

not;) as dividends had never been declared by the corporate authorities, nor had any profits been earned. But that whilst maintaining his right to the premises, he denied obstructing the faculty or professors in tending the sick, they having been daily in attendance whilst he was in possession. That the resident professor continued to perform his duties all the time, and the sick were provided with necessaries at his (Green's) expense. That, as to his forcible entry on the 2d of August, he only took such measures as are necessary to the preservation of property in large cities. That, in his answer, filed in the other suit against him, he had exposed the invalidity of the claim of the trustees, and the answer of the said university, filed in the same case, also, opposed and denied it; although it might suit the succeeding faculty to deny the admissions of their predecessors, who were fully cognizant of the facts of the case, and to seek by union with the trustees, to benefit themselves, whilst they failed to keep down the current expenses of the institution, or to apply any thing to the repair of the property. That none of the members of the institution had sworn to the bill, and that the only one of them who had any interest in the concern refused to join in the suit. And that the title of the complainants, if any they had, was a legal one, and to be asserted at law, not in chancery.

On the coming in of this answer, a motion was made to dissolve the injunction, which was argued before the Chancellor, who delivered the following opinion : }

—
THE CHANCELLOR :

One of the grounds taken by the defendant against the continuance of this injunction is, that it transcends the limits usually assigned to this preventive process of the court. That the injunction in this case, instead of simply prohibiting an act to be done, injurious to the rights of the complainants, and leaving things in their then condition, passes beyond this boundary, and commands an act to be undone which had been consummated prior to the filing of the bill. Such, however, was not, nor is it now, my understanding of the extent to which