



22 U.S. 738

Page 1

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S.Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
 (Cite as: **22 U.S. 738**)



Osborn v. U.S. Bank
 U.S., 1824

[CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. CHANCERY.]

Supreme Court of the United States

OSBORN and others, *Appellants*,

v.

The PRESIDENT, DIRECTORS, AND
 COMPANY OF THE BANK OF THE UNITED

STATES, *Respondents*.

March 19, 1824

****1** APPEAL from the Circuit Court of Ohio.

The bill filed in this cause, was exhibited in the Court below, at September term, 1819, in the name of the respondents, and signed by solicitors of the Court, praying an injunction to restrain Ralph Osborn, Auditor of the State of Ohio, *740 from proceeding against the complainants, under an act of the Legislature of that State, passed February the 8th, 1819, entitled, 'An act to levy and collect a tax from all banks, and individuals, and companies, and associations of individuals, that may transact banking business in this State, without being allowed to do so by the laws thereof.' This act, after reciting that the Bank of the United States pursued its operations contrary to a law of the State, enacted, that if, after the 1st day of the following September, the said Bank, or any other, should continue to transact business in the State, it should be liable to an annual tax of 50,000 dollars on each office of discount and deposit. And that on the 15th day of September, the Auditor should charge such tax to the Bank, and should make out his warrant, under his seal of office, directed to any person, commanding him to collect the said tax, who should enter the banking house, and demand the same, and if payment should not be made, should levy the amount on the money or other goods of the Bank, the money to be retained, and the goods to be sold, as if taken on a *fi. fa.* If no effects should be found in the banking room, the person having the warrant

was authorized to go into every room, vault, &c. and to open every chest, &c. in search of what might satisfy his warrant.

The bill, after reciting this act, stated, that Ralph Osborn is the Auditor, and gives out, &c. that he will execute the said act. It was exhibited in open Court, on the 14th of September, and, notice of the application having been given to the defendant, *741 Osborn, an order was made, awarding the injunction on the execution of bonds and security in the sum of 100,000 dollars; after which, a subpoena was issued, on which the order that had been made for the injunction was endorsed by the solicitors for the plaintiffs; and a memorandum, that bond with security had been given by the plaintiffs, was endorsed by the clerk; and a power to James M'Dowell to serve the same, was endorsed by the Marshal. It appeared, from the affidavit of M'Dowell, that both the subpoena and endorsement were served on R. Osborn, early in the morning of the 15th. On the 18th of the same month of September, a writ of injunction was issued on the same bill, which was served on R. Osborn and on John L. Harper. The affidavit of M'Dowell stated, that he served the writ on Harper, while on his way to Columbus, with the money and funds on which the same were to operate, as he understood; and that the writ was served on Osborn, before Harper reached Columbus.

In September, 1820, leave was given to file a supplemental and amended bill, and to make new parties.

****2** The amended bill charges, that, subsequent to the service of the subpoena and injunction, to wit, on the 17th of September, 1819, J. L. Harper, who was employed by Osborn to collect the tax, and well knew that an injunction had been allowed, proceeded by violence to the office of the Bank at Chilicothe, and took therefrom 100,000 dollars, in specie and bank notes, belonging to, or in deposit with, the plaintiffs. That this money *742 was

© 2007 Thomson/West. No Claim to Orig. U.S. Govt. Works.

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

delivered to H. M. Curry, who was then Treasurer of the State, or to the defendant, Osborn, both of whom had notice of the illegal seizure, and paid no consideration for the amount, but received it to keep it on safe deposit. That Curry did keep the same until he delivered it over to one S. Sullivan, his successor as Treasurer. That neither Curry nor Sullivan held the said money in their character as Treasurer, but as individuals. The bill prays, that the said H. M. Curry, late Treasurer, S. Sullivan, the present Treasurer, and R. Osborn, in their official and private characters, and the said J. L. Harper, may be made defendants; that they may make discovery, and may be enjoined from using or paying away the coin or notes taken from the Bank, may be decreed to restore the same, and may be enjoined from proceeding further under the said act.

The defendant, Curry, filed his answer, admitting that the defendant, Harper, delivered to him, about the 20th of September, 1819, the sum of 98,000 dollars, which, he was informed and believed, was a tax levied of the Branch Bank of the United States. He passed this sum to the credit of the State, as revenue; but, in fact, kept it separate from other moneys, until January or February, 1820, when the moneys in the treasury were seized upon by a committee of the House of Representatives; soon after which he resigned his office, and the moneys and bank notes, in the bill mentioned, still separate from other moneys in the treasury, came to the hands of S. Sullivan, the *743 present Treasurer, who gave a receipt for the same.

The defendant, Sullivan, failing to answer, an attachment for contempt was issued, on which he was taken into custody. He then filed his answer, and was discharged.

This answer denies all personal knowledge of the levying, collecting, and paying over, the money in the bill mentioned. It admits that he was appointed Treasurer, as successor to Curry, on the 17th of February, 1820, and that he entered the Treasury on the 23d, and began an examination of the funds, among which he found the sum of 98,000 dollars, which he understood was the same that is charged in the bill; but this was not a fact within his own knowledge. He gave a receipt as Treasurer, and the

money has remained in his hands, as Treasurer, and not otherwise. The sum of 98,000 dollars remains untouched, out of respect to an injunction said to have been allowed by the Circuit Court, on a bill since dismissed. He admits the sum in his hands to correspond with the description in the bill, so far as that description goes, and annexes to his answer a description of the residue. He has no private individual interest in the money, and holds it only as State Treasurer; admits notice, from general report, and from the late Treasurer, that the said sum of 98,000 dollars was levied as a tax from the Bank, and that the Bank alleged it to be illegal and void.

**3 The cause came on to be heard upon these answers, and upon the decrees *nisi*, against Osborn and Harper, and the Court pronounced a decree *744 directing them to restore to the Bank the sum of 100,000 dollars, with interest on 19,830 dollars, the amount of specie in the hands of Sullivan. The cause was then brought, by appeal, to this Court.

West Headnotes

Banks and Banking 52 🔑232

52 Banks and Banking

52IV National Banks

52k232 k. Nature and Status. Most Cited Cases

Congress has power to incorporate or create a bank because it is an instrument which is necessary and proper for carrying on the fiscal operations of the government.

Banks and Banking 52 🔑275

52 Banks and Banking

52IV National Banks

52k273 Actions by or Against National Banking Associations

52k275 k. Jurisdiction and Venue. Most Cited Cases

Federal Courts 170B 🔑231

170B Federal Courts

170BIII Federal Question Jurisdiction

170BIII(C) Cases Arising Under Laws of the United States

170Bk231 k. National Banks or Receivers

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: **22 U.S. 738**)

Thereof, Actions by or Against. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k294)

The provision in the charter of the Bank of the United States, authorizing suits to be brought by and against it in the circuit courts of the United States, was authorized by the third article of the constitution of the United States, which declares “ that the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority.”

Banks and Banking 52 ↻275

52 Banks and Banking

52IV National Banks

52k273 Actions by or Against National
Banking Associations

52k275 k. Jurisdiction and Venue. Most
Cited Cases

Federal Courts 170B ↻231

170B Federal Courts

170BIII Federal Question Jurisdiction

170BIII(C) Cases Arising Under Laws of the
United States

170Bk231 k. National Banks or Receivers
Thereof, Actions by or Against. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k294)

The charter of the Bank of the United States making it capable “to sue and to be sued, plead and be impleaded, answer and be answered, defend and be defended, in all state courts having competent jurisdiction, and in any circuit court of the United States,” gave the circuit courts of the United States jurisdiction of suits by and against that bank.

Banks and Banking 52 ↻275

52 Banks and Banking

52IV National Banks

52k273 Actions by or Against National
Banking Associations

52k275 k. Jurisdiction and Venue. Most
Cited Cases

Federal Courts 170B ↻231

170B Federal Courts

170BIII Federal Question Jurisdiction

170BIII(C) Cases Arising Under Laws of the
United States

170Bk231 k. National Banks or Receivers
Thereof, Actions by or Against. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k294)

The clause in the act of 1816, 3 Stat. 266, incorporating the United States Bank, which authorizes the bank to sue in the courts of the United States, is warranted by the third article of the Constitution, which declares that “the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution, the laws of the United States,” etc., and gives to the Circuit Courts jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the bank.

Conspiracy 91 ↻3

91 Conspiracy

91I Civil Liability

91I(A) Acts Constituting Conspiracy and
Liability Therefor

91k1 Nature and Elements in General

91k3 k. Object. Most Cited Cases

Contempt 93 ↻40

93 Contempt

93II Power to Punish, and Proceedings Therefor

93k40 k. Nature and Form of Remedy. Most
Cited Cases

An injunction is unnecessary to attach responsibility on those who conspire to do an illegal act.

Equity 150 ↻94

150 Equity

150III Parties and Process

150k93 Necessary or Indispensable Parties

150k94 k. Persons Indispensable to
Complete and Final Determination. Most Cited
Cases

A court of chancery will not make a decree unless all those who are substantially interested are made parties to the suit where it is in the power of the plaintiff to make them parties.

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

Equity 150 ↻96

150 Equity

150III Parties and Process

150k93 Necessary or Indispensable Parties

150k96 k. Grounds for Omitting or Dispensing with Parties. Most Cited Cases

A court of chancery may enter a decree notwithstanding that person substantially interested is not party to the suit where such party is exempt from all judicial process.

Equity 150 ↻344

150 Equity

150V Evidence

150k338 Answer as Evidence

150k344 k. For or Against Codefendant. Most Cited Cases

Where one defendant in equity succeeds to another, so that the right of the one devolves on the other, and they become privies in estate, the answer of one may be read in evidence against the other.

Evidence 157 ↻222(10)

157 Evidence

157VII Admissions

157VII(B) By Parties or Others Interested in Event

157k221 Parties of Record

157k222 In General

157k222(10) k. Coparties. Most Cited Cases

Generally the answer of one defendant cannot be read against another.

Injunction 212 ↻41

212 Injunction

212II Subjects of Protection and Relief

212II(B) Matters Relating to Property

212k41 k. Transfer or Pledge of Instruments or Securities for Payment of Money. Most Cited Cases

A court of equity will interfere by injunction to prevent the transfer of a specific thing which, if transferred, will be irretrievably lost, as negotiable securities and stocks.

Injunction 212 ↻41

212 Injunction

212II Subjects of Protection and Relief

212II(B) Matters Relating to Property

212k41 k. Transfer or Pledge of Instruments or Securities for Payment of Money. Most Cited Cases

The holder of negotiable securities indorsed in the usual manner if he has acquired them fraudulently will be enjoined from negotiating them.

Injunction 212 ↻55

212 Injunction

212II Subjects of Protection and Relief

212II(B) Matters Relating to Property

212k55 k. Injury to Trade or Business. Most Cited Cases

In equity an injunction will issue to restrain a third person from using or exercising the same business protected by an exclusive privilege.

Corporations 101 ↻510

101 Corporations

101XI Corporate Powers and Liabilities

101XI(F) Civil Actions

101k510 k. Injunction. Most Cited Cases

Injunction 212 ↻65

212 Injunction

212II Subjects of Protection and Relief

212II(D) Corporate Franchises, Management, and Dealings

212k65 k. Infringement of Corporate Franchise or Rights. Most Cited Cases

An injunction will be granted to prevent the franchise of a corporation from being destroyed, as well as to restrain a party from violating it by attempting to participate in its exclusive privileges.

Federal Courts 170B ↻7

170B Federal Courts

170BI Jurisdiction and Powers in General

170BI(A) In General

170Bk7 k. Equity Jurisdiction. Most Cited

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

Cases

(Formerly 106k414)

Injunction 212 ↪85(2)

212 Injunction

212II Subjects of Protection and Relief

212II(E) Public Officers and Entities

212k85 Enforcement of Statutes,

Ordinances, or Other Regulations

212k85(2) k. On Ground of Invalidity.

Most Cited Cases

A United States circuit court, in a proper case in equity, may enjoin a state officer from executing a state law in conflict with the constitution or laws of the United States when such execution will violate plaintiff's rights.

Federal Courts 170B ↪13

170B Federal Courts

170BI Jurisdiction and Powers in General

170BI(A) In General

170Bk12 Case or Controversy Requirement

170Bk13 k. Particular Cases or Questions, Justiciable Controversy. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k282(23))

Injunction 212 ↪110

212 Injunction

212III Actions for Injunctions

212k110 k. Jurisdiction. Most Cited Cases

Taxation 371 ↪2882

371 Taxation

371III Property Taxes

371III(K) Collection and Enforcement Against Persons or Personal Property

371III(K)3 Remedies for Wrongful Enforcement

371k2873 Injunction

371k2882 k. Proceedings and Relief. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 371k611(1))

A suit by the Bank of the United States against a

state auditor for an injunction restraining the enforcement of a taxing statute was a "case" within constitutional provision that judicial power shall extend to specified "cases."

Injunction 212 ↪114(3)

212 Injunction

212III Actions for Injunctions

212k114 Parties

212k114(3) k. Defendants. Most Cited Cases

Principal and Agent 308 ↪188

308 Principal and Agent

308III Rights and Liabilities as to Third Persons

308III(F) Actions

308k188 k. Parties. Most Cited Cases

In general, an injunction will not be allowed, nor a decree rendered against an agent, where the principal is not made a party to the suit; but, where the principal is not subject to the jurisdiction of the court, as in the case of a sovereign state, the rule may be dispensed with.

Injunction 212 ↪208

212 Injunction

212VI Writ, Order, or Decree

212k207 Final Judgment or Decree

212k208 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

Though in general an injunction will not be allowed nor a decree rendered against an agent where the principal is not made a party to the suit, yet, if the principal himself be not subject to the jurisdiction of the court, the rule may be dispensed with and a decree entered against the agent.

Officers and Public Employees 283 ↪114

283 Officers and Public Employees

283III Rights, Powers, Duties, and Liabilities

283k114 k. Liabilities for Official Acts. Most Cited Cases

Statutes 361 ↪63

361 Statutes

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: **22 U.S. 738**)

361I Enactment, Requisites, and Validity in General

361k63 k. Effect of Total Invalidity. Most Cited Cases

A void statute can afford no protection to the officers who execute it.

States 360 191.4(2)

360 States

360VI Actions

360k191 Liability and Consent of State to Be Sued in General

360k191.4 Necessity of Consent

360k191.4(2) k. Nature and Capacity of Parties. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 360k191(1.6))

The privilege of a state exempting it from suit by a citizen is not communicated to the agent for the state.

Federal Courts 170B 268.1

170B Federal Courts

170BIV Citizenship, Residence or Character of Parties, Jurisdiction Dependent on

170BIV(A) In General

170Bk268 What Are Suits Against States

170Bk268.1 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k303(2))

The prohibition to sue a state does not extend to a case in which the state is not a party on the record, even if the state has the entire ultimate interest in the subject of the suit.

Federal Courts 170B 265

170B Federal Courts

170BIV Citizenship, Residence or Character of Parties, Jurisdiction Dependent on

170BIV(A) In General

170Bk264 Suits Against States

170Bk265 k. Eleventh Amendment in General; Immunity. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k303(1))

The Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution is a limitation of power granted in the original instrument.

Federal Courts 170B 264.1

170B Federal Courts

170BIV Citizenship, Residence or Character of Parties, Jurisdiction Dependent on

170BIV(A) In General

170Bk264 Suits Against States

170Bk264.1 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k303(1))

Jurisdiction of a court is not ousted by any incidental or consequential interest which a state may have in a decision to be made.

Federal Courts 170B 265

170B Federal Courts

170BIV Citizenship, Residence or Character of Parties, Jurisdiction Dependent on

170BIV(A) In General

170Bk264 Suits Against States

170Bk265 k. Eleventh Amendment in General; Immunity. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k303(1))

Federal Courts 170B 275

170B Federal Courts

170BIV Citizenship, Residence or Character of Parties, Jurisdiction Dependent on

170BIV(A) In General

170Bk275 k. Controversies Between a State or Citizens Thereof and Foreign States, Citizens or Subjects. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k303(1))

Under the Eleventh Amendment of the Constitution, federal courts cannot entertain a suit brought against a state by an alien or the citizen of another state.

Aliens, Immigration, and Citizenship 24 728

24 Aliens, Immigration, and Citizenship

24VIII Citizenship and Naturalization

24VIII(B) Naturalization

24k728 k. Operation and Effect. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 24k70)

Under the constitution congress has no power to enlarge or abridge the rights of a naturalized citizen,

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

the congress being limited to prescription of uniform rule of naturalization.

Appearance 31 ↩️1

31 Appearance

31k1 k. Nature of Proceeding. Most Cited Cases
A corporation can appear only by attorney, while a natural person may appear for himself.

Lis Pendens 242 ↩️24(1)

242 Lis Pendens

242k23 Purchasers Pending Suit
242k24 In General
242k24(1) k. In General. Most Cited Cases
A pendente lite purchaser is bound by the testimony taken against the vendor in suit in which both are parties.

Judgment 228 ↩️682(1)

228 Judgment

228XIV Conclusiveness of Adjudication
228XIV(B) Persons Concluded
228k682 Vendor and Purchaser
228k682(1) k. In General. Most Cited Cases

Lis Pendens 242 ↩️24(1)

242 Lis Pendens

242k23 Purchasers Pending Suit
242k24 In General
242k24(1) k. In General. Most Cited Cases
A pendente lite purchaser is bound by the decree without being made a party to the suit.

Attorney and Client 45 ↩️62

45 Attorney and Client

45II Retainer and Authority
45k62 k. Rights of Litigants to Act in Person or by Attorney. Most Cited Cases
Natural persons may appear in court either by themselves or by their attorney.

Attorney and Client 45 ↩️63

45 Attorney and Client

45II Retainer and Authority
45k63 k. The Relation in General. Most Cited Cases

Corporations 101 ↩️508

101 Corporations

101XI Corporate Powers and Liabilities
101XI(F) Civil Actions
101k508 k. Appearance and Representation by Attorney. Most Cited Cases
An attorney for a corporation must receive the authority of the corporation to enable him to represent it.

Attorney and Client 45 ↩️63

45 Attorney and Client

45II Retainer and Authority
45k63 k. The Relation in General. Most Cited Cases
No person has the right to appear as the attorney of another without the authority of that other.

Attorney and Client 45 ↩️69

45 Attorney and Client

45II Retainer and Authority
45k68 Proof of Authority
45k69 k. Necessity. Most Cited Cases

Corporations 101 ↩️508

101 Corporations

101XI Corporate Powers and Liabilities
101XI(F) Civil Actions
101k508 k. Appearance and Representation by Attorney. Most Cited Cases
In case of a corporation, as well as of an individual, appearance by an attorney, legally admitted to practice, is received as evidence of his authority to represent the party in court.

Attorney and Client 45 ↩️70

45 Attorney and Client

45II Retainer and Authority
45k68 Proof of Authority

22 U.S. 738

Page 8

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

45k70 k. Presumptions. Most Cited Cases
 The authority of an attorney at law to appear will be presumed.

Attorney and Client 45 ↪73

45 Attorney and Client
 45II Retainer and Authority
 45k68 Proof of Authority
 45k73 k. Warrant or Other Written Authority. Most Cited Cases

Corporations 101 ↪508

101 Corporations
 101XI Corporate Powers and Liabilities
 101XI(F) Civil Actions
 101k508 k. Appearance and Representation by Attorney. Most Cited Cases
 An attorney or solicitor, appearing for a corporation, need not show a warrant of attorney under the corporate seal.

Corporations 101 ↪524

101 Corporations
 101XI Corporate Powers and Liabilities
 101XI(F) Civil Actions
 101k524 k. Appeal and Error. Most Cited Cases
 Whatever authority may be necessary for an attorney to appear for a corporation, it is not a ground of reversal for error in an appellate court that such authority does not appear on the face of the record.

Courts 106 ↪1

106 Courts
 106I Nature, Extent, and Exercise of Jurisdiction in General
 106k1 k. Nature and Source of Judicial Authority. Most Cited Cases
 "Judicial power" as contradistinguished from the power of the laws has no existence, courts being mere instruments of the law.

Courts 106 ↪1

106 Courts
 106I Nature, Extent, and Exercise of Jurisdiction in General
 106k1 k. Nature and Source of Judicial Authority. Most Cited Cases
 "Discretion" exercised by the courts is a mere legal discretion to be exercised in discerning the course prescribed by law.

Courts 106 ↪98

106 Courts
 106II Establishment, Organization, and Procedure
 106II(G) Rules of Decision
 106k88 Previous Decisions as Controlling or as Precedents
 106k98 k. Decisions of Courts of Other Countries. Most Cited Cases
 A question arising out of the constitution may be determined from the words of the instrument rather than from decisions of analogous questions by courts of another country.

Federal Courts 170B ↪442.1

170B Federal Courts
 170BVII Supreme Court
 170BVII(A) In General
 170Bk442 Original Jurisdiction
 170Bk442.1 k. In General. Most Cited Cases
 (Formerly 106k256, 106k379)
 U.S.C.A.Const. art. 3, § 2, designating all cases to which the judicial power of the United States extends, and providing that in certain cases the supreme court shall have original jurisdiction, and in all other cases its jurisdiction shall be appellate, deprives the inferior courts created by congress pursuant to constitution of original jurisdiction only in those cases in which it is by the constitution given to the supreme court.

Federal Courts 170B ↪4

170B Federal Courts
 170BI Jurisdiction and Powers in General
 170BI(A) In General
 170Bk3 Jurisdiction in General; Nature

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

and Source

170Bk4 k. Constitutional and Statutory Provisions. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k260, 106k257)
Original jurisdiction of federal court under the constitution is coextensive with the judicial power.

Federal Courts 170B 3.1

170B Federal Courts

170BI Jurisdiction and Powers in General

170BI(A) In General

170Bk3 Jurisdiction in General; Nature and Source

170Bk3.1 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k257)

The judicial power is capable of acting only when the subject is submitted to it by a party who asserts his rights in the form prescribed by law.

Federal Courts 170B 161

170B Federal Courts

170BIII Federal Question Jurisdiction

170BIII(A) In General

170Bk161 k. Federal Question Jurisdiction in General. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k257)

Federal Courts 170B 162

170B Federal Courts

170BIII Federal Question Jurisdiction

170BIII(A) In General

170Bk162 k. Cases Arising Under Treaties. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k257)

The provision of the constitution that the judicial power shall extend to all cases arising under the constitution or laws of the United States and treaties made under their authority enables the judicial department to receive jurisdiction to the full extent of the constitution, laws and treaties of the United States when any question respecting them shall assume such a form that the judicial power is capable of acting on it.

Federal Courts 170B 442.1

170B Federal Courts

170BVII Supreme Court

170BVII(A) In General

170Bk442 Original Jurisdiction

170Bk442.1 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k258, 106k379)

In those cases in which original jurisdiction is given to the supreme court, the judicial power cannot be exercised in its appellate form. In every other case, the power is to be exercised in its original or appellate form, or both, as the wisdom of congress may direct.

Federal Courts 170B 1.1

170B Federal Courts

170BI Jurisdiction and Powers in General

170BI(A) In General

170Bk1 Judicial Power of United States; Power of Congress

170Bk1.1 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k258)

Federal Courts 170B 973

170B Federal Courts

170BIX District Courts

170BIX(A) In General

170Bk973 k. Civil Jurisdiction in General. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k414)

Where a question to which the judicial power of the Union is extended by the constitution forms an ingredient of the original cause, it is in the power of congress to give to the circuit courts jurisdiction of that cause, although other questions of fact or of law may be involved in it.

Federal Courts 170B 231

170B Federal Courts

170BIII Federal Question Jurisdiction

170BIII(C) Cases Arising Under Laws of the United States

170Bk231 k. National Banks or Receivers Thereof, Actions by or Against. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k258)

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S.Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: **22 U.S. 738**)

Federal Courts 170B **973**

170B Federal Courts
170BIX District Courts
170BIX(A) In General
170Bk973 k. Civil Jurisdiction in General.
Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k414)

Article 3 of the constitution, U.S.C.A. which declares that the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising “under the laws of the United States,” warrants the authority given, in the charter of the last Bank of the United States, to the circuit courts to take cognizance of suits by and against that bank.

Federal Courts 170B **12.1**

170B Federal Courts
170BI Jurisdiction and Powers in General
170BI(A) In General
170Bk12 Case or Controversy Requirement
170Bk12.1 k. In General. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k282(23))

The submission of a subject to the court by a party who asserts his rights in the form prescribed by law is a “case” within constitutional provision that judicial power shall extend to designated “cases”.

Federal Courts 170B **161**

170B Federal Courts
170BIII Federal Question Jurisdiction
170BIII(A) In General
170Bk161 k. Federal Question Jurisdiction in General. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k284)

A case was not deprived of its character as one arising under the laws of the United States within constitutional provision because questions might arise therein depending on general principles of law and not on any acts of congress.

Federal Courts 170B **209.1**

170B Federal Courts
170BIII Federal Question Jurisdiction

170BIII(C) Cases Arising Under Laws of the United States
170Bk209 Patent Laws
170Bk209.1 k. In General. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k290)

Patents 291 **220**

291 Patents
291XI Regulation of Dealings in Patent Rights and Patented Articles
291k220 k. Power to Control and Regulate. Most Cited Cases
The provision of the constitution, article 3, U.S.C.A., declaring that the judicial power of federal courts shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under the constitution or laws of the United States, and treaties, gives such courts jurisdiction of cases involving patent rights, they being cases arising under a law of the United States.

Federal Courts 170B **261**

170B Federal Courts
170BIV Citizenship, Residence or Character of Parties, Jurisdiction Dependent on
170BIV(A) In General
170Bk261 k. Jurisdiction in General. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k300)
In all cases where jurisdiction depends on the party, it is the party named in the record.

Federal Courts 170B **263**

170B Federal Courts
170BIV Citizenship, Residence or Character of Parties, Jurisdiction Dependent on
170BIV(A) In General
170Bk263 k. Controversies to Which United States Is a Party. Most Cited Cases
(Formerly 106k302)

Postal Service 306 **4**

306 Postal Service
306I Postal Service in General
306k3 The Postal Service

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: **22 U.S. 738**)

306k4 k. Postmaster General. Most Cited Cases

United States 393 ↩️131

393 United States
393IX Actions

393k131 k. Jurisdiction. Most Cited Cases

Suits brought by the postmaster general for money due the United States are not suits by the United States, within the provision of the constitution relating to "controversies in which the United States shall be a party."

Federal Courts 170B ↩️281

170B Federal Courts

170BIV Citizenship, Residence or Character of Parties, Jurisdiction Dependent on

170BIV(B) Controversies Between Citizens of Different States

170Bk281 k. Diversity of Citizenship in General. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k307(1))

Jurisdiction of federal courts in suits between citizens of different states is neither given nor ousted by relative situation of parties concerned in interest but by relative situation of parties named on the record.

Federal Courts 170B ↩️316.1

170B Federal Courts

170BIV Citizenship, Residence or Character of Parties, Jurisdiction Dependent on

170BIV(D) Evidence

170Bk316 In General

170Bk316.1 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k307(1))

To establish jurisdiction of federal courts in controversies between citizens of different states, the character of the parties must be shown on the record.

Federal Courts 170B ↩️973

170B Federal Courts

170BIX District Courts

170BIX(A) In General

170Bk973 k. Civil Jurisdiction in General. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 106k414)

Under the constitution Congress may give the circuit court original jurisdiction in any case to which the appellate jurisdiction extends.

Interest 219 ↩️52

219 Interest

219III Time and Computation

219k48 Suspension

219k52 k. Injunction. Most Cited Cases

Where a party is restrained by injunction from using funds in his hands, he will not be chargeable with interest while so restrained.

Taxation 371 ↩️2006

371 Taxation

371I In General

371k2004 Power of State

371k2006 k. United States Entities, Property, and Securities. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 371k9)

The state within which a branch of the United States Bank may be established cannot constitutionally tax it, nor pass any law to control or impede its operations, or the operations of the parent bank.

Taxation 371 ↩️2876

371 Taxation

371III Property Taxes

371III(K) Collection and Enforcement Against Persons or Personal Property

371III(K)3 Remedies for Wrongful Enforcement

371k2873 Injunction

371k2876 k. Illegal Tax. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 371k608(2))

A state law imposing a tax on the Bank of the United States was unconstitutional, and any attempt on the part of the officers of the state to enforce such tax against the property of the bank might be restrained by injunction from a circuit court of the United States.

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

Mr. *Hammond*, for the appellants, contended, that the decree was erroneous, for the following reasons:

1. Because, no authority is shown in the records, from the Bank, authorizing the institution or prosecution of the suit.
2. Because, as against the defendant, Sullivan, there are neither proofs nor admissions sufficient to sustain the decree.
3. Because, upon equitable principles, the case made in the bill does not warrant a decree against either Osborn or Harper, for the amount of coin and notes in the bill specified to have passed through their hands.
4. Because, the defendants are decreed to pay interest upon the coin, when it was not in the power of Osborn or Harper, and was stayed in the hands of Sullivan by injunction.
5. Because, the case made in the bill does not warrant the interference of a Court of Chancery by injunction or otherwise.
6. Because, if any case is made in the bill, proper for the interference of a Court of Chancery, it is against the State of Ohio, in which case the Circuit Court could not exercise jurisdiction.
7. Because, the decree assumes, that the Bank of the United States is not subject to the taxing *745 power of the State of Ohio, and decides that the law of Ohio, the execution of which is enjoined, is unconstitutional.

1. A sufficient authority must be shown for the institution of every legal proceeding. This principle is peculiarly applicable to suits brought in the name of corporations; because, such a body must always appear by attorney, either to institute or defend a legal proceeding. It cannot appear in person, and it can only constitute an attorney by written power, under its common seal. This doctrine is not impugned by the decision of this Court in the case of the *Bank of Columbia v. Patterson*.^{FNa} The old doctrine, that a corporation could not contract or promise, except by writing, under its common seal,

is overruled in that case; and it was adjudged, that a contract made by a committee duly authorized for that purpose, binds the Corporation. It seems, also, to be intimated, that a Corporation may, by resolution, or other act, not under their common seal, duly appoint and authorize an agent, whose contracts would bind them; and the case of *Rex v. Bigg*,^{FNb} is referred to as authority. But, upon looking into that case, it will be found, that the principle is merely laid down by counsel *arguendo*; and the counsel, by whom it is advanced, add, 'But in case of any thing of consequence, or the employing any one to act in their behalf, in a matter which is not an ordinary service, a corporation *746 aggregate cannot do that without deed.' Now, what can be of more consequence, than such a suit as this, commenced, in effect, against a sovereign State, by this corporation? In *Fleckner v. the Bank of the United States*,^{FNc} the Court has gone no farther, than to determine that the board of Directors may, by resolution, authorize their Cashier to transfer bills or notes, the property of the Bank, and need not make a power under seal for that purpose. This is a very different matter from authority to prosecute such a suit as the present. It falls within the scope of the ordinary official duties of the Cashier. But even admitting that any express authority from the Bank, whether under the common seal or not, would have been sufficient in the present case, it is indispensable that such authority should be produced and filed. This has not been done, and therefore it must be concluded, that the suit is wholly unauthorized by the corporation, in whose name it has been commenced.

The act of incorporation of the Bank of the United States gives the Circuit Courts of the United States jurisdiction of suits by and against the Bank.

This provision in the charter is warranted by the 3d article of the Constitution, which declares, that 'the judicial power shall extend to *all cases*, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, *the laws of the United States*, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority.'

It is unnecessary for an attorney or solicitor, who prosecutes a suit for the Bank of the United States, or other corporation, to produce a warrant of

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S.Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

attorney under the corporate seal.

Whatever authority may be necessary for an attorney or solicitor to appear for a natural or artificial person, it is not a ground of reversal *739 for error, in an appellate Court, that such authority does not appear on the face of the record. It is a formal defect, which is cured by the statute of jeofails, and the 32d section of the Judiciary Act of 1789, ch. 20.

In general, the answer of one defendant in equity cannot be read in evidence against another. But where one defendant succeeds to another, so that the right of the one devolves on the other, and they become privies in estate, the rule does not apply.

Where the defendant is restrained by an injunction, from using money in his possession, interest will not be decreed against him.

An injunction will be granted to prevent the franchise of a corporation from being destroyed, as well as to restrain a party from violating it, by attempting to participate in its exclusive privileges.

In general, an injunction will not be allowed, nor a decree rendered, against an agent, where the principal is not made a party to the suit. But if the principal be not himself subject to the jurisdiction of the Court, (as in the case of a sovereign State,) the rule may be dispensed with.

A Court of equity will interpose by injunction to prevent the transfer of a specific thing, which, if transferred, will be irretrievably lost to the owner, such as negotiable securities and stocks.

The Circuit Courts of the United States have jurisdiction of a bill brought by the Bank of the United States, for the purpose of protecting the Bank in the exercise of its franchises, which are threatened to be invaded, under the unconstitutional laws of a State; and, as the State itself cannot, according to the 11th amendment of the Constitution, be made a party defendant to the suit, it may be maintained against the officers and agents of the State, who are intrusted with the execution of such laws.

A State cannot tax the Bank of the United States; and any attempt, on the part of its agents and officers, to enforce the collection of such tax against the property of the Bank, may be restrained by injunction from the Circuit Court.

The Circuit Courts have jurisdiction of suits by and against the Bank.

The clause in the charter of the Bank, which authorizes it to sue in the Circuit Courts, is constitutional.

How far a warrant of attorney, or other authority, must be shown, to enable on attorney or solicitor to prosecute a suit.

The answer of one defendant, when evidence against another.

Responsibility of the parties against whom the bill was taken *pro confesso*.

Interest will not be decreed against a party, upon money which he is enjoined from using.

Case made in the bill, proper for an injunction, and other equitable relief.

The exemption of the State from suability, no objection to the proceedings against its officers, for executing an unconstitutional law.

The decision of the Court in *M'Culloch v. Maryland*, reviewed and confirmed.

FNa 7 *Cranch*, 299.

FNb *P. Wms.* 419.

FNc 8 *Wheat. Rep.* 338.

2. The answer of the defendant, Sullivan, contains no admission that the notes and coin were the property of the plaintiff, or that the injunction was violated in taking them from their possession. In *Hills v. Binney*,^{FNd} bill was filed by a creditor against an administrator, who, by his answer, stated,

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

that he *believed* the debt was due. Mr. Fonblanque, for the plaintiff, expressed a doubt whether there was a sufficient foundation for a *747 decree. Lord Eldon inclined to think it sufficient; but Mr. Richards, as *amicus curiae*, suggesting that it was doubtful, Mr. Fonblanque consented to exhibit an interrogatory. The admission there was much stronger than any in the answer of the defendant, Sullivan. He has nowhere said, that he believes the notes and coin to be the property of the plaintiffs; on the contrary, he avers that, personally, he knew nothing about the collection of the tax, except from general report, and the information of the late Treasurer. No proof whatever, of general report, or of the declarations of the late Treasurer, would be sufficient to establish any fact. Sullivan's admission of this general report, and of this information, gives it no higher character than it would be entitled to upon being proved. The admission does not support the decree, and there is no other proof in the case.

FNd 6 *Ves. Jun.* 738.

3. The decree against the defendants, Osborn and Harper, so far as it requires them to pay the amount of the coin and notes specified in the bill, to the plaintiffs, is erroneous, because the bill shows that the same were not in the possession of those defendants. The foundation upon which a Court of equity proceeds, is to redress the party under its protection, not to punish the wrongdoers. When punishment is the object, process for contempt is resorted to. Equity will look at the situation of all the parties, and will distinguish among the defendants, who can, and who cannot, comply with such decree, as, upon equitable principles, must be pronounced. A plaintiff in equity cannot *748 fasten upon the specific subject for which he sues, and obtain an order retaining it in the hands of one defendant, subject to a final decree, and obtain a decree for restitution against other defendants, who, by his own showing, have not the subject in their power. Admitting that it was necessary to make all concerned in the transaction defendants, in order to ascertain who had possession of the subject, yet when that fact was ascertained, no decree (except as to costs) could be pronounced against those who were not in possession of it, and who claimed no

interest in it. Where a party acts under an authority which he supposes valid, but which the Court adjudge to be void, he is not to be regarded as a principal wrongdoer, further than the purposes necessarily require. In a Court of equity, he is equitably, not vindictively, responsible.

4. Under the circumstances of the case, the defendants ought not to be chargeable with interest upon the coin in question. It may be admitted, that, in general, where a defendant has wrongfully possessed himself of the plaintiff's money, and thus deprived him of the use of it, equity may compel him to account for interest. But here, the injunction forbidding the use of the coin was obtained at the plaintiff's request. Its effect and operation were, to place it in the custody of the law. The defendants could not use it, and, consequently, cannot be charged with interest.

5. No case is made out in the original bill, warranting the interposition of a Court of equity by injunction. The injunction, if sustained at all, *749 must be upon one of two principles; either that it was necessary to secure to the Bank the enjoyment of a franchise or exclusive privilege, or to protect it from an irreparable mischief.

