GENERAL STATUTES

OF THE

STATE OF MINNESOTA

IN FORCE

JANUARY 1, 1889.

COMPLETE IN TWO VOLUMES.

Volume 1, the General Statutes of 1878, prepared by George B. Young, edited and published under the authority of chapter 67 of the Laws of 1878, and chapter 67 of the Laws of 1879.

Volume 2, Supplement.—Changes effected in the General Statutes of 1878 by the General Laws of 1879, 1881, 1881 Extra, 1883, 1885, and 1887, arranged by H. J. Horn, Esq., with Annotations by Stuart Rapalje, Esq., and others, and a General Index by the Editorial Staff of the National Reporter System.

VOL. 2.

SUPPLEMENT, 1879-1888,

WITH

ANNOTATIONS AND GENERAL INDEX TO BOTH VOLUMES.

ST. PAUL: WEST PUBLISHING CO. 1888.

[Chap.

CHAPTER 79.

ACTIONS TO VACATE CHARTERS AND LETTERS PATENT, AND TO PREVENT THE USURPATION OF AN OFFICE OR FRANCHISE.

§ 1. Action to annul act of incorporation.

Where a case is presented to the attorney general, making it reasonably probable that any of the acts or omissions enumerated in c. 80, Rev. St., can be proved against a corporation, it is his duty to apply for leave to bring the action contemplated by such chapter, and if he neglect or refuse so to do, mandamus will lie to compel him to apply for such leave. State v. Berry, 3 Minn. (Gil.) 190.

After application for leave to sue has been made, the discretion, as to whether suit

will be brought, is for the court alone. Id.

See State v. Sharp, 27 Minn. 38, 6 N. W. Rep. 408; State v. St. Paul & S. C. R. Co.,

35 Minn. 222, 28 N. W. Rep. 245.

Action against intruders, etc., in office.

See State v. Sherwood, 15 Minn. 221, (Gil. 172, 177;) State v. Williams, 25 Minn. 340, 344; State v. Parker, Id. 215, 218.

Joinder of complainants.

In an action in the nature of a quo warranto under this section, two dissimilar interests may be united—the one public, on the part of the territory, to prevent one not duly chosen from exercising official functions; and the other private, and on behalf of the claimant, to establish his right to the office, and to recover damages he may have sustained by the usurpation. Territory v. Smith, 3 Minn. 240, (Gil. 164.)

CHAPTER 80.

SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS.

TITLE 1.

WRIT OF MANDAMUS. . .

To whom issued.

A writ of mandamus will not be granted unless it appears that there has been a clear violation of a legal right. Post v. Sparta, (Mich.) 29 N. W. Rep. 721.

The writ of mandamus will not lie to require an act to be done which it would not be lawful for the person to do without it. Clark v. Buchanan, 2 Minn. 346, (Gil. 298.)

The writ should not be granted after the expiration of the period which, under the statute of limitations, would be a bar to an action. People v. Chapin, (N. Y.) 10 N. E.

Rep. 141.
While the court cannot determine the right of a party to hold a seat in the legislature, it can determine his right to a certificate of election to the legislature, and will, by mandamus, compel its issuance to the party entitled to it. O'Ferrall v. Colby, 2 Minn. 180, (Gil. 148.)

Mandamus will not lie to compel a public officer to perform an official duty till a demand on him to perform it. State v. Davis, 17 Minn. 429, (Gil. 406.) Mandamus will not lie to compel the treasurer of a school-district to demand and receive from the county treasurer the money in his hands due the district, where the only demand upon such treasurer of the school-district was to pay an order by the trustees on such treasurer. Id.

For the use of the writ to compel the payment of claims against municipal corporations, see State v. Ames, 31 Minn. 440, 18 N. W. Rep. 277.