

to undo any thing. (f) The Court of Chancery by this writ merely prohibits certain acts, or any further acts from being done. And where acts have been done in violation of an injunction, it will order them to be undone or the matter restored; but I am not aware of any instance where it has, by an original writ of this kind, caused a nuisance to be abated or removed. (g)

Whereupon it is *Ordered*, that an injunction issue prohibiting the said company from erecting any new or other obstruction in the said towing path or highway in the bill mentioned; or in any manner to prevent him, the plaintiff, from using the same. And the said defendants may at any time, after the filing of their answer, move to dissolve the said injunction on giving ten days notice thereof to the said plaintiff. And the register is directed to endorse a copy of this order on the said writ of injunction.

On the 16th of July, 1829, the defendants put in their answer, which is certified as the answer of '*The Proprietors of the Susquehanna Canal*,' under the seal of that body politic; in which they admit the deed from them to *Wilson*, as stated in the bill; but put the plaintiff to the proof of his title in other respects; and they admit that a frame house was erected on the place mentioned; but aver, that ample space between it and the Canal has been left for a towing path, &c. And deny, that the plaintiff, or any other person had a right to use the said towing path as a wagon or cart way to the said mill, &c.

On the 22d of August, 1829, the plaintiff, with leave, filed an amended bill, upon which an injunction was granted upon the same terms as on the original bill. After which the defendants answered as before.

The plaintiff, by his petition filed on the 11th of October, 1830, so far as it is sustained by the affidavits exhibited with it, complains that the defendants and two of their agents had committed a breach of the injunction, by cutting away the bank or towing path of the Canal in two places, so as to prevent the use of it; and were about to erect locks of stone walls and wood in the places where the banks were removed. Upon which an attachment was prayed and granted.

The respondents against whom the attachments were awarded, by their answer, admit the fact of their having made two cuts

---

(f) *Norwood v. Norwood*, 2 Bland, 471, note.—(g) *Murdock's Case*, 2 Bland, 470.