All the cases where injunctions have been granted, to protect parties in the enjoyment of a franchise, proceed upon the principle, that the injury was consequential, not direct, and that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to estimate the damages. Thus, the proprietor of a machine, for which a patent has been granted, or of a book for which a copy-right has been obtained, may have an injunction to prevent others from using the machine, or vending the book. So, also, the proprietor of a toll-bridge or a turnpike road, may have an injunction to prevent others from constructing and using a bridge or road, where it would be contrary to the terms of the plaintiff's grant. But in all these cases, the injunction is granted upon the principle, that the act complained of is not only unlawful, and, therefore, unjustifiable, but that it is, in addition to its illegality, of a character for which compensation cannot be made in damages. But no case can be found of an injunction granted to protect the proprietor, in the instances mentioned, against the

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

commission of a mere trespass, where the party could have redress in damages, and where the trespass would not interfere with the franchise, further than every wrong interferes with the right of the individual upon whom it is inflicted. Wherever an injunction is granted for the protection of a franchise, the case must show that the party has the sole and exclusive *750 right to do the act, or transact the business, which he seeks to inhibit the defendant from performing. Thus, an injunction has been allowed to the *East India Company*, to prevent an interference with the trade exclusively secured to them by their charter.^{FNe} But, would an injunction be granted against seizing, by violence, the goods they may import, or doing injury to their ships when in port? So, a person entitled to an exclusive right of ferry, has been allowed an injunction to prevent ferrying by others.^{FNf} But it does not follow that an injunction would be allowed, to prevent an injury which the proprietor might apprehend to his boats, or their tackle, or to the landing place. Here the original bill does not present a case for an injunction to secure the enjoyment of a franchise upon these principles. It seeks to be protected against an injury amounting to a trespass, and nothing more. The bill claims, that it is one of the corporate franchises of the Bank, to establish offices of discount and deposit, and transact banking business, any where, according to the discretion of the directors. But it is only when the franchise confers a sole and exclusive right, that the jurisdiction of a Court of equity attaches, and it then attaches only so as to prevent others from invading that right, by attempting an actual participation in its use and enjoyment. It cannot be pretended, that the charter of the Bank confers upon it any exclusive right to carry on the *751 trade of banking. It cannot, therefore, come into a Court of Chancery to seek protection against any person for violating an exclusive franchise. If it be said, that the privilege of exemption from State taxation is one of this nature, the answer is, that this privilege operates, not against individuals, but against the power authorized to lay and collect taxes. It does not operate against any individual, who is invested with no power of taxation, but who commits a trespass under colour of levying a tax.

FNe 1 *Ves.* 127.

FNf 1 *Ves.* 476.

Nor can the injunction be supported, upon the ground that the case presented required this extraordinary interference of the Court, to protect the Bank against irreparable mischief. It is but recently that injunctions have been issued to restrain the commission of an act amounting to trespass only. Lord Hardwicke says, 'every common trespass is not a foundation for an injunction in this Court.'^{FNg} Lord Kenyon, M. R., asserts, that 'a Court of Chancery will not interfere, when the matter is merely in damages.'^{FNh} And Lord Eldon says, 'I remember when, in a case of trespass, unless it grew into a nuisance, an injunction would have been refused.'^{FNi} The first reported case of an injunction in trespass, is that of *Mitchel v. Dorrs*, where the defendant had begun to dig coal in his own ground, and worked into that of the plaintiff. Lord Eldon said, 'That is trespass, not waste. But I will grant the injunction *752 upon the authority of a case before Lord Thurlow.'^{FNj} This last case was where the landlord owned two adjacent closes, and demised one. The tenant commenced mining for coal in the demised close, and continued to mine until he entered the close not demised. Lord Thurlow, after great hesitation, granted the injunction, upon the ground, as Lord Eldon himself asserts, of the irreparable ruin of the property as a mine, and it being a species of trade; and upon the principle of the Court enjoining in matters of trespass, where irreparable damage is the consequence.^{FNk} The next case was that of *Hanson v. Gardiner*,^{FNl} where an injunction was granted upon the application of a person claiming in different rights, one of which was as lord of the manor, under the statute of Merton, against trespass by the commoners, and, upon hearing, the injunction was dissolved. An application was afterwards made by the devisees of an equity of redemption, in receipt of the rents, for an injunction against the mortgagee, claiming, as heir, to restrain him from cutting timber; but it was refused.^{FNm} An injunction was subsequently granted, at the application of the landlord, to restrain a person charged to be in collusion with the tenant, from cutting or removing timber, or committing any other

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

waste. Lord Eldon puts this upon the ground, that it partakes more of *753 waste than in general cases, and says, he will not be bound as to what is to be done upon a mere trespass; though, he adds, that it is strange if there cannot be an injunction in that case, to prevent irreparable mischief. The next case of an injunction in trespass, is *Crochford v. Alexander*.^{FNn} The plaintiff contracted to sell an estate to the defendant, who got possession from the tenant, and began to cut timber. The injunction was allowed; but the Lord Chancellor says, 'I will grant this protection against cutting timber, until the power of the Court to grant the injunction against trespass shall be fully discussed.' It is singular, that in this case Lord Eldon should again state the case decided by Lord Thurlow, respecting the mines; and add, that Lord Thurlow considered it trespass, not waste, and refused the injunction. The injunction is justified by analogy; and reference is made to *Robinson v. Byron*,^{FNo} which, upon examination, will be found not to be a case of trespass, but one where the defendant, having a command of the water, was about so to use it, within his own premises, as to throw it out and deluge the plaintiff: it was destruction. In *Thomas v. Oakley*,^{FNp} the plaintiff was seised in fee of an estate, in which there was a stone quarry, and the defendant held a contiguous estate, with a right to enter the quarry and take stone for a special purpose, but was taking it for other purposes. *754 The counsel insisted that it was the course of modern authority, to afford assistance in cases of coal mines, timber, &c. to prevent irremediable mischief and injury, which damages could not compensate. Lord Eldon held, that upon the decisions which had taken place, the bill must be sustained. He refers to the first case decided by Lord Thurlow, and his hesitation, and adds, 'But I take it that Lord Thurlow changed his opinion upon that; holding, that if the defendant was taking the substance of the inheritance, the liberty of bringing an action was not all the relief to which, in equity, he was entitled. The interference of the Court is to prevent your removing that which is his estate. If this protection would be granted in the case of timber, coals, and lead ore, why is it not equally to be applied to a quarry?'

FNg 3 *Atk.* 21.

FNh 2 *Bro. C. C.* 65.

FNi 7 *Ves. jr.* 307.

FNj 6 *Ves. jr.* 147.

FNk 7 *Ves. jr.* 307.

FNl 7 *Ves. jr.* 305.

FNm *Smith v. Collyer*, 8 *Ves.* 89

FNn 15 *Ves.* 137.

FNo 1 *Bro. C. C.* 588.

FNp 18 *Ves.* 185. See also *Kinder v. Jones*, 17 *Ves.* 110. and *Earl Cowper v. Baker*, *Id.* 127.

There is no analogy between these cases and the present. No estate of a stable and permanent character is to be injured. The naked suggestion in the bill is, that the plaintiffs verily believe that the defendant threatens to do an act amounting to a mere trespass. Lord Eldon says, 'I never would grant an injunction, upon an affidavit stating that the deponent verily believes the defendant is about to cut timber.'^{FNq} Some act must be done, moving towards the commission of wrong; such as sending a surveyor to mark trees.^{FNr} None of the cases stand upon a mere *quia timet*. But *755 here, not even a belief that the defendant meant to commit the trespass is asserted. Regard the case as against Osborn only and individually; separate him from the State tax, and from his office as Auditor; and whether the bill is brought to protect a franchise or prevent a trespass, it cannot be maintained.

FNq *Etches v. Lance*, 7 *Ves.* 417.

FNr *Jackson v. Cator*, 5 *Ves.* 690.

6. But, in fact, the bill is against the State, and as such, the Circuit Court has no jurisdiction of it. In this bill, all the component parts of a case against the State, are set out in their regular and proper order: the privilege; the measures set on foot to

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

invade it; their unjust and oppressive character, and the prayer for relief against them. There is no allegation against any individual; no relief is prayed against any person in his private and individual character. The acts complained of, are the acts of the Legislature; the party charged with aggression on the plaintiff's right, is the Legislature; the relief prayed, is against the acts of the Legislature; the State is the sole party in interest. It is true, process is not prayed or awarded against the State; but the bill is substantially the same as it would have been, had the plaintiffs intended to make the State a formal party by process. In all ordinary cases, if the Court sees from the face of the bill, that the actual and principal party in interest is not before them, it will either dismiss the bill, or stay the proceedings until proper parties are made. A decree, vitally affecting the interests of a principal, will never be pronounced, where his agent is the only party to the bill. In *Vernon v. Blackerly*,^{FNs} *756 the suit was brought against the defendant, treasurer of the commissioners for building fifty new churches, to compel the payment of moneys claimed to be due from the commissioners. Lord Hardwicke dismissed the bill, saying, 'it would be absurd that a bill should lie against a person who is only an officer, and subordinate to others, and has no discretionary power. It is absurd to make a party who acts ministerially, the sole party.'

FNs 2 *Atk.* 144.

If, then, the State be the only party interested, and if the bill, in its terms, and in its effect, operates solely upon the State, the State ought to be made a party. If the Circuit Court cannot exercise jurisdiction where the State is a party direct, it ought not, it cannot, be permitted to obtain that jurisdiction, by an indirect mode of proceeding. This would be to disregard the substance of things, and found a jurisdiction upon arbitrary definition.

We maintain, that the State of Ohio is, in fact, the sole defendant in this cause; and that the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court is excluded, (1.) By the constitution of the United States; (2.) By the judiciary act.

We contend, further, that if the subject matter in controversy between the actual parties to this cause, presents a case within the jurisdiction of the federal judiciary, that jurisdiction is vested exclusively in the Supreme Court, both by the constitution and by the judiciary act.

The constitution, after defining the cases in which the federal judiciary shall take cognizance, *757 declares, that 'in all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction.'

According to the interpretation given to the constitution by this Court, in *Cohens v. Virginia*,^{FNt} a State may be made a party, before the federal Courts, wherever the case arises under the constitution, or a law of the United States; or where the controversy is between two States, or one State and a foreign State.

FNt 3 *Wheat. Rep.* 378.

In this case, the controversy arises under the constitution of the United States, or under the act of incorporation, or under both. It is a case of original jurisdiction; and by the express letter of the constitution, the Supreme Court alone are authorized to take jurisdiction.

In *Marbury v. Madison*,^{FNu} this Court decided, that it was not competent for Congress to invest the Supreme Court with original jurisdiction, in any other cases than those described in the constitution. It is supposed, that the principle of this decision, and the reasoning of the Court in support of it, both conduce to the conclusion, that where original jurisdiction is given by the constitution to the Supreme Court, Congress cannot distribute any part of such original jurisdiction to an inferior federal tribunal. It would hardly seem rational to decide, that the framers of the constitution inserted this clause for no other purpose but that of *758 limiting the power of Congress, as to the cases in which they should give the Supreme Court original jurisdiction. There could have been no just ground for apprehending, that the National Legislature would

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

impose original jurisdiction upon the Supreme Court to a mischievous extent. Considering the character of the parties, between whom the constitution invests the Supreme Court with this jurisdiction, it is a much more rational inference, that it was intended to prevent Congress from subjecting them to the power of any inferior tribunal. 'If the solicitude of the Convention, respecting our peace with foreign powers, induced a provision, that the Supreme Court should take original jurisdiction, in cases which might be supposed to affect them,' the same solicitude would seem to require an interpretation, by which the original jurisdiction of other Courts should be excluded. If Congress be at liberty to give original jurisdiction to inferior Courts, where the constitution has given it to the Supreme Court, it will be the easiest thing in nature to defeat that object, which the solicitude of the Convention intended to secure. If these terms do not operate exclusively upon Congress, they cannot operate exclusively upon the States; so that the exemption of foreign ministers from liability in State tribunals, is not secured by the constitution, but depends upon an act of Congress, and may be put an end to whenever the National Legislature choose.

FNu 1 *Cranch*, 174.

**4 In the case of *Cohens v. Virginia*, it is said, that 'when the constitution declares the jurisdiction, in cases where a State shall be a party, to be *759 original, and in all cases arising under the constitution or a law, to be appellate, the conclusion seems irresistible, that its framers designed to include in the first class, those cases in which jurisdiction is given, because a State is a party; and to include in the second, those in which jurisdiction is given, because the case arises under the constitution, or a law.'^{FNv}

FNv 6 *Wheat. Rep.* 393.

It is allowed, that 'it may be conceded, that where the case is of such a nature as to admit of its originating in the Supreme Court, it ought to originate there,'^{FNw} though it be immediately

afterwards asked, 'can it be affirmed that a State might not sue a citizen of another State in the Circuit Court?'^{FNx} From the whole, this final conclusion is deduced: 'The original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, in cases where a State is a party, refers to those cases in which, according to the grant of power made in the preceding clause, jurisdiction might be exercised, in consequence of the character of the party; and an original suit might be instituted in any of the Federal Courts, not to those cases in which an original suit might not be instituted in a Federal Court.'

FNw *Id.* 395.

FNx *Id.* 396.

The result of this reasoning seems to be, that where the jurisdiction of the Federal Court attaches, in consequence of the character of the party, in that case, no original suit can be brought against a State, except in the Supreme Court. But if a *760 State become liable to an action, in a case arising under the constitution, or a law of the United States, then any of the Federal Courts may entertain jurisdiction.

We cannot think, that the Court meant to assert this position; or that if they did, they will adhere to it. No good reason can be perceived, for sustaining a distinction of this kind. The policy which exempts the States from the jurisdiction of inferior Courts, is the same in both cases; and the terms of the constitution comprehend the one class of cases as well as the other. The words, '*all cases*,' embrace as fully a case against a State, arising under the constitution, or a law, as they do a case between two States, or between a State and a foreign State. The same terms are used in defining the extent of the judicial power in the first class of cases described, and the Court thus speak of their effect: 'This clause extends the jurisdiction of the Court to all the cases described, without making in its terms any exception whatever, and without any regard to the condition of the party. If there be any exception, it is to be implied against the express words of the article.' The same may be said, with equal force, of the terms, when employed to define the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The true reading

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

and understanding are, 'in all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, and in all those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction.' If there be any exception, by which a State can be sued in an original suit before an inferior federal tribunal such *761 exception must be implied against the express words of the article, and can only be sustained 'upon the spirit and true meaning of the constitution; which spirit and true meaning must be so apparent, as to overrule the words which its framers have employed.'

**5 There is no difficulty in giving full force and effect to the constitutional distribution of jurisdiction, as we interpret it, without touching the appellate jurisdiction asserted in the case of *Cohens v. Virginia*. By that case, it is settled, that the judicial power of the United States extends to a class of cases which cannot originate in any federal tribunal, and that this jurisdiction must, of necessity, be appellate. The distribution of jurisdiction must be interpreted as if the judicial power was extended, by the letter of the constitution, to this class of cases, in express terms. The first member of the sentence must be understood as applicable only to cases in which original jurisdiction is vested in the federal judiciary. The second, to every description of appellate jurisdiction, whether it arise under the constitution, or be created by law. Thus, if a case arise under the constitution, or a law of the Union, in which an original suit may be sued against a State, the constitution requires such suit to be brought in the Supreme Court. If a State be plaintiff or defendant in a State Court, and a question arise under the constitution, or a law of the Union, and a case be made at the trial, upon which the federal judicial power attaches, the constitution authorizes the Supreme Court to exercise appellate jurisdiction. *762

There is no occasion to confound the two classes of cases, or to bring the two kinds of jurisdiction into collision. The appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court may, consistently, be extended to the proper class of cases where a State is a party, without so interpreting the constitution, as to subject the States to original actions in the inferior national tribunals.

But whatever may be the correct interpretation of the constitution upon this point, it has long been settled, that the Circuit Courts can exercise no jurisdiction but what is conferred upon them by law. The judiciary act does not vest them with jurisdiction where a State is a party. On the contrary, in a case like the present, it vests exclusive jurisdiction in the Supreme Court.

The judiciary act of 1789, c. 20. sec. 13., provides, that 'the Supreme Court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all controversies of a civil nature, where a State is a party, except between a State and its citizens, and except also between a State and citizens of other States, or aliens; in which latter case, it shall have original, but not exclusive jurisdiction.' This act, which distributes and defines the jurisdiction of the different federal Courts, does not, in terms, vest the Circuit Court with jurisdiction in any case arising under the constitution or the laws of the United States. And in *M'Intire v. Wood*,^{FNy} this Court decided, that this portion of federal jurisdiction could not be exercised by the Circuit Courts, unless expressly conferred *763 by law. Neither does this act give jurisdiction to the Circuit Court, in any case where a State is a party; but, on the contrary, all original jurisdiction that is given to the federal judiciary, where a State is a party, is vested in the Supreme Court, and, with certain exceptions, in that Court exclusively. The case before the Court comes not within any of the exceptions; so that, if it be a case of federal jurisprudence, it is exclusively vested in the Supreme Court.

FNy 7 *Cranch*, 505.

**6 Should it be conceded, that the State cannot be sued in the Circuit Court, and an attempt made to sustain the case and the jurisdiction against the individuals, upon the ground of necessity, lest there should be a failure of justice, it may be answered: First, that the reasons which exempt the State from direct responsibility, operate at least equally strong to exempt her from indirect responsibility. No necessity can warrant a judicial tribunal in disregarding the maxim, that that which cannot legally be directly done, cannot rightfully be

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

effected by indirection.

A second, and a more decisive answer, may be given: the supposed necessity does not exist. The case arises under the constitution and the charter. A suit direct against the States, may be prosecuted in the federal Courts. The constitution has made the State amenable to justice before the Supreme Court of the nation. The national Legislature have provided that this jurisdiction shall be exclusive. It cannot be defeated or evaded by the selection of improper parties, in subversion of established practice, and of correct and *764 well settled principles. The bill might have been filed in the Supreme Court; the injunction might have been allowed by a Judge of that Court in vacation; the whole case might have been proceeded in as the framers of the constitution intended. The high and solemn measure of citing a sovereign State before a Court of judicature, to defend its attributes of sovereignty, and the exercise of its power, ought not to be permitted to any authority but the highest tribunal of the nation. I say nothing of consequences; I look only to what is fit and proper in itself, adapted to the nature of man, to the organization of government, and consistent with the plain letter of the constitution.

If this were not the case, if the constitution had conferred jurisdiction, but Congress had omitted to make provision for exercising it by the Supreme Court, in an original form, still no necessity can justify an evasive assumption of it by any tribunal, much less by one to which the constitution never intended to intrust it. The Bank must take the consequences, as in the case of other men who transact business, where Congress have failed to make provision for vesting in the Courts all the jurisdiction conferred by the constitution.

In the case of *M'Intire v. Wood*, before cited, this Court said, 'When questions arise under the constitution of the United States, in the State Courts, and the party who claims a right or privilege under them is unsuccessful, an appeal is given to the Supreme Court; and this provision the Legislature has thought *sufficient, at present*, for all the political purposes to be answered by *765 the clause of the constitution which relates to the subject.' It must

remain sufficient until the law is changed, whatever inconvenience may result to individuals.

If, then, the case made in the bill be, in fact, a case against the State, in which the State is the sole party interested, and the defendants only ministerial agents, then the decree is erroneous, (1.) because the proper parties are not before the Court; (2.) because the Circuit Court cannot, under either the constitution or laws of Congress, exercise jurisdiction over the proper party; (3.) because both the constitution and law vests *exclusive* jurisdiction of the case made in the Supreme Court.

**7 7. The last and the most important point in the case remains yet to be considered. It is, that the decree assumes that the Bank of the United States is not subject to the taxing power of the State of Ohio, and decides that the law of Ohio, the execution of which is enjoined, is unconstitutional.

Upon this point, we ask the Court to reconsider so much of their opinion in the case of *M'Culloch v. Maryland*, as decides that the States have no rightful power to tax the Bank of the United States.

The question, whether the Bank of the United States, as now constituted, is exempt, by the constitution of the Union, from the taxing power of the State, depends upon the nature and character of the institution. If it stands upon the same foundation with the mint and the post office; if its business can justly be assimilated to the process *766 and proceedings of the federal Courts, we admit, without hesitation, that it is entitled to the exemption it claims. The States cannot tax the offices, establishments, and operations, of the national government. It is not the argument of the opinion, in *M'Culloch v. Maryland*, but the premises upon which that argument is founded, that we ask the Court now to re-examine and reconsider.

Banking is, in its nature, a private trade; and is a business in which individuals may at all times engage, unless the municipal law forbid it. Where this is not the case, it is competent for individuals to contract together, and create capital to be employed in lending money, and buying and selling coins, bullion, promissory notes, and bills of exchange. No

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

law is necessary to authorize a contract between individuals for concentrating capital to be thus employed; nor does the business itself depend upon any special laws for its creation or existence. An association thus formed, may take to themselves a name, and may establish rules and regulations to govern them in the transaction of their business, and to determine their relative rights and duties among themselves. The general law not only recognises the obligation of this contract between the parties; it recognises also the capacity of the association thus formed, to make contracts in the name they have assumed, and the right of the individuals, as joint partners, or one party, to enforce those contracts. The whole is a private concern: the capital is private property; the business a private and individual trade; the *767 convenience and profit of private men the end and object. Such is the true character of a bank, constituted by individual stockholders. Its rights and privileges, its liabilities and disabilities, are all the rights, privileges, liabilities, and disabilities of private persons.

If the individuals thus associated apply for and obtain, from the legislative power of the country, a special law, creating them a corporation, what change does it effect in their condition? A better answer cannot be given, than that contained in the definition of a corporation by this Court: 'A corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and existing only in contemplation of law. Being the mere creature of law, it possesses only those properties which the charter of its creation confers upon it, either expressly, or as incidental to its existence. These are such as are supposed best calculated to effect the object for which it was created. Among the most important are immortality, and, if the expression may be allowed, individuality; properties by which a perpetual succession of many persons are considered as the same, and may act as a single individual. They enable a corporation to manage its own affairs, and to hold property, without the perplexing intricacies, the hazardous and endless necessity of perpetual conveyances, for the purpose of transmitting it from hand to hand. *It is chiefly for the purpose of clothing bodies of men with these qualities and capacities, that corporations were invented and are in use.*'^{FNz}

FNz *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 4 *Wheat. Rep.* 634.*768

**8 If the character of a corporation, as here defined, be regarded in granting a charter to a banking company in the case stated, the change effected in the condition of a company by the charter, can be easily and readily comprehended. It relates to their character, not to their rights. It would not change the nature of their business, but would afford facility in transacting it. It would confer upon the whole one individual character, comprising, for particular purposes, the capacities of an individual; but it would exempt them from liabilities, only so far as an express exemption was stipulated or granted. By the charter, they would be constituted an invisible, intangible, and artificial being, capable of perpetual existence, and of acting as an individual in the management of their appropriate affairs. But this would operate only to change the form, it would not alter the substance of things. These would still consist of the individuals that composed the association, and of the business in which they were engaged.

This was distinctly decided in the case of the *United States Bank v. Deveaux*.^{FN1} In that case it was contended, that the character of the individuals was completely merged in the charter of incorporation. But this Court adjudged otherwise; they determined that they could look behind the charter, and notice the character of individuals; and the cases and the principles upon which this decision is founded, also establish, that *769 Courts may look beyond the charter for all substantial and beneficial purposes.

FN1 5 *Cranch*, 84.

When individuals, associated to carry on the trade of banking, apply to the Legislature of the country for an act of incorporation, they found their application upon some benefit to be derived to the public from conferring upon them the character they ask. This public benefit may consist of the facilities afforded to the State, in the management of its fiscal concerns; or it may consist in the convenience to the community in the transaction of mercantile and other money affairs. It may arise from the payment

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

of annual revenue, or a stipulated sum, into the public treasury. If the benefit to the public be considered a sufficient compensation for the faculty conferred, the corporation is created. But from this fact, in the language of this Court, 'nothing can be inferred which changes the character of the institution, or transfers to the government any new power over it. The character of civil institutions does not grow out of their incorporation, but out of the manner in which they are formed, and the objects for which they are created.'^{FN2}

FN2 *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 4 *Wheat. Rep.* 638.

If, then, a banking association be formed, the capital collected, the mode of transacting the business settled, and the whole concern regulated and established, before any application be made for a charter, it is clear that the mere fact of enacting a law, creating the association a corporation, could not change its character. It was a company of *770 individuals, conducting a private trade, before it was incorporated, and it retained the same character afterwards. The charter was granted to give facility to the individuals in the management of their private affairs; not that, in virtue of that charter, they might share in the civil government of the country. For special purposes, it constituted them an immortal being; but of this being it has been correctly said, that 'its immortality no more confers on it political power, or a political character, than immortality would confer such power or character on a natural person.'^{FN3}

FN3 4 *Wheat. Rep.* 656.

**9 If in fact the incorporation be obtained before the association is formed, does it vary the principle? It is supposed and insisted that it does not. If the corporation be originated for the management of an individual concern; if it be based upon contract between individuals; if its great end and principal object be private trade and private profit, its character must be the same, whether the trade commenced precedent or subsequent to the incorporation; whether the individuals solicited the

charter, or the Legislature invited the individuals. The character of the association must be ascertained by the same rules, and it must be subject to the same legal consequences.

We may suppose, then, that individuals resident in every part of the Union, and in foreign countries, have associated for the purpose of establishing a bank, with a capital of 28,000,000 of dollars; that they have actually collected this capital *771 together in the city of Philadelphia, and, no law prohibiting such a measure, have commenced trading as bankers. Not finding sufficient employment for their capital at that place, they establish a banking house in New-York, one in Boston, and one in Baltimore, where they carry on a profitable business. It is perfectly clear, that all this may be done, if no State law be contravened, by individuals in their natural capacities. But it is equally clear, that the capital thus employed, and the business thus transacted, must be subject to the regulations of the respective States, and that the parties must be subject to all the inconveniences and embarrassments resulting from the death of its members, and from the transfers of its shares and interests; from the perplexing intricacies, the hazardous and endless necessity of perpetual conveyances for transferring their property, as well as the still greater inconvenience of pursuing its rights and enforcing its contracts in Courts of justice.

Deriving great advantage from its trade, anxious to extend it into other States, and to be relieved from the embarrassments incident to a joint stock company not incorporated, the corporation apply to the Congress of the United States for an act of incorporation. But this Congress cannot confer, unless the association can be employed by the national government in the execution of some of the powers with which it is invested by the constitution. All the powers of the government must be carried into operation by individual agency, either through the medium of public officers, or contracts made with individuals. Can any public office be created, *772 or does one exist, the performance of which may, with propriety, be assigned to this association, when incorporated? If such office exist, or can be created, then the company may be incorporated, that

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

they may be appointed to execute such office. Is there any portion of the public business performed by individuals upon contracts, that this association could be employed to perform, with greater advantage and more safety to the public, than an individual contractor? If there be an employment of this nature, then may this company be incorporated to undertake it.

****10** There is an employment of this nature. Nothing can be more essential to the fiscal concerns of the nation, than an agent of undoubted integrity and established credit, with whom the public moneys can, at all times, be safely deposited. Nothing can be of more importance to a government, than that there should be some capitalist in the country, who possesses the means of making advances of money to the government upon any exigency, and who is under a legal obligation to make such advances. For these purposes the association would be an agent peculiarly suitable and appropriate. There are also other minor employments, such as the transmission of the revenue from one place to another, for the performance of which this company would be a most safe and certain agent. As, then, this association may be thus connected with the public interest, and made useful and advantageous to the government, by conferring a charter upon them, the power of securing to the nation these benefits, advantages, and conveniences, ***773** results to the National Legislature. A just construction of their constitutional powers, invests them with authority to incorporate a banking company, upon the basis of contracting with the institution thus created, for the performance of certain public employments, beneficial to the nation, and necessary to be performed by some one.

The mere creation of a corporation, does not confer political power or political character. So this Court decided in *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, already referred to. If I may be allowed to paraphrase the language of the Chief Justice, I would say, a bank incorporated, is no more a State instrument, than a natural person performing the same business would be. If, then, a natural person, engaged in the trade of banking, should contract with the government to receive the public money

upon deposit, to transmit it from place to place, without charging for commission or difference of exchange, and to perform, when called upon, the duties of commissioner of loans, would not thereby become a public officer, how is it that this artificial being, created by law for the purpose of being employed by the government for the same purposes, should become a part of the civil government of the country? Is it because its existence, its capacities, its powers, are given by law? because the government has given it power to take and hold property in a particular form, and to employ that property for particular purposes, and in the disposition of it to use a particular name? because the government has sold it a privilege ***774** for a large sum of money, and has bargained with it to do certain things; is it, therefore, a part of the very government with which the contract is made?

If the Bank be constituted a public office, by the connexion between it and the government, it cannot be the mere legal franchise in which the office is vested; the individual stockholders must be the officers. Their character is not merged in the charter. This is the strong point of the *Mayor and Commonalty v. Wood*, upon which this Court ground their decision in the *Bank v. Deveaux*, and from which they say, that cause could not be distinguished. Thus, aliens may become public officers, and public duties are confided to those who owe no allegiance to the government, and who are even beyond its territorial limits.

****11** With the privileges and perquisites of office, all individuals holding offices, ought to be subject to the disabilities of office. But if the Bank be a public office, and the individual stockholders public officers, this principle does not have a fair and just operation. The disabilities of office do not attach to the stockholders; for we find them every where holding public offices, even in the national Legislature, from which, if they be public officers, they are excluded by the constitution in express terms.

If the Bank be a public institution of such character as to be justly assimilated to the mint and the post office, then its charter may be amended, altered, or even abolished, at the discretion of the National

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

Legislature. All public offices are created *775 purely for public purposes, and may, at any time, be modified in such manner as the public interest may require. Public corporations partake of the same character. So it is distinctly adjudged in *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*. In this point, each Judge who delivered an opinion concurred. By one of the Judges it is said, that 'public corporations are generally esteemed such as exist for public political purposes only, such as towns, cities, parishes and counties; and in many respects they are so, although they involve some private interests; but, strictly speaking, public corporations are such only as are founded by the government for public purposes, where the whole interest belongs also to the government. If, therefore, the foundation be private, though under the charter of the government, the corporation is private, however extensive the uses may be to which it is devoted, either by the bounty of the founder, or the nature and objects of the institution. For instance, a bank, created by the government for its own uses, whose stock is exclusively owned by the government, is, in the strictest sense, a public corporation. So, a hospital created and endowed by the government for general charity. *But a bank, whose stock is owned by private persons, is a private corporation, although it is erected by the government, and its objects and operations partake of a public nature.* The same doctrine may be affirmed of insurance, canal, bridge, and turnpike companies. In all these cases, the uses may, in a certain sense, be called public, but the corporations are private; as much *776 so, indeed, as if the franchises were vested in a single person.^{FN4}

FN4 4 *Wheat. Rep.* 668.

If the Court adopt this reasoning of one of themselves, the point is decided. The act of incorporation, in the case supposed, does neither create a public office, nor a public corporation. The association, notwithstanding their charter, remain a private association, the proprietors and conductors of a private trade, bound by contract, for a consideration paid, to perform certain employments for the government.

**12 The qualities and capacities which are ordinarily conferred upon a private corporation, have already been stated. These Congress must have power to confer, for they cannot create a corporation, unless they can confer the qualities and capacities requisite to its constitution. It must be remembered, that this power in the National Legislature, to create a private corporation, is not a general, but a special power, limited to cases where the corporation, when created, may be employed by the government as an appropriate agent in the transaction of public affairs. It is not essential to the creation or existence of a corporation, that any uncommon or extraordinary privilege or exemption should be conferred upon it. It is, therefore, beyond question, that the admitted power of creating, in its strict and proper sense, does not include or imply a power to exercise discretion in conferring privileges. If this be attempted, it is *777 open for inquiry, whether such privilege be compatible with the constitution.

Before the act of incorporation, the association, we have supposed, was necessarily subject to the law of the State in which it transacted business; that law, whatever it might be, entered into and operated upon all their contracts. By that law, their property was protected, and for that protection the property was subject to equal rateable taxation. The ordinary qualities and capacities conferred upon a corporation, would not place the protection of the property under a different law, nor exempt it from bearing its proportion of legal burthens. To effect this, an extraordinary provision must be inserted in the charter. This kind of immunity is not incident to a corporation; the power to create one does not include the power to confer such immunity upon it. It is not essential to its creation or existence, and is not, therefore, within the sphere of national legislation.

A State is invested with constitutional power to levy a tax upon stamps, and may extend its operation to all the dealings of individuals. It cannot subject the transactions of the national government to the payment of such tax, because the operations of that government are national, and not subject to the power of any of its parts. If the nation borrow money, it is competent for the nation to decide upon

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

the evidence to be given of the debt. It would be absurd to subject this national measure to the municipal regulations of one of its parts, and thus permit a part to assess a tax upon the whole. But if the national government *778 incorporate a company of private bankers, who, before they received their charter, were subject to the payment of this tax, their subsequent exemption from it would not seem to be a necessary consequence, unless they were constituted a public institution. If they remained mere private dealers, with only increased facilities, and a new faculty conferred upon them, it would seem a rational inference, that their private duties and liabilities also remained. Supposing them to remain a private corporation of trade, the tax collected from them would be abstracted, not from the national treasury, but from the pockets of private men. The supposition, that this tax is incompatible with the capacity to trade, conferred in the charter, proceeds upon the hypothesis, that that capacity partakes of the character of the government that confers it, and is, therefore, supreme. Unquestionably such would be the fact, if the Bank were a public corporation; if it were created by the government for its own uses; and if the stock were exclusively owned by the government. But if it remain a private corporation, then the capacity given in the charter ought to be regarded as that which is adapted to the character of the party receiving it: a capacity properly appertaining to private individuals, which necessarily imports, that it is to be enjoyed like other individual rights, subject to the municipal law.

**13 A stamp duty is one mode of collecting revenue from individuals engaged in private trade, but it is not the only mode. The principle which exempts the Bank of the United States from the *779 payment of a stamp duty imposed by a State, is supposed to exempt it from the payment of any tax assessed by State authority. It is deemed an incident attached to the charter, because that charter is conferred by the supreme authority. It is said, that if any other than the supreme authority that confers the faculty, is permitted to tax the trade or business to be carried on under it, the faculty itself may be rendered useless, and the object of granting it entirely defeated. The power to confer the faculty, and the power to tax the business, if vested in

different hands, are thus held to be incompatible, and from this incompatibility the exemption is deemed a necessary incident to the charter, because, without it, it cannot exist. For we must here repeat, that this Court have said, that a corporation ‘ possesses only those properties which the charter of its creation confers upon it, either expressly, or as incidental to its very existence.’^{FN5}

FN5 4 *Wheat. Rep.* 686.

This position involves several inquiries, which may be embraced in an examination of the reasons assigned for considering this exemption as an incident attached to the charter, and in an investigation of the powers of Congress to confer this exemption, in express terms, if it cannot be sustained as incidental to the very existence of the Bank.

The fact, that a private corporation, created by the sovereign or supreme power, is not, therefore, clothed with any portion of the political character *780 or political power of its creator, is asserted by the concurring opinions of the Judges of this Court, and is established by its judgment in the case of *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*. That an exemption from taxation for public purposes, by an inferior legislative power, is not incident to a corporation created by the supreme power, is a just inference from the doctrines laid down in the case just cited, and from the whole history of private corporations, down to the decision of this Court in *M'Culloch v. Maryland*.

The power of assessing taxes is always a legislative power; but in our government, and in that of England, from which many of our institutions, and most of our principles of jurisprudence are derived, this power is exercised by other authorities than the National and State Legislatures. Counties, cities, towns, boroughs, and townships, have bodies of magistracy authorized to assess taxes for various specific purposes. We have the high authority of Lord Coke himself, that the Justices of a city, shire, or riding, in England, might assess a tax upon the property of a corporation, for the repair of bridges.^{FN6} And in *The King v. Gardner*,^{FN7} it was

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: **22 U.S. 738**)

decided by the Court of King's Bench, that a corporation was subject to be assessed for poor rates, even as a corporation. In these cases, it was not pretended that exemption from taxation was an incident to the corporation.

FN6 2 *Inst.* 697. 700.

FN7 *Cowp.* 83.*781

****14** If a State Legislature incorporate a company to construct a turnpike road, such charter would be predicated upon the advantage the community would derive from the road; yet no man would suppose that the horses, cattle, carriages, and other implements employed and used by the company, would be exempt from county levies, poor rates, and other burthens to which the other property of the individuals was subject. And if a general tax upon business or income was assessed, it would not be pretended that the amount received for tolls would be exempt from this tax, upon the ground that a right to have the corporate property and corporate business exempt from taxation, was an incident of the charter. This argument is applicable to every species of individual business conducted by private corporations. If exemption from any particular tax be claimed, it is founded upon a privilege specifically granted in the charter, it is not claimed as an incident to the grant.

It is not uncommon, that almost every species of business carried on within the boundaries of a city, is subject to be taxed by the city magistracy, for city purposes. Should this general authority to tax, extend to bankers, money-lenders, brokers, and others trading in money, notes, stocks, bills of exchange, &c., would the mere fact, that the sovereign authority granted to the individual or individuals carrying on any one of these employments, a corporate character, operate to exempt such individual or individuals from the payment of a city tax, to which he was liable before the corporate character was bestowed upon him?
***782**

Private corporations, emanating from State authority, and ultimately connected with the private

and public welfare, are numerous in all our commercial cities. Such are fire and marine insurance companies. Are these regarded as exempt from taxes assessed by the city magistrates? Have they ever claimed such exemption? Has it ever been conceded to them? In all the cases put, it is evident, that the body of inferior magistracy, authorized to levy a tax, if they be not limited as to the amount, which is frequently not the case, may assess upon the corporation an amount which their business could not pay, and thus defeat the object for which the charter was obtained. That such exemption, as an incident of their charter, has never been claimed by such corporations, is strong proof that it was not supposed to exist.

