

been apparently ordered, by an injunction of this kind, to do, or  
**66** \*to undo any thing. *Norwood v. Norwood*, 2 *Bland*, 471,  
*note*. The Court of Chancery by this writ merely prohibits  
certain acts, or any further acts from being done. And where  
acts have been done in violation of an injunction, it will order  
them to be undone or the matter restored; but I am not aware of  
any instance where it has, by an original writ of this kind, caused  
a nuisance to be abated or removed. *Murdock's Case*, 2 *Bland*, 470.

Whereupon it is ordered, that an injunction issue prohibiting  
the said company from erecting any new or other obstruction in  
the said towing path or highway in the bill mentioned; or in any  
manner to prevent him, the plaintiff, from using the same. And  
the said defendants may at any time, after the filing of their  
answer, move to dissolve the said injunction on giving ten days  
notice thereof to the said plaintiff. And the register is directed  
to endorse a copy of this order on the said writ of injunction.

On the 16th of July, 1829, the defendants put in their answer,  
which is certified as the answer of "The Proprietors of the Susque-  
hanna Canal," under the seal of that body politic; in which they  
admit the deed from them to Wilson, as stated in the bill; but put  
the plaintiff to the proof of his title in other respects; and they  
admit that a frame house was erected on the place mentioned; but  
aver, that ample space between it and the canal has been left for  
a towing path, &c. And deny, that the plaintiff, or any other per-  
son had a right to use the said towing path as a wagon or cart  
way to the said mill, &c.

On the 22d of August, 1829, the plaintiff, with leave, filed an  
amended bill, upon which an injunction was granted upon the  
same terms as on the original bill. After which the defendants  
answered as before.

The plaintiff, by his petition filed on the 11th of October, 1830,  
so far as it is sustained by the affidavits exhibited with it, com-  
plains that the defendants and two of their agents had committed  
a breach of the injunction, by cutting away the bank or towing  
path of the canal in two places, so as to prevent the use of it; and  
were about to erect locks of stone walls and wood in the places  
where the banks were removed. Upon which an attachment was  
prayed and granted.

The respondents against whom the attachments were awarded,  
by their answer, admit the fact of their having made two cuts  
**67** \*across the towing path of the canal, but deny that the use  
of it has ever been at all obstructed even while they were  
making those cuts; and state, that they have erected locks and  
built good bridges over them, which are safely and readily pass-  
able for men and horses, though not for carriages, which could no  
before pass along that portion of the towing path across which the