

hauled loads over said land, except as aforesaid, or entered upon or penetrated said land or removed any barriers thereon placed except as aforesaid. They deny that complainant has sustained any injury, in fact, from the acts of defendants, but admit he has brought suit against them, as stated in the bill.

A motion to dissolve the injunction was then made, and testimony taken under a commission issued by agreement of parties, to be read at the hearing of this motion. The purport of this testimony sufficiently appears from the following opinion of the Chancellor.]

---

THE CHANCELLOR :

The allegations of this bill, which stated a case of irreparable mischief, are so far denied by the answer that the injunction must be dissolved unless the proof shows that the trespasses complained of are such that adequate compensation at law could not be given, for it is now settled definitively that the Court of Chancery in this state will not interfere by injunction where the injury is not irreparable and destructive to the plaintiff's estate, but is susceptible of perfect pecuniary compensation, and for which the party may obtain adequate satisfaction in the ordinary course of law. *Amelung et al, vs. Seekamp*, 9 G. & J., 468. The proof in this case does not show such irreparable mischief, and therefore, the injunction must be dissolved.

---

J. J. SPEED, for Complainant.

T. P. SCOTT, for Defendant.