It may be said, that the inferior magistracy and the corporations, in the cases supposed, both derive their authority from the same source, and that it is competent for the authority that created both, so to regulate and control their operations, as to prevent one from being destroyed by the other. This may be granted, without affecting the argument. If the exemption be incident to the corporation, regulations are unnecessary. The power of the national Legislature to confer this exemption, upon a corporation created by it, in express terms, is one thing. That it exists as an incident to the charter, without any express provision, is a very different proposition.

****15** It is distinctly admitted, in the case of *M'Culloch v. Maryland*, that the real property of the ***783** Bank may be taxed, and that the stock held by residents of the State may be taxed. But it is asserted, that the operations of the Bank are exempt, because they are the means of the national government; and it is only by the total exemption of the operations of the Bank from the taxing power of the States, that our institutions can be relieved from the absurdity of a power, in one government, to pull down what another may build up, and a right in one government to destroy what there is a right in another to preserve.

But if the real property of the Bank and its stock may be taxed, it is as completely within the power of the States to destroy it by taxation, as it is by taxing its operations. The States may tax the stock

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

owned by its citizens, so high as to compel them to retain it at a loss. Every State in the Union, by adopting this course, may paralyze the operations of the Bank, as effectually as in any other mode. If the States act in concert, there is an end of the Bank; and that which the national government have built up, is prostrated by the States. The concession, then, that the exemption is qualified, admits the very mischief which it is set up to prevent. Whatever misapprehension may have prevailed with respect to the operations of the Bank, it certainly never can be asserted, that the individual stock of the members, or the real estate of the company, are the means of the government, and, as such, exempt from taxation. And while these are subject to taxation by the States, it would seem difficult to sustain the position upon *784 which the operations of the Bank are held to be exempt.

We can well understand, how an absolute exemption may be a consequence of the character of the corporation established. Certainly it would be an incident of this Bank, were it established solely for public use, and were the stock wholly owned by the nation. But a qualified exemption must, in its very nature, depend upon specific provision. It is so connected with considerations of policy, and interwoven with the exercise of discretion, that it cannot be conceived, how it is to exist otherwise than by special creation or enactment.

No such exemption, either general or qualified, has heretofore been regarded as an incident to the creation of a private corporation. On the contrary, every corporate privilege beyond the creation of individuality of character and of capacity, has been founded upon special grant. In the case of *Head v. the Providence Insurance Company*,^{FN8} this Court declared, that a private company, 'in its corporate capacity, is the mere creature of the act to which it owes its existence. It may correctly be said, to be precisely what the incorporating act has made it, and to be capable of exerting its faculties only in the manner in which that act authorizes.' And this principle has been recognised in every case where the rights, privileges and powers of a corporation have been considered, except in respect to the Bank.

FN8 2 *Cranch*, 167.*785

****16** If we examine the claim of this particular corporation, to attach to itself this exemption, as incident to its charter, upon what ground is it to be distinguished from private corporations generally? It is said, that it is an instrument employed by the national government in the execution of its powers, and for that reason cannot be taxed; that, in this particular, it is distinguishable from all other corporations.

In what sense is it an instrument of the government? and in what character is it employed as such? Do the government employ the faculty, the legal franchise, or do they employ the individuals upon whom it is conferred? and what is the nature of that employment? does it resemble the post office, or the mint, or the custom house, or the process of the federal Courts?

The post office is established by the general government. It is a public institution. The persons who perform its duties are public officers. No individual has, or can acquire, any property in it. For all the services performed, a compensation is paid out of the national treasury; and all the money received upon account of its operations, is public property. Surely there is no similitude between this institution, and an association who trade upon their own capital, for their own profit, and who have paid the government a million and a half of dollars for a legal character and name, in which to conduct their trade.

Again: the business conducted through the agency of the post office, is not in its nature a private business. It is of a public character, and the *786 charge of it is expressly conferred upon Congress by the constitution. The business is created by law, and is annihilated when the law is repealed. But the trade of banking is strictly a private concern. It exists and can be carried on without the aid of the national Legislature. Nay, it is only under very special circumstances, that the national Legislature can so far interfere with it, as to facilitate its operations.

The post office executes the various duties assigned

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

to it, by means of subordinate agents. The mails are opened and closed by persons invested with the character of public officers. But they are transported by individuals employed for that purpose, in their individual character, which employment is created by and founded in contract. To such contractors no official character is attached. These contractors supply horses, carriages, and whatever else is necessary for the transportation of the mails, upon their own account. The whole is engaged in the public service. The contractor, his horses, his carriage, his driver, are all in public employ. But this does not change their character. All that was private property before the contract was made, and before they were engaged in public employ, remain private property still. The horses and the carriages are liable to be taxed as other property, for every purpose for which property of the same character is taxed in the place where they are employed. The reason is plain: the contractor is employing his own means to promote his own private profit, and the tax collected is from the individual, though assessed upon the *787 means he uses to perform the public service. To tax the transportation of the mails, as such, would be taxing the operations of the government, which could not be allowed. But to tax the means by which this transportation is effected, so far as those means are private property, is allowable; because it abstracts nothing from the government; and because, the fact that an individual employs his private means in the service of the government, attaches to them no immunity whatever.

****17** It is only in this character, that the Bank is in public employ. The business it transacts for the government, originates in contract. It receives the public treasure upon deposit, and pays it out upon the checks of the proper officer. This is an individual business, transacted for the government precisely as if it were an individual concern. It receives the cash of individuals upon deposit in the same manner, and in the same manner pays it out. It is one department of its trade, by which it makes individual profit. Any private person, or moneyed corporation, may be employed to do the same thing; and as to that, would be in the employment of the government; would be an instrument used by the government: a means of executing its powers. Yet it has never been supposed, that such employment

constituted a public office, or that the person employed was thereby invested with official character. All these contracts are made with a view to the profitable employment of individual exertion, and are performed by individual means, in the private personal character of the contractor. They are, of course, subject to *788 the municipal law; by it they must be protected and enforced, and, therefore, cannot be exempt from its exactions.

The carriages and horses of the contractor for transporting the mail, is a stronger case than that of the Bank. The transportation of the mail is the principal object for which the team and vehicle are engaged; the business of carrying passengers and baggage, is merely incidental. Public service is the first great object; its employment as a means of travelling, by individuals, is but secondary. But in the case of the Bank, the private trade of the company is the great object of pursuit, and the end of their exertions; the public business is subordinate and incidental, and is, in reality, a very essential means of promoting that private gain, which is the principal, if not the sole object of the corporation.

Again-In the case of the mail, the contractor receives a stipulated sum, as a compensation for his services. He takes upon himself a burthensome and hazardous employment. But the Bank, on the contrary, receive a privilege, a substantial pecuniary advantage, resulting necessarily in the augmentation of the private individual wealth of the stockholders; of this advantage they are the purchasers, not for the public account, but for private use.

The post office, as such, that is, the mere legal entity created by the law, cannot be taxed, because it is a public institution. The moneys received for postage cannot be taxed, because they are public property. This immunity attaches to their public *789 character. But the building in which the post office is kept, is a proper subject of taxation, because it is private property; and the fact, that it is an instrument used or employed by the government, in the execution of its powers, attaches to it no immunity.

The mint, the custom house, the process of the federal Courts, bear still less analogy to the Bank

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

than the post office. They partake less of the character of private business. The functions they perform are more palpably of a public nature, requiring the personal agency of individuals, rather than the employment of private property in their performance; especially the papers of the custom house, and the proceedings of the federal Courts. However much individuals may be interested in the existence and preservation of these documents, yet they are not, in their nature, subjects in which a right of property can be acquired. If it ever could have been supposed that these were subjects of taxation by the States, the argument of the opinion in the case of *M'Culloch v. Maryland*, demonstrates the absurdity of such supposition. Because to all these institutions exemption from State taxation is attached, as an incident essential to their very existence, it does not follow that the same exemption attaches to the Bank, unless its character, end, and object, are the same. It seems to us impossible that this can be maintained. If it cannot, what is there peculiar to the constitution of this corporation, that should attach to its charter an exemption not incident to other corporations? Surely some foundation for this very extraordinary *790 character, unknown to other establishments of the same nature, ought to be made out by those who claim it.

**18 I am aware, that an indefinite, indistinct, confused idea exists, by which the charter, and the private trade, and the stockholders, and the government, are combined together, and the whole made to produce a something which cannot well be defined, but which is called a public institution. This might produce some legal effect, if we were compelled to contemplate this something only as a creation of the national government, by the name of *the Bank of the United States*. If its legal envelope, and legal name, constituted its whole character, or if these could be used so as to shut out all further inquiry into that character, its claim to the incidents and immunities of a public institution might rest upon some sort of foundation. But this misconception of its character vanishes, when we are permitted to examine all its constituent parts. We have seen that the persons who compose it are not public officers; that the business it pursues is not a public business, and that its agency for the

government is that of a private individual: from none of which it can derive any exemption not common to private corporations.

The charter itself, abstracted from the individuals upon whom it is conferred, must be without any operative effect. It is in the nature of a grant; but a grant is nothing, unless there be a grantee to take, as well as a subject to be granted. When an association of individuals is formed, and entitle themselves to a grant of corporate franchises, *791 so as to give operative effect to that grant, they acquire in it a private vested right; it becomes their private property; and so long as they comply with its terms, they can no more be disturbed in the possession of it, by the grantors, than by a third person or stranger. Such is the situation of the Bank. The charter is their property, derived, to be sure, from a public grant, but, nevertheless, as distinctly the private property of the individuals, as if derived from a contract or grant from individuals, its former proprietors. Why is it an incident to this species of property, that it should be exempt from taxation by the States?

One reason only is offered. It is granted by the national government; and if the States can tax it, they may, in effect, render it useless to the grantees. But the States may confessedly exercise this power over the employments and property of individuals. All property is held subject to it, when held by individuals, no matter whence it is derived. In Ohio, the State cannot tax the public lands, while owned by the government, nor for five years after they become the property of individuals. She is bound by compact on this point. But it never was conceived, that because it was once owned by the nation, and the title to the individual derived from a national grant, the States could not tax it. Restricted as this power of taxation is in the State of Ohio, yet there can be no possible difficulty in so employing it, as to defeat all future sales of public lands within that State. It is only to provide by law for assessing such tax upon all lands hereafter sold, to be collected after *792 the expiration of five years from the sale, as would render the lands a burthen to the proprietor, and the object would be effected. Yet the power to do this would hardly be held a sufficient ground for attaching to lands thus sold, an

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

exemption from State taxation as incident to the grant. Why should a grant of franchises be distinguished from a grant of land, when the grantee, in both cases, receives it in confirmation of a purchase from the government, to be held as his own individual property? We are warranted by the opinion of at least one of the Judges of this Court, in asserting, that 'a grant of franchises is not, in point of principle, distinguishable from a grant of any other property.'^{FN9} If this be correct, then there can be no reason for attaching any exemption to a grant of franchises, because the grant is conferred by the national government. The grantee must hold the property subject to all the burthens which might be imposed upon it, had he obtained it from any other source.

FN9 4 *Wheat. Rep.* 684.

****19** It may be objected, that this doctrine asserts a power in the States to tax the patent rights granted by the national government. And why not? By the grant it is constituted individual property; but does the power conferred upon the national government, to secure to the authors of useful inventions the exclusive use of their machines, necessarily attach to the patent for such exclusive right an exemption from taxation also? Is it not enough, that the inventor of a new species of property ***793** may be secured in a monopoly of its employment? Does the mere fact of conferring such monopoly, of necessity imply a right to enjoy it exempt from the burthens to which other property is subject? How far is this exemption to be carried? Would it exempt a steam loom from a general tax upon looms? or a steam mill from a general tax upon mills? Would a barrel of flour be subject to taxation, if, in the process of manufactory, it were carried from the meal chest to the cooling room upon a miller's shoulder; but exempt if it were hoisted by elevators, or gathered to the bolt-hopper by a hopper boy? Does this exemption attach to the grant, only in the hands of the monopolist, or extend also to his grantees of the monopoly? Is the exemption to be withdrawn so soon as the invention passes into the hands of the mechanic for practical purposes? or does it adhere to the machinery, and attach to the fabric manufactured? At whatever point it is withdrawn,

the same consequences may follow. The power of State taxation, if it attach at all, may be so used as to render the patent of very little value. If the patent itself, or the machinery when constructed, or the employment of such machinery, or the fabrics manufactured by it, may be taxed, an excessive tax can, in one way as well as another, affect the benefits derived by the patentee from the patent, and may even prevent its use. Still, in this respect, it stands upon the same footing with other private property, and there is no sound reason for conferring upon it any ***794** higher privilege. Every thing in the nature of property, produced by the labour of the husbandman and the mechanic, may be taxed. They have no other security that the tax may not be excessive and oppressive, than what is afforded by their weight in the government, and a sense of justice in legislative assemblies. If the powers of genius be so applied as to produce any thing in which the inventor claims a property, this product of labour must be treated as other productions of the same class. No special exemptions are necessary incidents of its invention or creation. So far, then, as there is a just analogy between the Bank and patent rights, so far they are alike to be looked upon as private property, and no exemption from taxation can be conceded to either, as an incident of the franchise conferred upon them by a grant from the National Legislature.

Last of all, this exemption from taxation is not an incident essential to the very existence of the Bank; the Bank may exist without it; may exist beneficially without it, as we contend, did exist for twenty years without it, and was extensively useful. This exemption may conduce much to its convenience, and, perhaps, very considerably to its profit. But many things may be convenient and beneficial in the account of mercantile profit or Bank dividends, which are not necessary to the very existence of the corporation. Certainly the exemption from taxation is of this character. It is not incident to the corporation. If necessary to secure to it the most beneficial uses of its corporate franchises, it must obtain it by a special ***795** grant; it must be specially inserted. An inquiry, how far Congress have constitutional power to do this, were they to attempt it, would still further elucidate the erroneous character of the position, that it is an

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

incident of the charter, independent of special grant.

****20** Mr. *Clay*, for the respondents, declined arguing the question of the right of the State of Ohio to tax the Bank, considering it as finally determined by the former decision of the Court, which was supported by irresistible arguments, to which he could add no farther illustration. But this was not, like the law of Maryland, a case of taxation. It was a law enacted for the purpose of expelling the branches of the Bank from the State of Ohio, by inflicting penalties amounting to a prohibition. It might be called a bill of pains and penalties. An examination of its provisions, would show, that the penalties were greater in amount than the entire dividends. It was unequal and unjust in its operations. It was a confiscation, and not a tax. It was the same on the branch at Cincinnati, which had a capital of one million and a half, with that at Chillicothe, which had only a capital of half a million of dollars. It was obvious, that if one State could, in this manner, expel one of the offices of discount and deposit from its territory, every State might do the same thing. If one State may expel a branch, another State may expel the parent Bank itself; and thus this great institution of the national government, would be extirpated and destroyed ***796** by the local governments, within whose territory it was established.

Is it possible, that against this highly penal law, there is no preventive, peaceable remedy? that the Bank must submit to the alternative of withdrawing its branches, or of paying the penalty? that it must do this, not for one year, but for the whole period of its existence? Is it possible, that our jurisprudence should be so defective, that the law of the whole may be defeated in its operation by a single part? that if a State should lay a duty on imports or tonnage, contrary to the express provisions of the constitution, no adequate means could be found to prevent its collection by the officers of the State government?

All these propositions must be maintained by our opponents, or they must surrender their cause. It is, accordingly, contended by them, that the remedy is misconceived, (1.) because the State is not made a party. But if such parties are before the Court, as

will enable it to make an effectual decree, it will proceed, although there be improper parties made, or parties omitted, who might have been made. Such is the practice where jurisdiction is sustained in the Circuit Court against some parties, against whom an effectual decree can be made, although others are omitted, on account of their being absent, or citizens of the same State with the plaintiff. The true ground seems to be, that if the Court can give redress; if its decree can be rendered effectual; if the party can ***797** be put in possession of the thing claimed, the Court will proceed. Here the party omitted is a sovereign State, who is entirely exempt from jurisdiction. The Court will, therefore, proceed against the other proper parties.

****21** But it is also insisted, that the remedy is misconceived, because a State is the real party defendant. We deny that a collateral or contingent interest, will necessarily make a party who must be joined.

The State is not a formal party on the record; and that the State is not necessarily a party, by reason of its incidental interest, is conceded by the admission, that the Bank might have recovered in trover, trespass, or detinue, against the defendants, who actually took the money. That the suit concerns the public acts of an officer of the State government, who is one of the defendants, does not make the State itself a necessary party. This is the settled law of the Court. In the case of the *United States v. Peters*,^{FN10} it was held that, although the interests of a State may be ultimately affected by the decision of a cause, yet if an effectual remedy can be had, without making the State a defendant to the suit, the Courts of the United States are bound to exercise jurisdiction. So, in England, in the Grenada case, the fiscal rights of the sovereign were drawn directly in question, and finally determined, in a suit brought by an individual, to recover back from the collector of the customs of the island, the amount of duties unconstitutionally ***798** levied by that officer.^{FN11} The party there was not compelled to resort to his petition of right, or any other mode of proceeding peculiar to claims against the crown. The immunity of one of the States of this Union from suits in the Courts of justice, is not greater than that of the crown in England. The constitution

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

merely ordains, that a State, in its sovereign capacity, shall not be sued. It does not ordain, that the citizen shall not have justice done him, because a State may happen to be collaterally interested. It does not ordain that a law of the United States shall be violated, to the prejudice of a citizen, because a law of the State happens to come under consideration. If the State of Ohio is a party, so is the government of the United States a party in its sovereign interests, which are more sacred and important than mere proprietary interests. But even if the State be a party, that circumstance would not oust the jurisdiction of the Court, in a case arising under the constitution and laws of the Union. There the nature of the controversy, and not the character of the parties, must determine the question of jurisdiction. Such is conceived to be the spirit and effect of the decision of the Court, in the case of *Cohens v. Virginia*. It is competent for Congress to determine what Court shall have jurisdiction in this class of cases, which it has done as to the Bank, by giving it, the right of suing in the Circuit Courts of the Union.

FN10 5 *Cranch*, 115.

FN11 *Campbell v Hall, Cowp.* 204.

**22 Again; if the State is to be considered a party, *799 it is a party plaintiff. The State is the actor, and the Bank is a defendant. In form it may not be so, but the substance is to be regarded. The injunction is essentially a defensive proceeding. Suppose the State, or even the United States, had recovered a judgment against the Bank, might not the proceedings upon that judgment be enjoined? And is the nature of the case varied, because the proceeding is here *in pais*? Suppose the State had proceeded by distraining for the tax, and the Bank had replevied, who would have been both the real and technical plaintiff in that case? The whole case is to be considered according to its true nature and character, which is, that of a proceeding by the State to recover a tax or penalty; and the Bank resorts to its natural protector for defence, by means of an injunction, which is a parental, preventive, peaceable remedy.

It is said that this is a case of trespass only, and that the party ought to have been left to his appropriate remedy at law. But this is not a case of a solitary remediable trespass. It is one of annual, of repeated, vexatious occurrence, for which an injunction is the appropriate remedy. All injunctions are discretionary, and granted upon the peculiar circumstances of the case. The jurisdiction of a Court of equity as to injunctions, has been always considered a most useful one, and, of late years, they have been dispensed with a much more liberal hand than formerly. They are granted to prevent fraud or injustice; to stay proceedings in other Courts; to restrain the infringement of patent and copy rights; to restrain the *800 transfer of negotiable instruments, where the transfer will defeat the object of the suit; to stay waste, in which case they have superseded the common law remedy by writ of estrepement. In the case of patents and copyrights, it is not necessary to establish previously the right at law, for it is grounded on an act of parliament, and appears by record.^{FN12} The principle on which injunctions in all these cases are granted, is to prevent a wrong where damages would not give adequate relief. So, there are cases where bills of peace have been brought, though a mere general right was claimed by the plaintiff, and no privity between him and the defendants, nor any general rights on the part of the defendants, and where many more might be concerned than those brought before the Court. Such are bills for duties, as in the case of the *City of London v. Perking*. In the present case, it is quite clear that it would be an idle mockery to compel the parties to resort to their legal remedy, which would be wholly inadequate to prevent the destruction of their franchise.

FN12 1 *Madd. ch.* 113. 123. 128. and the cases there cited.

As to the formal objection of the defect of a warrant of attorney from the Bank, authorizing these proceedings, it is now too late to take that objection, even if it could have been available at any stage of the suit. It is matter of form only, which should have been pleaded in abatement. It is cured by the provisions of the Judiciary Act of 1789, ch. 20. s. 34.*801

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

****23** Mr. *Wright*, for the appellants, in reply, insisted, that a special authority must be shown for the institution of the suit in the name of a corporation, which could only appear by attorney, under its common seal. Admitting, however, that the corporation might, by a mere resolution of the board of directors, authorize the suit, following the analogy of the cases of *The Bank of Columbia v. Patterson*, and *Fleckner v. The Bank of the United States*, such resolution must appear on the record, in the same manner as a warrant of attorney. Nor are the defendants precluded by the appeal from taking advantage of this defect. A decree is a judicial act. Its validity depends upon there being a party before the Court, legally competent to ask it. A corporation can only appear by its attorney or solicitor, duly authorized; and if this authority is not apparent upon the face of the record, the decree is erroneous, and cannot be supported.

There are no proofs of admissions sufficient to charge the defendant, Sullivan. He knows nothing of his own knowledge. The information from his predecessor in office, Currie, is no proof. The bill charges, that he received the money as a deposit, without any interest in it. The answer states, that he receives and holds it as a public officer, and has no private interest in it. The case in *6 Ves. jr.* 738. was a much stronger admission than this, and yet it was held insufficient. The answer of one defendant cannot affect another. The answer of a party having no interest, cannot affect a person having an interest. The ***802** answer of Sullivan and Currie could not affect the State of Ohio, against which the decree operated, and whose treasury was entered, in order to execute the writ of sequestration.

It is impossible to determine, whether the injunction is meant to be supported upon the ground of preventing an irreparable injury, or of protecting the franchise of the plaintiffs. No case has been shown of an injunction to prevent a mere trespass on chattels, or where the injury intended is not an interference in the enjoyment of the plaintiff's exclusive privileges, but only a trespass upon their property, for which they have an adequate remedy, by suit at law, in various forms of action. Mere general principles, upon which Courts of equity may have proceeded a certain length in interposing

by injunction, will not warrant the extending this extraordinary remedy still further. Some analogous case must be found to support this injunction.

An injunction binds no person but the parties to the suit.^{FN13} Here the sole interest is in the State of Ohio. She is, therefore, an indispensable party to the bill. But she cannot be made a party, because she cannot be sued. The inevitable consequence is, that the Court below cannot take jurisdiction of the cause. Where, indeed, the proceeding is *in rem*, or operates upon the subject matter in controversy, disconnected from the persons interested; if it can be shown that any person interested, who is subject to the jurisdiction of ***803** the Court, is absent beyond the reach of its process, it is not necessary to make such person a party. But here the party omitted is a sovereign State, who is within reach of process, but is not subject to the jurisdiction, and cannot be brought before the Court. The case of *Cohens v. Virginia* does not apply. That case relates exclusively to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, and merely establishes the doctrine, that where the State commences a suit in its own Courts, and a question arises under the constitution, laws, and treaties of the Union, the defendant may bring the cause before this Court by appeal or writ of error. The appellate process is not considered as a suit against the State, within the meaning of the 11th amendment. The *Grenada* case, in England, is equally inapplicable.^{FN14} It was an action of assumpsit, brought to recover back the amount of certain duties paid to the Collector of the island, and which had been retained in his hands, *by the consent of the Attorney-General*, for the express purpose of trying the question, as to the validity of the King's proclamation, by which the duties were imposed. The Court determined, that the King had precluded himself from the exercise of his power of prerogative legislation over a conquered country, by previously authorizing the establishment of a colonial Legislature, and, therefore, gave judgment for the plaintiff. The present suit is substantially a suit against the State. The 11th amendment to the constitution was intended to protect the State effectually ***804** from the suit of an individual, not to permit its sovereign rights to be drawn in question, and its property to be taken indirectly by suing its officers. In the case of the *United States v.*

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

Peters, the interference of the State was by a law passed subsequent to the decree, and intended to operate directly upon it, and defeat its execution. A Court of law, from necessity, sometimes allows suits to be maintained against mere agents, who are the active parties, in cases of trespass or other torts; but it is the invariable practice of the Court of Chancery to proceed against the parties really interested, and the omission of any of them is a fatal defect. The policy which exempts the States from being sued in the Courts of the Union, is the same, whether the case arise under the constitution and laws of the United States, or whether the jurisdiction is founded upon the character of the parties. The terms of the exemption equally comprehend both classes of cases.

FN13 7 *Ves.* 255. 4 *Johns. Ch. Rep.* 25.

FN14 *Cowp.* 204.

March 11th.

****24** The Court having expressed a wish that the cause should be re-argued upon the point of the constitutionality and effect of the provision in the charter of the Bank, which authorizes it to sue in the Circuit Courts of the Union, it was this day again argued upon that point, (in connexion with the case of the *Bank of the United States v. The Planters' Bank of Georgia*, in which the same question was involved,) by Mr. *Clay*, Mr. *Wrbster*, and Mr. *Sergeant*, for the jurisdiction, and by Mr. *Harper*, Mr. *Brown*, and Mr. *Wright*, against it.*805

In favour of the jurisdiction, it was argued, (1.) that the jurisdiction was expressly and unequivocally conferred by the act of 1816, s. 7. incorporating the Bank. The terms used were free from all ambiguity, and they were introduced for the avowed purpose of giving jurisdiction to the Circuit Courts. In the case of the *Bank of the United States v. Deveaux*,^{FN15} it had been decided, that the former national Bank had not, by virtue of its charter, a right to sue in the federal Courts. That charter gave it a right 'to sue and be used, in Courts of record, or any other place whatsoever,' which it was determined did not confer the privilege of suing in the Courts of the

Union, they not being expressly mentioned. But no doubt was intimated, that those Courts would have had jurisdiction, if they had been mentioned in the act. It was to supply this defect, that Congress adopted the phraseology which is contained in the present charter, giving the Bank power 'to sue and be sued in all State Courts having competent jurisdiction, and in any Circuit Court of the United States.' Power in the party 'to sue,' confers jurisdiction on the Court. Jurisdiction is always given for the sake of the suitor, never for the sake of the Court. It was most natural to give the privilege to the suitor, and that necessarily carries with it the jurisdiction; for without the jurisdiction, he cannot enjoy the right. To authorize the bringing of a suit, is to authorize a suit to be entertained. The patent laws, and many other statutes *806 of Congress, have been construed to give jurisdiction by the use of similar terms.

FN15 5 *Cranch*, 61. 85. 86.

2. That Congress had constitutional authority to confer this jurisdiction on the Circuit Courts. It was 'a case arising under the constitution and laws of the United States.' Every case, in which the Bank of the United States is a party, is, in the strictest literal interpretation of the clause, a *case* arising under a *law* and the constitution of the United States. But for the *law*, the *case* would never have existed. But for the continued existence of the law, it could not continue to exist. If, by any conceivable means, the law were to be determined, the case must be at an end. There is, therefore, an inseparable, indissoluble connexion between the law and the case, as cause and effect. The case owes its being to the law, and only to the law. The establishment of a corporation is a legislative creation of a faculty, of a moral being, invisible and intangible, but with capacities, powers, and privileges, rights and duties. The rights it may acquire, the wrongs it may suffer, the obligations it may incur, the injuries it may inflict, the acts it may do, its power to do, or to endure, are all derived from, and dependent upon, the charter. To the charter it owes its being, its continued existence, its qualities and properties. The charter defines its duties, and effords the only measure of its responsibilities. Every act it

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

performs, derives its validity from the charter only; and whenever it deals with another, it deals under and according to the charter. In the same manner, whoever deals with it, deals under and according to the charter. *807 Its capacity to contract, and to sue and be sued, all are derived from that source. It cannot come into Court, without bringing the law in its hand. It is bound in every case to show, that it is acting within the limits of its corporate powers, as defined in that law. There can be no case, where the Bank is a party, in which questions may not arise under the laws of the United States. In every such case, it must appear, that it was duly created, continues to exist, has power to contract, and to bring the suit. All these are matters arising under the laws of the United States, and under no other. Suppose an officer created by act of Congress, could not Congress confer on him the privilege of suing and being sued, in his official capacity, in the Courts of the Union? Such an officer has two capacities, private and official, and may be subject to different jurisdictions, according as either is affected. But a corporation has but one capacity, and its faculties cannot be divided. Wherever an authority is given, all that is done by virtue of that authority, is done under it. Every thing done by the Bank, is done under the charter.

**25 If it should be contended, that the character of the case depends upon the questions to arise in it, the answer is, that it is not so restricted by the constitution; and that it cannot be previously known, what particular questions may arise in the progress of the cause. The principal draws to it the incident, or accessory. The character of the case depends upon its general nature. Every suit brought by the Bank, is for the funds placed in its charge, under a law of the United States.*808

But the question here, is about the exercise of a sovereign power, given for great national purposes. Those who framed the constitution, intended to establish a government complete for its own purposes, supreme within its sphere, and capable of acting by its own proper powers. They intended it to consist of three co-ordinate branches, legislative, executive, and judicial. In the construction of such a government, it is an obvious maxim, 'that the judicial power should be competent to give efficacy

to the constitutional laws of the Legislature.^{FN16} The judicial authority, therefore, must be co-extensive with the legislative power.^{FN17} It would be quite as reasonable to leave the execution of the laws of the Union to the State executives, as to leave the exposition of them to the State judiciaries. It was intended, that the federal judiciary should expound all the laws of the government, and that the federal executive should execute them all. This association is so inseparable, that the power of legislation carries with it the power of establishing judicial tribunals. It is so with respect to the power of exclusive legislation within the District of Columbia. So the power of establishing post offices and post roads, involves that of providing judicial means for the punishment of mail robbers. Most of the statutes for the punishment of crimes, are founded on the same basis. The great object, then, of the *809 constitutional provision, respecting the judiciary, must make it co-extensive with the power of legislation, and to associate them inseparably, so that where one went, the other might go along with it. The first part of the article, where the jurisdiction is made to depend upon the nature of the controversy, is employed for this purpose, not to limit and restrain. But it was necessary, for great purposes of public policy, to extend it to other cases, where the jurisdiction is made to depend upon the character of the parties. These are the subject of the remaining part of the article. In that part of it which relates to cases arising under the constitution, laws, and treaties of the Union, there is a redundancy in the language: 'ALL cases.' The pleonasm is here meant to perform its usual office, to be emphatic. It marks the intention, and affords a principle of construction. The additional terms, 'all cases in *law and equity*,' also serve to heighten the effect, and to show that nothing of this essential power was to be put to hazard. Surely such a clause must be construed liberally. It is a maxim applicable to the interpretation of a grant of political power, that the authority to create must infer a power effectually to protect, to preserve, and to sustain.^{FN18} It is no less a maxim, that the power to create a faculty of any sort, must infer the power to give it the means of exercise. A grant of the end is necessarily a grant of the means. The constitutional power of Congress to create a Bank, is derived

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

altogether *810 from the necessity of such an institution, for the fiscal purposes of the Union. It is established, not for the benefit of the stockholders, but for the benefit of the nation. It is part of the fiscal means of the nation. Indeed, 'the power of creating a corporation, is never used for its own sake, but for the purpose of effecting something else.'^{FN19} The Bank is created for the purpose of facilitating all the fiscal operations of the national government. All its powers and faculties are conferred for this purpose, and for this alone; and it is to be supposed, that no other or greater powers are conferred than are necessary to this end. The collection and administration of the public revenue is, of all others, the most important branch of the public service. It is that which least admits of hindrance or obstruction. The Bank is, in effect, an instrument of the government, and its instrumental character is its *principal* character. That is the end; all the rest are means. It is as much a servant of the government as the treasury department. The two faculties of the Bank, which are essential to its existence and utility, are, its capacity to hold property, and that of suing and being sued. The latter is the necessary sanction and security of the former, and of all the rest. The former must be inviolable, and the latter must be sufficient to secure its inviolability. But it is not so, if Congress cannot erect a forum, to which the Bank may resort for justice. A needful operation of the government becomes dependent upon foreign support, *811 which may be given, but which may also be withheld. There is no unreasonable jealousy of State judicatures; but the constitution itself supposes that they may not always be worthy of confidence, where the rights and interests of the national government are drawn in question. It is indispensable, that the interpretation and application of the laws and treaties of the Union should be uniform. The danger of leaving the administration of the national justice to the local tribunals, is not merely speculative. In Ohio, the Bank has been outlawed; and if it cannot seek redress in the federal tribunals, it can find it no where. Where is the power of coercion in the national government? What is to become of the public revenue while it is going on? Congress might not only have given original, but it might have given exclusive jurisdiction, in the cases mentioned in the 25th

section of the Judiciary Act of 1789, c. 20.; instead of which, it has contended itself with giving an appellate jurisdiction, to correct the errors of the State Courts, where a question incidentally arises under the laws and treaties of the Union. But here the question is, whether the government of the United States can execute one of its own laws, through the process of its own Courts. The right of the Bank to sue in the national Courts, is one of its essential faculties. If that can be taken away, it is deprived of a part of its being, as much as if it were stripped of its power of discounting notes, receiving deposits, or dealing in bills of exchange.

FN16 *Cohens v. Virginia*, 6 *Wheat. Rep.* 414.

FN17 *The Federalist*, No. 80. *Cohens v. Virginia*, 6 *Wheat. Rep.* 384.

FN18 *M'Culloch v. Maryland*, 4 *Wheat. Rep.* 426.

FN19 *M'Culloch v. Maryland*, 4 *Wheat. Rep.* 411.

**26 Against the jurisdiction, it was said, that by the act incorporating the old Bank of the United *812 States, authority is given to the corporation 'to sue, &c. in Courts of record, or any other place whatsoever.' By the present charter, it is empowered 'to sue, &c. in all State Courts having competent jurisdiction, and in any Circuit Court of the United States.' No difference is perceived in the legal effect of these two acts. Both give the same privileges. The Circuit Courts of the Union are 'Courts of record;' and an authority to sue in Courts of record, or any other place whatsoever, is an authority to sue in the Circuit Courts. So that, if Congress were competent, under the constitution, to vest such a jurisdiction in the federal Courts, it was vested by the first act of incorporation. But in the case of the *Bank of the United States v. Deveaux*,^{FN20} the Court says, that 'by the judiciary act, the jurisdiction of the Circuit Courts is extended to cases where the constitutional right to plead and be impleaded in the Courts of the Union, depends on the *character of the parties*; but where that right

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

depends on the *the nature of the case*, the Circuit Courts derive no jurisdiction from that act, except in the single case of a controversy between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants from different States. Unless, then, jurisdiction over this cause has been given to the Circuit Court, by some other than the Judiciary Act, the Bank of the United States had not a right to sue in that Court, upon the principle that the case arises under a law of the United States.' The Court then proceeds to consider, *813 whether jurisdiction had been given to the Circuit Court by the act incorporating the Bank, and determines that it had not. The Judiciary Act, nor no other law of Congress, can extend the jurisdiction of the federal Courts beyond the constitutional limits. The charter attempted to confer jurisdiction on the State Courts, in cases where the Bank is a party. This provision, and that empowering it to sue in the Circuit Courts of the Union, are both equally void. The act must, therefore, be restricted, so as to give the corporation authority to sue and be sued in such Courts only as are competent to take jurisdiction. This Court has determined, that the right of a corporation to litigate in the Courts of the Union, depends upon the character (as to citizenship) of the members which compose the body corporate, and that a corporation, as such, cannot be a citizen, within the meaning of the constitution.^{FN21} There is here no averment on the record, that the plaintiffs have a right to sue, upon the ground of the corporation being citizens of a different State from the defendants; nor could such averment have been made, consistently with the truth of the fact.

FN20 7 *Cranch*, 85.

FN21 *Hope Insurance Company v. Boardman*, 5 *Cranch*, 61.

**27 It had been said, that every suit brought by the Bank, arises under the laws of the United States, because the Bank, with all its powers and faculties, was created, and existed, by a law of the United States. So it might be said of an alien who is naturalized by the laws of the Union, that *814 he derives his citizenship from those laws. But, could Congress, therefore, authorize all naturalized

citizens to sue in the Courts of the Union? A clear distinction exists between a party and a cause; the party may originate under a law with which the cause has no connexion. A revenue officer may commit a trespass while executing his official duties, and if he justifies under the statutes of the United States, a question will arise under them, in which an appellate jurisdiction is given to this Court, to correct the errors of the State Courts. But could Congress give additional jurisdiction to the federal Courts, in all suits brought by or against the revenue officers? In *M'Intyre v. Wood*,^{FN22} this Court says, 'when questions arise under the constitution of the United States, in the State Courts, and the party who claims a right or privilege under them is unsuccessful, an appeal is given to the Supreme Court; and this provision the Legislature has thought *sufficient at present* for all the political purposes to be answered by the clause of the constitution which relates to the subject.' And it may be added, that it must remain sufficient until the law shall be changed by some unequivocal provision within the constitutional competency of Congress to make.

FN22 7 *Cranch*, 505.

