

extends a presumption that was recognized at common law.

Callahan v Clemens
184 Md 520, 526 41 A 2d 473

And the rule applies, whether the way be public or private.

Grunwell v Henderson
220 Md 240, 246; 151 A 2d 920

Thus, it seems clear that, at least since 1839, plaintiffs and their predecessors in title have held title to the centers of Federal Street and North Alley, subject only to the limited acceptance of the dedication offered by Nicholas Hall in Federal Street.

It follows that, since Plaintiffs' title runs to the center of Federal Street and North Alley, and there has been only a limited easement created by the public authorities by way of acceptance of dedication, Plaintiffs' improvements in the bed of Federal Street and North Alley may not be disturbed, except by condemnation.

Whittington v Crisfield
121 Md 387, 393; 88 A 232

In conclusion, it must be noted that all the foregoing principles apply where title is held in fee simple. Here, however, Nicholas Hall conveyed only leasehold interests reserving nominal ground rents.

Creation of the Town in this fashion clearly demonstrated Halls intent to dedicate easements in the highways, retaining a reversionary interest and also to retain reversions in the lots.

However, with the passage of time the leasehold interests became fees and when they did the titles acquired carried the reversionary interest to the center of the streets and alleys. In short, the statute of limitations above cited served to convey to the grantees of the several lots all of Nicholas Hall's rever-