

and rights may be involved. A policy decision must be made as to whether some provision for jury trial or transfer to the circuit court should be made with respect to such cases, since concurrent jurisdiction and jury trial provisions are keyed to a monetary claim. There is a similar problem under present Art. 26, § 156 with respect to de novo and on the record appeals.

The derivation of this particular provision is somewhat obscure. In 1965, the Maryland State Bar Association Committee on Trial Magistrates recommended that magistrates be given exclusive jurisdiction over civil cases when the amount in controversy did not exceed \$1,000 and that there be a uniform Statewide procedure for distress.

This was followed by the adoption of former Art. 53, § 9, which gave the people's courts and magistrates with civil jurisdiction exclusive jurisdiction "in all cases of distress for rent ... regardless of the amount of rent" involved.

The Maryland State Bar Association 11/20/67 draft of the District Court Act gave the District Court jurisdiction "in all actions involving landlord and tenant, distraint, forcible entry, and detainer". The subsequent subsection granted exclusive jurisdiction if the amount in controversy did not exceed \$1,000.

The 12/4/67 draft gave the District Court "exclusive original jurisdiction ... in all actions involving landlord and tenant, distraint, forcible entry, and detainer regardless of the amount of rent involved".

The 3/19/68 draft contained essentially the language of the present law. Maryland State Bar Association documents available to the Commission, including the Committee on Judicial Administration's Report of 6/4/68 dealing with the District Court shed no light on the reasons for the changes in the drafts or the policy considerations supporting (or opposing) the present