It was also contended, that every right that accrues to the Bank in its corporate character, upon which a suit can be maintained, is to be regarded as arising under the charter, and, consequently, under a law of the United States. But the jurisdiction *815 of the federal Courts, if it attach at all, must attach either to the *party* or to the *case*. The party and his rights cannot be so mixed together, as that the legal origin of the first shall give character to the latter. A controversy regarding a promissory note or bill of exchange cannot be said to arise under an act of Congress, because the Bank, which is created by an act of Congress, has purchased the note or bill. Neither the rules of evidence, nor the law of contract, can be regulated by the National Legislature. But, in the case supposed, no question can arise, except under the law of contract and the rules of evidence. No law of Congress is drawn into question, and its correct decision cannot possibly depend upon the construction of such law. The Bank cannot come into the federal Courts as a party

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

suing for a breach of contract or a trespass upon its property; for, neither its character as a party, nor the nature of a controversy, can give the Court jurisdiction. The case does not arise under its charter. It arises under the general or local law a contract, and may be determined without opening the statute book of the United States. The privilege conferred upon the Bank in its charter, to sue in the Circuit Courts, must be limited, not only by the criterion indicated; it must also be limited by the general provisions of the Judiciary Act, regulating the exercise of jurisdiction in the Circuit Courts. It cannot sue upon a *chose in action* assigned to it, unless the jurisdiction would have attached between the original parties; it cannot sue a party in the Circuit Court, *816 over whom the existing laws give the Supreme Court exclusive jurisdiction. The privilege must be enjoyed, subject to existing laws. As to the legislation of Congress in giving to the Courts of the Union cognizance of criminal offences, that depended on the plain principle, that where a power is granted, all its incidents pass. Congress has power to legislate on various subjects. It is an incident, that they may enforce obedience to the laws they make on those subjects, by punishing offences against them. Thus, for example, the right to punish perjury, and the falsification of judicial records, is essential to the administration of justice. Hence, Congress has assumed the power of punishing those offences, when connected with the proceedings in the Courts of the Union. So, in the case of patents, the grant creates the right; and the power to secure to inventors the exclusive benefit of their discoveries, could not be executed without giving the patentees a right to sue in those Courts.

March 19th.

Mr. Chief Justice MARSHALL delivered the opinion of the Court, and, after stating the case, proceeded as follows:

**28 At the close of the argument, a point was suggested, of such vital importance, as to induce the Court to request that it might be particularly spoken to. That point is, the right of the Bank to sue in the Courts of the United States. It has been argued, and ought to be disposed of, before we proceed to the actual exercise of jurisdiction, by deciding on the rights of the parties.

*817 The appellants contest the jurisdiction of the Court on two grounds:

- 1st. That the act of Congress has not given it.
- 2d. That, under the constitution, Congress cannot give it.

1. The first part of the objection depends entirely on the language of the act. The words are, that the Bank shall be 'made able and capable in law,' 'to sue and be used, plead and be impleaded, answer and be answered, defend and be defended, in all State Courts having competent jurisdiction, and in any Circuit Court of the United States.'

These words seem to the Court to admit of but one interpretation. They cannot be made plainer by explanation. They give, expressly, the right 'to sue and be sued,' 'in every Circuit Court of the United States,' and it would be difficult to substitute other terms which would be more direct and appropriate for the purpose. The argument of the appellants is founded on the opinion of this Court, in *The Bank of the United States v. Deveaux*, (5 Cranch, 85.) In that case it was decided, that the former Bank of the United States was not enabled, by the act which incorporated it, to sue in the federal Courts. The words of the 3d section of that act are, that the Bank may 'sue and be sued,' &c. 'in Courts of record, or any other place whatsoever.' The Court was of opinion, that these general words, which are usual in all acts of incorporation, gave only a general capacity to sue, not a particular privilege to sue in the *818 Courts of the United States; and this opinion was strengthened by the circumstance that the 9th rule of the 7th section of the same act, subjects the directors, in case of excess in contracting debt, to be sued in their private capacity, 'in any Court of record of the United States, or either of them.' The express grant of jurisdiction to the federal Courts, in this case, was considered as having some influence on the construction of the general words of the 3d section, which does not mention those Courts. Whether this decision be right or wrong, it amounts only to a declaration, that a general capacity in the Bank to sue, without mentioning the Courts of the Union, may not give a right to sue in those Courts. To infer

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

from this, that words expressly conferring a right to sue in those Courts, do not give the right, is surely a conclusion which the premises do not warrant.

The act of incorporation, then, confers jurisdiction on the Circuit Courts of the United States, if Congress can confer it.

****29** 2. We will now consider the constitutionality of the clause in the act of incorporation, which authorizes the Bank to sue in the federal Courts.

In support of this clause, it is said, that the legislative, executive, and judicial powers, of every well constructed government, are co-extensive with each other; that is, they are potentially co-extensive. The executive department may constitutionally execute every law which the Legislature may constitutionally make, and the judicial department may receive from the Legislature the power of construing every such law. All governments ***819** which are not extremely defective in their organization, must possess, within themselves, the means of expounding, as well as enforcing, their own laws. If we examine the constitution of the United States, we find that its framers kept this great political principle in view. The 2d article vests the whole executive power in the President; and the 3d article declares, 'that the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority.'

This clause enables the judicial department to receive jurisdiction to the full extent of the constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States, when any question respecting them shall assume such a form that the judicial power is capable of acting on it. That power is capable of acting only when the subject is submitted to it by a party who asserts his rights in the form prescribed by law. It then becomes a case, and the constitution declares, that the judicial power shall extend to all cases arising under the constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States.

The suit of *The Bank of the United States v. Osborn and others*, is a case, and the question is, whether it

arises under a law of the United States?

The appellants contend, that it does not, because several questions may arise in it, which depend on the general principles of the law, not on any act of Congress.

If this were sufficient to withdraw a case from ***820** the jurisdiction of the federal Courts, almost every case, although involving the construction of a law, would be withdrawn; and a clause in the constitution, relating to a subject of vital importance to the government, and expressed in the most comprehensive terms, would be construed to mean almost nothing. There is scarcely any case, every part of which depends on the constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. The questions, whether the fact alleged as the foundation of the action, be real or fictitious; whether the conduct of the plaintiff has been such as to entitle him to maintain his action; whether his right is barred; whether he has received satisfaction, or has in any manner released his claims, are questions, some or all of which may occur in almost every case; and if their existence be sufficient to arrest the jurisdiction of the Court, words which seem intended to be as extensive as the constitution, laws, and treaties of the Union, which seem designed to give the Courts of the government the construction of all its acts, so far as they affect the rights of individuals, would be reduced to almost nothing.

****30** In those cases in which original jurisdiction is given to the Supreme Court, the judicial power of the United States cannot be exercised in its appellate form. In every other case, the power is to be exercised in its original or appellate form, or both, as the wisdom of Congress may direct. With the exception of these cases, in which original jurisdiction is given to this Court, there is none to which the judicial power extends, from which the original jurisdiction of the inferior Courts is excluded ***821** by the constitution. Original jurisdiction, so far as the constitution gives a rule, is co-extensive with the judicial power. We find, in the constitution, no prohibition to its exercise, in every case in which the judicial power can be exercised. It would be a very bold construction to say, that this power could be applied in its appellate

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

form only, to the most important class of cases to which it is applicable.

The constitution establishes the Supreme Court, and defines its jurisdiction. It enumerates cases in which its jurisdiction is original and exclusive; and then defines that which is appellate, but does not insinuate, that in any such case, the power cannot be exercised in its original form by Courts of original jurisdiction. It is not insinuated, that the judicial power, in cases depending on the character of the cause, cannot be exercised in the first instance, in the Courts of the Union, but must first be exercised in the tribunals of the State; tribunals over which the government of the Union has no adequate control, and which may be closed to any claim asserted under a law of the United States.

We perceive, then, no ground on which the proposition can be maintained, that Congress is incapable of giving the Circuit Courts original jurisdiction, in any case to which the appellate jurisdiction extends.

We ask, then, if it can be sufficient to exclude this jurisdiction, that the case involves questions depending on general principles? A cause may depend on several questions of fact and law. Some *822 of these may depend on the construction of a law of the United States; others on principles unconnected with that law. If it be a sufficient foundation for jurisdiction, that the title or right set up by the party, may be defeated by one construction of the constitution or law of the United States, and sustained by the opposite construction, provided the facts necessary to support the action be made out, then all the other questions must be decided as incidental to this, which gives that jurisdiction. Those other questions cannot arrest the proceedings. Under this construction, the judicial power of the Union extends effectively and beneficially to that most important class of cases, which depend on the character of the cause. On the opposite construction, the judicial power never can be extended to a whole case, as expressed by the constitution, but to those parts of cases only which present the particular question involving the construction of the constitution or the law. We say it never can be extended to the whole case, because, if

the circumstance that other points are involved in it, shall disable Congress from authorizing the Courts of the Union to take jurisdiction of the original cause, it equally disables Congress from authorizing those Courts to take jurisdiction of the whole cause, on an appeal, and thus will be restricted to a single question in that cause; and words obviously intended to secure to those who claim rights under the constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States, a trial in the federal Courts, will be restricted to the insecure remedy of an appeal upon an insulated point, after it has *823 received that shape which may be given to it by another tribunal, into which he is forced against his will.

**31 We think, then, that when a question to which the judicial power of the Union is extended by the constitution, forms an ingredient of the original cause, it is in the power of Congress to give the Circuit Courts jurisdiction of that cause, although other questions of fact or of law may be involved in it.

The case of the Bank is, we think, a very strong case of this description. The charter of incorporation not only creates it, but gives it every faculty which it possesses. The power to acquire rights of any description, to transact business of any description, to make contracts of any description, to sue on those contracts, is given and measured by its charter, and that charter is a law of the United States. This being can acquire no right, make no contract, bring no suit, which is not authorized by a law of the United States. It is not only itself the mere creature of a law, but all its actions and all its rights are dependant on the same law. Can a being, thus constituted, have a case which does not arise literally, as well as substantially, under the law?

Take the case of a contract, which is put as the strongest against the Bank.

When a Bank sues, the first question which presents itself, and which lies at the foundation of the cause, is, has this legal entity a right to sue? Has it a right to come, not into this Court particularly, but into any Court? This depends on a *824 law of the United States. The next question is, has this being a right to make this particular contract? If this

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

question be decided in the negative, the cause is determined against the plaintiff; and this question, too, depends entirely on a law of the United States. These are important questions, and they exist in every possible case. The right to sue, if decided once, is decided for ever; but the power of Congress was exercised antecedently to the first decision on that right, and if it was constitutional then, it cannot cease to be so, because the particular question is decided. It may be revived at the will of the party, and most probably would be renewed, were the tribunal to be changed. But the question respecting the right to make a particular contract, or to acquire a particular property, or to sue on account of a particular injury, belongs to every particular case, and may be renewed in every case. The question forms an original ingredient in every cause. Whether it be in fact relied on or not, in the defence, it is still a part of the cause, and may be relied on. The right of the plaintiff to sue, cannot depend on the defence which the defendant may choose to set up. His right to sue is anterior to that defence, and must depend on the state of things when the action is brought. The questions which the case involves, then, must determine its character, whether those questions be made in the cause or not.

The appellants say, that the case arises on the contract; but the validity of the contract depends on a law of the United States, and the plaintiff is *825 compelled, in every case, to show its validity. The case arises emphatically under the law. The act of Congress is its foundation. The contract could never have been made, but under the authority of that act. The act itself is the first ingredient in the case, is its origin, is that from which every other part arises. That other questions may also arise, as the execution of the contract, or its performance, cannot change the case, or give it any other origin than the charter of incorporation. The action still originates in, and is sustained by, that charter.

**32 The clause giving the Bank a right to sue in the Circuit Courts of the United States, stands on the same principle with the acts authorizing officers of the United States who sue in their own names, to sue in the Courts of the United States. The Postmaster General, for example, cannot sue under that part of the constitution which gives jurisdiction

to the federal Courts, in consequence of the character of the party, nor is he authorized to sue by the Judiciary Act. He comes into the Courts of the Union under the authority of an act of Congress, the constitutionality of which can only be sustained by the admission that his suit is a case arising under a law of the United States. If it be said, that it is such a case, because a law of the United States authorizes the contract, and authorizes the suit, the same reasons exist with respect to a suit brought by the Bank. That, too, is such a case; because that suit, too, is itself authorized, and is brought on a contract authorized by a law of the United States. It depends absolutely on that law, and cannot exist a moment without its authority.

If it be said, that a suit brought by the Bank may depend in fact altogether on questions unconnected with any law of the United States, it is equally true, with respect to suits brought by the Postmaster General. The plea in bar may be payment, if the suit be brought on a bond, or nonassumpsit, if it be brought on an open account, and no other question may arise than what respects the complete discharge of the demand. Yet the constitutionality of the act authorizing the Postmaster General to sue in the Courts of the United States, has never been drawn into question. It is sustained singly by an act of Congress, standing on that construction of the constitution which asserts the right of the Legislature to give original jurisdiction to the Circuit Courts, in cases arising under a law of the United States.

The clause in the patent law, authorizing suits in the Circuit Courts, stands, we think, on the same principle. Such a suit is a case arising under a law of the United States. Yet the defendant may not, at the trial, question the validity of the patent, or make any point which requires the construction of an act of Congress. He may rest his defence exclusively on the fact, that he has not violated the right of the plaintiff. That this fact becomes the sole question made in the cause, cannot oust the jurisdiction of the Court, or establish the position, that the case does not arise under a law of the United States.

It is said, that a clear distinction exists between *827 the party and the cause; that the party may originate

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

under a law with which the cause has no connexion; and that Congress may, with the same propriety, give a naturalized citizen, who is the mere creature of a law, a right to sue in the Courts of the United States, as give that right to the Bank.

This distinction is not denied; and, if the act of Congress was a simple act of incorporation, and contained nothing more, it might be entitled to great consideration. But the act does not stop with incorporating the Bank. It proceeds to bestow upon the being it has made, all the faculties and capacities which that being possesses. Every act of the Bank grows out of this law, and is tested by it. To use the language of the constitution, every act of the Bank arises out of this law.

****33** A naturalized citizen is indeed made a citizen under an act of Congress, but the act does not proceed to give, to regulate, or to prescribe his capacities. He becomes a member of the society, possessing all the rights of a native citizen, and standing, in the view of the constitution, on the footing of a native. The constitution does not authorize Congress to enlarge or abridge those rights. The simple power of the national Legislature, is to prescribe a uniform rule of naturalization, and the exercise of this power exhausts it, so far as respects the individual. The constitution then takes him up, and, among other rights, extends to him the capacity of suing in the Courts of the United States, precisely under the same circumstances under which a native might sue. He is ***828** distinguishable in nothing from a native citizen, except so far as the constitution makes the distinction. The law makes none.

There is, then, no resemblance between the act incorporating the Bank, and the general naturalization law.

Upon the best consideration we have been able to bestow on this subject, we are of opinion, that the clause in the act of incorporation, enabling the Bank to sue in the Courts of the United States, is consistent with the constitution, and to be obeyed in all Courts.

We will now proceed to consider the merits of the

cause.

The appellants contend, that the decree of the Circuit Court is erroneous--

1. Because no authority is shown in the record, from the Bank, authorizing the institution or prosecution of the suit.
2. Because, as against the defendant, Sullivan, there are neither proofs nor admissions, sufficient to sustain the decree.
3. Because, upon equitable principles, the case made in the bill, does not warrant a decree against either Osborn or Harper, for the amount of coin and notes in the bill specified to have passed through their hands.
4. Because, the defendants are decreed to pay interest upon the coin, when it was not in the power of Osborn or Harper, and was stayed in the hands of Sullivan by injunction.
5. Because, the case made in the bill does not warrant the interference of a Court of Chancery, by injunction.
6. Because, if any case is made in the bill proper for the interference of ***829** a Court of Chancery, it is against the State of Ohio, in which case the Circuit Court could not exercise jurisdiction.
7. Because, the decree assumes that the Bank of the United States is not subject to the taxing power of the State of Ohio, and decides that the law of Ohio, the execution of which is enjoined, is unconstitutional.

These points will be considered in the order in which they are made.

1. It is admitted that a corporation can only appear by attorney, and it is also admitted, that the attorney must receive the authority of the corporation to enable him to represent it. It is not admitted that this authority must be under seal. On the contrary, the principle decided in the cases of the *Bank of Columbia v. Patterson, &c.* is supposed to apply to

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

this case, and to show that the seal may be dispensed with. It is, however, unnecessary to pursue this inquiry, since the real question is, whether the non-appearance of the power in the record be error, not whether the power was insufficient in itself.

****34** Natural persons may appear in Court, either by themselves, or by their attorney. But no man has a right to appear as the attorney of another, without the authority of that other. In ordinary cases, the authority must be produced, because there is, in the nature of things, no *prima facie* evidence that one man is in fact the attorney of another. ***830** The case of an attorney at law, an attorney for the purpose of representing another in Court, and prosecuting or defending a suit in his name, is somewhat different. The power must indeed exist, but its production has not been considered as indispensable. Certain gentlemen, first licensed by government, are admitted by order of Court, to stand at the bar, with a general capacity to represent all the suitors in the Court. The appearance of any one of these gentlemen in a cause, has always been received as evidence of his authority; and no additional evidence, so far as we are informed, has ever been required. This practice, we believe, has existed from the first establishment of our Courts, and no departure from it has been made in those of any State, or of the Union.

The argument supposes some distinction, in this particular, between a natural person and a corporation; but the Court can perceive no reason for this distinction. A corporation, it is true, can appear only by attorney, while a natural person may appear for himself. But when he waives this privilege, and elects to appear by attorney, no reason is perceived why the same evidence should not be required, that the individual professing to represent him has authority to do so, which would be required if he were incapable of appearing in person. The universal and familiar practice, then, of permitting gentlemen of the profession to appear without producing a warrant of attorney, forms a rule, which is as applicable in reason to their appearance for a corporation, as for a natural person. Were it even otherwise, the practice is ***831** as uniform and as ancient, with regard to

corporations, as to natural persons. No case has ever occurred, so far as we are informed, in which the production of a warrant of attorney has been supposed a necessary preliminary to the appearance of a corporation, either as plaintiff or defendant, by a gentleman admitted to the bar of the Court. The usage, then, is as full authority for the case of a corporation, as of an individual. If this usage ought to be altered, it should be a rule to operate prospectively, not by the reversal of a decree pronounced in conformity with the general course of the Court, in a case in which no doubt of the legality of the appearance had ever been suggested.

In the statutes of jeofails and amendment, which respect this subject, the non-appearance of a warrant of attorney in the record, has generally been treated as matter of form; and the 32d section of the Judiciary Act may very well be construed to comprehend this formal defect in its general terms, in a case of law. No reason is perceived why the Courts of Chancery should be more rigid in exacting the exhibition of a warrant of attorney than a Court of laws and, since the practice has, in fact, been the same in both Courts, an appellate Court ought, we think, to be governed in both by the same rule.

****35** 2. The second point is one on which the productiveness of any decree in favour of the plaintiffs most probably depends; for, if the claim be not satisfied with the money found in the possession of Smlivan, it is, at best, uncertain whether ***832** a fund, out of which it can be satisfied, is to be found elsewhere.

In inquiring whether the proofs or admissions in the cause be sufficient to charge Sullivan, the Court will look into the answer of Currie, as well as into that of Sullivan. In objection to this course, it is said, that the answer of one defendant cannot be read against another. This is generally, but not universally, true. Where one defendant succeeds to another, so that the right of the one devolves on the other, and they become privies in estate, the rule is not admitted to apply. Thus, if an ancestor die, pending a suit, and the proceedings be revived against his heir, or if a suit be revived against an executor or administrator, the answer of the

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

deceased person, or any other evidence, establishing any fact against him, might be read also against the person who succeeds to him. So, a *pendente lite* purchaser is bound by the decree, without being even made a party to the suit; *a fortiori*, he would, if made a party, be bound by the testimony taken against the vendor.

In this case, if Currie received the money taken out of the Bank, and passed it over to Sullivan, the establishment of this fact, in a suit against Currie, would seem to bind his successor, Sullivan, both as a privy in estate, and as a person getting possession *pendente lite*, if the original suit had been instituted against Currie. We can perceive no difference, so far as respects the answer of Currie, between the case supposed, and the case as it stands. If Currie, who was the predecessor of Sullivan, admits that he received the money of *833 the Bank, the fact seems to bind all those coming in under him, as completely as it binds himself. This, therefore, appears to the Court to be a case in which, upon principle, the answer of Currie may be read.

His answer states, that on or about the 19th or 20th of September, 1819, the defendant, Harper, delivered to him, in coin and notes, the sum of 98,000 dollars, which he was informed, and believed to be the money levied on the Bank as a tax, in pursuance of the law of the State of Ohio. After consulting counsel on the question, whether he ought to retain this sum within his individual control, or pass it to the credit of the State on the books of the treasury, he adopted the latter course, but retained it carefully in a trunk, separate from the other funds of the treasury. The money afterwards came to the hands of Sullivan, the gentleman who succeeded him as treasurer, and gave him a receipt for all the money in the treasury, including this, which was still kept separate from the rest.

We think no reasonable doubt can be entertained, but that the 98,000 dollars, delivered by Harper to Currie, were taken out of the Bank. Currie understood and believed it to be the fact. When did he so understand and believe it? At the time when he received the money. And from whom did he derive his understanding and belief? The inference is irresistible, that he derived it from his own

knowledge of circumstances, for they were of public notoriety, and from the information of Harper. In the necessary course of things, Harper, who was sent, as Currie must have known, on this *834 business, brings with him to the treasurer of the State, a sum of money, which, by the law, was to be taken out of the Bank, pays him 98,000 dollars thereof, which the treasurer receives and keeps, as being money taken from the Bank, and so enters it on the books of the treasury. In a suit brought against Mr. Currie for this money, by the State of Ohio, if he had failed to account for it, could any person doubt the competency of the testimony to charge him? We think no mind could hesitate in such a case.

**36 Currie, then, being clearly in possession of this money, and clearly liable for it, we are next, to look into Sullivan's answer, for the purpose of inquiring whether he admits any facts which show him to be liable also.

Sullivan denies all personal knowledge of the transaction; that is, he was not in office when it took place, and was not present when the money was taken out of the Bank, or when it was delivered to Currie. But when he entered the treasury office, he received this sum of 98,000 dollars, separate from the other money of the treasury, which, he understood from report, and was informed by his predecessor, from whom he received it, was the money taken out of the Bank. This sum has remained untouched ever since, from respect to the injunction awarded by the Court.

We ask, if a rational doubt can remain on this subject.

Mr. Currie, as treasurer of the State of Ohio, receives 98,000 dollars, as being the amount of a tax imposed by the Legislature of that State on *835 the Bank of the United States; enters the same on the books of the treasury; and, the legality of the act by which the money was levied being questioned, puts it in a trunk, and keeps it apart from the other money belonging to the public. He resigns his office, and is succeeded by Mr. Sullivan, to whom he delivers the money, informing him, at the same time, that it is the money raised from the Bank; and

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

Mr. Sullivan continues to keep it apart, and abstains from the use of it, out of respect to an injunction, forbidding him to pay it away, or in any manner to dispose of it. Is it possible to doubt the identity of this money?

Even admitting that the answer of Currie, though establishing his liability as to himself, could not prove even that fact as to Sullivan; the answer of Sullivan is itself sufficient, we think, to charge him. He admits that these 98,000 dollars were delivered to him, as being the money which was taken out of the Bank, and that he so received it; for, he says, he understood this sum was the same as charged in the bill; that his information was from report, and from his predecessor; and that the money has remained untouched, from respect to the injunction. This declaration, then, is a part of the fact. The fact, as admitted in his answer, is not simply that he received 98,000 dollars, but that he received 98,000 dollars, as being the money taken out of the Bank—the money to which the writ of injunction applied.

In a common action between two private individuals, such an admission would, at least, be sufficient to throw on the defendant the burthen of *836 proving that the money, which he acknowledges himself to have received and kept as the money of the plaintiff, was not that which it was declared to be on its delivery. A declaration, accompanying the delivery, and constituting a part of it, gives a character to the transaction, and is not to be placed on the same footing with a declaration made by the same person at a different time. The answer of Sullivan, then, is, in the opinion of the Court, sufficient to show that these 98,000 dollars were the specific dollars for which this suit was brought. This sum having come to his possession with full knowledge of the fact, in a separate trunk, unmixed with money, and with notice that an injunction had been awarded respecting it, he would seem to be responsible to the plaintiff for it, unless he can show sufficient matter to discharge himself.

**37 3. The next objection is, to the decree against Osborn and Harper, as to whom the bill was taken for confessed.

The bill charges, that Osborn employed John L. Harper to collect the tax, who proceeded by violence to enter the office of discount and deposit at Chilicothe, and forcibly took therefrom 100,000 dollars in specie and bank notes; and that, at the time of the seizure, Harper well knew, and was duly notified, that an injunction had been allowed, which money was delivered either to Currie or Osborn.

So far as respects Harper and Osborn, these allegations are to be considered as true. If the act of the Legislature of Ohio, and the official *837 character of Osborn, constitute a defence, neither of these defendants are liable, and the whole decree is erroneous; but if the act be unconstitutional and void, it can be no justification, and both these defendants are to be considered as individuals who are amenable to the laws. Considering them, for the present, in this character, the fact, as made out in the bill, is, that Osborn employed Harper to do an illegal act, and that Harper has done that act; and that they are jointly responsible for it, is supposed to be as well settled as any principle of law whatever.

We think it unnecessary, in this part of the case, to enter into the inquiry respecting the effect of the injunction. No injunction is necessary to attach responsibility on those who conspire to do an illegal act, which this is, if not justified by the authority under which it was done.

4. The next objection is, to the allowance of interest on the coin, which constituted a part of the sum decreed to the complainants. Had the complainants, without the intervention of a Court of equity, resorted to their legal remedy for the injury sustained, their right to principal and interest would have stood on equal ground. The same rule would be adopted in a Court of equity, had the subject been left under the control of the party in possession, while the right was in litigation. But the subject was not left under the control of the party. The Court itself interposed, and forbade the person, in whose possession the property was, to make any use of it. This order having been obeyed, places the defendant in the same *838 situation, so far as respects interest, as if the Court had taken the money into its own custody. The defendant, in

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

obeying the mandate of the Court, becomes its instrument, as entirely as the Clerk of the Court would have been, had the money been placed in his hands. It does not appear reasonable, that a decree which proceeds upon the idea, that the injunction of the Court was valid, ought to direct interest to be paid on the money which that injunction restrained the defendant from using.

5. The fifth objection to the decree is, that the case made in the bill does not warrant the interference of a Court of Chancery.

In examining this question, it is proper that the Court should consider the real case, and its actual circumstances. The original bill prays for an injunction against Ralph Osborn, Auditor of the State of Ohio, to restrain him from executing a law of that State, to the great oppression and injury of the complainants, and to the destruction of rights and privileges conferred on them by their charter, and by the constitution of the United States. The true inquiry is, whether an injunction can be issued to restrain a person, who is a State officer, from performing any official act enjoined by statute; and whether a Court of equity can decree restitution, if the act be performed. In pursuing this inquiry, it must be assumed, for the present, that the act is unconstitutional, and furnishes no authority or protection to the officer who is about to proceed under it. This must be assumed, because, in the arrangement of his argument, *839 the counsel who opened the cause, has chosen to reserve that point for the last, and to contend that, though the law be void, no case is made out against the defendants. We suspend, also, the consideration of the question, whether the interest of the State of Ohio, as disclosed in the bill, shows a want of jurisdiction in the Circuit Court, which ought to have arrested its proceedings. That question, too, is reserved by the appellants, and will be subsequently considered. The sole inquiry, for the present, is, whether, stripping the case of these objections, the plaintiffs below were entitled to relief in a Court of equity, against the defendants, and to the protection of an injunction. The appellants expressly waive the extravagant proposition, that a void act can afford protection to the person who executes it, and admits the liability of the defendants to the plaintiffs, to the

extent of the injury sustained, in an action at law. The question, then, is reduced to the single inquiry, whether the case is cognizable in a Court of equity. If it is, the decree must be affirmed, so far as it is supported by the evidence in the cause.

****38** The appellants allege, that the original bill contains no allegation which can justify the application for an injunction, and treat the declarations of Ralph Osborn, the Auditor, that he should execute the law, as the light and frivolous threats of an individual, that he would commit an ordinary trespass. But surely this is not the point of view in which the application for an injunction is to be considered. The Legislature of Ohio had passed *840 a law for the avowed purpose of expelling the Bank from the State; and had made it the duty of the Auditor to execute it as a ministerial officer. He had declared that he would perform this duty. The law, if executed, would unquestionably effect its object, and would deprive the Bank of its chartered privileges, so far as they were to be exercised in that State. It must expel the Bank from the State; and this is, we think, a conclusion which the Court might rightfully draw from the law itself. That the declarations of the Auditor would be fulfilled, did not admit of reasonable doubt. It was to be expected, that a person continuing to hold an office, would perform a duty enjoined by his government, which was completely within his power. This duty was to be repeated until the Bank should abandon the exercise of its chartered rights.

To treat this as a common casual trespass, would be to disregard entirely its true character and substantial merits. The application to the Court was, to interpose its writ of injunction, to protect the Bank, not from the casual trespass of an individual, who might not perform the act he threatened, but from the total destruction of its franchise, of its chartered privileges, so far as respected the State of Ohio. It was morally certain, that the Auditor would proceed to execute the law, and it was morally certain, that the effect must be the expulsion of the Bank from the State. An annual charge of 100,000 dollars, would more than absorb all the advantages of the privilege, and would consequently annul it.

***841** The appellants admit, that injunctions are

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

often awarded for the protection of parties in the enjoyment of a franchise; but deny that one has ever been granted in such a case as this. But, although the precise case may never have occurred, if the same principle applies, the same remedy ought to be afforded. The interference of the Court in this class of cases, has most frequently been to restrain a person from violating an exclusive privilege, by participating in it. But if, instead of a continued participation in the privilege, the attempt be to disable the party from using it, is not the reason for the interference of the Court rather strengthened than weakened? Had the privilege of the Bank been exclusive, the argument admits that any other person, or company, might have been enjoined, according to the regular course of the Court of Chancery, from using or exercising the same business. Why would such person or company have been enjoined? To prevent a permanent injury from being done to the party entitled to the franchise or privilege; which injury, the appellants say, cannot be estimated in damages. It requires no argument to prove, that the injury is greater, if the whole privilege be destroyed, than if it be divided; and, so far as respects the estimate of damages, although precise accuracy may not be attained, yet a reasonable calculation may be made of the amount of the injury, so as to satisfy the Court and Jury. It will not be pretended, that, in such a case, an action at law could not be maintained, or that the materials do not exist on which a verdict might be *842 found, and a judgment rendered. But in this, and many other cases of continuing injuries, as in the case of repeated ejectments, a Court of Chancery will interpose. The injury done, by denying to the Bank the exercise of its franchise in the State of Ohio, is as difficult to calculate, as the injury done by participating in an exclusive privilege. The single act of levying the tax in the first instance, is the cause of an action at law; but that affords a remedy only for the single act, and is not equal to the remedy in Chancery, which prevents its repetition, and protects the privilege. The same conservative principle, which induces the Court to interpose its authority for the protection of exclusive privileges, to prevent the commission of waste, even in some cases of trespass, and in many cases of destruction, will, we think, apply to this. Indeed, trespass is destruction, where there is no

privity of estate.

****39** If the State of Ohio could have been made a party defendant, it can scarcely be denied, that this would be a strong case for an injunction. The objection is, that, as the real party cannot be brought before the Court, a suit cannot be sustained against the agents of that party; and cases have been cited, to show that a Court of Chancery will not make a decree, unless all those who are substantially interested, be made parties to the suit.

This is certainly true, where it is in the power of the plaintiff to make them parties; but if the person who is the real principal, the person who is the true source of the mischief, by whose power and for whose advantage it is done, be himself *843 above the law, be exempt from all judicial process, it would be subversive of the best established principles, to say that the laws could not afford the same remedies against the agent employed in doing the wrong, which they would afford against him, could his principal be joined in the suit. It is admitted, that the privilege of the principal is not communicated to the agent; for the appellants acknowledge that an action at law would lie against the agent, in which full compensation ought to be made for the injury. It being admitted, then, that the agent is not privileged by his connexion with his principal, that he is responsible for his own act, to the full extent of the injury, why should not the preventive power of the Court also be applied to him? Why may it not restrain him from the commission of a wrong, which it would punish him for committing? We put out of view the character of the principal as a sovereign State, because that is made a distinct point, and consider the question singly as respects the want of parties. Now, if the party before the Court would be responsible for the whole injury, why may he not be restrained from its commission, if no other party can be brought before the Court? The appellants found their distinction on the legal principle, that all trespasses are several as well as joint, without inquiry into the validity of this reason, if true. We ask, if it be true? Will it be said, that the action of trespass is the only remedy given for this injury? Can it be denied, that an action on the case, for money had and received to the plaintiff's use, might be maintained? *844 We think

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

it cannot; and if such an action might be maintained, no plausible reason suggests itself to us, for the opinion, that an injunction may not be awarded to restrain the agent, with as much propriety as it might be awarded to restrain the principal, could the principal be made a party.

We think the reason for an injunction is much stronger in the actual, than it would be in the supposed case. In the regular course of things, the agent would pay over the money immediately to his principal, and would thus place it beyond the reach of the injured party, since his principal is not amenable to the law. The remedy for the injury, would be against the agent only; and what agent could make compensation for such an injury? The remedy would have nothing real in it. It would be a remedy in name only, not in substance. This alone would, in our opinion, be a sufficient reason for a Court of equity. The injury would, in fact, be irreparable; and the cases are innumerable, in which injunctions are awarded on this ground.

****40** But, were it even to be admitted, that the injunction, in the first instance, was improperly awarded, and that the original bill could not be maintained, that would not, we think, materially affect the case. An amended and supplemental bill, making new parties, has been filed in the cause, and on that bill, with the proceedings under it, the decree was pronounced. The question is, whether that bill and those proceedings support the decree.

The case they make, is, that the money and ***845** notes of the plaintiffs, in the Circuit Court, have been taken from them without authority, and are in possession of one of the defendants, who keeps them separate and apart from all other money and notes. It is admitted, that this defendant would be liable for the whole amount in an action at law; but it is denied that he is liable in a Court of equity.

We think it a case in which a Court of equity ought to interpose, and that there are several grounds on which its jurisdiction may be placed.

One, which appears to be ample for the purpose, is, that a Court will always interpose, to prevent the transfer of a specific article, which, if transferred,

will be lost to the owner. Thus, the holder of negotiable securities, indorsed in the usual manner, if he has acquired them fraudulently, will be enjoined from negotiating them; because if negotiated, the maker or indorser must pay them.^{FN23} Thus, too, a transfer of stock will be restrained in favour of a person having the real property in the article. In these cases, the injured party would have his remedy at law; and the probability that this remedy would be adequate, is stronger in the cases put in the books, than in this, where the sum is so greatly beyond the capacity of an ordinary agent to pay. But it is the province of a Court of equity, in such cases, to arrest the injury, and prevent the wrong. The remedy is more beneficial and complete, than the law can give. The money of the Bank, if mingled with the other money ***846** in the treasury, and put into circulation, would be totally lost to the owners; and the reason for an injunction is, at least, as strong in such a case, as in the case of a negotiable note.

FN23 1 *Mad.* 154, 155.

6. We proceed now to the 6th point made by the appellants, which is, that if any case is made in the bill, proper for the interference of a Court of Chancery, it is against the State of Ohio, in which case the Circuit Court could not exercise jurisdiction.

The bill is brought, it is said, for the purpose of protecting the Bank in the exercise of a franchise granted by a law of the United States, which franchise the State of Ohio asserts a right to invade, and is about to invade. It prays the aid of the Court to restrain the officers of the State from executing the law. It is, then, a controversy between the Bank and the State of Ohio. The interest of the State is direct and immediate, not consequential. The process of the Court, though not directed against the State by name, acts directly upon it, by restraining its officers. The process, therefore, is substantially, though not in form, against the State, and the Court ought not to proceed without making the State a party. If this cannot be done, the Court cannot take jurisdiction of the cause.

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

****41** The full pressure of this argument is felt, and the difficulties it presents are acknowledged. The direct interest of the State in the suit, as brought, is admitted; and, had it been in the power of the Bank to make it a party, perhaps no decree ought to have been pronounced in the cause, until the ***847** State was before the Court. But this was not in the power of the Bank. The eleventh amendment of the constitution has exempted a State from the suits of citizens of other States, or aliens; and the very difficult question is to be decided, whether, in such a case, the Court may act upon the agents employed by the State, and on the property in their hands.

Before we try this question by the constitution, it may not be time misapplied, if we pause for a moment, and reflect on the relative situation of the Union with its members, should the objection prevail.

A denial of jurisdiction forbids all inquiry into the nature of the case. It applies to cases perfectly clear in themselves; to cases where the government is in the exercise of its best established and most essential powers, as well as to those which may be deemed questionable. It asserts, that the agents of a State, alleging the authority of a law void in itself, because repugnant to the constitution, may arrest the execution of any law in the United States. It maintains, that if a State shall impose a fine or penalty on any person employed in the execution of any law of the United States, it may levy that fine or penalty by a ministerial officer, without the sanction even of its own Courts; and that the individual, though he perceives the approaching danger, can obtain no protection from the judicial department of the government. The carrier of the mail, the collector of the revenue, the marshal of a district, the recruiting officer, may all be inhibited, under ruinous ***848** penalties, from the performance of their respective duties; the warrant of a ministerial officer may authorize the collection of these penalties, and the person thus obstructed in the performance of his duty, may indeed resort to his action for damages, after the infliction of the injury, but cannot avail himself of the preventive justice of the nation to protect him in the performance of his duties. Each member of the Union is capable, at its will, of attacking the nation, of arresting its progress

at every step, of acting vigorously and effectually in the execution of its designs, while the nation stands naked, stripped of its defensive armour, and incapable of shielding its agent or executing its laws, otherwise than by proceedings which are to take place after the mischief is perpetrated, and which must often be ineffectual, from the inability of the agents to make compensation.

