

Romaine et al. vs. Insurance Co., 28 Fed. Rep., 675 (Circuit Court of the United States, Western District Tennessee, 1886, opinion by Hammond, J.).

U. S. vs. Bell Telephone Co. et al., 29 Fed. Rep., 17 (Circuit Court of the United States, Southern District, 1886, opinion by Jackson, J.).

Manufacturing Co. vs. Manufacturing Co., 34 Fed. Rep., 818 (Circuit Court United States, Northern District Illinois, 1888, opinion by Blodgett, J.).

Preston vs. Fire Extinguisher Company, 36 Fed. Rep., 721 (decided Circuit Court United States, Northern District Illinois, 1888, opinion by Blodgett, J.).

These cases all concur in holding that a defendant cannot be sued in a district other than that of which he is an inhabitant in any transitory civil action, and, therefore, it is conclusively fixed in the case, by the concurrent force of explicit statute law and of unanimous decisions in expounding such law, that the writ, in the present case against Crawford, must be quashed.

THE WORDS "IN ANY COURT OF THE UNITED STATES."

Should it be urged, in reply to what we have last stated, regarding the prohibition contained in the acts of 1887 and 1888 against a citizen being sued, in transitory actions, outside of his district, that section 2103, in the provision authorizing this particular suit to be brought "in the name of the United States in *any* court of the United States, regardless of the amount in controversy," is a provision that authorizes a citizen of Maine to be sued in California, where he never was, provided the suit is brought in a United States court, then our reply to such contention is as follows:

1. That giving this statute such a construction is to render it extremely harsh, oppressive, and absurd, and such construction will never be given to statutes where it can be avoided.