

1888, art. 16, sec. 66. 1860, art. 16, sec. 54. 1793, ch. 75, sec. 3.

77. Whenever an application shall be made by an executor or administrator for an injunction to stay proceedings at law, the court may, in its discretion, prescribe the penalty of a bond, which shall be executed to the plaintiff at law, with security approved by the court, before the injunction shall be granted, and the condition of such bond shall be to perform such order or decree as the court shall finally pass in the cause on the hearing of both parties; and whenever an injunction is obtained by an executor or administrator, on filing a bill and executing a bond as aforesaid, the court shall have full power and discretion to decree against such executor or administrator, as equity and good conscience shall seem to require.

Ibid. sec. 67. 1860, art. 16, sec. 55. 1799, ch. 79, sec. 10.

78. In all cases where a sheriff, or other officer, is prevented by an injunction from selling personal property taken in execution, he shall deliver back the property taken in execution to the party from whom it was taken, and shall not be answerable to the plaintiff at law on account of the same.

Slusser v. Chapline, 4 H. & McH. 222 *Cape Sable Co.'s Case*, 3 Bl. 637. *Dail v. Traverse*, 8 Gill, 43.

Ibid. sec. 68. 1835, ch. 380, sec. 8 1861, ch. 32. 1872, ch. 157.

79. In all cases pending on motion to grant an injunction, motion to dissolve an injunction, motion to appoint a receiver, or motion to rescind an order appointing a receiver, the court may, at the instance of either party, order testimony to be taken before such person, and upon such notice and in such manner as the court in its discretion may direct, to be used at the hearing of such motion.*

*Inadvertently omitted from the Code of 1860, but restored by 1861, ch. 32.

Lamborn v. Covington Co., 2 Md. Ch 412. *Hamilton v. Whitridge*, 11 Md. 128. *Keighler v. Savage Mfg. Co.*, 12 Md., 413 *Bouldin v. Mayor & C. C.*, 15 Md. 18. *Bell v. Purvis*, 15 Md. 22. *Steigerwald v. Winans*, 17 Md. 62. *Colvin v. Warford*, 18 Md. 275. *Griffith v. Clarke*, 18 Md. 457. *Belt v. Blackburn*, 28 Md 227. *Mayor & C C. v. Warren Manfg. Co.* 59 Md 96.

Ibid. sec. 69. 1888, ch 260.

80. No court shall refuse to issue a mandamus or injunction on the mere ground that the party asking for the same has an adequate remedy in damages, unless the party against whom the same is asked shall show to the court's satisfaction that he has property from which the damages can be made, or shall