These are said to be extreme cases; but the case at bar, had it been put by way of illustration in argument, might have been termed an extreme case; and, if a penalty on a revenue officer, for performing his duty, be more obviously wrong than a penalty on the Bank, it is a difference in degree, not in principle. Public sentiment would be more shocked by the infliction of a penalty on a public officer for the performance of his duty, than by the infliction of this penalty on a Bank, which, while carrying on the fiscal operations of the government, is also transacting its own business; but, in both cases, the officer levying the penalty acts under a void authority, and the power ***849** to restrain him is denied as positively in the one as in the other.

****42** The distinction between any extreme case, and that which has actually occurred, if, indeed, any difference of principle can be supposed to exist between them, disappears, when considering the question of jurisdiction; for, if the Courts of the United States cannot rightfully protect the agents who execute every law authorized by the constitution, from the direct action of State agents in the collection of penalties, they cannot rightfully protect those who execute any law.

The question, then, is, whether the constitution of the United States has provided a tribunal which can peacefully and rightfully protect those who are employed in carrying into execution the laws of the Union, from the attempts of a particular State to resist the execution of those laws.

The State of Ohio denies the existence of this power, and contends, that no preventive proceedings whatever, or proceedings against the very property which may have been seized by the agent; of a State, can be sustained against such agent, because they would be substantially against

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

the State itself, in violation of the 11th amendment of the constitution.

That the Courts of the Union cannot entertain a suit brought against a State by an alien, or the citizen of another State, is not to be controverted. Is a suit, brought against an individual, for any cause whatever, a suit against a State, in the sense of the constitution?

***850** The 11th amendment is the limitation of a power supposed to be granted in the original instrument; and to understand accurately the extent of the limitation, it seems proper to define the power that is limited.

The words of the constitution, so far as they respect this question, are, 'The judicial power shall extend to controversies between two or more States, between a State and citizens of another State, and between a State and foreign states, citizens, or subjects.'

A subsequent clause distributes the power previously granted, and assigns to the Supreme Court original jurisdiction in those cases in which 'a State shall be a party.'

The words of the 11th amendment are, 'The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States, by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of a foreign state.'

The Bank of the United States contends, that in all cases in which jurisdiction depends on the character of the party, reference is made to the party on the record, not to one who may be interested, but is not shown by the record to be a party.

The appellants admit, that the jurisdiction of the Court is not ousted by any incidental or consequential interest, which a State may have in the decision to be made, but is to be considered as a party where the decision acts directly and immediately upon the State, through its officers.

****43 *851** If this question were to be determined on

the authority of English decisions, it is believed that no case can be adduced, where any person has been considered as a party, who is not made so in the record. But the Court will not review those decisions, because it is thought a question growing out of the constitution of the United States, requires rather an attentive consideration of the words of that instrument, than of the decisions of analogous questions by the Courts of any other country.

Do the provisions, then, of the American constitution, respecting controversies to which a State may be a party, extend, on a fair construction of that instrument, to cases in which the State is not a party on the record?

The first in the enumeration, is a controversy between two or more States.

There are not many questions in which a State would be supposed to take a deeper or more immediate interest, than in those which decide on the extent of her territory. Yet the constitution, not considering the State as a party to such controversies, if not plaintiff or defendant on the record, has expressly given jurisdiction in those between citizens claiming lands under grants of different States. If each State, in consequence of the influence of a decision on her boundary, had been considered, by the framers of the constitution, as a party to that controversy, the express grant of jurisdiction would have been useless. The grant of it certainly proves, that the constitution ***852** does not consider the State as a party in such a case.

Jurisdiction is expressly granted, in those cases only where citizens of the same State claim lands under grants of different States. If the claimants be citizens of different States, the Court takes jurisdiction for that reason. Still, the right of the State to grant, is the essential point in dispute: and in that point the State is deeply interested. If that interest converts the State into a party, there is an end of the cause; and the constitution will be construed to forbid the Circuit Courts to take cognizance of questions to which it was thought necessary expressly to extend their jurisdiction, even when the controversy arose between citizens of the same State.

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

We are aware, that the application of these cases may be denied, because the title of the State comes on incidentally, and the appellants admit the jurisdiction of the Court, where its judgment does not act directly upon the property or interests of the State; but we deemed it of some importance to show, that the framers of the constitution contemplated the distinction between cases in which a State was interested, and those in which it was a party, and made no provision for a case of interest, without being a party on the record.

In cases where a State is a party on the record, the question of jurisdiction is decided by inspection. If jurisdiction depend, not on this plain fact, but on the interest of the State, what rule has the constitution given, by which this interest *853 is to be measured? If no rule be given, is it to be settled by the Court? If so, the curious anomaly is presented, of a Court examining the whole testimony of a cause, inquiring into, and deciding on, the extent of a State's interest, without having a right to exercise any jurisdiction in the case. Can this inquiry be made without the exercise of jurisdiction?

**44 The next in the enumeration, is a controversy between a State and the citizens of another State.

Can this case arise, if the State be not a party on the record? If it can, the question recurs, what degree of interest shall be sufficient to change the parties, and arrest the proceedings against the individual? Controversies respecting boundary have lately existed between Virginia and Tennessee, between Kentucky and Tennessee, and now exist between New-York and New-Jersey. Suppose, while such a controversy is pending, the collecting officer of one State should seize property for taxes belonging to a man who supposes himself to reside in the other State, and who seeks redress in the federal Court of that State in which the officer resides. The interest of the State is obvious. Yet it is admitted, that in such a case the action would lie, because the officer might be treated as a trespasser, and the verdict and judgment against him would not act directly on the property of the State. That it would not so act, may, perhaps, depend on circumstances. The officer may retain the amount of the taxes in his hands, and, on the proceedings of the State against him, may plead

in bar the judgment of a Court of *854 competent jurisdiction. If this plea ought to be sustained, and it is far from being certain that it ought not, the judgment so pleaded would have acted directly on the revenue of the State, in the hands of its officer. And yet the argument admits, that the action, in such a case, would be sustained. But, suppose, in such a case, the party conceiving himself to be injured, instead of bringing an action sounding in damages, should sue for the specific thing, while yet in possession of the seizing officer. It being admitted, in argument, that the action sounding in damages would lie, we are unable to perceive the line of distinction between that and the action of detinue. Yet the latter action would claim the specific article seized for the tax, and would obtain it, should the seizure be deemed unlawful.

It would be tedious to pursue this part of the inquiry farther, and it would be useless, because every person will perceive that the same reasoning is applicable to all the other enumerated controversies to which a State may be a party. The principle may be illustrated by a reference to those other controversies where jurisdiction depends on the party. But, before we review them, we will notice one where the nature of the controversy is, in some degree, blended with the character of the party.

If a suit be brought against a foreign minister, the Supreme Court alone has original jurisdiction, and this is shown on the record. But, suppose a suit to be brought which affects the interest of a foreign minister, or by which the person of his secretary, *855 or of his servant, is arrested. The minister does not, by the mere arrest of his secretary, or his servant, become a party to this suit, but the actual defendant pleads to the jurisdiction of the Court, and asserts his privilege. If the suit affects a foreign minister, it must be dismissed, not because he is a party to it, but because it affects him. The language of the constitution in the two cases is different. This Court can take cognizance of all cases 'affecting' foreign ministers; and, therefore, jurisdiction does not depend on the party named in the record. But this language changes, when the enumeration proceeds to States. Why this change? The answer is obvious. In the case of foreign ministers, it was intended, for reasons which all comprehend, to give

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

the national Courts jurisdiction over all cases by which they were in any manner affected. In the case of States, whose immediate or remote interests were mixed up with a multitude of cases, and who might be affected in an almost infinite variety of ways, it was intended to give jurisdiction in those cases only to which they were actual parties.

****45** In proceeding with the cases in which jurisdiction depends on the character of the party, the first in the enumeration is, 'controversies to which the United States shall be a party.'

Does this provision extend to the cases where the United States are not named in the record, but claim, and are actually entitled to, the whole subject in controversy?

Let us examine this question.

Suits brought by the Postmaster-General are ***856** for money due to the United States. The nominal plaintiff has no interest in the controversy, and the United States are the only real party. Yet, these suits could not be instituted in the Courts of the Union, under that clause which gives jurisdiction in all cases to which the United States are a party; and it was found necessary to give the Court jurisdiction over them, as being cases arising under a law of the United States.

The judicial power of the Union is also extended to controversies between citizens of different States; and it has been decided, that the character of the parties must be shown on the record. Does this provision depend on the character of those whose interest is litigated, or of those who are parties on the record? In a suit, for example, brought by or against an executor, the creditors or legatees of his testator are the persons really concerned in interest; but it has never been suspected that, if the executor be a resident of another State, the jurisdiction of the federal Courts could be ousted by the fact, that the creditors or legatees were citizens of the same State with the opposite party. The universally received construction in this case is, that jurisdiction is neither given nor ousted by the relative situation of the parties concerned in interest, but by the relative situation of the parties named on the record. Why is

this construction universal? No case can be imagined, in which the existence of an interest out of the party on the record is more unequivocal than in that which has been just stated. Why, then, is it universally admitted, that this interest in ***857** no manner affects the jurisdiction of the Court? The plain and obvious answer is, because the jurisdiction of the Court depends, not upon this interest, but upon the actual party on the record.

Were a State to be the sole legatee, it will not, we presume, be alleged, that the jurisdiction of the Court, in a suit against the executor, would be more affected by this fact, than by the fact that any other person, not suable in the Courts of the Union, was the sole legatee. Yet, in such a case, the Court would decide directly and immediately on the interest of the State.

This principle might be further illustrated by showing that jurisdiction, where it depends on the character of the party, is never conferred in consequence of the existence of an interest in a party not named; and by showing that, under the distributive clause of the 2d section of the 3d article, the Supreme Court could never take original jurisdiction, in consequence of an interest in a party not named in the record.

****46** But the principle seems too well established to require that more time should be devoted to it. It may, we think, be laid down as a rule which admits of no exception, that, in all cases where jurisdiction depends on the party, it is the party named in the record. Consequently, the 11th amendment, which restrains the jurisdiction granted by the constitution over suits against States, is, of necessity, limited to those suits in which a State is a party on the record. The amendment has its full effect, if the constitution be construed as it ***858** would have been construed, had the jurisdiction of the Court never been extended to suits brought against a State, by the citizens of another State, or by aliens.

The State not being a party on the record, and the Court having jurisdiction over those who are parties on the record, the true question is, not one of jurisdiction, but whether, in the exercise of its jurisdiction, the Court ought to make a decree

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

against the defendants; whether they are to be considered as having a real interest, or as being only nominal parties.

In pursuing the arrangement which the appellants have made for the argument of the cause, this question has already been considered. The responsibility of the officers of the State for the money taken out of the Bank, was admitted, and it was acknowledged that this responsibility might be enforced by the proper action. The objection is, to its being enforced against the specific article taken, and by the decree of this Court. But, it has been shown, we think, that an action of detinue might be maintained for that article, if the Bank had possessed the means of describing it, and that the interest of the State would not have been an obstacle to the suit of the Bank against the individual in possession of it. The judgment in such a suit might have been enforced, had the article been found in possession of the individual defendant. It has been shown, that the danger of its being parted with, of its being lost to the plaintiff, and the necessity of a discovery, justified the application to a Court of equity. It was in a *859 Court of equity alone that the relief would be real, substantial, and effective. The parties must certainly have a real interest in the case, since their personal responsibility is acknowledged, and, if denied, could be demonstrated.

It was proper, then, to make a decree against the defendants in the Circuit Court, if the law of the State of Ohio be repugnant to the constitution, or to a law of the United States made in pursuance thereof, so as to furnish no authority to those who took, or to those who received, the money for which this suit was instituted.

7. Is that law unconstitutional?

This point was argued with great ability, and decided by this Court, after mature and deliberate consideration, in the case of *M'Culloch v. The State of Maryland*. A revision of that opinion has been requested; and many considerations combine to induce a review of it.

**47 The foundation of the argument in favour of

the right of a State to tax the Bank, is laid in the supposed character of that institution. The argument supposes the corporation to have been originated for the management of an individual concern, to be founded upon contract between individuals, having private trade and private profit for its great end and principal object.

If these premises were true, the conclusion drawn from them would be inevitable. This mere private corporation, engaged in its own business, with its own views, would certainly be subject to the taxing power of the State, as any individual would be; and the casual circumstance of its being *860 employed by the government in the transaction of its fiscal affairs, would no more exempt its private business from the operation of that power, than it would exempt the private business of any individual employed in the same manner. But the premises are not true. The Bank is not considered as a private corporation, whose principal object is individual trade and individual profit; but as a public corporation, created for public and national purposes. That the mere business of banking is, in its own nature, a private business, and may be carried on by individuals or companies having no political connexion with the government, is admitted; but the Bank is not such an individual or company. It was not created for its own sake, or for private purposes. It has never been supposed that Congress could create such a corporation. The whole opinion of the Court, in the case of *M'Culloch v. The State of Maryland*, is founded on, and sustained by, the idea that the Bank is an instrument which is 'necessary and proper for carrying into effect the powers vested in the government of the United States.' It is not an instrument which the government found ready made, and has supposed to be adapted to its purposes; but one which was created in the form in which it now appears, for national purposes only. It is, undoubtedly, capable of transacting private as well as public business. While it is the great instrument by which the fiscal operations of the government are effected, it is also trading with individuals for its own advantage. The appellants endeavour to distinguish between this trade and its *861 agency for the public, between its Banking operations and those qualities which it possesses in

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

common with every corporation, such as individuality, immortality, &c. While they seem to admit the right to preserve this corporate existence, they deny the right to protect it in its trade and business.

If there be any thing in this distinction, it would tend to show that so much of the act as incorporates the Bank is constitutional, but so much of it as authorizes its Banking operations is unconstitutional. Congress can make the inanimate body, and employ the machine as a depository of, and vehicle for, the conveyance of the treasure of the nation, if it be capable of being so employed, but cannot breathe into it the vital spirit which alone can bring it into useful existence.

****48** Let this distinction be considered.

Why is it that Congress can incorporate or create a Bank? This question was answered in the case of *M'Culloch v. The State of Maryland*. It is an instrument which is 'necessary and proper' for carrying on the fiscal operations of government. Can this instrument, on any rational calculation, effect its object, unless it be endowed with that faculty of lending and dealing in money, which is conferred by its charter? If it can, if it be as competent to the purposes of government without, as with this faculty, there will be much difficulty in sustaining that essential part of the charter. If it cannot, then this faculty is necessary to the legitimate operations of government, and was constitutionally and rightfully engrafted on the institution. It is, in that view of the subject, ***862** the vital part of the corporation; it is its soul; and the right to preserve it originates in the same principle, with the right to preserve the skeleton or body which it animates. The distinction between destroying what is denominated the corporate franchise, and destroying its vivifying principle, is precisely as incapable of being maintained, as a distinction between the right to sentence a human being to death, and a right to sentence him to a total privation of sustenance during life. Deprive a Bank of its trade and business, which is its sustenance, and its immortality, if it have that property, will be a very useless attribute.

This distinction, then, has no real existence. To tax its faculties, its trade, and occupation, is to tax the Bank itself? To destroy or preserve the one, is to destroy or preserve the other.

It is urged, that Congress has not, by this act of incorporation, created the faculty of trading in money; that it had anterior existence, and may be carried on by a private individual, or company, as well as by a corporation. As this profession or business may be taxed, regulated, or restrained, when conducted by an individual, it may, likewise, be taxed, regulated, or restrained, when conducted by a corporation.

The general correctness of these propositions need not be controverted. Their particular application to the question before the Court, is alone to be considered. We do not maintain that the corporate character of the Bank exempts its operations from the action of State authority. If an individual were to be endowed with the same faculties, ***863** for the same purposes, he would be equally protected in the exercise of those faculties. The operations of the Bank are believed not only to yield the compensation for its services to the government, but to be essential to the performance of those services. Those operations give its value to the currency in which all the transactions of the government are conducted. They are, therefore, inseparably connected with those transactions. They enable the Bank to render those services to the nation for which it was created, and are, therefore, of the very essence of its character, as national instruments. The business of the Bank constitutes its capacity to perform its functions, as a machine for the money transactions of the government. Its corporate character is merely an incident, which enables it to transact that business more beneficially.

****49** Were the Secretary of the Treasury to be authorized, by law, to appoint agencies throughout the Union, to perform the public functions of the Bank, and to be endowed with its faculties, as a necessary auxiliary to those functions, the operations of those agents would be as exempt from the control of the States as the Bank, and not more so. If, instead of the Secretary of the Treasury, a distinct office were to be created for the purpose,

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

filled by a person who should receive, as a compensation for his time, labour, and expense, the profits of the banking business, instead of other emoluments, to be drawn from the treasury, which banking business was essential to the operations of the government, would each State in the Union possess a right to *864 control these operations? The question on which this right would depend must always be, are these faculties so essential to the fiscal operations of the government, as to authorize Congress to confer them? Let this be admitted, and the question, does the right to preserve them exist? must always be answered in the affirmative.

Congress was of opinion that these faculties were necessary, to enable the Bank to perform the services which are exacted from it, and for which it was created. This was certainly a question proper for the consideration of the national Legislature. But, were it now to undergo revision, who would have the hardihood to say, that, without the employment of a banking capital, those services could be performed? That the exercise of these faculties greatly facilitates the fiscal operations of the government, is too obvious for controversy; and who will venture to affirm, that the suppression of them would not materially affect those operations, and essentially impair, if not totally destroy, the utility of the machine to the government? The currency which it circulates, by means of its trade with individuals, is believed to make it a more fit instrument for the purposes of government, than it could otherwise be; and, if this be true, the capacity to carry on this trade, is a faculty indispensable to the character and objects of the institution.

The appellants admit, that, if this faculty be necessary, to make the Bank a fit instrument for the purposes of the government, Congress possesses the same power to protect the machine in *865 this, as in its direct fiscal operations; but they deny that it is necessary to those purposes, and insist that it is granted solely for the benefit of the members of the corporation. Were this proposition to be admitted, all the consequences which are drawn from it might follow. But it is not admitted. The Court has already stated its conviction, that without this capacity to trade with individuals, the Bank would be a very

defective instrument, when considered with a single view to its fitness for the purposes of government. On this point the whole argument rests.

It is contended, that, admitting Congress to possess the power, this exemption ought to have been expressly asserted in the act of incorporation; and, not being expressed, ought not to be implied by the Court.

****50** It is not unusual, for a legislative act to involve consequences which are not expressed. An officer, for example, is ordered to arrest an individual. It is not necessary, nor is it usual, to say that he shall not be punished for obeying this order. His security is implied in the order itself. It is no unusual thing for an act of Congress to imply, without expressing, this very exemption from State control, which is said to be so objectionable in this instance. The collectors of the revenue, the carriers of the mail, the mint establishment, and all those institutions which are public in their nature are examples in point. It has never been doubted, that all who are employed in them, are protected, while in the line of duty; and yet this protection is not expressed in any act of Congress. It is incidental *866 to, and is implied in the several acts by which these institutions are created, and is secured to the individuals employed in them, by the judicial power alone; that is, the judicial power is the instrument employed by the government in administering this security.

That department has no will, in any case. If the sound construction of the act be, that it exempts the trade of the Bank, as being essential to the character of a machine necessary to the fiscal operations of the government, from the control of the States, Courts are as much bound to give it that construction, as if the exemption had been established in express terms. Judicial power, as contradistinguished from the power of the laws, has no existence. Courts are the mere instruments of the law, and can will nothing. When they are said to exercise a discretion, it is a mere legal discretion, a discretion to be exercised in discerning the course prescribed by law; and, when that is discerned, it is the duty of the Court to follow it. Judicial power is never exercised for the purpose of giving effect to

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

the will of the Judge; always for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the Legislature; or, in other words, to the will of the law.

The appellants rely greatly on the distinction between the Bank and the public institutions, such as the mint or the post office. The agents in those offices are, it is said, officers of government, and are excluded from a seat in Congress. Not so the directors of the Bank. The connexion of the government with the Bank, is likened to that with contractors.

It will not be contended, that the directors, or *867 other officers of the Bank, are officers of government. But it is contended, that, were their resemblance to contractors more perfect than it is, the right of the State to control its operations, if those operations be necessary to its character, as a machine employed by the government, cannot be maintained. Can a contractor for supplying a military post with provisions, be restrained from making purchases within any State, or from transporting the provisions to the place at which the troops were stationed? or could he be fined or taxed for doing so? We have not yet heard these questions answered in the affirmative. It is true, that the property of the contractor may be taxed, as the property of other citizens; and so may the local property of the Bank. But we do not admit that the act of purchasing, or of conveying the articles purchased, can be under State control.

**51 If the trade of the Bank be essential to its character, as a machine for the fiscal operations of the government, that trade must be as exempt from State control as the actual conveyance of the public money. Indeed, a tax bears upon the whole machine; as well upon the faculty of collecting and transmitting the money of the nation, as on that of discounting the notes of individuals. No distinction is taken between them.

Considering the capacity of carrying on the trade of banking, as an important feature in the character of this corporation, which was necessary, to make it a fit instrument for the objects for which it was created, the Court adheres to its decision in the case of *M'Culloch* against *The State* *868 of *Maryland*,

and is of opinion, that the act of the State of Ohio, which is certainly much more objectionable than that of the State of Maryland, is repugnant to a law of the United States, made in pursuance of the constitution, and, therefore, void. The counsel for the appellants are too intelligent, and have too much self respect, to pretend, that a void act can afford any protection to the officers who execute it. They expressly admit that it cannot.

It being then shown, we think conclusively, that the defendants could derive neither authority nor protection from the act which they executed, and that this suit is not against the State of Ohio within the view of the constitution, the State being no party on the record, the only real question in the cause is, whether the record contains sufficient matter to justify the Court in pronouncing a decree against the defendants? That this question is attended with great difficulty, has not been concealed or denied. But when we reflect that the defendants, Osborne and Harper, are incontestably liable for the full amount of the money taken out of the Bank; that the defendant, Currie, is also responsible for the sum received by him, it having come to his hands with full knowledge of the unlawful means by which it was acquired; that the defendant, Sullivan, is also responsible for the sum specifically delivered to him, with notice that it was the property of the Bank, unless the form of having made an entry on the books of the treasury can countervail the fact, that it was, in truth, kept untouched, in a trunk, by itself, as a deposit, to await *869 the event of the pending suit respecting it; we may lay it down as a proposition, safely to be affirmed, that all the defendants in the cause were liable in an action at law for the amount of this decree. If the original injunction was properly awarded, for the reasons stated in the preceding part of this opinion, the money, having reached the hands of all those to whom it afterwards came with notice of that injunction, might be pursued, so long as it remained a distinct deposit, neither mixed with the money of the treasury, nor put into circulation. Were it to be admitted, that the original injunction was not properly awarded, still the amended and supplemental bill, which brings before the Court all the parties who had been concerned in the transaction, was filed after the cause of action had

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S.Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

completely accrued. The money of the Bank had been taken, without authority, by some of the defendants, and was detained by the only person who was not an original wrong doer, in a specific form; so that detinue might have been maintained for it, had it been in the power of the Bank to prove the facts which are necessary to establish the identity of the property sued for. Under such circumstances, we think, a Court of equity may afford its aid, on the ground that a discovery is necessary, and also on the same principle that an injunction issues to restrain a person who has fraudulently obtained possession of negotiable notes, from putting them into circulation; on a person having the apparent ownership of stock really belonging to another, from transferring it. The suit, then, might be as well sustained in a *870 Court of equity as in a Court of law, and the objection that the interests of the State are committed to subordinate agents, if true, is the unavoidable consequence of exemption from being sued-of sovereignty. The interests of the United States are sometimes committed to subordinate agents. It was the case in *Hoyt v. Gelston*, in the case of *The Apollon*, and in the case of *Doddridge's Lessee v. Thompson and Wright*, and in many others. An independent foreign sovereign cannot be sued, and does not appear in Court. But a friend of the Court comes in, and, by suggestion, gives it to understand, that his interests are involved in the controversy. The interests of the sovereign, in such a case, and in every other where he chooses to assert them under the name of the real party to the cause are as well defended as if he were a party to the record. But his pretensions, where they are not well founded, cannot arrest the right of a party having a right to the thing for which he sues. Where the right is in the plaintiff, and the possession in the defendant, the inquiry cannot be stopped by the mere assertion of title in a sovereign. The Court must proceed to investigate the assertion, and examine the title. In the case at bar, the tribunal established by the constitution, for the purpose of deciding, ultimately, in all cases of this description, had solemnly determined, that a State law imposing a tax on the Bank of the United States, was unconstitutional and void, before the wrong was committed for which this suit was brought.

**52 We think, then, that there is no error in the decree *871 of the Circuit Court for the district of Ohio, so far as it directs restitution of the specific sum of 98,000 dollars, which was taken out of the Bank unlawfully, and was in the possession of the defendant, Samuel Sullivan, when the injunction was awarded, in September, 1820, to restrain him from paying it away, or in any manner using it; and so far as it directs the payment of the remaining sum of 2000 dollars, by the defendants, Ralph Osborne and John L. Harper; but that the same is erroneous, so far as respects the interest on the coin, part of the said 98,000 dollars, it being the opinion of this Court, that, while the parties were restrained by the authority of the Circuit Court from using it, they ought not to be charged with interest. The decree of the Circuit Court for the district of Ohio is affirmed, as to the said sums of 98,000 dollars, and 2000 dollars; and reversed, as to the residue.

Mr. Justice JOHNSON.

The argument in this cause presents three questions: 1. Has Congress granted to the Bank of the United States, an unlimited right of suing in the Courts of the United States? 2. Could Congress constitutionally grant such a right? and 3. Has the power of the Court been legally and constitutionally exercised in this suit?

I have very little doubt that the public mind will be easily reconciled to the decision of the Court here rendered; for, whether necessary or unnecessary originally, a state of things has now grown up, in some of the States, which renders all *872 the protection necessary, that the general government can give to this Bank. The policy of the decision is obvious, that is, if the Bank is to be sustained; and few will bestow upon its legal correctness, the reflection, that it is necessary to test it by the constitution and laws, under which it is rendered.

The Bank of the United States, is now identified with the administration of the national government. It is an immense machine, economically and beneficially applied to the fiscal transactions of the nation. Attempts have been made to dispense with it, and they have failed; serious and very weighty doubts have been entertained of its constitutionality, but they have been abandoned; and it is now become the functionary that collects, the depository

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

that holds, the vehicle that transports, the guard that protects, and the agent that distributes and pays away, the millions that pass annually through the national treasury; and all this, not only without expense to the government, but after paying a large bonus, and sustaining actual annual losses to a large amount; furnishing the only possible means of embodying the most ample security for so immense a charge.

Had its effects, however, and the views of its framers, been confined exclusively to its fiscal uses, it is more than probable that this suit, and the laws in which it originated, would never have had existence. But it is well known, that with that object was combined another, of a very general, and not less important character.

****53** The expiration of the charter of the former Bank, led to State creations of Banks; each new Bank increased ***873** the facilities of creating others; and the necessities of the general government, both to make use of the State Banks for their deposits, and to borrow largely of all who would lend to them, produced that rage for multiplying Banks, which, aided by the emoluments derived to the States in their creation, and the many individual incentives which they developed, soon inundated the country with a new description of bills of credit, against which it was obvious that the provisions of the constitution opposed no adequate inhibition.

A specie-paying Bank, with an overwhelming capital, and the whole aid of the government deposits, presented the only resource to which the government could resort, to restore that power over the currency of the country, which the framers of the constitution evidently intended to give to Congress alone. But this necessarily involved a restraint upon individual cupidity, and the exercise of State power; and, in the nature of things, it was hardly possible for the mighty effort necessary to put down an evil spread so wide, and arrived to such maturity, to be made without embodying against it an immense moneyed combination, which could not fail of making its influence to be felt, wherever its claimances could reach, or its industry and wealth be brought to operate.

I believe, that the good sense of a people, who know that they govern themselves, and feel that they have no interests distinct from those of their government, would readily concede to the Bank, thus circumstanced, some, if not all the rights here ***874** contended for. But I cannot persuade myself, that they have been conceded in the extent which this decision affirms. Whatever might be proper to be done by an amendment of the constitution, this Court is only, at present, expounding its existing provisions.

In the present instance, I cannot persuade myself, that the constitution sanctions the vesting of the right of action in this Bank, in cases in which the privilege is exclusively personal, or in any case, merely on the ground that a question might *possibly* be raised in it, involving the constitution, or constitutionality of a law, of the United States.

When laws were heretofore passed for raising a revenue by a duty on stamped paper, the tax was quietly acquiesced in, notwithstanding it entrenched so closely on the unquestionable power of the States over the law of contracts; but had the same law which declared void contracts not written upon stamped paper, declared, that every person holding such paper should be entitled to bring his action 'in any Circuit Court' of the United States, it is confidently believed that there could have been but one opinion on the constitutionality of such a provision. The whole jurisdiction over contracts, might thus have been taken from the State Courts, and conferred upon those of the United States. Nor would the evil have rested there; by a similar exercise of power, imposing a stamp on deeds generally, jurisdiction over the territory of the State, whoever might be parties, even between citizens of the same State-jurisdiction of suits instituted for the recovery of legacies ***875** or distributive portions of intestates' estates-jurisdiction, in fact, over almost every possible case, might be transferred to the Courts of the United States. Wills may be required to be executed on stamped paper; taxes may be, and have been, imposed upon legacies and distributions; and, in all such cases, there is not only a possibility, but a probability, that a question may arise, involving the constitutionality, construction, &c. of a law of the United States. If the circumstance, that

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

the questions which the case involves, are to determine its character, whether those questions be made in the case or not, then every case here alluded to, may as well be transferred to the jurisdiction of the United States, as those to which this Bank is a party. But still farther, as was justly insisted in argument, there is not a tract of land in the United States, acquired under laws of the United States, whatever be the number of mesne transfers that it may have undergone, over which the jurisdiction of the Courts of the United States might not be extended by Congress, upon the very principle on which the right of suit in this Bank is here maintained. Nor is the case of the alien, put in argument, at all inapplicable. The one acquires its character of individual property, as the other does his political existence, under a law of the United States; and there is not a suit which may be instituted to recover the one, nor an action of ejectment to be brought by the other, in which a right acquired under a law of the United States, does not lie as essentially at the basis of the right of action, as in the suits brought by this Bank. *876 It is no answer to the argument, to say, that the law of the United States is but ancillary to the constitution, as to the alien; for the constitution could do nothing for him without the law: and, whether the question be upon law or constitution, still if the possibility of its arising be a sufficient circumstance to bring it within the jurisdiction of the United States Courts, that possibility exists with regard to every suit affected by alien disabilities; to real actions in time of peace-to all actions in time of war.

**54 I cannot persuade myself, then, that, with these palpable consequences in view, Congress ever could have intended to vest in the Bank of the United States, the right of suit to the extent here claimed. And, notwithstanding the confidence with which this point has been argued, an examination of the terms of the act, and a consideration of them with a view to the context, will be found to leave it by no means a clear case, that such is the legal meaning of the act of incorporation. To be sure, if the act had simply and substantively given the right 'to sue and be sued in the Circuit Courts of the United States,' there could have been no question made upon the construction of those words. But such is not the fact. The words are, not that the

Bank shall be made able and capable in law, to sue, &c., but that it shall, 'by a certain name,' be made able and capable in law to do the various acts therein enumerated. And these words, under the force of which this suit is instituted, are found in the ordinary incorporating clause of this act, a clause *877 which is well understood to be, and which this Court, in the case of *Deveaux*, has recognised to be, little more than the mere common place or formula of such an act. The name of a corporation is the symbol of its personal existence; a misnomer there is fatal to a suit, (and still more fatal as to other transactions.) By the incorporating clause, a name is given it, and, with that name, a place among created beings; then usually follows an enumeration of the ordinary acts in which it may personate a natural man; and among those acts, the right to sue and be sued, of which the Court, in *Deveaux's* case, very correctly remarks, that it is 'a power which if not incident to a corporation, is conferred by every incorporating act, and is not understood to enlarge the jurisdiction of any particular Court, but to give a capacity to the corporation to appear as a corporation in any Court which would by law have cognizance of the cause if brought by individuals.' With this qualification, the clause in question will be construed, as an enumeration of incidents, instead of a string of enactments; and such a construction is strongly countenanced by the concluding sentence of the section; for, after running through the whole routine of powers, most of which are unquestionably incidental, and needed no enactment to vest them, it concludes thus: 'and generally to do and execute all and singular the acts, matters, and things, which to them it shall and may appertain to do.' And, in going over the act, it will be found, that whenever it is contemplated to vest a power not incidental, it is done by a specific provision, made *878 the subject of a distinct clause; such is that power to transact the business of the loan-office of the United States. And, indeed, there is one section of the act, which strikingly exhibits the light in which the law-makers considered the incorporating clause. I mean the tenth; which, notwithstanding that the same clause in the seventh section, which is supposed to confer this sweeping power *to sue*, confers also, in terms equally comprehensive, the power to make laws for the institution, and 'to do and execute all and

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

singular the matters and things, which to them it shall and may appertain to do,' contains an enactment in the following words: 'That they shall have power to appoint such officers, clerks, and servants, under them, for executing the business of the corporation, and to allow them such compensation for their services respectively, as shall be reasonable; and shall be capable of exercising such other powers and authorities for the well governing and ordering the officers of the said corporation, as shall be prescribed by the laws, regulations, and ordinances, of the same;' a section which would have been altogether unnecessary, had the seventh section been considered as enacting, instead of enumerating and limiting. I consider the incorporating clause, then, not as purporting the absolute investment of any power, but as the usual and formal declaration of the extent to which this artificial should personate the natural person, in the transactions incident to ordinary life, or to the peculiar objects of its creation; and, therefore, not vesting the right to sue in the Courts of the United *879 States, but only the right of personating the natural man in the Courts of the United States, as it might, upon general principles, in any other Courts of competent jurisdiction. And this, I say, is consonant to the decision in *Deveaux's* case, and sustained by abundant evidence on the face of the act itself. Indeed, any other view of the effect of the section, converts some of its provisions into absolute nonsense.

**55 It has been argued, and I have no objection to admit, that the phraseology of this act has been varied from that incorporating the former Bank, with a view to meet the decision in *Deveaux's* case. But it is perfectly obvious, that in the prosecution of that design, the purport of *Deveaux's* case has been misapprehended. The Court there decide, that the jurisdiction of the United States depended, (1.) on the character of the cause, (2.) on the character of the parties; that the Judiciary Act confined the jurisdiction of the Circuit Courts to the second class of cases, and the incorporating act contained no words that purported to carry it further. Whether the legislative power of the United States could extend it as far as is here insisted on, or what words would be adequate to that purpose, the case neither called on the Court to decide, nor has it proposed to

decide. If any thing is to be inferred from that decision on those points, it is unfavourable to the sufficiency of the words inserted in the present act. For, the argument of the Court intimates, that where the Legislature propose to give jurisdiction to the Courts of the United States, they do *880 it by a separate provision, as in the case of the action of debt for exceeding the sum authorized to be loaned. And on the words of the incorporating section, it makes this remark, 'that it is not understood to enlarge the jurisdiction of any particular Court, but to give a capacity to the corporation to appear as a corporation in any Court, which would by law have cognizance of the cause if brought by individuals. If jurisdiction is given by this clause to the federal Courts, it is equally given to all Courts having original jurisdiction, and for all sums, however small they be.' Now, the difference of phraseology between the former act and the present, in the clause in question, is this: The former has these words, 'may sue and be sued, &c. in Courts of record or any other place whatsoever;' the present act has substituted these words, 'in all State Courts having competent jurisdiction, and in any Circuit Court of the United States.' Now, the defect here could not have been the want of adequate words, had the intent appeared to have been, to enlarge the jurisdiction of any particular Court. For, if the Circuit Courts were *Courts of record*, the right of suit given was as full as any other words could have made it. But, as the Court in its own words assigns the ground of its decision, the clause could not have been intended to enlarge the jurisdiction of the State Courts, and therefore could not have been intended to enlarge that of the federal Courts, much less to have extended it to the smallest sum possible. Therefore it concludes, that the clause is one of mere enumeration, containing, *881 as it expresses it, 'the powers which, if not incident to a corporation, are conferred by every incorporating act, and are not understood to enlarge,' &c. If, then, this variation had in view the object which is attributed to it, the words intended to answer that object have been inserted so unhappily as to neutralize its influence; but, I think it much more consistent with the respect due to the draftsman, who was known to have been an able lawyer, to believe that, with such an object in view, he would have pursued a much more plain and obvious

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

course, and given it a distinct and unequivocal section to itself, or at least have worded it with more marked attention. This opinion is further supported, by considering the absurdities that a contrary opinion would lead to.

