

which was abundantly evidenced by his conduct previous to 1st May in assisting in the disruption of the congregation, and by ceasing to worship in that church and worshipping in another church along with those formerly composing a part of the congregation of St. Peter's church.

I thought during the trial, and still think, that the fair course for the trustees to have pursued was to give notice to plaintiff of their intended meeting and the nature of the resolution it was proposed to submit; but, for the reasons stated, that course was not obligatory. Had it been obligatory, and had the trustees been enjoined from proceeding further on the resolution, they could have called another meeting, giving plaintiff notice to attend; and, from the feeling which it was manifest during the trial had been engendered in the minds of the trustees—'doubtless participated in by the congregation—by reason of the conduct of plaintiff already referred to, there is no doubt that another resolution in like terms . . . would be passed; so that, if he were entitled to the injunction asked, it would be of no real benefit to him, even had he an honest desire to continue a member of St. Peter's church—which I very much doubt.

The action must be dismissed with costs.