo. Cathcart, who held ward of the Prince free from recognition but not from ward.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 435. Kerse, MS. fol. 81.

*** See Durie's report of this case, No 6. p. 4176.

1669. June 19.

Scot against Langton.

No 56.

Found that the King's consenting to a wadset granted by his vassal, implied a renunciation of the vassal's liferent escheat quead the wadset.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 435. Stair.

** See this case, No 32. p. 5100.

1672. June 28.

EARL of EGLINTON against LORD GREENOCK.

No 57.

Feus granted to a sub-vassal with consent of the superior are, by virtue of the act 1606, cap. 12. secure against ward.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 435. Gosford. Stair.

. See this case, No 7. p. 4177.

1673. February 6.

LORD HALTON against The Earl of WEMYSS.

The Lord Halton having a gift of the recognition of the estate of Craig, pursues declarator of recognition, on this ground, that the whole ward lands were disponed by Craig to Pittarro, after the King's return, anno 1660. Compearance is made for the Earl of Wemyss, who produced an infeftment of annualrent granted by Craig out of his whole estate united in one barony; which

No 58.
The King's confirmation of a right to part of the ward lands granted by the vassal,