

1. Bloecher & Schaaf v. Baltimore, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, 275 U.S. 490; 48 S. Ct. 33; 72 L. Ed. 389; 1927 U.S. LEXIS 302, Argued October 17, 1927, October 24, 1927

ET AL. v. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE** AND HAMPSON JONES, COMMISSIONER OF ...

2. Phillips v. Baltimore, No. 2476, Circuit Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, 15 F.2d 1016; 1926 U.S. App. LEXIS 3113, April 15, 1926

PHILLIPS, Appellant, v. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE**, Appellees

3. Grand Lodge of Maryland, K. P. v. Baltimore, Nos. 35, 36, COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 157 Md. 542; 146 A. 744; 1929 Md. LEXIS 125, June 25, 1929, Decided

OVERVIEW: Where a benevolent corporation was the equitable owner of property and a building commission was the legal owner during a construction project, the commission, as the holder of the legal title, was subject to a tax assessment. ET AL. v. **THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.**

4. Reinhardt Constr. Co. v. Baltimore, No. 1, COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 157 Md. 420; 146 A. 577; 1929 Md. LEXIS 109, June 24, 1929, Decided

OVERVIEW: In a city's action to recover on a paving contractor's guaranty, the trial court improperly refused to allow pursuit of the defense that guaranty did not cover the concrete's erosion caused by unsuitable liquids flowing onto it from yards.

ET AL. v. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.**

5. Frisch v. Baltimore, No. 67, COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 156 Md. 310; 144 A. 478; 1929 Md. LEXIS 14, January 17, 1929, Decided

OVERVIEW: Tenants' declaration against lessors based on damage from bursting pipes was deficient, in that it did not allege a duty of the lessors in regard to the pipes, and its allegation of negligence in installation and maintenance was too vague.

ET AL. v. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.**

6. Portsmouth Stove & Range Co. v. Baltimore, No. 58, COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 156 Md. 244; 144 A. 357; 1929 Md. LEXIS 9, January 16, 1929, Decided

OVERVIEW: City ordinances for the licensing and regulation of the sale of manufactured gas devices were not void due to an unlawful delegation of power to certain testing agencies. The agencies merely determined if a device was within prescribed regulations.

RANGE COMPANY v. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.**

7. APPLESTEIN v. MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE CITY, No. 18, COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 156 Md. 40; 143 A. 666; 1928 Md. LEXIS 80, November 16, 1928, Decided

OVERVIEW: Following disapproval of a building permit by a board of zoning appeals, the building owners were not entitled to a writ of mandamus. Under relevant ordinances, the owners had the right to appeal and failed to exercise it.

ET AL. v. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE CITY ET AL.**

8. Baltimore v. Board of Supervisors of Elections, No. 111, COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 156 Md. 196; 143 A. 800; 1928 Md. LEXIS 97, October 17, 1928, Decided

OVERVIEW: Mayor and City Council of Baltimore were not entitled to writ of mandamus to compel submission of an ordinance to voters because Maryland Constitution required dual sanction of Maryland General Assembly and voters for creation of municipal debt.

... **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE** v. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ELECTIONS OF **BALTIMORE CITY.**

9. Douty v. Baltimore, No. 66, COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 155 Md. 125; 141 A. 499; 1928 Md. LEXIS 109, April 11, 1928, Decided

OVERVIEW: A citizen in a taxpayer suit was properly denied an injunction against a mayor and city council to prohibit the issuance of certificates of indebtedness. City citizens approved an ordinance allowing such in a regular municipal election.

DOUTY, JR., v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.

10. Thom v. Baltimore, No. 100, COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 154 Md. 273; 141 A. 125; 1928 Md. LEXIS 23, February 2, 1928, Decided

OVERVIEW: A taxpayer was entitled to enjoin a mayor and a city council from issuing certain stock where the mayor and the city council could not validly change a rate of interest specified in an ordinance, which had been submitted to the city's voters.

PEMBROKE THOM v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.

11. Merryman v. Baltimore City, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 153 Md. 419; 138 A. 324; 1927 Md. LEXIS 60, July 8, 1927, Decided

OVERVIEW: Property owners' action seeking to recover damages resulting from the failure of a city to deliver water to a building he owned should have gone to the jury because an implied contract had been created and there was evidence tending to show a loss.

