

city. To have and exercise within the limits of the City of Baltimore all the power commonly known as the Police Power to the same extent as the State has or could exercise said power within said limits. But no ordinance heretofore passed, or that shall hereafter be passed by the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, shall hereafter conflict or interfere with the powers or exercise of the powers of the Police Commissioner of the City of Baltimore, heretofore created, nor shall the said city, or any officer or agent of the city, or of the Mayor thereof, in any manner impede, obstruct, hinder or interfere with the said Police Commissioner, or any officer, agent or servant thereof or thereunder.

Mayor *ex rel.* v. Police Board, 15 Md. 455. Shafer v. Mumma, 17 Md. 331. Boehm v. Baltimore, 61 Md. 259. State v. Mott, 61 Md. 297. Singer v. State, 72 Md. 467. State v. Rowe, 72 Md. 551. Trageser v. Gray, 73 Md. 250. Lake Roland, &c., R. R. Co. v. Balto., 77 Md. 352. Deems v. Mayor & C. C. of Baltimore, 80 Md. 173. M. & C. C. of Balto. v. Turnpike Co., 80 Md. 536, 545. Cochrane v. Frostburg, 81 Md. 54, 65. Hagerstown v. Wittmer, 86 Md. 293. Bear Creek Co. v. Balto. City, 87 Md. 94. Balto. City v. Cowen, 88 Md. 447. Poole v. Falls Road, &c., Co., 88 Md. 533. Upshur v. Balto., 94 Md. 751. Bostock v. Sams, 95 Md. 414, 415. Frostburg v. Hitchins, 99 Md. 627. Stove & Range Co. v. Balto., 155 Md. 247.

City may regulate height of buildings.

Cochran v. Preston, 108 Md. 221. Martin v. District, 205 U. S. 139.

Moving picture machines may be regulated.

State v. Loden, 117 Md. 373.

City must pass ordinance to prevent nuisances or obstructions in the street, but is not responsible for the failure of the Police Department to enforce them.

Taxi Cab Company v. Baltimore, 118 Md. 359.

Reasonable segregation Ordinance not interfering with vested rights is within the police power.

State v. Gurry, 121 Md. 535. 47 L. R. A. New Series, 1087.

Statute may regulate hours of labor for laborers employed by contractors on city work.

Sweeten v. State, 122 Md. 635. Elkan v. State, 122 Md. 642.

Regulations concerning removal of garbage and offal are valid exercise of the police power.

Wm. R. Schultz v. State of Maryland, 112 Md. 211.

Power to pass ordinance providing additional penalty for offense punishable under State law. Validity of ordinance imposing a different penalty for sale of cocaine. Invalidity of a provision for forfeiture of license not affecting remainder of ordinance.

Rossberg v. State, 111 Md. 394.

Whatever police power can be exercised by a municipal corporation over the rights and property of its citizens must be derived from the legislature; it must be expressed by grant or fair and reasonable intendment.

United Railways Co. v. State Roads Commission, 123 Md. 561.

May require ordinance for moving picture show.

Brown v. Stubbs, 128 Md. 129.

City may exercise police power through water board.

Lee v. Leitch, 131 Md. 30.

Mayor may refuse permit for garage.

Osborne v. Grauel, 136 Md. 88.

Mayor and City Council cannot delegate all of its legislative or police power to another agency.

Tighe v. Osborne, 149 Md. 349.

Regulating hours for laundries; invalid.

Spann v. Gaither, 152 Md. 5.

City has general police power.

R. B. Construction Co. v. Jackson, 152 Md. 674.