had occasion to examine this question, and there came to the conclusion that under the act of March 3, 1887, and the same holds good in regard to the act as explained and modified by the act of August 13, 1888, a non-resident corporation cannot be sued in this district; that is, a corporation not a resident of this district cannot be sued here merely by service upon the agent or officer. The opinion in that case has been published, and counsel are familiar with it, so it is hardly necessary to quote from it. It is enough to say that the act of 1887 requires suit to be brought in the district where the defendant is an inhabitant, but drops the provision in prior statutes upon the subject that he may also be sued in any district where he may be found at the time of the serving of the process.

"I have re-examined that question in the light of suggestions made by counsel for complainant and still adhere to the conclusion there announced that a corporation created and existing solely under the laws of another State and having its principal office and place of business in another State and district cannot be said to be inhabitant of this district and be sued here even although such corporation may do business in this district through agents, except, possibly, where the jurisdiction depends solely on

citizenship."

Justice Miller, in the case of Railroad Co. vs. Railroad Co., 1 McCreary, 647, in a case where he set aside a process because it had been served on a defendant outside the district where the suit was brought, explains, with his usual felicity, the principles and foundations of the rule embodied in the law which prohibits a court from issuing its process beyond its own jurisdiction.

He says:

"It is of the essence of the power and jurisdiction of all courts that their process is of no validity beyond the territory in which the court sits and to which its jurisdiction extends. If therefore there is no other statute on the subject than simply that the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri shall have jurisdiction co-extensive with the limits of the district, it would follow logically from this limitation upon the inherent