H. MERRYMAN v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

12. Baltimore v. Baltimore Marine Works, Inc., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 152 Md. 367; 136 A. 829; 1927 Md. LEXIS 125, February 16, 1927, Decided

OVERVIEW: Judgment for landowner in its action against the mayor and city council for a taking of property was reversed where the mere inconvenience caused by the change of the grade on surrounding city streets was not a taking under the state constitution.

... MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE v. BALTIMORE MARINE WORKS, INC.

13. Christhlf v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 152 Md. 204; 136 A. 527; 1927 Md. LEXIS 108, January 26, 1927, Decided

OVERVIEW: A contract provision releasing liability against the city in its performance under the terms of the contract included any claims by the contractor against the city for its delay in obtaining title to the property subject to the construction.

ET AL. v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

14. Schluderberg v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 151 Md. 603; 135 A. 412; 1926 Md. LEXIS 135, December 8, 1926, Decided

OVERVIEW: In a suit by a mayor and council against a corporation for taxes due and unpaid, the corporation was precluded from raising the defense that the property was used chiefly for manufacturing because it failed to protest a tax commission's assessment.

KURDLE COMPANY v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

15. State use of Baltimore v. Francis, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 151 Md. 147; 134 A. 26; 1926 Md. LEXIS 92, June 11, 1926, Decided

OVERVIEW: In State's reimbursement suit, dependents' demurrer was improperly sustained because legislature did not intend statute of limitation to limit employer or insurers' reimbursement action to two months after workmen's compensation award was granted.

MARYLAND, FOR THE USE OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, ET AL. v. ...

16. Dobler v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 151 Md. 154; 134 A. 201; 1926 Md. LEXIS 94, June 11, 1926, Decided

OVERVIEW: A court properly instructed a verdict against a landowner where there was no constitutional taking of his property. A city had statutory authority to regrade its street, and the landowner's easement in the use of the street was not destroyed.

J. DOBLER v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.

17. Harris v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 151 Md. 11; 133 A. 888; 1926 Md. LEXIS 76, June 10, 1926, Decided

OVERVIEW: It was proper to deny workman's compensation for the death of a park policeman where the job was that

of a public officer who was not a workman employed for wages within the meaning of the applicable statute.
M. HARRIS v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.

18. St. Paul Bldg. Co. v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 149 Md. 685; 132 A. 51; 1926 Md. LEXIS 159, January 21, 1926, Decided

OVERVIEW: A city seeking to collect a tax assessment against a company was not barred by the statute of limitations from enforcing collection because the statute of limitations did not apply to actions for collection of improvement assessments.

BUILDING COMPANY v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

19. South Baltimore Co. v. Washington, B. & A. E. R. Co., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 149 Md. 678; 132 A. 269; 1926 Md. LEXIS 170, January 21, 1926, Decided

OVERVIEW: A railroad company could not claim that there was an infringement upon rights of ownership in a bridge by the enlargement of the use beyond that contemplated in an agreement because the agreement did not confer a fee simple interest to the company.

... **SOUTH BALTIMORE COMPANY v. WASHINGTON, BALTIMORE AND ANNAPOLIS ELECTRIC RAILROAD COMPANY. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE v. WASHINGTON, BALTIMORE AND ANNAPOLIS ELECTRIC RAILROAD** ...

20. Baltimore v. Bloecher & Schaff, Inc., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 149 Md. 648; 132 A. 160; 1926 Md. LEXIS 168, January 14, 1926, Decided

OVERVIEW: A city's demurrer to a complaint by butchers should have been sustained because the meat ordinance was valid, having a direct relation to protection of public health; it did not deny equal protection by its exemptions.

... **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL. v.** ...

21. Block v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 149 Md. 39; 129 A. 887; 1925 Md. LEXIS 155, June 30, 1925, Decided

OVERVIEW: The dismissal of a bill without prejudice to the rights at law was improper where it precluded the tenants and owners from seeking relief in a court of equity, and to that extent was erroneous.

ET AL. v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.

22. Baltimore v. Fine, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 148 Md. 324; 129 A. 356; 1925 Md. LEXIS 37, May 6, 1925, Decided

OVERVIEW: City collector had right to refuse to accept from taxpayer anything less than amount of taxes due and in arrears for any one year, so that writ of mandamus commanding an act he was under no legal obligation to perform was reversed.