****56** A literal translation of the words in question is impossible. Nothing but inconsistencies present themselves, if we attempt to apply it without a reference to the laws and constitution of the United States, forming together the judicial system of the Union. The words are, 'may sue and be sued, &c., in any State Court having competent jurisdiction, and in any Circuit Court of the United States.' But why should one member of the passage be entitled to an enacting effect, and not the residue? Yet, who will impute to the Legislature or the draftsman, and intention to vest a jurisdiction by these words in a State Court? I do not speak of the positive effect; since the failure of one enactment, because of a want either of power to give or capacity to receive, will not control ***882** the effect as to any other enactment. I speak of the intent or understanding of the law-maker; who must have used these words, as applicable to the State Courts, in an enacting sense, if we suppose him to have used them in that sense, as to the Courts of the United States. Yet I should be very unwilling to impute to him, or to the Legislature of the country, ignorance of the fact, that such an enactment, if it was one, could not give a right to sue in the State Courts, if the right did not exist without it. Or, in fact, that such enactment was altogether unnecessary, if the legislative power, which must give effect to such an enactment, was adequate to constitute effectually this body corporate.

But why should this supposed enactment go still farther, and confer the capacity to be sued, as well as to sue, either in the Courts of the one jurisdiction or the other? Did the lawgivers suppose that this corporation would not be subject to suit, without an express enactment for that purpose also? Or was it guilty of the more unaccountable mistake, of supposing that it could confer upon individuals, indiscriminately, this privilege of bringing suits in the Courts of the United States against the Bank? that too, for a cause of action originating, say, in work and labour, or in a special action on the case,

or perhaps, ejection to try title to land mortgaged by a person not having the estate in him, or purchased of a tortious holder for a banking house? I cannot acquiesce in the supposition; and yet, if one is an enactment, and ***883** takes effect as such, they are all enactments, for they are uttered *eodem flatu*.

My own conclusion is, that none of them are enactments, but all merely declaratory; or, at most, only enacting, in the words of the Court, in the case of *Deveaux*, that the Bank may, by its corporate name and metaphysical existence, bring suit, or personate the natural man, in the Courts specified, as though it were in fact a natural person; that is, in those cases in which, according to existing laws, suits may be brought in the Courts specified respectively.

Indeed, a more unrestricted sense given to the words of the act, could not be carried into execution; a literal exercise of the right of suit, supposed to be granted, would be impossible. Can the Bank of the United States be sued (in the literal language of the act) 'in any Circuit Court of the United States?' in that of Ohio, or Louisiana, for instance? Locality, in this respect, cannot be denied to such an institution; or, at least, it is only incidentally, by distress infinite, or attachment, for instance, that such a suit could be maintained. Nor, on the other hand, could the Bank sue literally in any Circuit Court of the United States. It must, of necessity, be confined to the Circuit Court of that district in which the defendant resides, or is to be found. And thus, at last, we circumscribe these general words, by reference to the judicial system of the United States, as it existed at the time. And why the same restriction should not have been imposed, as to amount, which is imposed as to all other suitors, ***884** to wit, 500 dollars and upwards, is to me inscrutable, except on the supposition that this clause was not intended for any other purpose than that which I have supposed. The United States have suffered no other suitors to institute a suit in its Courts for less than that sum, and it is hard to conceive why the Bank should be permitted to institute a suit to recover, if it will, a single cent. This consideration is expressly drawn into notice by this Court, in the case of *Deveaux*, and if it was

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

entitled to weight then, in fixing the construction of the incorporating section, I see no reason why it should be unnoticed now.

****57** I will dwell no longer on a point, which is in fact secondary and subordinate; for if Congress can vest this jurisdiction, and the people will it, the act may be amended, and the jurisdiction vested. I next proceed to consider, more distinctly, the constitutional question, on the right to vest the jurisdiction to the extent here contended for.

And here I must observe, that I altogether misunderstood the counsel, who argued the cause for the plaintiff in error, if any of them contended against the jurisdiction, on the ground that the cause involved questions depending on general principles. No one can question, that the Court which has jurisdiction of the principal question, must exercise jurisdiction over every question. Neither did I understand them as denying, that if Congress could confer on the Circuit Courts appellate, they could confer original jurisdiction. The argument went to deny the right to assume jurisdiction on a mere hypothesis. It was one of ***885** description, identity, definition; they contended, that until a question involving the construction or administration of the laws of the United States did actually arise, the *casus federis* was not presented, on which the constitution authorized the government to take to itself the jurisdiction of the cause. That until such a question actually arose, until such a case was actually presentd, *non constat*, but the cause depended upon general principles, exclusively cognizable in the State Courts; that neither the letter nor the spirit of the constitution sanctioned the assumption of jurisdiction on the part of the United States at any previous stage.

And this doctrine has my hearty concurrence in its general application. A very simple case may be stated, to illustrate its bearing on the question of jurisdiction between the two governments. By virtue of treaties with Great Britain, aliens holding lands were exempted from alien disabilities, and made capable of holding, aliening, and transmitting their estates, in common with natives. But why should the claimants of such lands, to all eternity, be vested with the privilege of bringing an original suit in the

Courts of the United States? It is true, a question might be made, upon the effect of the treaty, on the rights claimed by or through the alien; but until that question does arise, nay, until a decision against the right takes place, what end has the United States to subserve in claiming jurisdiction of the cause? Such is the present law of the United States, as to all but this one distinguished party; and that law was ***886** passed when the doctrines, the views, and ends of the constitution, were, at least, as well understood as they are at present. I attach much importance to the 25th section of the judiciary act, not only as a measure of policy, but as a cotemporaneous exposition of the constitution on this subject; as an exposition of *the words* of the constitution, deduced from a knowledge of its views and policy. The object was, to secure a uniform construction and a steady execution of the laws of the Union. Except as far as this purpose might require, the general government had no interest in stripping the State Courts of their jurisdiction; their policy would rather lead to avoid incumbering themselves with it. Why then should it be vested with jurisdiction in a thousand causes, on a mere possibility of a question arising, which question, at last, does not occur in one of them? Indeed, I cannot perceive how such a reach of jurisdiction can be asserted, without changing the reading of the constitution on this subject altogether. The judicial power extends only to 'cases arising,' that is, actual, not potential cases. The framers of the constitution knew better, than to trust such a *quo minus* fiction in the hands of any government.

****58** I have never understood any one to question the right of Congress to vest original jurisdiction in its inferior Courts, in cases coming properly within the description of 'cases arising under the laws of the United States;' but surely it must first be ascertained, in some proper mode, that the cases are such as the constitution describes. By possibility, a constitutional question may be raised in ***887** any conceivable suit that may be instituted; but that would be a very insufficient ground for assuming universal jurisdiction; and yet, that a question has been made, as that, for instance, on the Bank charter, and may again be made, seems still worse, as a ground for extending jurisdiction. For, the folly of raising it again in every suit instituted by the

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

Bank, it too great, to suppose it possible. Yet this supposition, and this alone, would seem to justify vesting the Bank with an unlimited right to sue in the federal Courts. Indeed, I cannot perceive how, with ordinary correctness, a question can be said to be involved in a cause, which only may possibly be made, but which, in fact, is the very last question that there is any probability will be made; or rather, how that can any longer be denominated a question, which has been put out of existence by a solemn decision. The constitution presumes, that the decisions of the supreme tribunal will be acquiesced in; and after disposing of the few questions which the constitution refers to it, all the minor questions belong properly to the State jurisdictions, and never were intended to be taken away in mass.

Efforts have been made to fix the precise sense of the constitution, when it vests jurisdiction in the general government, in 'cases arising under the laws of the United States.' To me, the question appears susceptible of a very simple solution; that all depends upon the identity of the case supposed; according to which idea, a case may be such in its very existence, or it may become such in its progress. An action may 'live, move, and have *888 its being,' in a law of the United States; such is that given for the violation of a patent-right, and four or five different actions given by this act of incorporation; particularly that against the President and Directors for over-issuing; in all of which cases the plaintiff must count upon the law itself as the ground of his action. And of the other description, would have been an action of trespass, in this case, had remedy been sought for an actual levy of the tax imposed. Such was the case of the former Bank against *Deveaux*, and many others that have occurred in this Court, in which the suit, in its form, was such as occur in ordinary cases, but in which the pleadings or evidence raised the question on the law or constitution of the United States. In this class of cases, the occurrence of a question makes the case, and transfers it, as provided for under the twenty-fifth section of the Judiciary Act, to the jurisdiction of the United States. And this appears to me to present the only sound and practical construction of the constitution on this subject; for no other cases does it regard as necessary to place under the control of the general government. It is

only when the case exhibits one or the other of these characteristics, that it is acted upon by the constitution. Where no question is raised, there can be no contrariety of construction; and what else had the constitution to guard against? As to cases of the first description, *ex necessitate rei*, the Courts of the United States must be susceptible of original jurisdiction; and as to all other cases, I should hold them, also, susceptible of original jurisdiction, if it were practicable, *889 in the nature of things, to make out the definition of the case, so as to bring it under the constitution judicially, upon an original suit. But until the plaintiff can control the defendant in his pleadings, I see no practical mode of determining when the case does occur, otherwise than by permitting the cause to advance until the case for which the constitution provides shall actually arise. If it never occurs, there can be nothing to complain of; and such are the provisions of the twenty-fifth section. The cause might be transferred to the Circuit Court before an adjudication takes place; but I can perceive no earlier stage at which it can possibly be predicated of such a case, that it is one within the constitution; nor any possible necessity for transferring it then, or until the Court has acted upon it to the prejudice of the claims of the United States. It is not, therefore, because Congress may not vest an *original* jurisdiction, where they can constitutionally vest in the Circuit Courts *appellate* jurisdiction, that I object to this general grant of the right to sue; but, because that the peculiar nature of this jurisdiction is such, as to render it impossible to exercise it in a strictly original form, and because the principle of a possible occurrence of a question as a ground of jurisdiction, is transcending the bounds of the constitution, and placing it on a ground which will admit of an *enormous accession*, if not an *unlimited assumption*, of jurisdiction.

**59 But, dismissing the question of possibility, which, I must think, would embrace every other case as well as those to which this Bank is a party, in what *890 sense can it be predicated of this case, that it is one arising under a law of the United States? It cannot be denied, that jurisdiction of this suit in equity could not be entertained, unless the Court could have had jurisdiction of the action of trespass, which this injunction was intended to

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

anticipate. And, in fact, there is no question, that the Bank here maintains, that the right to sue extends to common trespass, as well as to contracts, or any other cause of action. But suppose trespass in the common form instituted; the declaration is general, and the defendant pleads not guilty, and goes to trial. Where is the feature in such a cause that can give the Court jurisdiction? What question arises under a law of the United States? or what question that must not be decided exclusively upon the *lex loci*, upon State laws? Take also the case of a contract, and in what sense can it be correctly predicated of that, that in common with every other act of the Bank, it arises out of the law that incorporates it? May it not with equal propriety be asserted, that all the crimes and all the controversies of mankind, arise out of the fat that called their progenitor into existence? It is not because man was created, that he commits a trespass, or incurs a debt; but because, being indued with certain faculties and propensities, he is led by an appropriate motive to the one action or the other. Sound philosophy attributes effects to their proximate causes. It is but pursuing the grade of creation from one step to another, to deduce the acts of this Bank from State law, or even divine law, with as much correctness as from the law of *891 its immediate creation. Its contracts arise under its own acts, and not under a law of the United States; so far from it, indeed, that their effect, their construction, their limitation, their concoction, are all the creatures of the respective State laws in which they originate. There is a satisfactory illustration of the distinction between contracts which draw their existence from statutes, and those which originate in the acts of man, afforded by this act of incorporation itself. It will be unnecessary to look beyond it. The action of debt before alluded to, given by the ninth clause of the seventh section, against the directors, to any one who will sue, is one of those factitious or statute contracts which exist in, and expire with, the statute that creates it. Not so with the ordinary contracts of the Bank; upon the expiration of the charter, they would be placed in the state of the credits of an intestate before administration; there is no one to sue for them; but the moral obligation would remain, and a Court of equity would enforce it against their debtors, at the suit of the individual stockholders. Nor would this be on the principle of

contracts executed under power of attorney; for, the law applicable to principals would govern every question in such causes. All the acts of the corporation are executed *in their own right*, and not *in the right of another*. A personal existence, with all its incidents, is given to them, and it is in right of that existence that they are capable of acting, and do act. Nor, indeed, in another point of view, is it strictly predicable of this Bank, that its acts arise *892 out of, because its existence is drawn from, a law of the United States. It is because it is *incorporated*, not because incorporated by a *law of the United States*, that it is made capable of exercising certain powers incidentally, and of being vested with others expressly. The same effects would follow, if incorporated by any other competent legislative power. The law of the United States creates the Bank, and the common law, or State law more properly, takes it up and makes it what it is. Who can deny, that in many points the incidents to such an institution may vary in different States, although its existence be derived from the general government? It is the case with the natural alien, when adopted into the national family. His rights, duties, powers, &c., receive always a shade from the *lex loci* of the State in which he fixes his domicil.

**60 If this right to sue could be vested at all in the Bank, it is obvious that it must have been for one or more of three causes: 1. That a law of the United States incorporated it; 2. That a law of the United States vested in it the power to sue; or, 3. That the power to defend itself from trespasses as applicable to this case strictly, or to contract debts as applicable to the Georgia case, was conferred on it by a law of the United States expressly.

The first I have considered. On the second, no one would have the hardihood to contend, that such a grant has any efficacy, unless the suits come within the description of cases arising under a law of the United States, independently of the *893 grant of the right to sue; and it only remains to add a few more remarks on the third ground.

Of the power to repel trespasses, and to enter into contracts, as mere incidents to its creation, I trust I have shown, that neither comes within the

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
 (Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

description of a case arising under a law of the United States. But where will we find, in the law in question, any express grant of power relative to either? The contracts on which the Georgia case is founded, are declared on as common promissory notes, payable to bearer. Now, as mere incidents, I have no doubt of an action being sustainable in a State Court in both cases. But if an express grant is relied on, as bringing this, or the case of a contract, within the description of 'a case arising under a law of the United States,' then I look through the law in vain for any express grant, either to make the contract, or repel the trespass. It is true, the sweeping terms with which the incorporating section concludes, import, that 'by that name it shall and may be lawful for the Bank to do and execute all and singular the acts, matters, and things, which to them it shall and may appertain to do.' But this contains no grant of either, since the inquiry, at last, must be into the incidents of such an institution, and, as incidents, they needed not these words to sustain them; nor could those words give any more force to the right. So that, at last, we are referred to the mere fact of its corporate existence, for the basis of either of the actions, or either of the powers here insisted on, as bringing this cause within the constitutional definition. Having a legal *894 existence as an incorporated banking institution, it has a right to security in its possessions, and to the performance of its contracts; but that right will be precisely the same, if incorporated by a State law, or even, as was held in the case of *Terrett v. Taylor*, if having a common law corporate existence. The common law, or the State law, is referred to by the law of the United States, as the source of these incidents, when it speaks of the acts which are appurtenant to it; and I know of no other law that can define them, or confer them as incidents. Suppose a naturalization act passed, which, after specifying the terms and conditions upon which an alien shall become a citizen, proceeds to declare, 'that, as a citizen, he shall lawfully do and execute all and singular the acts, matters, and things, which to 'a citizen,' or 'to him as a citizen,' it shall and may appertain to do,' would not these words be a mere nullity? His new existence, and the relations with the society into which he is introduced, that grow out of that connexion, give him the right to defend his property

or his existence, (as in this case,) and to enter into and enforce those contracts which, as an alien, he would have been precluded from. He was no more a citizen, without an act of Congress, than this was a Bank. Finally, after the most attentive consideration of this cause, I cannot help thinking, that this idea of taking jurisdiction upon an hypothesis, or even of assuming original, unlimited jurisdiction, of all questions arising under a law of the United States, involves some striking inconsistencies. A Court may take cognizance of a question *895 in a cause, and enter a judgment upon it, and yet not have jurisdiction of the cause itself. Such are all questions of jurisdiction, of which every Court, however limited its jurisdiction, must have cognizance in every cause brought before it. So, also, I see not why, upon the same principle, a law expressly violating the constitution, may not be made the groundwork of a transfer of jurisdiction. Cases may arise, and would arise, under such a law; and if the simple existence, or possibility of such a case, is a sufficient ground of jurisdiction, and that ground sufficient to transfer the whole case to the federal judiciary, the least that can be said of it is, that it was not a case within the mischief intended to be obviated by the constitution. I shall say no more on this subject, but proceed to one which also acts forcibly on my judgment in forming my opinion in this cause.

**61 I will not undertake to define the limits within which the discretion of the Legislature of the Union may range, in the adoption of measures for executing their constitutional powers. It is very possible, that in the choice of means as 'proper and necessary' to carry their powers into effect, they may have assumed a latitude not foreseen at the adoption of the constitution. For example, in order to collect a stamp duty, they have exercised a power over the general law of contracts; in order to secure debts due the United States, they have controlled the State laws of estates of deceased persons and of insolvents' estates; in the distributions and the powers of individuals themselves, when insolvent, in the assignment of their *896 own estates; in the exercise of various powers, they have taken jurisdiction over crimes which the State laws took cognizance of; and all this, being within the range of their discretion, is aloof from *judicial* control,

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

while unaffectedly exercised for the purposes of the constitution. Nor, indeed, is there much to be alarmed at in it, while the same people who govern the States, can, where they will, control the Legislature of the United States.

Yet, certainly, there is one limit to this chain of implied powers, which must lie beyond the reach of legislative discretion. No one branch of the general government can new model the constitutional structure of the other.

Much stress was laid, in the argument, upon the necessity of giving co-ordinate extent to the several departments of a government; but it was altogether unnecessary to bring this consideration into the present case. As a ground of policy, this is not its proper place; and as a ground of construction, it must be needless, when applied to a constitution in which the judicial power so very far transcends both the others, in its acknowledged limits.

The principle is, that every government should possess the means of protecting itself; that is, of construing and enforcing its own laws. But this is not the half of the extent of the judicial power of the Union. Its most interesting province, is to enforce the equal administration of laws, and systems of laws, over which the legislative power can exercise no control. And thus, the judicial power is distributed into the two *897 classes: 1. That which is defined by the circumstances of the case; and, 2. That which depends upon the circumstances of the person. On the first, I have endeavoured to show, that the end is adequately effected by the provisions of the 25th section of the Judiciary Act, and, practically, can be exercised in no other way. But with regard to the second class, the argument turns against the United States; and every reason that may be urged in favour of eking out the jurisdiction in the first class of cases, reacts forcibly to confine the jurisdiction strictly within its constitutional limits, as to the second class. When the alien, or the citizen of another State, or the grants of another State, are implicated, the State Courts open their tribunals to the judiciary of the United States, and recognise their power as co-ordinate. Their citizens, their territory, their laws, all are subjected to a power quite foreign to the States, and judicial power is

literally poured out upon the Courts of the Union, without stint.

****62** How interesting, then, is it to the States, that the number of those *persons* who claim the privilege of coming into the Courts of the United States should be strictly limited! *Cases*, since they arise out of laws, &c. of the United States, must be very limited in number; but *persons* may bring into the Courts of the United States any question and every question, and, if this law be correctly construed, for any, the very smallest possible amount.

But if the plain dictates of our senses be relied on, what state of facts have we exhibited here? ***898** Making a person, makes a case; and thus, a government which cannot exercise jurisdiction unless an alien or citizen of another State be a party, makes a party which is neither alien nor citizen, and then claims jurisdiction because it has made a case. If this be true, why not make every citizen a corporation sole, and thus bring them all into the Courts of the United States *quo minus*? Nay, it is still worse, for there is not only an evasion of the constitution implied in this doctrine, but a positive power to violate it. Suppose every individual of this corporation were citizens of Ohio, or, as applicable to the other case, were citizens of Georgia, the United States could not give any one of them, individually, the right to sue a citizen of the same State in the Courts of the United States; then, on what principle could that right be communicated to them in a body? But the question is equally unanswerable, if any single member of the corporation is of the same State with the defendant, as has been repeatedly adjudged.

One of the counsel who argued this cause in behalf of the Bank, has denominated it a bundle of faculties. This is very true; but those faculties are substituted for the organization of a natural person; and it is perfectly certain, that when it comes into this Court, it must be treated as a person. It is altogether inadmissible, to refine away the principles of jurisprudence, so as to consider it in any other light than that of a person. As such, it sues out a writ, declares, pleads, takes judgment, and levies an execution. If it is not a ***899** person, it has

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S. Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

no standing in this Court; it must, therefore, abandon this suit, or be subjected to personal disabilities. Gentlemen have a right to take what ground here they please, to sustain this action; but it is perfectly clear to me, that the act of Congress was intended to vest this right as a personal right, or not at all. Let any one look through this act, and notice the unrestricted latitude that has been assumed in vesting the right to sue both by and against this Bank, and he will see, that either there is no general right to sue given in the seventh section, now relied on, or that it is given under the general power granted to pass all laws necessary to carry the powers of the general government into execution. The proviso to the 17th section is a remarkable proof of this. It puts the limits of judicial power altogether out of view. If Congress, in legislating on this subject, did intend such a grant as is here contended for, it must be presumed that they did not advert to the consideration, that granting to an individual a right to sue, was enlarging the jurisdiction of the Court. It never can be supposed, that they meant to assume the power of adding to the number of persons who might constitutionally become suitors in the Courts of the United States. But every difficulty vanishes, when we limit the meaning of the language of the act, by a reference to the context. In fact, a general power to bring actions in the Courts of the United States, is so peculiarly and explicitly personal on the face of the constitution, that it is hard to perceive how Congress could have for a moment lost sight of the restrictions *900 imposed, in this respect, upon the judicial power.

**63 Nor had the Bank any idea that this power was vested in it, upon the ground that every possible case in which it might be involved in litigation, came within the constitutional definition of cases arising under laws, &c. of the United States. In its averments, those on which it claims jurisdiction, it simply takes two grounds: 1. That it was incorporated by an act of Congress; 2. That the right to sue was given it by an act of Congress. But there is no averment, that the cause of action was a case arising under a law of the United States. It well knew, that it was a case emphatically arising out of an act of the State of Ohio, operating upon the domicile of the Bank, which, although purchased in

right of an existence metaphysically given it by Congress, was acquired and held according to the laws of Ohio, acting upon its own territory. Technically, these averments cover only two grounds; they affirm, 1. That the Bank, being incorporated by Congress, had, therefore, a right to sue; 2. That being incorporated, and having the right to sue conferred upon it by an act of Congress, therefore, it could maintain this action. But yet neither, nor both of these, could give the right, unless in one of the cases defined in the constitution, which case is not the subject of an averment. I would not willingly place the case on the ground of mere technicality; and, therefore, only make the observation to show, that the ground assumed in argument, is an afterthought. I believe that, until this argument, the *901 ground now made was never thought of; and I am at a loss to conceive how it is possible to maintain the position, that all possible cases in which this Bank shall sue or be sued, come within the description now contended for. Take, for instance, a trespass or a fraud committed by the Bank, and suit brought by the injured party, in what sense could they be said to be cases arising under a law of the United States? Or, take the case of ejectment, suppose to recover part of the premises of the banking house in Philadelphia, and not a question raised in the suit, but what arises under the territorial laws of the country, and what circumstances characterize that as a case of the proper description to give this Court jurisdiction? If this cause of action arises under a statute, why is not the statute referred to, and the provision particularly relied on, if there is any other than what the averments specify?

Various instances have been cited and relied on, in which this right of suit in the Courts of the United States has been given to particular officers of the United States. But on these I would remark, that it is not logical to cite as proofs, the exercise of this right, in instances which may themselves be the subject of constitutional questions. It cannot be intended to surprise this Court into the recognition of the constitutionality of the laws so cited. But there is a stronger objection; no such instance is in point, until it be shown that Congress has authorized such officers to bring their private contracts and private controversies into the Courts

22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S.Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738
(Cite as: 22 U.S. 738)

of the United States. In all the *902 cases cited, the individual is acting distinctly as the organ of government; but let them take the character of a mere contractor, a factor, a broker, a common carrier, and then let laws authorizing them to sue in the Courts of the United States be passed, and I will acknowledge the cases to be in point; though I will still dispute the principle, that a repetition of error can convert an act into law or truth. The distinction is a clear one between all these cases and the Bank. The latter is a mere agent or attorney, in some instances; in others, and especially in the cases now before the Court, it is a private person, acting on its own account, not clothed with an official character at all. But the acts of public officers are the acts of government; and emphatically so, in suits by the Postmaster-General; the money to be recovered being the property of the United States, it may be considered that they are parties to the suit, just as those States are to the suits by or against their Attorney-General, where he is by law authorized to bring and defend suits in his own name officially. When the United States are parties, the grant of jurisdiction is general. But, there is express law also for every contract that the Postmaster enters into, or it will be in vain for him to bring his suit in his own name or otherwise. It would be in vain for him to rely simply on his being made Postmaster under an act of Congress; in which point alone, there would seem to exist any analogy between his case and that of the Bank.

****64** As to the instance of the action given under the patent law, it has been before remarked, that so *903 entirely is its existence blended with an act of Congress, that to prosecute it, it is indispensable that the act should be set forth as the ground of action. I rather think it an unfortunate quotation, since it presents a happy illustration of what we are to understand by those cases arising under a law of Congress, which in their nature admit of an exercise of original jurisdiction. The plaintiff must recover, must count upon the act of Congress; the constitutional characteristic appears on the record before the defendant is called to answer; and the repeal of the statute before judgment, puts an end to his right altogether. Various such cases may be cited. But how the act of Congress is to be introduced into an action of trespass, ejection, or

slander, before the defendant is called to plead, I cannot imagine.

Upon the whole, I feel compelled to dissent from the Court, on the point of jurisdiction; and this renders it unnecessary for me to express my sentiments on the residue of the points in the cause.

Decree affirmed, except as to interest on the amount of the specie in the hands of the defendant, Sullivan.

U.S.,1824
 Osborn v. Bank of U.S.
 22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682 (U.S.Ohio), 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738

END OF DOCUMENT

KEYCITE

▶ **Osborn v. Bank of U.S., 22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682, 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738 (U.S.Ohio, Mar 19, 1824)**

History
Direct History

=> 1 **Osborn v. Bank of U.S., 22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682, 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738 (U.S.Ohio Mar 19, 1824)**

Negative Citing References (U.S.A.)

Superseded by Statute as Stated in

- H 2 Smart v. First Federal Sav. & Loan Ass'n of Detroit, 500 F.Supp. 1147 (E.D.Mich. Sep 15, 1980) (NO. CIV. 79-74483, CIV. 79-74646, CIV. 79-74804, CIV. 80-70101, CIV. 80-70143, CIV. 80-70169, CIV. 80-70246, CIV. 80-70269, CIV. 80-71370)★★★
- ▶ 3 Anonymous Blood Recipient v. William Beaumont Hosp., 721 F.Supp. 139, 58 USLW 2215 (E.D.Mich. Sep 22, 1989) (NO. CIV.A. 89-70657)★★★★
- C 4 McEvelly v. Rush Presbyterian St. Luke's Medical Center, 765 F.Supp. 434 (N.D.Ill. May 01, 1991) (NO. 90 C 5413)★★★★
- C 5 Roberts v. American Nat. Red Cross, 1991 WL 80345 (E.D.Pa. May 13, 1991) (NO. CIV. A. 90-6737)★★★
- ▶ 6 S.G. v. American Nat. Red Cross, 938 F.2d 1494, 60 USLW 2099 (1st Cir.(N.H.) Jul 24, 1991) (NO. 90-1873)★★★★
- ▶ 7 Harlan Sprague Dawley, Inc. v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue, 583 N.E.2d 214 (Ind.Tax Dec 06, 1991) (NO. 49T05-9007-TA-00038)★★
- C 8 Marcus v. Northeast Commuter Services Corp., 1992 WL 129637 (E.D.Pa. Jun 09, 1992) (NO. CIV. 92-2296)★★
- ▶ 9 A.I. Trade Finance, Inc. v. Petra Intern. Banking Corp., 62 F.3d 1454, 64 USLW 2150, 314 U.S.App.D.C. 122 (D.C.Cir. Aug 22, 1995) (NO. 94-7117)★★★★
- C 10 Viqueira v. First Bank, 140 F.3d 12, 40 Fed.R.Serv.3d 618 (1st Cir.(Puerto Rico) Mar 30, 1998) (NO. 97-2127)★★
- ▶ 11 Nicodemus v. Union Pacific Corp., 318 F.3d 1231 (10th Cir.(Wyo.) Feb 13, 2003) (NO. 02-8016, 02-8017), rehearing in banc granted (Apr 22, 2003)★

Overruling Recognized by

- H 12 Hollus v. Amtrak Northeast Corridor, 937 F.Supp. 1110 (D.N.J. Sep 20, 1996) (NO. CIV. A. 95-1147)★★★

Disagreement Recognized by

- C 13 Bonaparte v. Camden & A.R. Co., Baldw. 205, 3 F.Cas. 821, No. 1617 (C.C.D.N.J. Oct Term 1830)★★★
- ▶ 14 Kaiser v. Memorial Blood Center of Minneapolis, Inc., 724 F.Supp. 1255 (D.Minn. Feb 07, 1989) (NO. 3-88 CIV 666)★★★
- ▶ 15 Collins v. American Red Cross, 724 F.Supp. 353 (E.D.Pa. Oct 25, 1989) (NO. CIV. A. 89-1704)★
★★★
- H 16 McCool v. American Red Cross, 1991 WL 32857 (E.D.Pa. Mar 06, 1991) (NO. CIV. A. 90-7661)
★★★
- C 17 Luckett v. Harris Hospital-Fort Worth, 764 F.Supp. 436 (N.D.Tex. Jun 21, 1991) (NO. CIV. A. 4-91-124-A)★★★★

- C** 18 Friends and Residents of St. Thomas Township, Inc. v. St. Thomas Development, Inc., 176 Fed.Appx. 219 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Apr 10, 2006) (Not selected for publication in the Federal Reporter, NO. 05-2378)★
- Distinguished by*
- C** 19 McConnell v. Dennis, 153 F. 547, 82 C.C.A. 501 (C.C.A.8 (Kan.) May 07, 1907) (NO. 2488)★★
- H** 20 State v. Hyde, 88 Or. 1, 169 P. 757, Am. Ann.Cas. 1918E,688 (Or. Jan 08, 1918)★★
- C** 21 Ex parte Marshall, L.R.A. 1918C,944, 75 Fla. 97, 77 So. 869 (Fla. Jan 19, 1918)★★★
- Y** 22 Railroad Commissioners of State of Florida v. Burleson, 255 F. 604 (N.D.Fla. Jan 24, 1919)★★
- Y** 23 Prudential Ins. Co. of America v. Small Claims Court of City and County of San Francisco, 76 Cal.App.2d 379, 173 P.2d 38, 167 A.L.R. 820 (Cal.App. 1 Dist. Oct 08, 1946) (NO. CIV 13082)★
- Y** 24 U.S. v. Priority Products, Inc., 9 C.I.T. 392, 615 F.Supp. 593, 7 ITRD 1144 (CIT Aug 07, 1985) (NO. 84-9-01311)★
- H** 25 U.S. v. Revie, 834 F.2d 1198, 17 Collier Bankr.Cas.2d 1446, Bankr. L. Rep. P 72,152 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Dec 21, 1987) (NO. 86-2968)★★
- H** 26 Boudreau v. Federal Trust Bank, 115 S.W.3d 740 (Tex.App.-Dallas Aug 25, 2003) (NO. 05-02-01160-CV), rehearing overruled (Oct 08, 2003), review denied (Dec 19, 2003)★★
- Limitation of Holding Recognized by*
- H** 27 Sitkoff v. BMW of North America, Inc., 846 F.Supp. 380 (E.D.Pa. Mar 14, 1994) (NO. CIV.A. 93-3804)★★★
- Modification Recognized by*
- C** 28 Faust v. American Red Cross, Santa Clara Valley Chapter (Blood Center), 773 F.Supp. 1380 (N.D.Cal. Oct 03, 1991) (NO. C 91-20379 JW)★★
- Y** 29 International Armor & Limousine Co. v. Moloney Coachbuilders, Inc., 272 F.3d 912, 60 U.S.P.Q.2d 1911 (7th Cir.(Ill.) Nov 26, 2001) (NO. 01-1493), rehearing and rehearing en banc denied (Dec 18, 2001)★★ (BNA Version)

Citing References

Positive Cases (U.S.A.)

