

quired any argument from the defendants' counsel he would notify them, otherwise he would decide the case at once, when the complainants' notes had been considered.

ANSWER OF THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS.

The following is the answer filed by Mr. Wallis, the counsel for the Police Board, to the bill for injunction, &c.:

To the Hon. Robert N. Martin, Judge of the Superior Court of the City of Baltimore, sitting in Equity: The answer of Lefevre Jarrett, Wm. H. B. Fusselbaugh and Jas. E. Carr, constituting the Board of Police of the City of Baltimore, to the bill of complaint and injunction of Alexander M. Rogers, William Kennedy, John Clark, Johns Hopkins and Benjamin Deford, filed in this court against them and William Thomson, sheriff of Baltimore:

These respondents, reserving all proper exceptions, say that they are not advised as to the place of residence of the said complainant, Alexander M. Rogers, but they are informed and believe that the complainants, Johns Hopkins, William Kennedy and John Clark, profess to reside and claim their residence in Baltimore county, and have done so ever since the taxation of the City of Baltimore on personal property has been onerous and greatly in excess of that of the counties, although they do and during all that time have done business in the City of Baltimore, and have had and still have all the benefits of a residence there, while avoiding its burdens. These respondents therefore charge that said Hopkins, Kennedy and Clark are not residents, nor is either of them a resident of said city, and that their allegation to the contrary is false. The respondents believe that Benjamin Deford, the other complainant, resides in the City of Baltimore. Whether any of said complainants, as they allege, pay taxes "to the fisc of this State" these respondents do not know, except from hearsay. They are quite sure that said complainants pay no taxes they can avoid, and they, therefore, neither admit nor deny the allegation of the bill in that regard, leaving the complainants to proof thereof.

These respondents know nothing of the alleged qualifications of said complainants, or any of them, to vote at all State elections, nor do they know what oaths two or