... **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL. vs.** ...

23. Baltimore City v. Harper, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 148 Md. 234; 129 A. 641; 1925 Md. LEXIS 24, April 29, 1925, Decided

OVERVIEW: A mortgage participation certificate, issued by a mortgagee which remained the record holder of the specific mortgage underlying the certificate, was taxable in the hands of the certificate holder and not exempt as an assignment of a mortgage.

... **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE CITY ET AL.** ...

24. Baltimore v. O'Connor, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 147 Md. 639; 128 A. 759; 1925 Md. LEXIS 143; 40 A.L.R. 1058, April 8, 1925, Decided

OVERVIEW: When statute (Maryland), which sought to alter common law practice with respect to compensation and expenses of various municipal officials' salaries, contravened constitutional amendment (Maryland), statute was wholly unconstitutional and void.

... **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE vs. HERBERT R.** ...

25. Baltimore v. Terio, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 147 Md. 330; 128 A. 353; 1925 Md. LEXIS 129, February 6, 1925, Decided

OVERVIEW: A pedestrian could recover from a mayor and city council for injuries he sustained when he was struck by a trash can that a passing truck had dislodged from a sidewalk because he showed that the mayor and council were negligent in locating the can.

... **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE** vs. ELI TERIO.

26. Baltimore use of Warren Webster & Co. v. Maryland Casualty Co., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 146 Md. 508; 126 A. 880; 1924 Md. LEXIS 158, December 4, 1924, Decided

OVERVIEW: The payment for materials furnished by subcontractors was not guaranteed by a surety's bond on a city contract because record failed to disclose any intention on the part of the parties to the bond to provide for the protection of material men.

... **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, FOR THE USE OF WARREN** ...

27. Marchant v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 146 Md. 513; 126 A. 884; 1924 Md. LEXIS 159, December 4, 1924, Decided

OVERVIEW: Judgment in favor of a mayor, a city council, and city commissions was affirmed in their condemnation proceedings against trustees because the proceeding was authorized by resolutions passed by the commissions in the exercise of their powers.

ET AL. vs. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.**

28. Baltimore v. State, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 146 Md. 440; 126 A. 130; 1924 Md. LEXIS 152, September 3, 1924, Decided

OVERVIEW: Recovery against a municipality was affirmed in an action for the death of a passenger who was killed when a motorcycle went over a drop at the end of a street because the municipality was negligent in not erecting a barrier or warning of the drop.

... **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE** vs. STATE OF MARYLAND, ...

29. Stanley v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 146 Md. 277; 126 A. 151; 1924 Md. LEXIS 138, June 21, 1924, Decided

OVERVIEW: The city was without authorization to pass a second ordinance changing the interest rate on the issuance of certain stock because the statute authorizing the city's issuance of said stock provided for only one interest rate for an issuance of stock.

S. STANLEY vs. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.**

30. Fairmount Land Corp. v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 145 Md. 391; 125 A. 796; 1924 Md. LEXIS 93, April 9, 1924, Decided

OVERVIEW: A city could not exercise its summary power of sale to collect an unpaid assessment against a company where the city failed to comply with the prerequisites outlined in its own city charter.

LAND CORPORATION vs. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.**

31. Chesapeake & Potomac Tel. Co. v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 145 Md. 71; 125 A. 440; 1924 Md. LEXIS 44, February 1, 1924, Decided

OVERVIEW: An ordinance that imposed a tax on certain of a company's telephone poles was valid and enforceable; the ordinance did not violate the company's right to equal protection and did not deprive the company of property without due process of law.

TELEPHONE COMPANY vs. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.**

32. Canton Co. of Baltimore v. Seal, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 144 Md. 174; 125 A. 63; 1923 Md. LEXIS 177, November 16, 1923, Decided

OVERVIEW: A company was not chargeable with a duty of keeping a street, where an injured party fell, in repair where the evidence established an effectual dedication and acceptance by a city of the street as a public thoroughfare subject to municipal control.

... THE CANTON COMPANY OF **BALTIMORE** vs. DAISY M. SEAL. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE** vs. DAISY M. ...

