

section and §6-202.

Paragraph (4) is new language derived from Rules BQ40 and BQ53(a). It should be noted that replevin is technically a local action while detinue is not.

Paragraph (5) is new language derived from Art. 16, §66(b) and Art. 26, §70-4.

Paragraph (6) is new language combining the provisions of Art. 75, §12 and Art. 90, §11(d).

Paragraph (7) is new language derived from Rule T-41(a)(2). Ejectment is a local action which fits the general rule, with the exception noted in this paragraph.

Paragraph (8) is new language derived from Art. 75, §75(c). It should be noted that this paragraph may be qualified by §6-203(d).

Paragraph (9) is new language derived from Art. 9, §36. The section has been substantively changed, in a minor way, by allowing (under §6-201) suit to be brought where the defendant works as well as where he resides.

Paragraph (10) is new language derived from Art. 75, §80. Apparently this venue is in addition to the general rule, although under some constructions it might be construed to be the exclusive venue for such suits.

Paragraph (11) codifies the rule of Alcarese v. Stinger, 197 Md. 236 (1951).

Paragraphs (12) and (13) state the general rule found in Art. 75, §§ 75(a) and 79 with respect to persons absconding from justice. The provisions relating to a person twice returned non-est is proposed for deletion as unnecessary in light of current rules and statutes which allow State-wide service of process.

SEC. 6-203. EXCEPTIONS TO THE GENERAL RULE.

(A) IN GENERAL.