

will create a perception of a problem with her property and cause harm to her goodwill. Defendant submits that there is no injury done or threatened in this situation. Not only does Plaintiff have adequate off street parking space for her tenants without having to use the Disputed Area, there have been no defection of tenants from her apartment building as a result of the alleged lack of off street parking. In fact, one of the former owners of Defendant's property, is currently one of Plaintiff's tenants and waited several months for a vacancy to occur. In short, rental properties such as that owned by Plaintiff are in extremely high demand among prospective tenants in Frederick and there is no indication that Plaintiff has or will suffer the harm alleged.

Finally, in connection with the issue of whether or not Plaintiff has an adequate remedy at law in this particular case, Maryland law has always held that when title to realty is in dispute, and no irreparable damage from the delay in an action at law is to be feared, the proper jurisdiction is at law and not by injunction. Potomac Edison Co. v. Routzahn, 192 Md. 449 (1949); Easter v. Overlea Land Co., 129 Md. 627 (1917) (injunction should not be granted where landowners have a full and adequate remedy at law for any trespass committed by other landowners in erecting a fence on their land). In Finglass v. George Franke Sons Co., 172 Md. 135 (1937) the Court of Appeals upheld the trial court's denial of an injunction sought by the Plaintiff lot owner to enjoin the