33. *President & Managers of Baltimore General Dispensary v. Baltimore*, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 143 Md. 527; 122 A. 638; 1923 Md. LEXIS 117, June 26, 1923, Decided

OVERVIEW: President and managers of a corporation could not restrain collection of an assessment for the cost of a concrete footway or pavement laid in front of the corporation's lot where ordinance was valid. Also, notice was sufficient for proceeding in rem.

... PRESIDENT AND MANAGERS OF THE **BALTIMORE GENERAL DISPENSARY** vs. THE **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.**

34. *Baltimore v. Chesapeake & Potomac Tel. Co.*, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 142 Md. 79; 120 A. 229; 1923 Md. LEXIS 3, January 9, 1923, Decided

OVERVIEW: A telephone company was required to pay a license fee for its use of telephone poles located upon certain public highways in a newly annexed territory to the City of Baltimore because plaintiffs were obligated by law to maintain such highways.

... **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE** vs. **CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC** ...

35. *Dombrowski v. Baltimore*, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 141 Md. 422; 118 A. 861; 1922 Md. LEXIS 125, June 23, 1922, Decided

OVERVIEW: In Maryland case in which intestate's estate funds went to city under statute due to lack of widow or kin within fifth degree, intestate's first cousins were within fifth degree under court's construction of other statute and could recover the funds.

ET AL. vs. THE **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.**

36. *State use of Dove v. Baltimore*, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 141 Md. 344; 118 A. 753; 1922 Md. LEXIS 112, June 22, 1922, Decided

OVERVIEW: In State's negligence suit, verdict for power company was improper because where a decedent's alleged contributorily negligent acts were such that reasonable minds could differ as to their quality, the question should have been submitted to a jury.

ET AL., vs. THE **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE** AND THE **CONSOLIDATED GAS ELECTRIC** ...

37. *Baltimore v. Tickner*, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 141 Md. 148; 118 A. 136; 1922 Md. LEXIS 87, May 3, 1922, Decided

OVERVIEW: Where a city water board failed to respond to customer protests in their bills, and instead entered into new contracts, the board waived its right to terminate the water service for nonpayment.

... THE **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.** vs. ...

38. *Baltimore v. Dobler*, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 140 Md. 634; 118 A. 168; 1922 Md. LEXIS 75, March 22, 1922, Decided

OVERVIEW: A preliminary injunction was improperly granted where city's proposed regrading of street did not amount to a constitutional taking of landowner's property for public use. There was no physical taking or destruction of his easement in use of street.

... THE **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.** vs. ...

39. *State ex rel. Baltimore v. Rutherford*, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 145 Md. 363; 125 A. 725; 1922 Md. LEXIS 256, March 5, 1922, Decided

OVERVIEW: City officials were denied certiorari review of city court's refusal to strike landowner's request for jury trial in zoning appeal where court of appeals did not have original jurisdiction to issue the writ and an ordinance permitted the jury trial.

MARYLAND EX REL. **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL.** vs. ...

40. *Engel v. Mayor, etc., of Baltimore*, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 140 Md. 284; 117 A. 901; 1922 Md. LEXIS 58, January 13, 1922, Decided

OVERVIEW: After it became illegal to sell certain liquors, licensee was entitled to only a portion of his license fee

because refund was required only after use of the license was stopped and it was surrendered, and he had continued to use it for other drinks.

N. ENGEL vs. THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

41. Pennsylvania R. Co. v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 140 Md. 77; 116 A. 859; 1922 Md. LEXIS 11, January 11, 1922, Decided

OVERVIEW: A railroad company was entitled to a judgment as a matter of law in an action against it by the city for the cost of work on the city's water pipe line that ran over a railroad bridge. Changes in the bridge did not require changes in the pipe line.

RAILROAD COMPANY vs. THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

42. MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE v. BOARD OF HEALTH FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 139 Md. 210; 115 A. 43; 1921 Md. LEXIS 158, June 28, 1921, Decided

OVERVIEW: A city council was required to answer bill praying for injunction to restrain garbage contract where the city council admitted that the contract would cause garbage to be unloaded near community, which would prove a source of disease and pestilence.

