

28.

This section applied in construing article 9, section 38—see notes thereto. *Bonn v. Linders*, 116 Md. 56.

To the first note to section 28 on page 212 of volume 1 of the Annotated Code, add "And see *De Bearn v. De Bearn*, 119 Md. 429."

See notes to section 13.

29.

See notes to section 11.

32.

See article 52, section 43.

33.

This section applied. *Wilmer v. Epstein*, 116 Md. 146.

To the first and fourth notes to this section on page 214 of volume 1 of the Annotated Code, add the case of *Wilmer v. Mann*, 121 Md. 245.

36.

The fact that the affidavit used in the case at bar is withdrawn from a former suit between the same parties brought about a year previous in another county is an irregularity and not jurisdictional, and hence does not sustain a motion to quash. *Bonn v. Linders*, 116 Md. 56.

38.

If the defendant is actually summoned in the county where the attachment is issued, the court has jurisdiction although the summons was not directed to the county of the defendant's residence. A substantial compliance with the terms of the statute is sufficient. The suit need not be brought in the defendant's home county. *Bonn v. Linders*, 116 Md. 54.

47.

Practice under this section. The burden is upon the claimant to establish his claim to the property involved; hence the case at bar could not, at the instance of the claimant, have been withdrawn from the jury. The sufficiency of evidence to satisfy the jury, or the circumstance that it is all on one side, does not authorize the court to instruct the jury that it proves a fact. *Lemp Brewing Co. v. Mantz*, 120 Md. 185.