

1904, art. 98, sec. 20. 1888, art. 98, sec. 20. 1860, art. 97, sec. 20.  
1828, ch. 88, sec. 3.

20. It shall be the duty of every justice of the peace for said city to make an annual return to the treasurer of all fines imposed under the provisions of the foregoing section and to receive and pay over the same at the time of making said return.

*Ibid.* sec. 21. 1888, art. 98, sec. 21. 1860, art. 97, sec. 21. 1835, ch. 168.

21. Any person owning real estate in fee simple, or having therein an estate for years renewable forever on any of the navigable waters of this State may construct wharves thereon and extend the same such a distance into the stream as may be required to admit the safe approach thereto of any vessel navigating said waters; provided said wharves be not extended so as to interfere with the fishing or navigation of said waters.

This section conferred upon riparian owners new rights of property, and extensions out into the water are held by the same title as the original lots. The conflicting rights of a claimant under this section and of the grantee of made land, determined. *Tome Institute v. Crothers*, 87 Md. 584. And see *Tome Institute v. Davis*, 87 Md. 601.

A leasehold owner by making improvements out into the water, acquires a fee-simple title to them. *Tome Institute v. Davis*, 87 Md. 605. And see *Williams v. Baker*, 41 Md. 528.

Where A. leases water front property thus giving to the lessee the right to erect improvements in the water, and then sells the reversion to B. who ejects the lessee for non-payment of rent, the right to make improvements, and the improvements when made, belong to B. and not to A. The reversioner may enter or distrain upon the improvements as well as upon the original lot. Improvements out into the water under ordinance, are not within our registration system—how title is shown. *Baltimore v. White*, 2 Gill, 444.

Unless a person owns adjoining land, he has no right to build a wharf. *Harrison v. Sterett*, 4 H. & McH. 540.

This section referred to in deciding that where a vested docking at a certain wharf extended over a portion of an adjoining wharf, the owner of the latter was entitled to compensation. *Ranstead v. The William H. Brinsfield*, 39 Fed. 215.

For a case holding that the city, and not certain individuals, owned improvements made by the latter out into the water and hence, that the wharves were public. see *Dugan v. Baltimore*, 5 G. & J. 357.

See art. 54, sec. 47, *et seq.*

*Ibid.* sec. 22. 1888, art. 98, sec. 22. 1860, art. 97, sec. 22. 1840, ch. 124.

22. Any person authorized to build a wharf on the west side of the Susquehanna river shall build the same in front of the shore to which such wharf may be attached and shall not, without the consent of the owner of the lands adjoining that to which such wharf may be attached, build any part of such wharf outside of a line drawn from the land of the owner of such wharf to the channel of said river at right angles to said channel.

See sec. 21 and notes.