★★★★★ Examined

- Y** 30 American National Red Cross v. S.G., 112 S.Ct. 2465, 2467+, 505 U.S. 247, 247+, 120 L.Ed.2d 201, 201+, 60 USLW 4631, 4631+ (U.S.N.H. Jun 19, 1992) (NO. 91-594) ""
- Y** 31 Afroyim v. Rusk, 87 S.Ct. 1660, 1664+, 387 U.S. 253, 261+, 18 L.Ed.2d 757, 757+ (U.S.N.Y. May 29, 1967) (NO. 456)
- Y** 32 Ex parte Ayers, 8 S.Ct. 164, 173+, 123 U.S. 443, 487+, 31 L.Ed. 216, 216+ (U.S.Va. Dec 05, 1887) ""
- Y** 33 State of Louisiana ex rel. Elliott v. Jumel, 2 S.Ct. 128, 138+, 107 U.S. 711, 724+, 17 Otto 711, 711+, 27 L.Ed. 448, 448+ (U.S.La. Mar 05, 1883)
- Y** 34 U.S. v. Lee, 1 S.Ct. 240, 254+, 106 U.S. 196, 212+, 16 Otto 196, 196+, 27 L.Ed. 171, 171+ (U.S.Va. Dec 04, 1882)
- Y** 35 Kendall v. U.S. ex rel. Stokes, 1838 WL 3946, *18+, 37 U.S. 524, 550+, 12 Pet. 524, 524+, 9 L.Ed. 1181, 1181+ (U.S.Dist.Col. Term 1838)
- Y** 36 In re TMI Litigation Cases Consol. II, 940 F.2d 832, 849+, Nuclear Reg. Rep. P 20,536, 20536+, 60 USLW 2101, 2101+ (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Jul 26, 1991) (NO. 90-5312, 90-5315, 90-5318, 90-5313, 90-5316, 90-5562, 90-5314, 90-5317, 90-5671) ""
- Y** 37 O'Conner v. Commonwealth Edison Co., 13 F.3d 1090, 1094+, Nuclear Reg. Rep. P 20,563, 20563+, 62 USLW 2514, 2515+, 62 USLW 2515+, 24 Env'tl. L. Rep. 20,689, 20689+, 38 Fed. R. Evid. Serv. 945, 945+ (7th Cir.(Ill.) Jan 07, 1994) (NO. 92-2989) ""
- C** 38 Chaffraix v. Board of Liquidation, 11 F. 638, 644+ (C.C.E.D.La. Mar 1882) ""
- Y** 39 Anonymous Blood Recipient v. Sinai Hosp., 692 F.Supp. 730, 731+ (E.D.Mich. Aug 24, 1988) (NO. 88-CV-71037-DT) ""
- Y** 40 In re TMI Coordinated Proceedings, 735 F.Supp. 640, 643+ (M.D.Pa. Mar 16, 1990) (NO. CIV.A. 88-1538) ""

- C** 41 Lee v. Kaufman, 15 F.Cas. 162, 177+, 3 Hughes 36, 36+, 17 Alb. L.J. 237, 237+, 24 Int.Rev.Rec. 90, 90+, No. 8191, 8191+ (C.C.E.D.Va. Mar 15, 1879)
- ▶** 42 State ex rel. Drake v. Doyle, 40 Wis. 175, 204+, 1876 WL 3916, *16+, 22 Am.Rep. 692, 692+ (Wis. Aug Term 1876) ""
- ★★★ Discussed**
- ▶** 43 Idaho v. Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho, 117 S.Ct. 2028, 2034+, 521 U.S. 261, 269+, 138 L.Ed.2d 438, 438+, 65 USLW 4540, 4540+, 27 Envtl. L. Rep. 21,227, 21227+, 97 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 4776, 4776+, 97 Daily Journal D.A.R. 7871, 7871+, 97 CJ C.A.R. 1000, 1000+, 11 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 90, 90+ (U.S.Idaho Jun 23, 1997) (NO. 94-1474) ""
- ▶** 44 Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida, 116 S.Ct. 1114, 1151+, 517 U.S. 44, 113+, 134 L.Ed.2d 252, 252+, 64 USLW 4167, 4167+, 42 ERC 1289, 1289+, 67 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 43,952, 43952+, 34 Collier Bankr.Cas.2d 1199, 1199+, 96 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 2125, 2125+, 96 Daily Journal D.A.R. 3499, 3499+ (U.S.Fla. Mar 27, 1996) (NO. 94-12) "" (*in dissent*)
- ▶** 45 Welch v. Texas Dept. of Highways and Public Transp., 107 S.Ct. 2941, 2950+, 483 U.S. 468, 482+, 97 L.Ed.2d 389, 389+, 55 USLW 5046, 5046+, 1987 A.M.C. 2113, 2113+ (U.S.Tex. Jun 25, 1987) (NO. 85-1716) ""
- ▶** 46 Atascadero State Hosp. v. Scanlon, 105 S.Ct. 3142, 3175+, 473 U.S. 234, 296+, 87 L.Ed.2d 171, 171+, 53 USLW 4985, 4985+, 38 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 97, 97+, 37 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 35,329, 35329+, 1 A.D. Cases 758, 758+ (U.S.Cal. Jun 28, 1985) (NO. 84-351) "" (*in dissent*)
- ▶** 47 Pennhurst State School & Hosp. v. Halderman, 104 S.Ct. 900, 917+, 465 U.S. 89, 117+, 79 L.Ed.2d 67, 67+ (U.S.Pa. Jan 23, 1984) (NO. 81-2101)
- ▶** 48 Verlinden B.V. v. Central Bank of Nigeria, 103 S.Ct. 1962, 1970+, 461 U.S. 480, 492+, 76 L.Ed.2d 81, 81+, 1983 A.M.C. 1817, 1817+ (U.S.N.Y. May 23, 1983) (NO. 81-920) ""
- ▶** 49 Quern v. Jordan, 99 S.Ct. 1139, 1147+, 440 U.S. 332, 345+, 59 L.Ed.2d 358, 358+ (U.S.Ill. Mar 05, 1979) (NO. 77-841) ""
- ▶** 50 Aldinger v. Howard, 96 S.Ct. 2413, 2417+, 427 U.S. 1, 6+, 49 L.Ed.2d 276, 276+, 22 Fed.R.Serv.2d 1, 1+ (U.S.Wash. Jun 24, 1976) (NO. 74-6521) ""
- ▶** 51 Perez v. Ledesma, 91 S.Ct. 674, 687+, 401 U.S. 82, 105+, 27 L.Ed.2d 701, 701+ (U.S.La. Feb 23, 1971) (NO. 60) ""
- ▶** 52 Schneider v. Rusk, 84 S.Ct. 1187, 1189+, 377 U.S. 163, 166+, 12 L.Ed.2d 218, 218+ (U.S.Dist.Col. May 18, 1964) (NO. 368) ""
- ▶** 53 Textile Workers Union of America v. Lincoln Mills of Ala., 77 S.Ct. 923, 928+, 353 U.S. 448, 471+, 1 L.Ed.2d 972, 972+, 40 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2113, 2120+, 40 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2120+, 32 Lab.Cas. P 70,733, 70733+ (U.S. Jun 03, 1957) (NO. 211, 262, 276) (*in dissent*)
- ▶** 54 Larson v. Domestic & Foreign Commerce Corp., 69 S.Ct. 1457, 1471+, 337 U.S. 682, 710+, 93 L.Ed. 1628, 1628+ (U.S.Dist.Col. Jun 27, 1949) (NO. 31) "" (*in dissent*)
- ▶** 55 James v. Dravo Contracting Co., 58 S.Ct. 208, 216+, 302 U.S. 134, 149+, 82 L.Ed. 155, 155+, 114 A.L.R. 318, 318+ (U.S.W.Va. Dec 06, 1937) (NO. 3)
- ▶** 56 Smith v. Kansas City Title & Trust Co., 41 S.Ct. 243, 245+, 255 U.S. 180, 199+, 65 L.Ed. 577, 577+, 22 A.F.T.R. 252, 252+ (U.S.Mo. Feb 28, 1921) (NO. 199) ""
- H** 57 First Nat. Bank of Bay City v. Fellows ex rel. Union Trust Co., 37 S.Ct. 734, 735+, 244 U.S. 416, 420+, 61 L.Ed. 1233, 1233+, Am. Ann. Cas. 1918D,1169, 1918D,1169+, L.R.A. 1918C,283, 1918C,283+ (U.S.Mich. Jun 11, 1917) (NO. 764) ""
- ▶** 58 Bankers' Trust Co. v. Texas & P. Ry. Co., 36 S.Ct. 569, 570+, 241 U.S. 295, 304+, 60 L.Ed. 1010, 1010+ (U.S.Tex. May 22, 1916) (NO. 889) ""
- ▶** 59 Ex parte Young, 28 S.Ct. 441, 450+, 209 U.S. 123, 150+, 52 L.Ed. 714, 714+, 13 L.R.A.N.S. 932, 932+, 14 Am. Ann. Cas. 764, 764+ (U.S.Minn. Mar 23, 1908) (NO. 10 ORIGINAL)
- ▶** 60 Pennoyer v. McConaughy, 11 S.Ct. 699, 701+, 140 U.S. 1, 10+, 35 L.Ed. 363, 363+ (U.S.Or. Apr 20, 1891) ""
- ▶** 61 Van Brocklin v. Anderson (U.S. Reports Title: Van Brocklin v. Tennessee), 6 S.Ct. 670, 673+, 117 U.S. 151, 156+, 29 L.Ed. 845, 845+, 42 Cont.Cas.Fed. (CCH) P 77,307, 77307+ (U.S.Tenn. Mar 07, 1886)
- H** 62 Poindexter v. Greenhow, 5 S.Ct. 903, 913+, 114 U.S. 270, 289+, 29 L.Ed. 185, 185+ (U.S.Va. Apr 20, 1885) ""

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 63 The Legal Tender Cases, 4 S.Ct. 122, 128+, 110 U.S. 421, 445+, 28 L.Ed. 204, 204+ (U.S.N.Y. Mar 03, 1884) ""
- 64 Proprietors of Charles River Bridge v. Proprietors of Warren Bridge, 1837 WL 3561, *33+, 36 U.S. 420, 463+, 11 Pet. 420, 420+, 9 L.Ed. 773, 773+ (U.S.Mass. Jan Term 1837)
- 65 Governor of Georgia v. Madrazo, 1828 WL 3005, *7+, 26 U.S. 110, 117+, 1 Pet. 110, 110+, 7 L.Ed. 73, 73+ (U.S.Ga. Jan Term 1828) ""
- 66 Zubi v. AT&T Corp., 219 F.3d 220, 223+, 83 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 417, 417+, 79 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 40,260, 40260+ (3rd Cir.(N.J.) Jul 18, 2000) (NO. 99-5206) ""
- 67 Thompson v. Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, 67 F.2d 644, 650+ (C.C.A.4 (S.C.) Nov 18, 1933) (NO. 3496) "" (*in dissent*)
- 68 State of South Carolina v. Virginia-Carolina Chemical Co., 117 F. 727, 728+ (C.C.D.S.C. Jul 29, 1902) ""
- 69 Booth v. Lloyd, 33 F. 593, 594+ (C.C.D.Md. May 06, 1887) ""
- 70 Arriba Ltd. v. Petroleos Mexicanos, 962 F.2d 528, 538+ (5th Cir.(Tex.) Jun 11, 1992) (NO. 91-2180, 91-6311) ""
- 71 Matter of Meyerland Co., 960 F.2d 512, 518+, 60 USLW 2734, 2734+ (5th Cir.(Tex.) May 13, 1992) (NO. 89-6118) ""
- 72 Matter of Meyerland Co., 910 F.2d 1257, 1260+, 59 USLW 2187, 2187+ (5th Cir.(Tex.) Sep 07, 1990) (NO. 89-6118) ""
- 73 Feigler v. Tidex, Inc., 826 F.2d 1435, 1437+, 1988 A.M.C. 1922, 1922+, 8 Fed.R.Serv.3d 931, 931+ (5th Cir.(La.) Sep 17, 1987) (NO. 86-3684) ""
- 74 Louisiana State Lottery Co. v. Fitzpatrick, 15 F.Cas. 970, 977+, 3 Woods 222, 222+, No. 8541, 8541+ (C.C.D.La. Apr Term 1879) ""
- 75 McCauley v. Kellogg, 15 F.Cas. 1261, 1265+, 2 Woods 13, 13+, 1 Cent. L.J. 164, 164+, No. 8688, 8688+ (C.C.D.La. Mar 21, 1874)
- 76 Gableman v. Peoria, D. & E. Ry. Co., 101 F. 1, 2+, 41 C.C.A. 160, 160+ (C.C.A.7 (Ind.) Mar 22, 1900) (NO. 546) ""
- 77 Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Henderson, 68 F. 588, 591+ (C.C.D.Ind. Jun 13, 1895) (NO. 9126) ""
- 78 Brasier v. Jeary, 256 F.2d 474, 476+, 67 A.L.R.2d 1096, 1096+, 1 Fed.R.Serv.2d 1064, 1064+ (8th Cir.(Neb.) Jun 23, 1958) (NO. 15937) ""
- 79 Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. George-Howard, 153 F.2d 591, 593+ (C.C.A.8 (Mo.) Feb 18, 1946) (NO. 13035) ""
- 80 Republic of the Philippines v. Marcos, 862 F.2d 1355, 1367+, 57 USLW 2351, 2351+, RICO Bus.Disp.Guide 7108, 7108+ (9th Cir.(Cal.) Dec 01, 1988) (NO. 86-6091) ""
- 81 U.S. v. Parrott, 27 F.Cas. 416, 420+, 1 McAll. 271, 271+, Hoff.Op. 234, 234+, No. 15,998, 15998+, 7 Morr. Min. Rep. 335, 335+, 7 Morr.Min.Rights 335, 335+ (C.C.D.Cal. Jul Term 1858) ""
- 82 Reshard v. Britt, 839 F.2d 1499, 1502+ (11th Cir.(Fla.) Mar 16, 1988) (NO. 86-3641) "" (*in dissent*)
- 83 Williams v. Federal Land Bank of Jackson, 954 F.2d 774, 776+, 293 U.S.App.D.C. 343, 345+ (D.C.Cir. Feb 04, 1992) (NO. 90-5064) ""
- 84 Monsanto Co. v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 448 F.Supp. 648, 651+ (N.D.Ala. Mar 27, 1978) (NO. CIV478-W-5024-NE)
- 85 Tobin v. Walkinshaw, 23 F.Cas. 1331, 1333+, 1 McAll. 26, 26+, 5 Am. Law Reg. 106, 106+, No. 14,068, 14068+ (C.C.N.D.Cal. Jul 1855) ""
- 86 Cook v. Rockwell Intern. Corp., 273 F.Supp.2d 1175, 1198+, Nuclear Reg. Rep. P 20,630, 20630+, 57 ERC 1294, 1294+ (D.Colo. Jul 24, 2003) (NO. CIV.A. 90-K-181) ""
- 87 Lamb v. U.S., 526 F.Supp. 1117, 1130+ (M.D.Ga. Nov 24, 1981) (NO. CIV 80-238-MAC)
- 88 O'Conner v. Commonwealth Edison Co., 770 F.Supp. 448, 454+, Nuclear Reg. Rep. P 20,544, 20544+ (C.D.Ill. Jul 10, 1991) (NO. 88-1272) ""
- 89 Chapalain Compagnie v. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 467 F.Supp. 181, 183+, 1979 A.M.C. 615, 615+ (N.D.Ill. Dec 07, 1978) (NO. 78 C 1975, 78 C 1983, 78 C 1984)
- 90 Louisville & N.R. Co. v. Bosworth, 209 F. 380, 386+ (E.D.Ky. Sep 22, 1913) (NO. 729) ""

- 91 Warner v. Board of Trustees of Police Pension Fund of City of New Orleans, 277 F.Supp. 736, 739+ (E.D.La. Dec 19, 1967) (NO. CIV. 67-499) ""
- 92 Roche v. American Red Cross, 680 F.Supp. 449, 451+ (D.Mass. Jan 29, 1988) (NO. CIV.A. 87-2293-K) ""
- 93 In re Rail Collision Near Chase, Md. on Jan. 4, 1987 Litigation, 680 F.Supp. 728, 729+ (D.Md. Sep 24, 1987) (NO. MDL 728, CIV H-87-1631, CIV H-87-1632, CIV H-87-1633, CIV H-87-2361)
- 94 Acme Markets, Inc. v. Retail Store Emp. Union Local No. 692, AFL-CIO, 231 F.Supp. 566, 568+, 56 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2810, 2810+, 50 Lab.Cas. P 19,174, 19174+ (D.Md. Jul 21, 1964) (NO. CIV. 15653) ""
- 95 Westside Mothers v. Haveman, 133 F.Supp.2d 549, 563+, 73 Soc.Sec.Rep.Serv. 137, 137+ (E.D.Mich. Mar 26, 2001) (NO. 99-CV-73442-DT)
- 96 Cheng Kai Yu v. Klapper, 1989 WL 47702, *1+ (E.D.N.Y. Apr 28, 1989) (NO. CV 88-3683)
- 97 Fisk v. Union Pac. R. Co., 9 F.Cas. 149, 150+, 6 Blatchf. 362, 362+, No. 4827, 4827+ (C.C.S.D.N.Y. Apr 06, 1869)
- 98 Doe v. American Red Cross, 763 F.Supp. 1084, 1086+ (D.Or. May 08, 1991) (NO. CIV. 90-1345-JU) ""
- 99 Combined Communications Corp. v. Marsh Products, Inc., 1986 WL 1213, *1+ (E.D.Pa. Jan 23, 1986) (NO. CIV. A. 85-7353) ""
- 100 Baker v. Biddle, 2 F.Cas. 439, 444+, Baldw. 394, 394+, No. 764, 764+ (C.C.E.D.Pa. Oct Term 1831)
- 101 Nashville, C. & St. L. Ry. v. Taylor, 86 F. 168, 172+ (C.C.M.D.Tenn. Mar 15, 1898) ""
- 102 Transamerican Refining Corp. v. Dravo Corp., 1991 WL 261765, *1+ (S.D.Tex. Oct 29, 1991) (NO. CIV. A. H-88-789)
- 103 Drake v. Cheyenne Newspapers, Inc., 842 F.Supp. 1403, 1408+ (D.Wyo. Feb 04, 1994) (NO. 93-CV-0339-B)
- 104 Rivera Gonzalez v. Com. of Puerto Rico, 726 F.Supp. 10, 12+ (D.Puerto Rico Sep 05, 1989) (NO. CIV. 88-1940 (GG)) ""
- 105 King v. La Grange, 9 P.C.L.J. 822, 822+, 61 Cal. 221, 226+, 1882 WL 1861, *4+ (Cal. Aug 15, 1882) (NO. 6555)
- 106 People v. Central Pac. R. Co., 43 Cal. 398, 406+, 1872 WL 1183, *3+ (Cal. Apr Term 1872) (NO. 2086)
- 107 Barnes v. Anderson Nat. Bank of Lawrenceburg, 169 S.W.2d 833, 835+, 293 Ky. 592, 592+, 145 A.L.R. 1066, 1066+ (Ky. Mar 16, 1943) ""
- 108 Dreux v. Kennedy, 12 Rob. (LA) 489, 495+, 1846 WL 1352, *4+ (La. Jan 1846) ""
- 109 Michigan State Bank v. Hammond, 1 Doug. 527, 533+, 1845 WL 1330, *5+ (Mich. Jan Term 1845)
- 110 Coulson v. Harris, 43 Miss. 728, 731+, 1871 WL 3963, *1+ (Miss. May Term 1871)
- 111 Northern Pac. R. Co. v. Carland, 3 P. 134, 138+, 5 Mont. 146, 146+ (Mont.Terr. Jan Term 1884)
- 112 Federal Land Bank of St. Paul v. Bismarck Lumber Co., 297 N.W. 42, 44+, 70 N.D. 607, 607+ (N.D. Mar 17, 1941) (NO. 6549)
- 113 State v. First Nat. Bank, 4 Nev. 348, 352+, 1868 WL 1984, *3+ (Nev. 1868) ""
- 114 Winberry v. Salisbury, 74 A.2d 406, 417+, 5 N.J. 240, 262+ (N.J. Jun 27, 1950) (NO. A-150) ""
- 115 American Dock & Improvement Co. v. Trustees for Support of Public Schools, 35 N.J. Eq. 181, 185+, 8 Stewart 181, 181+, 1882 WL 4213, *4+ (N.J.Err. & App. 1882)
- 116 Liberty Nat. Bank & Trust Co. v. Buscaglia, 288 N.Y.S.2d 33, 34+, 235 N.E.2d 101, 102+, 21 N.Y.2d 357, 360+ (N.Y. Dec 29, 1967)
- 117 Schlesinger v. Gilhooly, 81 N.E. 619, 624+, 27 Bedell 1+, 189 N.Y. 1, 15+ (N.Y. Jun 04, 1907)
- 118 PRESIDENT, DIRECTORS AND COMPANY OE THE VEAZIE BANK v. JEREMIAH FENNO, collector., 38 How. Pr. 147, 161+ (N.Y. 1869)
- 119 City of Utica v. Churchill, 6 Tiffany 161, 161+, 33 N.Y. 161, 161+, 1865 WL 4019, *1+ (N.Y. 1865)
- 120 Christie v. Bishop, 1 Barb.Ch. 105, 110+ (N.Y.Ch. 1845)
- 121 Patrie v. Murray & Buckley, 29 How. Pr. 312, 317+, 43 Barb. 323, 323+ (N.Y.Sup. 1864) ""
- 122 Jones v. Seward, 26 How. Pr. 433, 435+, 17 Abb.Pr. 377, 377+, 41 Barb. 269, 269+ (N.Y.Sup.Gen.Term 1864) ""

- H 123 Paramount Film Distributing Corp. v. Tracy, 176 N.E.2d 610, 618+, 86 Ohio Law Abs. 225, 246+, 86 Ohio Law Abs. 246+ (Ohio Com.Pl. Feb 04, 1960) (NO. 203518)
- ▶ 124 Lowry v. Commissioners of Sinking Fund (State Report Title: Lowry v. Thompson), 25 S.C. 416, 419+, 1 S.E. 141, 141+ (S.C. Nov 22, 1886) ""
- C 125 Lynn v. Polk, 76 Tenn. 121, 235+, 1881 WL 4428, *48+, 8 Lea 121, 121+ (Tenn. Dec Term 1881) (*in dissent*)

★★ Cited

- 126 Sanchez v. Minson Corp., 2004 WL 2112804, *2112804+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 26, 2004) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 04-401) ""
- 127 Verizon Internet Services, Inc. v. Recording Industry, 2004 WL 1943673, *1943673+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 30, 2004) **Response to Conditional Cross-Petition** (NO. 03-1722) ""
- 128 Jonas v. Town of Yemassee Mun. Court, 2004 WL 2191195, *2191195+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 19, 2004) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 04-431)
- ▶ 129 Jones v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 124 S.Ct. 1836, 1841+, 541 U.S. 369, 375+, 158 L.Ed.2d 645, 645+, 41 USLW 4332, 4332+, 93 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 993, 993+, 85 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 41,634, 41634+, 04 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 3774, 3774+, 2004 Daily Journal D.A.R. 5294, 5294+, 17 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 266, 266+ (U.S. May 03, 2004) (NO. 02-1205)
- ▶ 130 Alden v. Maine, 119 S.Ct. 2240, 2266, 527 U.S. 706, 753, 144 L.Ed.2d 636, 636, 67 USLW 3683, 4601, 67 USLW 4601, 138 Lab.Cas. P 33,890, 33890, 5 Wage & Hour Cas.2d (BNA) 609, 609, 99 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 4913, 4913, 1999 Daily Journal D.A.R. 6329, 6329, 1999 CJ C.A.R. 3654, 3654, 12 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 467 (U.S.Me. Jun 23, 1999) (NO. 98-436) ""
- ▶ 131 Crawford-El v. Britton, 118 S.Ct. 1584, 1599, 523 U.S. 574, 603, 140 L.Ed.2d 759, 759, 66 USLW 4311, 4311, 98 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 3288, 3288, 98 Daily Journal D.A.R. 4550, 4550, 98 CJ C.A.R. 2205, 2205, 11 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 505, 505 (U.S.Dist.Col. May 04, 1998) (NO. 96-827) (*in dissent*)
- ▶ 132 Atherton v. F.D.I.C., 117 S.Ct. 666, 672, 519 U.S. 213, 221, 136 L.Ed.2d 656, 656, 97 FCDR 330, 330, 97 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 335, 335, 97 Daily Journal D.A.R. 522, 522, 97 CJ C.A.R. 79, 79, 10 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 249, 249 (U.S.N.J. Jan 14, 1997) (NO. 95-928)
- ▶ 133 U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton, 115 S.Ct. 1842, 1879, 514 U.S. 779, 854, 131 L.Ed.2d 881, 881, 63 USLW 4413, 4413 (U.S.Ark. May 22, 1995) (NO. 93-1456, 93-1828) (*in dissent*)
- ▶ 134 Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., 115 S.Ct. 961, 968+, 513 U.S. 374, 386+, 130 L.Ed.2d 902, 902+, 63 USLW 4109, 4109+ (U.S.N.Y. Feb 21, 1995) (NO. 93-1525)
- H 135 Rowland v. California Men's Colony, Unit II Men's Advisory Council, 113 S.Ct. 716, 717+, 506 U.S. 194, 195+, 121 L.Ed.2d 656, 656+, 61 USLW 4060, 4060+ (U.S.Cal. Jan 12, 1993) (NO. 911188)
- ▶ 136 Port Authority Trans-Hudson Corp. v. Feeney, 110 S.Ct. 1868, 1879, 495 U.S. 299, 317, 109 L.Ed.2d 264, 264, 58 USLW 4536, 4536 (U.S.N.Y. Apr 30, 1990) (NO. 89-386)
- ▶ 137 Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Sperling, 110 S.Ct. 482, 489, 493 U.S. 165, 176, 107 L.Ed.2d 480, 480, 58 USLW 4072, 4072, 51 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 853, 853, 29 Wage & Hour Cas. (BNA) 937, 937, 52 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 39,479, 39479 (U.S.N.J. Dec 11, 1989) (NO. 88-1203) (*in dissent*)
- ▶ 138 Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 109 S.Ct. 2304, 2312+, 491 U.S. 58, 71+, 105 L.Ed.2d 45, 45+, 57 USLW 4677, 4677+, 49 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 1664, 1664+, 50 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 39,067, 39067+ (U.S.Mich. Jun 15, 1989) (NO. 87-1207)
- ▶ 139 Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Thompson, 106 S.Ct. 3229, 3232+, 478 U.S. 804, 807+, 92 L.Ed.2d 650, 650+, 54 USLW 5088, 5088+ (U.S.Ohio Jul 07, 1986) (NO. 85-619)
- ▶ 140 Franchise Tax Bd. of State of Cal. v. Construction Laborers Vacation Trust for Southern California, 103 S.Ct. 2841, 2846, 463 U.S. 1, 8, 77 L.Ed.2d 420, 420, 4 Employee Benefits Cas. 1604, 1604 (U.S.Cal. Jun 24, 1983) (NO. 82-695)
- ▶ 141 District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 103 S.Ct. 1303, 1312, 460 U.S. 462, 478, 75 L.Ed.2d 206, 206 (U.S.Dist.Col. Mar 23, 1983) (NO. 81-1335)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- ▶ 142 United Ass'n of Journeymen and Apprentices of Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry of U.S. and Canada, AFL CIO v. Local 334, United Ass'n of Journeymen and Apprentices of Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry of U.S. and Canada, 101 S.Ct. 2546, 2556, 452 U.S. 615, 634, 69 L.Ed.2d 280, 280, 107 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2715, 2715, 91 Lab.Cas. P 12,804, 12804 (U.S.N.J. Jun 22, 1981) (NO.

- 80-710) (*in dissent*)
- ▶ 143 Carlson v. Green, 100 S.Ct. 1468, 1484, 446 U.S. 14, 43, 64 L.Ed.2d 15, 15 (U.S.Ind. Apr 22, 1980) (NO. 78-1261) (*in dissent*)
 - ▶ 144 Butz v. Economou, 98 S.Ct. 2894, 2902, 438 U.S. 478, 489, 57 L.Ed.2d 895, 895 (U.S.N.Y. Jun 29, 1978) (NO. 76-709)
 - ▶ 145 Hagans v. Lavine, 94 S.Ct. 1372, 1388+, 415 U.S. 528, 554+, 39 L.Ed.2d 577, 577+ (U.S.N.Y. Mar 25, 1974) (NO. 72-6476) "" (*in dissent*)
 - ▶ 146 Rogers v. Bellei, 91 S.Ct. 1060, 1064, 401 U.S. 815, 822, 28 L.Ed.2d 499, 499 (U.S.Dist.Col. Apr 05, 1971) (NO. 24)
 - ▶ 147 Powell v. McCormack, 89 S.Ct. 1944, 1960, 395 U.S. 486, 514, 23 L.Ed.2d 491, 491 (U.S.Dist.Col. Jun 16, 1969) (NO. 138)
 - ▶ 148 First Agr. Nat. Bank of Berkshire County v. State Tax Commission, 88 S.Ct. 2173, 2179+, 392 U.S. 339, 350+, 20 L.Ed.2d 1138, 1138+ (U.S.Mass. Jun 17, 1968) (NO. 755) (*in dissent*)
 - ▶ 149 J. I. Case Co. v. Borak, 84 S.Ct. 1555, 1561, 377 U.S. 426, 434, 12 L.Ed.2d 423, 423 (U.S.Wis. Jun 08, 1964) (NO. 402) ""
 - ▶ 150 Mercantile Nat. Bank at Dallas v. Langdeau, 83 S.Ct. 520, 522+, 371 U.S. 555, 559+, 9 L.Ed.2d 523, 523+ (U.S.Tex. Jan 21, 1963) (NO. 14, 15)
 - ▶ 151 Robert C. Herd & Co. v. Krawill Machinery Corp., 79 S.Ct. 766, 770, 359 U.S. 297, 303, 3 L.Ed.2d 820, 820, 1959 A.M.C. 879 (U.S.Md. Apr 20, 1959) (NO. 276)
 - ▶ 152 Perez v. Brownell, 78 S.Ct. 568, 580, 356 U.S. 44, 66, 2 L.Ed.2d 603, 603 (U.S.Cal. Mar 31, 1958) (NO. 44) (*in dissent*)
 - ▶ 153 Mitsugi Nishikawa v. Dulles, 78 S.Ct. 612, 618+, 356 U.S. 129, 139+, 2 L.Ed.2d 659, 659+ (U.S.Cal. Mar 31, 1958) (NO. 19)
 - ▶ 154 U. S. ex rel. Toth v. Quarles, 76 S.Ct. 1, 18, 350 U.S. 11, 41, 100 L.Ed. 8, 8 (U.S.Dist.Col. Jun 06, 1955) (NO. 3) "" (*in dissent*)
 - ▶ 155 Association of Westinghouse Salaried Emp. v. Westinghouse Elec. Corp., 75 S.Ct. 489, 495+, 348 U.S. 437, 451+, 99 L.Ed. 510, 510+, 35 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2643, 2643+, 27 Lab.Cas. P 69,063, 69063+ (U.S.Pa. Mar 28, 1955) (NO. 51)
 - ▶ 156 National Mut. Ins. Co. of Dist. of Col. v. Tidewater Transfer Co., 69 S.Ct. 1173, 1189, 337 U.S. 582, 614, 93 L.Ed. 1556, 1556 (U.S.Md. Jun 20, 1949) (NO. 29)
 - ▶ 157 Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Glander, 69 S.Ct. 1291, 1301, 337 U.S. 562, 580, 93 L.Ed. 1544, 1544, 55 Ohio Law Abs. 305, 305 (U.S.Ohio Jun 20, 1949) (NO. 447, 448) (*in dissent*)
 - ▶ 158 In re Summers, 65 S.Ct. 1307, 1311, 325 U.S. 561, 567, 89 L.Ed. 1795, 1795 (U.S.Ill. Jun 11, 1945) (NO. 205) ""
 - ▶ 159 Colorado Nat. Bank of Denver v. Bedford, 60 S.Ct. 800, 804, 310 U.S. 41, 51, 84 L.Ed. 1067, 1067 (U.S.Colo. Apr 22, 1940) (NO. 719)
 - ▶ 160 Tennessee Elec. Power Co. v. Tennessee Val. Authority, 59 S.Ct. 366, 370, 306 U.S. 118, 138, 83 L.Ed. 543, 543 (U.S.Tenn. Jan 30, 1939) (NO. 27)
 - ▶ 161 Helvering v. Gerhardt, 58 S.Ct. 969, 971, 304 U.S. 405, 411, 82 L.Ed. 1427, 1427, 38-2 USTC P 9320, 9320, 20 A.F.T.R. 1276, 1276 (U.S. May 23, 1938) (NO. 779, 780, 781)
 - ▶ 162 Helvering v. Mountain Producers Corporation, 58 S.Ct. 623, 628, 303 U.S. 376, 388, 82 L.Ed. 907, 907, 38-1 USTC P 9153, 9153, 20 A.F.T.R. 789, 789 (U.S. Mar 07, 1938) (NO. 600) (*in dissent*)
 - ▶ 163 Aetna Life Ins. Co. of Hartford, Conn. v. Haworth, 57 S.Ct. 461, 464, 300 U.S. 227, 240, 81 L.Ed. 617, 617, 108 A.L.R. 1000, 1000 (U.S.Mo. Mar 01, 1937) (NO. 446)
 - ▶ 164 BAXTER N. FOUST, ADMINISTRATOR, ETC., Petitioner, vs. MUNSON STEAMSHIP LINES, DEBTOR IN REORGANIZATION, Respondent., 1936 WL 64838, *64838, 1936 A.M.C. 1669, 1674 (U.S. Nov 09, 1936) (NO. NO NUMBER IN ORIGINA)
 - ▶ 165 Gully v. First Nat. Bank, 57 S.Ct. 96, 98, 299 U.S. 109, 113, 81 L.Ed. 70, 70 (U.S.Miss. Nov 09, 1936) (NO. 29)
 - ▶ 166 Foust v. Munson S.S. Lines, 57 S.Ct. 90, 94, 299 U.S. 77, 83, 81 L.Ed. 49, 49, 1936 A.M.C. 1668, 1668 (U.S.N.Y. Nov 09, 1936) (NO. 19)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 167 Federal Radio Commission v. Nelson Bros. Bond & Mortg. Co. (Station WIBO), 53 S.Ct. 627, 633, 289 U.S. 266, 278, 77 L.Ed. 1166, 1166, 89 A.L.R. 406, 406 (U.S.Dist.Col. May 08, 1933) (NO. 657, 658, 659, 660)
- ▶ 168 Hurn v. Oursler, 53 S.Ct. 586, 588, 289 U.S. 238, 243, 77 L.Ed. 1148, 1148, 17 U.S.P.Q. 195, 195 (U.S.N.Y. Apr 17, 1933) (NO. 565) (BNA Version)
- ▶ 169 People of Puerto Rico v. Russell & Co., Sucesores S. En. C., 53 S.Ct. 447, 450+, 288 U.S. 476, 485+, 77 L.Ed. 903, 903+ (U.S.Puerto Rico Mar 13, 1933) (NO. 492)
- ▶ 170 Old Colony Trust Co. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 49 S.Ct. 499, 502, 279 U.S. 716, 724, 73 L.Ed. 918, 918, 1 USTC P 408, 408, 7 A.F.T.R. 8875, 8875 (U.S.Mass. Jun 03, 1929) (NO. 130) ""
- ▶ 171 Panhandle Oil Co. v. State of Mississippi ex rel. Knox, 48 S.Ct. 451, 453, 277 U.S. 218, 222, 72 L.Ed. 857, 857, 56 A.L.R. 583, 583, 42 Cont.Cas.Fed. (CCH) P 77,297, 77297 (U.S.Miss. May 14, 1928) (NO. 288)
- ▶ 172 Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Columbia, S.C., v. Mitchell, 48 S.Ct. 449, 450, 277 U.S. 213, 214, 72 L.Ed. 854, 854 (U.S.S.C. May 14, 1928) (NO. 456)
- ▶ 173 Goltra v. Weeks, 46 S.Ct. 613, 616, 271 U.S. 536, 545, 70 L.Ed. 1074, 1074, 1926 A.M.C. 1015 (U.S.Mo. Jun 07, 1926) (NO. 718)
- 174 Norton v. Larney, 45 S.Ct. 145, 147, 266 U.S. 511, 515, 69 L.Ed. 413, 413 (U.S.Okla. Jan 05, 1925) (NO. 146)
- ▶ 175 First Nat. Bank in St. Louis v. State of Missouri at inf. Barrett, 44 S.Ct. 213, 217+, 263 U.S. 640, 663+, 68 L.Ed. 486, 486+ (U.S.Mo. Jan 28, 1924) (NO. 252) (*in dissent*)
- ▶ 176 Sloan Shipyards Corp. v. U.S. Shipping Bd. Emergency Fleet Corp., 42 S.Ct. 386, 388, 258 U.S. 549, 567, 66 L.Ed. 762, 762 (U.S.Wash. May 01, 1922) (NO. 308, 376, 526)
- ▶ 177 In re State of New York, 41 S.Ct. 588, 590, 256 U.S. 490, 500, 65 L.Ed. 1057, 1057 (U.S.N.Y. Jun 01, 1921) (NO. 25)
- ▶ 178 American Bank & Trust Co. v. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, 41 S.Ct. 499, 500, 256 U.S. 350, 356, 65 L.Ed. 983, 983, 25 A.L.R. 971, 971 (U.S.Ga. May 16, 1921) (NO. 679)
- ▶ 179 Johnson v. State of Maryland, 41 S.Ct. 16, 16, 254 U.S. 51, 56, 65 L.Ed. 126, 126 (U.S.Md. Nov 08, 1920) (NO. 289) ""
- 180 Paine Lumber Co. v. Neal, 37 S.Ct. 718, 722, 244 U.S. 459, 477, 61 L.Ed. 1256, 1256 (U.S.N.Y. Jun 11, 1917) (NO. 24) (*in dissent*)
- 181 Male v. Atchison, T. & S.F.R. Co., 36 S.Ct. 351, 353, 240 U.S. 97, 102, 60 L.Ed. 544, 544 (U.S.N.Y. Feb 21, 1916) (NO. 220)
- ▶ 182 Mackenzie v. Hare, 36 S.Ct. 106, 108, 239 U.S. 299, 310, 60 L.Ed. 297, 297, Am. Ann. Cas. 1916E,645, 1916E,645 (U.S.Cal. Dec 06, 1915) (NO. 79)
- 183 Farmers' & Mechanics' Sav. Bank of Minneapolis v. State of Minnesota, 34 S.Ct. 354, 355, 232 U.S. 516, 521, 58 L.Ed. 706, 706 (U.S.Minn. Feb 24, 1914) (NO. 39)
- ▶ 184 Shulthis v. McDougal, 32 S.Ct. 704, 707, 225 U.S. 561, 571, 56 L.Ed. 1205, 1205 (U.S.Okla. Jun 07, 1912) (NO. 156, 157)
- ▶ 185 Philadelphia Co. v. Stimson, 32 S.Ct. 340, 344, 223 U.S. 605, 620, 56 L.Ed. 570, 570 (U.S.Dist.Col. Mar 04, 1912) (NO. 70)
- ▶ 186 Flint v. Stone Tracy Co., 31 S.Ct. 342, 349+, 220 U.S. 107, 152+, 55 L.Ed. 389, 389+, 3 A.F.T.R. 2834, 2834+, Am. Ann. Cas. 1912B,1312, 1912B,1312+ (U.S.Vt. Mar 13, 1911) (NO. 407, 409, 410, 412, 415, 420, 425, 431, 432)
- ▶ 187 Muskrat v. U.S., 31 S.Ct. 250, 254, 219 U.S. 346, 358, 55 L.Ed. 246, 246 (U.S.Ct.Cl. Jan 23, 1911) (NO. 330, 331)
- ▶ 188 Macon Grocery Co. v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co., 30 S.Ct. 184, 186+, 215 U.S. 501, 506+, 54 L.Ed. 300, 300+ (U.S.Ga. Jan 17, 1910) (NO. 351) ""
- 189 In re Dunn, 29 S.Ct. 299, 301, 212 U.S. 374, 384, 53 L.Ed. 558, 558 (U.S.Tex. Feb 23, 1909) (NO. 10 ORIGINAL)
- 190 Scully v. Bird, 28 S.Ct. 597, 599, 209 U.S. 481, 486, 52 L.Ed. 899, 899 (U.S.Mich. May 04, 1908) (NO. 353) ""
- ▶ 191 State of South Carolina v. U.S., 26 S.Ct. 110, 113+, 199 U.S. 437, 452+, 50 L.Ed. 261, 261+, 3 A.F.T.R. 2775, 2775+, 4 Am. Ann. Cas. 737, 737+ (U.S.S.C. Dec 04, 1905) (NO. 10)

