

75.

Cited but not construed in *Weller v. Ellis*, *Daily Record*, June 18, 1985.  
See notes to sec. 74.

76.

Aunt of deceased mother of child not entitled to adopt child over objection of father even though not in position at time to provide home for it. *Connelly v. Jones*, 165 Md. 546.

Cited but not construed in *Victory Sparkler Co. v. Gilbert*, 160 Md. 184.  
See notes to sec. 74.

77.

See notes to sec. 74.

78.

See notes to sec. 74.

79.

See notes to sec. 74.

80.

The power conferred on equity courts by this section should be exercised with paramount purpose of securing the welfare and promoting the best interest of the children. *Barnard v. Godfrey*, 157 Md. 265.

Court of equity has no power to award permanent custody or guardianship of an infant. *Alston v. Thomas*, 161 Md. 617.

In action by father to secure possession of his seven-year-old boy who had for most part lived with his father's brother since the death of his mother, three weeks after his birth, held that the natural rights of parents to custody of their children entitled the father to the boy; the interest of the boy paramount consideration. *Kartman v. Kartman*, 163 Md. 21.

Cited but not construed in *Backus v. Reynolds*, 159 Md. 604.  
See notes to sec. 39.

86.

This section does not require court to have testimony taken on motion to appoint co-receiver or to determine whether certain person should be appointed receiver in case the existing receivers should resign. *Great Nat. Ins. Co. v. Fire Ins. Co.*, 165 Md. 519.

### Injunction.

87.

Art. 26, sec. 25, which was identical with this section, has been repealed.

### Jurisdiction.

89.

This section referred to in holding that suit against Secretary of State to prevent void referendum election was not confined to county of his official residence; suit was also against supervisors of elections of Baltimore City, and as defendants were proceeded against jointly, the venue of the suit had to be outside of the jurisdiction of one of the parties. *Sun Cab Co. v. Cloud*, 162 Md. 419.

90.

This section and sec. 92 have no application to a proceeding to foreclose a mortgage in Baltimore City under an assent to a decree. *Ahrens v. Ijams*, 158 Md. 413.