... **MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL. vs. BOARD OF HEALTH FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY.**

43. Burns v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 138 Md. 582; 115 A. 111; 1921 Md. LEXIS 125, June 27, 1921, Decided

OVERVIEW: In a pedestrian's negligence action, where the defect causing the injury was long-standing, and the pedestrian had full knowledge of it, a city court properly instructed the jury the pedestrian had been guilty of contributory negligence.

... **LEONORA BURNS vs. THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.**

44. Charles v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 138 Md. 523; 114 A. 565; 1921 Md. LEXIS 106, May 13, 1921, Decided

OVERVIEW: In suit for damages to car, judgment for mayor and a city council and against automobile owner was proper. Driver of car struck central wall of bridge. Lights were out on bridge because of unusual weather conditions, and the city was not negligent.

... **MARION CHARLES vs. THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.**

45. Baltimore v. Hampton Court Co., [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 138 Md. 271; 113 A. 850; 1921 Md. LEXIS 85; 15 A.L.R. 304, April 6, 1921, Decided

OVERVIEW: Building owner's action questioning validity of ash removal ordinance was dismissed because there was nothing in ordinance that was capricious, oppressive, unreasonable, or discriminating to such extent as to invite or permit judicial interference.

... **THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE ET AL. vs. THE ...**

46. Bouis v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 138 Md. 284; 113 A. 852; 1921 Md. LEXIS 86, April 6, 1921, Decided

OVERVIEW: A decree sustaining a city's demurrer to a complaint challenging the validity of several ordinances concerning a parkway was affirmed because the title to one ordinance was sufficient and the preliminary advertisements were sufficient.

G. BOUIS vs. THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

47. Cordish v. Bloom, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 138 Md. 81; 113 A. 578; 1921 Md. LEXIS 56, March 1, 1921, Decided

OVERVIEW: A city and a property owner were liable for a pedestrian's injuries after the pedestrian caught his foot between a door and its frame because the door and the frame were constructed in violation of a city ordinance.

ABRAHAM CORDISH vs. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

48. Mason v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 137 Md. 476; 112 A. 818; 1921 Md. LEXIS 17; 13 A.L.R. 939, January 12, 1921, Decided

OVERVIEW: Driver who attempted to outrun the opening of the draw of a bridge and who ran into an obstruction or safety gate as it arose in his path was properly found guilty of contributory negligence in an action against a mayor and a city council.

B. MASON vs. THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

49. Gold v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 137 Md. 335; 112 A. 588; 1921 Md. LEXIS 7; 14 A.L.R. 1389, January 11, 1921, Decided

OVERVIEW: A municipal corporation was immune from the father's negligence action that alleged that his infant child was injured by a door at a public school that was maintained by the municipal corporation.

REUBEN GOLD. vs. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

50. Baltimore v. De Palma, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 137 Md. 179; 112 A. 277; 1920 Md. LEXIS 117, December 1, 1920, Decided

OVERVIEW: A child was not entitled to recover for injuries he sustained while on a city pier where the pier was not a public highway and the child had no right to be on the pier. The pier was reserved for the use of lumber merchants and other city merchants.

... THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE AND GODDARD J. MATTINGLY ...

51. Duross v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 136 Md. 56; 110 A. 98; 1920 Md. LEXIS 31, February 4, 1920, Decided

OVERVIEW: In a negligence action brought to recover damages for personal injuries sustained by a pedestrian on a city street, the case was properly withdrawn from the jury where the pedestrian was guilty of contributory negligence in not using due care.

... THEODORE DUROSS vs. THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

52. Baltimore v. Pattison, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 136 Md. 64; 110 A. 106; 1920 Md. LEXIS 34, February 4, 1920, Decided

OVERVIEW: A judgment for a criminal court clerk in an action against a city to recover fees for his services was upheld because, while there was no statutory basis for the recovery of those fees, the established custom was part of the State's common law.

**... THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE vs. SAM W. ...
CLERK OF THE CRIMINAL COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY.**

53. Sanderson v. Baltimore, [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL], COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, 135 Md. 509; 109 A. 425; 1920 Md. LEXIS 11, January 13, 1920, Decided

OVERVIEW: A property owner, who bought a lot after a street was dedicated to a city, was entitled to recovery for the damages caused to her property by the strict construction, when the city had not accepted the dedication until after she built her house.

N. SANDERSON vs. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.