port the allegation of their bill, and the case having been heard on the application for a receiver, and the motion to dissolve the injunction, the Chancellor delivered the following opinion:]

THE CHANCELLOR:

This case is brought before the court upon the motion to dissolve the injunction, in connection with which the application for the appointment of a receiver has been argued; and it is quite manifest, and has not been controverted, that if the injunction should be continued, it would be proper and necessary to put a receiver upon the property—and if, on the contrary, it should be thought proper, under the circumstances, to refuse the application for a receiver, the injunction should be dissolved, as in that event its continuance would only embarrass and injure the defendants in the prosecution of their business without benefit to any one.

The question to be considered, therefore, is, whether under the circumstances of this case, a receiver should or should not be appointed?

In the case of *Williamson* vs. *Wilson*, 1 *Bland*, 418, the late Chancellor laid down with precision, and, as I think, in entire conformity with the authorities, the principles which should govern the court upon applications similar to the present. It was there said, that "the court reluctantly interfered against the legal title only in the case of fraud clearly proved, and of imminent danger; and a receiver will not be appointed when the matter depends upon the legal title, unless strong grounds are shown, and the rents and profits are in imminent danger." In *Lloyd* vs. *Passingham*, 16 *Ves.*, 69, 70, Lord Eldon said, "the court interposes by appointing a receiver against the legal title with reluctance, compelled by judicial necessity, the effect of fraud clearly proved, and imminent danger, if the intermediate possession should not be taken under the care of the court." In the case of *The Orphans' Asylum* vs. *McCartee*, 1 *Hopkins*, 435, it was said, "the fund must be shown to be in danger before a receiver will be appointed." "The court never ap-