- H** 192 Carroll v. Greenwich Ins. Co. of New York, 26 S.Ct. 66, 67, 199 U.S. 401, 409, 50 L.Ed. 246, 246 (U.S.Iowa Nov 27, 1905) (NO. 50)
- Y** 193 Madisonville Traction Co. v. St. Bernard Mining Co., 25 S.Ct. 251, 254, 196 U.S. 239, 246, 49 L.Ed. 462, 462 (U.S.Ky. Jan 16, 1905) (NO. 362) ""
- H** 194 Filhiol v. Torney, 24 S.Ct. 698, 700, 194 U.S. 356, 360, 48 L.Ed. 1014, 1014 (U.S.Ark. May 16, 1904) (NO. 252) ""
- H** 195 Continental Nat. Bank v. Buford, 24 S.Ct. 54, 55, 191 U.S. 119, 122, 48 L.Ed. 119, 119 (U.S.Ark. Nov 16, 1903) (NO. 60)
- H** 196 Pacific Steam Whaling Co v. U S, 23 S.Ct. 154, 155, 187 U.S. 447, 451, 47 L.Ed. 253, 253, 3 A.F.T.R. 2736, 2736, 2 Alaska Fed. 1, 5 (U.S.Alaska Jan 05, 1903) (NO. 26)
- Y** 197 Swafford v. Templeton, 22 S.Ct. 783, 785, 185 U.S. 487, 494, 46 L.Ed. 1005, 1005 (U.S.Tenn. May 19, 1902) (NO. 487)
- Y** 198 State of Minnesota v. Hitchcock, 22 S.Ct. 650, 655, 185 U.S. 373, 386, 46 L.Ed. 954, 954 (U.S.Minn. May 05, 1902) (NO. 4 ORIGINAL)
- Y** 199 Patton v. Brady, 22 S.Ct. 493, 494, 184 U.S. 608, 611, 46 L.Ed. 713, 713, 3 A.F.T.R. 2725, 2725 (U.S.Va. Mar 17, 1902) (NO. 16) ""
- Y** 200 Missouri, K. & T. Ry. Co. of Kansas v. Hickman, 22 S.Ct. 18, 20, 183 U.S. 53, 59, 46 L.Ed. 78, 78 (U.S.Mo. Nov 11, 1901) (NO. 11)
- C** 201 Illinois Cent. R. Co. v. Adams, 21 S.Ct. 251, 254, 180 U.S. 28, 37, 45 L.Ed. 410, 410 (U.S.Miss. Jan 07, 1901) (NO. 77) ""
- Y** 202 Smith v. Reeves, 20 S.Ct. 919, 923, 178 U.S. 436, 446, 44 L.Ed. 1140, 1140 (U.S.Cal. May 14, 1900) (NO. 242)
- Y** 203 Shoshone Mining Co. v. Rutter, 20 S.Ct. 726, 727, 177 U.S. 505, 509, 44 L.Ed. 864, 864 (U.S.Idaho Apr 30, 1900) (NO. 208)
- C** 204 Blackburn v. Portland Gold Min. Co., 20 S.Ct. 222, 226, 175 U.S. 571, 580, 44 L.Ed. 276, 276 (U.S.Colo. Jan 08, 1900) (NO. 54) ""
- H** 205 La Abra Silver Min. Co. v. U.S., 20 S.Ct. 168, 179, 175 U.S. 423, 456, 44 L.Ed. 223, 223 (U.S.Ct.Cl. Dec 11, 1899) (NO. 29)
- Y** 206 Fitts v. McGhee, 19 S.Ct. 269, 273, 172 U.S. 516, 527, 43 L.Ed. 535, 535 (U.S.Ala. Jan 03, 1899) (NO. 130)
- Y** 207 Sonnentheil v. Christian Moerlein Brewing Co., 19 S.Ct. 233, 234, 172 U.S. 401, 405, 43 L.Ed. 492, 492 (U.S.Tex. Jan 03, 1899) (NO. 45)
- H** 208 U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, 18 S.Ct. 456, 477, 169 U.S. 649, 703, 42 L.Ed. 890, 890 (U.S.Cal. Mar 28, 1898) (NO. 132)
- Y** 209 Tindal v. Wesley, 17 S.Ct. 770, 776, 167 U.S. 204, 220, 42 L.Ed. 137, 137 (U.S.S.C. May 10, 1897) (NO. 231)
- H** 210 Scott v. Donald, 17 S.Ct. 262, 263+, 165 U.S. 107, 112+, 41 L.Ed. 648, 648+ (U.S.S.C. Jan 18, 1897) (NO. 410) ""
- C** 211 Ex parte Jones, 17 S.Ct. 222, 223, 164 U.S. 691, 692, 41 L.Ed. 601, 601 (U.S.Mass. Jan 04, 1897)
- H** 212 Central Pac. R. Co. v. People of the State of California, 16 S.Ct. 766, 778+, 162 U.S. 91, 125+, 40 L.Ed. 903, 903+ (U.S.Cal. Mar 16, 1896) (NO. 559)
- Y** 213 Belknap v. Schild, 16 S.Ct. 443, 445, 161 U.S. 10, 18, 40 L.Ed. 599, 599 (U.S.Cal. Feb 03, 1896) (NO. 22)
- Y** 214 Ritchie v. McMullen, 16 S.Ct. 171, 173, 159 U.S. 235, 241, 40 L.Ed. 133, 133, 8 Ohio F.Dec. 562, 562 (U.S.Ohio Jun 03, 1895) (NO. 15)
- H** 215 Roberts v. Northern Pac. R. Co., 15 S.Ct. 756, 763+, 158 U.S. 1, 22+, 39 L.Ed. 873, 873+ (U.S.Wis. Apr 22, 1895) (NO. 124) ""
- C** 216 State of California v. Southern Pac. Co., 15 S.Ct. 591, 607, 157 U.S. 229, 270, 39 L.Ed. 683, 683 (U.S.Cal. Mar 18, 1895) (NO. 7) (*in dissent*)
- T** 217 Interstate Commerce Commission v. Brimson, 14 S.Ct. 1125, 1132+, 154 U.S. 447, 475+, 38 L.Ed. 1047, 1047+ (U.S.Ill. May 26, 1894) (NO. 883) ""
- H** 218 The Haytian Republic, 14 S.Ct. 992, 995, 154 U.S. 118, 128, 38 L.Ed. 930, 930 (U.S.Or. May 26, 1894) (NO. 1,136)
- Y** 219 Reagan v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., 14 S.Ct. 1047, 1051, 154 U.S. 362, 389, 38 L.Ed. 1014, 1014 (U.S.Tex. May 26, 1894) (NO. 928)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- H** 220 *State of Tennessee v. Union & Planters' Bank*, 14 S.Ct. 654, 656, 152 U.S. 454, 459, 38 L.Ed. 511, 511 (U.S.Tenn. Mar 19, 1894) (NO. 1,020, 1,021, 761) ""
- Y** 221 *Fong Yue Ting v. U.S.*, 13 S.Ct. 1016, 1028, 149 U.S. 698, 729, 37 L.Ed. 905, 905 (U.S.N.Y. May 15, 1893) (NO. 1345, 1346, 1347)
- Y** 222 *Ex parte Tyler*, 13 S.Ct. 785, 792+, 149 U.S. 164, 188+, 37 L.Ed. 689, 689+ (U.S.S.C. Apr 24, 1893) (NO. 17 ORIGINAL)
- C** 223 *Cooke v. Avery*, 13 S.Ct. 340, 344, 147 U.S. 375, 385, 37 L.Ed. 209, 209 (U.S.Tex. Jan 23, 1893) (NO. 72)
- C** 224 *Petri v. Commercial Nat. Bank*, 12 S.Ct. 325, 326, 142 U.S. 644, 648, 35 L.Ed. 1144, 1144 (U.S.Tex. Jan 18, 1892)
- Y** 225 *Shelton v. Platt*, 11 S.Ct. 646, 648+, 139 U.S. 591, 598+, 35 L.Ed. 273, 273+ (U.S.Tenn. Apr 06, 1891)
- Y** 226 *Hans v. Louisiana*, 10 S.Ct. 504, 507, 134 U.S. 1, 16, 33 L.Ed. 842, 842 (U.S.La. Mar 03, 1890)
- Y** 227 *Lincoln County v. Luning*, 10 S.Ct. 363, 363, 133 U.S. 529, 530, 33 L.Ed. 766, 766 (U.S.Nev. Mar 03, 1890)
- Y** 228 *Smith v. Adams*, 9 S.Ct. 566, 568, 130 U.S. 167, 174, 32 L.Ed. 895, 895 (U.S.Dak. Apr 01, 1889) ""
- Y** 229 *In re Sawyer*, 8 S.Ct. 482, 495, 124 U.S. 200, 224, 31 L.Ed. 402, 402 (U.S.Neb. Jan 09, 1888) (*in dissent*)
- C** 230 *Hagood v. Southern*, 6 S.Ct. 608, 616+, 117 U.S. 52, 69+, 29 L.Ed. 805, 805+ (U.S.S.C. Mar 01, 1886) ""
- H** 231 *Starin v. City of New York*, 6 S.Ct. 28, 31+, 115 U.S. 248, 257+, 29 L.Ed. 388, 388+ (U.S.N.Y. Nov 02, 1885)
- Y** 232 *Provident Sav. Life Assur. Soc. v. Ford*, 5 S.Ct. 1104, 1108, 114 U.S. 635, 642, 29 L.Ed. 261, 261 (U.S.N.Y. May 04, 1885)
- H** 233 *Poindexter v. Greenhow*, 5 S.Ct. 962, 965, 114 U.S. 269, 330, 114 U.S. 330, 29 L.Ed. 207, 207 (U.S.Va. Apr 20, 1885) (*in dissent*)
- H** 234 *Allen v. Baltimore & O.R. Co.*, 5 S.Ct. 925, 927+, 114 U.S. 311, 314+, 29 L.Ed. 200, 200+ (U.S.Va. Apr 20, 1885)
- Y** 235 *Kansas Pac. Ry. Co. v. Atchison, T. & S.F.R. Co.*, 5 S.Ct. 208, 209+, 112 U.S. 414, 416+, 28 L.Ed. 794, 794+ (U.S.Kan. Oct Term 1884)
- C** 236 *Ames v. State of Kansas*, 4 S.Ct. 437, 443+, 111 U.S. 449, 462+, 28 L.Ed. 482, 482+ (U.S.Kan. Apr 21, 1884) ""
- C** 237 *Bors v. Preston*, 4 S.Ct. 407, 410+, 111 U.S. 252, 258+, 28 L.Ed. 419, 419+ (U.S.N.Y. Apr 07, 1884)
- Y** 238 *Cunningham v. Macon & B. R. Co.*, 3 S.Ct. 292, 298, 109 U.S. 446, 454, 27 L.Ed. 992, 992 (U.S.Ga. Dec 03, 1883)
- C** 239 *Cunningham v. Macon & B.R. Co.*, 3 S.Ct. 609, 612+, 109 U.S. 446, 462+, 27 L.Ed. 992, 992+ (U.S.Ga. Dec 03, 1883) (*in dissent*)
- Y** 240 *Western Union Telegraph Co. v. State of Texas*, 1881 WL 19926, *2, 105 U.S. 460, 460, 15 Otto 460, 460, 26 L.Ed. 1067, 1067 (U.S.Tex. Oct Term 1881)
- H** 241 *Newton v. Mahoning County Com'rs*, 1879 WL 16536, *11, 100 U.S. 548, 560, 10 Otto 548, 548, 25 L.Ed. 710, 710, 4 Ohio F.Dec. 555, 555 (U.S.Ohio Oct Term 1879)
- Y** 242 *Tennessee v. Davis*, 1879 WL 16560, *6, 100 U.S. 257, 264, 10 Otto 257, 257, 25 L.Ed. 648, 648 (U.S.Tenn. Oct Term 1879) ""
- C** 243 *Claflin v. Houseman*, 1876 WL 19239, *2+, 93 U.S. 130, 131+, 3 Otto 130, 130+, 23 L.Ed. 833, 833+, 15 N.B.R. 49, 49+ (U.S.N.Y. Oct Term 1876)
- H** 244 *Board of Liquidation v. McComb*, 1875 WL 17841, *8, 92 U.S. 531, 541, 2 Otto 531, 531, 23 L.Ed. 623, 623 (U.S.La. Oct Term 1875)
- Y** 245 *Case of Sewing Mach. Co.*, 1873 WL 15935, *7+, 85 U.S. 553, 561+, 21 L.Ed. 914, 914+, 18 Wall. 553, 553+ (U.S.Mass. Oct Term 1873)
- Y** 246 *Union Pac. R. Co. v. Peniston*, 1873 WL 16043, *8+, 85 U.S. 5, 15+, 21 L.Ed. 787, 787+, 18 Wall. 5, 5+ (U.S.Neb. Oct Term 1873)
- Y** 247 *Davis v. Gray*, 1872 WL 15325, *12+, 83 U.S. 203, 220+, 21 L.Ed. 447, 447+, 16 Wall. 203, 203+ (U.S.Tex. Dec Term 1872)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- H** 248 Society for Sav. v. Coite, 1867 WL 11203, *10, 73 U.S. 594, 607, 18 L.Ed. 897, 897, 6 Wall. 594, 594 (U.S.Conn. Dec Term 1867)
- ▶** 249 Com. of Kentucky v. Dennison, 1860 WL 9971, *15+, 65 U.S. 66, 88+, 24 How. 66, 66+, 16 L.Ed. 717, 717+ (U.S.Ky. Dec Term 1860)
- ▶** 250 Dodge v. Woolsey, 1855 WL 8235, *2+, 59 U.S. 331, 333+, 18 How. 331, 331+, 15 L.Ed. 401, 401+, 3 Ohio F.Dec. 300, 300+, 4 A.F.T.R. 4528, 4528+ (U.S.Ohio Dec Term 1855)
- C** 251 State of Florida v. State of Georgia, 1854 WL 7516, *18+, 58 U.S. 478, 499+, 17 How. 478, 478+, 15 L.Ed. 181, 181+ (U.S. Dec Term 1854) (*in dissent*)
- C** 252 Richmond, F. & P.R. Co. v. Louisa R. Co., 1851 WL 6700, *2, 54 U.S. 71, 72, 13 How. 71, 71, 14 L.Ed. 55, 55 (U.S.Va. Dec Term 1851)
- C** 253 Gill v. Oliver's Ex'rs, 1850 WL 6794, *5, 52 U.S. 529, 534, 11 How. 529, 529, 13 L.Ed. 799, 799 (U.S.Md. Dec Term 1850)
- C** 254 Irwin v. Dixion, 1850 WL 6874, *16+, 50 U.S. 10, 27+, 9 How. 10, 10+, 13 L.Ed. 25, 25+ (U.S.Dist.Col. Jan Term 1850)
- ▶** 255 Shelton v. Tiffin, 1848 WL 6433, *16, 47 U.S. 163, 182, 6 How. 163, 163, 12 L.Ed. 387, 387 (U.S.La. Jan Term 1848)
- ▶** 256 Garland v. Davis, 1846 WL 5722, *22, 45 U.S. 131, 154, 4 How. 131, 131, 11 L.Ed. 907, 907 (U.S.Dist.Col. Jan Term 1846)
- C** 257 Bonnafee v. Williams, 1845 WL 5991, *4, 44 U.S. 574, 576, 3 How. 574, 574, 11 L.Ed. 732, 732 (U.S.Miss. Jan Term 1845) ""
- ▶** 258 Louisville, C. & C.R. Co. v. Letson, 1844 WL 5963, *7+, 43 U.S. 497, 504+, 2 How. 497, 497+, 11 L.Ed. 353, 353+ (U.S.S.C. Jan Term 1844)
- ▶** 259 Dobbins v. Commissioners of Erie County, 1842 WL 5748, *5+, 41 U.S. 435, 441+, 16 Pet. 435, 435+, 10 L.Ed. 1022, 1022+, 4 A.F.T.R. 4507, 4507+ (U.S.Pa. Jan Term 1842)
- C** 260 Livingston's Ex'x v. Story, 1837 WL 3548, *30, 36 U.S. 351, 397, 11 Pet. 351, 351, 9 L.Ed. 746, 746 (U.S.La. Jan Term 1837) "" (*in dissent*)
- C** 261 Brent v. Bank of Washington, 1836 WL 3715, *14, 35 U.S. 596, 613, 10 Pet. 596, 596, 9 L.Ed. 547, 547 (U.S.Dist.Col. Jan Term 1836)
- H** 262 Vattier v. Hinde, 1833 WL 4222, *9, 32 U.S. 252, 263, 7 Pet. 252, 252, 8 L.Ed. 675, 675, 1 Ohio F.Dec. 438, 438 (U.S.Ohio Jan Term 1833)
- ▶** 263 Cherokee Nation v. State of Ga., 1831 WL 3974, *46, 30 U.S. 1, 69, 5 Pet. 1, 1, 8 L.Ed. 25, 25 (U.S.Ga. Jan Term 1831)
- H** 264 Van Ness v. City of Washington, 1830 WL 3900, *27, 29 U.S. 232, 273, 4 Pet. 232, 232, 7 L.Ed. 842, 842 (U.S.Dist.Col. Jan Term 1830)
- ▶** 265 Willson v. Black-Bird Creek Marsh Co., 1829 WL 3183, *6+, 27 U.S. 245, 252+, 2 Pet. 245, 245+, 7 L.Ed. 412, 412+ (U.S.Del. Jan Term 1829)
- H** 266 American Ins. Co. v. 356 Bales of Cotton, 1828 WL 2951, *15, 26 U.S. 511, 536, 1 Pet. 511, 511, 7 L.Ed. 242, 242 (U.S.S.C. Jan Term 1828)
- ▶** 267 Rosario Ortega v. Star-Kist Foods, Inc., 370 F.3d 124, 136+, Prod.Liab.Rep. (CCH) P 17,013, 17013+ (1st Cir.(Puerto Rico) Jun 02, 2004) (NO. 02-2530)
- C** 268 Sallen v. Corinthians Licenciamientos LTDA, 273 F.3d 14, 23+, 60 U.S.P.Q.2d 1941, 1941+ (1st Cir.(Mass.) Dec 05, 2001) (NO. 01-1197) (BNA Version)
- ▶** 269 In re Las Colinas Development Corp., 585 F.2d 7, 11, Bankr. L. Rep. P 67,002, 67002 (1st Cir.(Puerto Rico) Sep 21, 1978) (NO. 78-1148) ""
- ▶** 270 In re Victor Publishers, Inc., 545 F.2d 285, 286+ (1st Cir.(Mass.) Nov 29, 1976) (NO. 76-1325) ""
- C** 271 Manosky v. Bethlehem-Hingham Shipyard, 177 F.2d 529, 534, 17 Lab.Cas. P 65,412, 65412 (1st Cir.(Mass.) Nov 09, 1949) (NO. 4424)
- ▶** 272 Strachman v. Palmer, 177 F.2d 427, 431+, 12 A.L.R.2d 687, 687+ (1st Cir.(Mass.) Oct 26, 1949) (NO. 4418) ""
- H** 273 Quinones v. Landron, 99 F.2d 618, 620 (C.C.A.1 (Puerto Rico) Nov 05, 1938) (NO. 3336)
- ▶** 274 Veitia v. Fortuna Estates, 240 F. 256, 259, 153 C.C.A. 182, 182 (C.C.A.1 (Puerto Rico) Dec 29, 1917) (NO. 1224)
- H** 275 McCreery Engineering Co. v. Massachusetts Fan Co., 195 F. 498, 507, 115 C.C.A. 408, 408 (C.C.A.1 (Mass.) Apr 09, 1912) (NO. 937)

- 276 Underfeed Stoker Co. v. American Ship Windlass Co., 165 F. 65, 67 (C.C.D.R.I. Oct 03, 1908) (NO. 2669)
- 277 Union Trust Co. v. Stearns, 119 F. 790, 793 (C.C.D.R.I. Jan 06, 1903) (NO. 2615)
- 278 Chow Loy v. U.S., 112 F. 354, 359, 50 C.C.A. 279, 279 (C.C.A.1 (Me.) Nov 23, 1901) (NO. 402)
- 279 Head v. Porter, 48 F. 481, 482+ (C.C.D.Mass. Dec 03, 1891)
- 280 U S v. New Bedford Bridge, 27 F.Cas. 91, 102, 1 Woodb. & M. 401, 401, 10 Law Rep. 127, 127, No. 15,867, 15867 (C.C.D.Mass. Apr 15, 1847)
- 281 Poor v. Carleton, 19 F.Cas. 1013, 1015, 3 Sumn. 70, 70, No. 11,272, 11272 (C.C.D.Mass. Oct Term 1837)
- 282 Wood v. Mann, 30 F.Cas. 447, 449, 1 Sumn. 578, 578, No. 17,952, 17952 (C.C.D.Mass. May Term 1834)
- 283 Locke v. Postmaster General, 15 F.Cas. 736, 739, 3 Mason 446, 446, No. 8441, 8441 (C.C.D.Mass. Oct Term 1824)
- 284 In re Dairy Mart Convenience Stores, Inc., 411 F.3d 367, 368+, 60 ERC 1666, 1666+, 54 Collier Bankr.Cas.2d 673, 673+, 44 Bankr.Ct.Dec. 244, 244+, Bankr. L. Rep. P 80,326, 80326+ (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Jun 13, 2005) (NO. 04-1156-BK)
- 285 Jones v. Ford Motor Credit Co., 358 F.3d 205, 213, 57 Fed.R.Serv.3d 883, 883 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Feb 05, 2004) (NO. 03-7398)
- 286 Benjamin v. Jacobson, 172 F.3d 144, 180 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Mar 23, 1999) (NO. 96-7957) ""
- 287 Mizuna, Ltd. v. Crossland Federal Sav. Bank, 90 F.3d 650, 657 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Jul 25, 1996) (NO. 642, 95-7242)
- 288 Farid v. Smith, 850 F.2d 917, 922 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Jun 22, 1988) (NO. 328, 86-2007)
- 289 West 14th Street Commercial Corp. v. 5 West 14th Owners Corp., 815 F.2d 188, 192 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Mar 18, 1987) (NO. 86-7210, 27)
- 290 Jones v. Niagara Frontier Transp. Authority, 722 F.2d 20, 22 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Nov 23, 1983) (NO. 83-7086, 32) ""
- 291 Stone & Webster Engineering Corp. v. Ilesley, 690 F.2d 323, 326+, 3 Employee Benefits Cas. 2141, 2141+ (2nd Cir.(Conn.) Sep 30, 1982) (NO. 81-7640, 81-7660, 689, 990)
- 292 Verlinden B.V. v. Central Bank of Nigeria, 647 F.2d 320, 329+, 1981 A.M.C. 1630, 1630+ (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Apr 16, 1981) (NO. 80-7413, 643)
- 293 Federman v. Empire Fire and Marine Ins. Co., 597 F.2d 798, 809+, 27 Fed.R.Serv.2d 48, 48+ (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Apr 02, 1979) (NO. 273, 77-7232)
- 294 Oneida Indian Nation of New York State v. Oneida County, N. Y., 464 F.2d 916, 924 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Jul 12, 1972) (NO. 720, 72-1029) (*in dissent*)
- 295 Almenares v. Wyman, 453 F.2d 1075, 1085, 15 Fed.R.Serv.2d 771, 771 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Dec 10, 1971) (NO. 383, 71-2038)
- 296 T. B. Harms Co. v. Eliscu, 339 F.2d 823, 825, 144 U.S.P.Q. 46, 46 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Dec 23, 1964) (NO. 93, 28921) (BNA Version)
- 297 Schwartz v. Eaton, 264 F.2d 195, 197, 1 Fed.R.Serv.2d 780, 780 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Feb 24, 1959) (NO. 85, 25219)
- 298 Lewis v. Vendome Bags, 108 F.2d 16, 20, 43 U.S.P.Q. 477, 477 (C.C.A.2 (N.Y.) Dec 11, 1939) (NO. 76) "" (*in dissent*) (BNA Version)
- 299 Macintosh v. U. S., 42 F.2d 845, 849 (C.C.A.2 (Conn.) Jun 30, 1930) (NO. 341)
- 300 Deere v. St. Lawrence River Power Co., 32 F.2d 550, 552 (C.C.A.2 (N.Y.) May 06, 1929) (NO. 305)
- 301 Oliver American Trading Co. v. Government of U.S. of Mexico, 5 F.2d 659, 663 (C.C.A.2 (N.Y.) Dec 15, 1924) (NO. 96) ""
- 302 Providence Engineering Corporation v. Downey Shipbuilding Corporation, 294 F. 641, 649 (C.C.A.2 (N.Y.) Nov 05, 1923) (NO. 43)
- 303 Globe & Rutgers Fire Ins. Co. v. Hines, 273 F. 774, 778 (C.C.A.2 (N.Y.) May 19, 1921) (NO. 212) ""
- 304 New York Evening Post Co. v. Chaloner, 265 F. 204, 213 (C.C.A.2 (N.Y.) Feb 18, 1920) (NO. 120)
- 305 Yale College v. Sanger, 62 F. 177, 180 (C.C.D.Conn. Jun 26, 1894)
- 306 Hendee v. Connecticut & P.R.R. Co., 26 F. 677, 678, 23 Blatchf. 453, 453 (C.C.D.Vt. Mar 08, 1886)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 307 Stoe v. Flaherty, 436 F.3d 209, 217, 55 Collier Bankr.Cas.2d 724, 724, 45 Bankr.Ct.Dec. 265, 265, 11 Wage & Hour Cas.2d (BNA) 229, 229 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Jan 23, 2006) (NO. 04-3947)
- 308 In re TMI, 89 F.3d 1106, 1114, Nuclear Reg. Rep. P 20,579, 20579, 65 USLW 2092, 2092, 26 Env'tl. L. Rep. 21,569, 21569 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Jul 18, 1996) (NO. 94-7598)
- 309 Mitchum v. Hurt, 73 F.3d 30, 35, 11 IER Cases 441, 441 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Dec 29, 1995) (NO. 94-3358)
- 310 Bennett v. White, 865 F.2d 1395, 1407 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Jan 13, 1989) (NO. 88-1204, 88-1267)
- 311 Lentino v. Fringe Emp. Plans, Inc., 611 F.2d 474, 478, 28 Fed.R.Serv.2d 676, 676 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Dec 18, 1979) (NO. 78-1110)
- 312 McCahill v. Borough of Fox Chapel, 438 F.2d 213, 214 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Feb 10, 1971) (NO. 18940)
- 313 Simbraw, Inc. v. U.S., 367 F.2d 373, 374+ (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Oct 05, 1966) (NO. 15782) ""
- 314 American Dredging Co. v. Local 25, Marine Division, Intern. Union of Operating Engineers, AFL-CIO, 338 F.2d 837, 844, 57 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2407, 2407, 9 Fed.R.Serv.2d 54c.2, 1, 54c.2, 1, 50 Lab.Cas. P 19,294, 19294 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Oct 30, 1964) (NO. 14710) ""
- 315 Serio v. Liss, 300 F.2d 386, 388, 49 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2111, 2111, 43 Lab.Cas. P 17,270, 17270 (3rd Cir.(N.J.) Nov 17, 1961) (NO. 13571)
- 316 Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission v. Welsh, 188 F.2d 447, 450 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Apr 11, 1951) (NO. 10322, 10341) ""
- 317 Manufacturers' Land & Improvement Co. v. U.S. Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corp., 284 F. 231, 235 (C.C.A.3 (N.J.) Sep 28, 1922) (NO. 2852)
- 318 Gregg v. Sanford, 65 F. 151, 155, 12 C.C.A. 525, 525 (C.C.A.3 (Pa.) Jan 02, 1895)
- 319 Allstate Ins. Co. v. West Virginia State Bar, 233 F.3d 813, 817 (4th Cir.(W.Va.) Nov 30, 2000) (NO. 98-1537)
- 320 Ormet Corp. v. Ohio Power Co., 98 F.3d 799, 806, 65 USLW 2295, 2295, 43 ERC 1545, 1545, 27 Env'tl. L. Rep. 20,302, 20302 (4th Cir.(W.Va.) Oct 23, 1996) (NO. 95-1835) ""
- 321 Wissman v. Pittsburgh Nat. Bank, 942 F.2d 867, 871, 60 USLW 2222, 2222, 25 Collier Bankr.Cas.2d 605, 605, 21 Bankr.Ct.Dec. 1697, 1697, Bankr. L. Rep. P 74,225, 74225 (4th Cir.(W.Va.) Aug 21, 1991) (NO. 90-2726)
- 322 Perdue v. Roy Stone Transfer Corp., 690 F.2d 1091, 1097+, 29 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 1673, 1673+, 30 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 33,094, 33094+ (4th Cir.(Va.) Oct 05, 1982) (NO. 81-2171) (*in dissent*)
- 323 Cook v. Arentzen, 582 F.2d 870, 877, 18 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 1005, 1005, 17 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 8623, 8623 (4th Cir.(Va.) Sep 19, 1978) (NO. 76-1359)
- 324 O'Neill v. Early, 208 F.2d 286, 288 (4th Cir.(Va.) Nov 09, 1953) (NO. 6604)
- 325 International Refugee Organization v. Republic S.S. Corp., 189 F.2d 858, 861+ (4th Cir. May 11, 1951) (NO. 6202, 6245, 6249)
- 326 Smith v. Blackwell, 115 F.2d 186, 188 (C.C.A.4 (S.C.) Oct 21, 1940) (NO. 4710)
- 327 U.S. Galvanizing & Plating Equipment Corp. v. Hanson-Van Winkle-Munning Co., 104 F.2d 856, 860, 42 U.S.P.Q. 222, 222 (C.C.A.4 (W.Va.) Jun 12, 1939) (NO. 4429) (BNA Version)
- 328 Bellaire, Benwood & Wheeling Ferry Co. v. Interstate Bridge Co., 40 F.2d 323, 326 (C.C.A.4 (W.Va.) Apr 08, 1930) (NO. 2927) ""
- 329 Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Columbia, S.C., v. Mitchell, 21 F.2d 51, 54+ (C.C.A.4 (S.C.) Jul 05, 1927) (NO. 2591) (*in dissent*)
- 330 Lynchburg Traction & Light Co. v. City of Lynchburg, 16 F.2d 763, 765 (C.C.A.4 (Va.) Jan 11, 1927) (NO. 2551)
- 331 Murray v. Wilson Distilling Co., 164 F. 1, 18, 92 C.C.A. 1, 1 (C.C.A.4 (S.C.) Sep 15, 1908) (NO. 821)
- 332 Fleischman Co. v. Murray, 161 F. 152, 160 (C.C.D.S.C. Jan 29, 1908)
- 333 Montgomery v. City Council of Charleston, 99 F. 825, 832+, 40 C.C.A. 108, 108+, 48 L.R.A. 503, 503+ (C.C.A.4 (S.C.) Feb 06, 1900) (NO. 335) ""
- 334 Mills v. Green, 67 F. 818, 824+ (C.C.D.S.C. May 08, 1895)
- 335 Smith v. Bivens, 56 F. 352, 355 (C.C.D.S.C. May 19, 1893)
- 336 North Carolina v. Trustees of University, 18 F.Cas. 347, 347+, 1 Hughes 133, 133+, 65 N.C. 714, 714+, 5 N.B.R. 466, 466+, No. 10,318, 10318+ (C.C.D.N.C. 1871)

- 337 Gittings v. Crawford, 10 F.Cas. 447, 448+, Taney 1, 1+, No. 5465, 5465+ (C.C.D.Md. Apr Term 1838)
- 338 American Ins. Co. v. Canter, 1 F.Cas. 658, 658+, No. 302A, 302A+ (C.C.D.S.C. 1800)
- 339 Okpalobi v. Foster, 244 F.3d 405, 437 (5th Cir.(La.) Mar 12, 2001) (NO. 98-30228)
- 340 Willy v. Coastal Corp., 855 F.2d 1160, 1164, 57 USLW 2216, 2216, 12 Fed.R.Serv.3d 305, 305, 4 IER Cases 819, 819 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Sep 29, 1988) (NO. 86-2992)
- 341 U.S. v. St. Bernard Parish, 756 F.2d 1116, 1126 (5th Cir.(La.) Apr 08, 1985) (NO. 83-3557, 83-3760, 84-3082) ""
- 342 Superior Oil Co. v. Pioneer Corp., 706 F.2d 603, 605 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Jun 06, 1983) (NO. 82-1464)
- 343 Matter of Gary Aircraft Corp., 698 F.2d 775, 781, 8 Collier Bankr.Cas.2d 186, 186, Bankr. L. Rep. P 69,089, 69089, 30 Cont.Cas.Fed. (CCH) P 70,845, 70845 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Feb 25, 1983) (NO. 81-1391) ""
- 344 Southwest Exp. Co., Inc. v. I. C. C., 670 F.2d 53, 55+ (5th Cir. Mar 12, 1982) (NO. 81-4445)
- 345 American Civil Liberties Union of Mississippi, Inc. v. Finch, 638 F.2d 1336, 1340, 31 Fed.R.Serv.2d 380, 380 (5th Cir.(Miss.) Mar 13, 1981) (NO. 79-2175)
- 346 Huber, Hunt & Nichols, Inc. v. Architectural Stone Co., Inc., 625 F.2d 22, 24 (5th Cir.(La.) Aug 27, 1980) (NO. 78-2575)
- 347 Government Nat. Mortg. Ass'n v. Terry, 608 F.2d 614, 620, 51 A.L.R. Fed. 863, 863 (5th Cir.(Ga.) Dec 20, 1979) (NO. 77-1785)
- 348 Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Sumner Financial Corp., 602 F.2d 670, 679 (5th Cir.(Fla.) Sep 04, 1979) (NO. 76-2515)
- 349 Muzquiz v. City of San Antonio, 520 F.2d 993, 1000 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Oct 08, 1975) (NO. 74-3177)
- 350 Florida East Coast Ry. Co. v. U.S., 519 F.2d 1184, 1193 (5th Cir.(Fla.) Sep 29, 1975) (NO. 74-2861)
- 351 Hander v. San Jacinto Junior College, 519 F.2d 273, 278 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Sep 12, 1975) (NO. 74-2279) ""
- 352 International Ass'n of Machinists, AFL-CIO v. Central Airlines, Inc., 295 F.2d 209, 217, 49 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2016, 2016, 43 Lab.Cas. P 17,210, 17210 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Oct 13, 1961) (NO. 18286) ""
- 353 Boman v. Birmingham Transit Co., 292 F.2d 4, 25 (5th Cir.(Ala.) Apr 14, 1961) (NO. 18187) (*in dissent*)
- 354 Huckins v. Duval County, Fla., 286 F.2d 46, 48 (5th Cir.(Fla.) Dec 28, 1960) (NO. 18337) ""
- 355 International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL v. Jay-Ann Co., 228 F.2d 632, 635+, 37 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2323, 2323+, 29 Lab.Cas. P 69,680, 69680+ (5th Cir.(Tex.) Jan 11, 1956) (NO. 15636)
- 356 Kansas City Southern Ry. Co. v. Daniel, 180 F.2d 910, 914 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Mar 24, 1950) (NO. 12819)
- 357 N.L.R.B. v. Robbins Tire & Rubber Co., 161 F.2d 798, 803, 20 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2161, 2161, 12 Lab.Cas. P 63,776, 63776 (C.C.A.5 May 21, 1947) (NO. 11841)
- 358 Eighth Regional War Labor Board v. Humble Oil & Refining Co., 145 F.2d 462, 464, 15 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 740, 740, 9 Lab.Cas. P 62,456, 62456 (C.C.A.5 (Tex.) Dec 21, 1944) (NO. 11157)
- 359 U.S. ex rel. Metzger v. City of Vero Beach, 90 F.2d 70, 72 (C.C.A.5 (Fla.) May 19, 1937) (NO. 8390) ""
- 360 Ryan v. Amazon Petroleum Corp., 71 F.2d 1, 4 (C.C.A.5 (Tex.) May 22, 1934) (NO. 7350)
- 361 Rodgers v. Bromberg, 53 F.2d 723, 723 (C.C.A.5 (Tex.) Nov 24, 1931) (NO. 6318)
- 362 American Bank & Trust Co. v. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, 269 F. 4, 6 (C.C.A.5 (Ga.) Nov 19, 1920) (NO. 3552)
- 363 Alabama Great Southern Ry. Co. v. American Cotton Oil Co., 229 F. 11, 19+, 143 C.C.A. 313, 313+ (C.C.A.5 (Miss.) Jan 10, 1916) (NO. 2786)
- 364 Florida C. & P.R. Co. v. Bell, 87 F. 369, 374, 31 C.C.A. 9, 9 (C.C.A.5 (Fla.) May 24, 1898) (NO. 599)
- 365 McComb v. Board of Liquidation, 15 F.Cas. 1288, 1290+, 2 Woods 48, 48+, 7 Chi.Leg.N. 251, 251+, No. 8707, 8707+ (C.C.D.La. Nov Term 1874)
- 366 Bird v. Cockrem, 3 F.Cas. 429, 429, 2 Woods 32, 32, No. 1429, 1429 (C.C.D.La. Apr Term 1874)

- 367 Robinson v. Michigan Consol. Gas Co. Inc., 918 F.2d 579, 585, 24 Collier Bankr.Cas.2d 49, 49, 17 Fed.R.Serv.3d 1145, 1145, 20 Bankr.Ct.Dec. 1971, 1971, Bankr. L. Rep. P 73,720, 73720 (6th Cir.(Mich.) Nov 01, 1990) (NO. 89-2097, 89-2098)
- 368 Com. of Ky. v. Long, 837 F.2d 727, 742 (6th Cir.(Ky.) Jan 21, 1988) (NO. 86-5842) ""
- 369 Geeslin v. Merriman, 527 F.2d 452, 455 (6th Cir.(Ohio) Dec 15, 1975) (NO. 74-1435)
- 370 Krause v. Rhodes, 471 F.2d 430, 451+ (6th Cir.(Ohio) Nov 17, 1972) (NO. 71-1622, 71-1624, 71-1623) (*in dissent*)
- 371 U.S. v. Reagan, 453 F.2d 165, 173 (6th Cir.(Ohio) Dec 09, 1971) (NO. 71-1262)
- 372 Toledo Fence & Post Co. v. Lyons, 290 F. 637, 642+, 1 Ohio Law Abs. 810, 810+ (C.C.A.6 (Ohio) Jun 06, 1923) (NO. 3904)
- 373 Union & Planters' Bank of Memphis v. City of Memphis, 111 F. 561, 563, 49 C.C.A. 455, 455 (C.C.A.6 (Tenn.) Oct 21, 1901) (NO. 924) ""
- 374 Marrs v. Felton, 102 F. 775, 779 (C.C.D.Ky. Jun 23, 1900)
- 375 Bank of Kentucky v. Stone, 88 F. 383, 392+ (C.C.D.Ky. Jun 04, 1898) (NO. 6555) ""
- 376 Grether v. Wright, 75 F. 742, 749+, 10 Ohio F.Dec. 49, 49+, 23 C.C.A. 498, 498+ (C.C.A.6 (Ohio) Jul 08, 1896) (NO. 399) ""
- 377 Woolsey v. Dodge, 30 F.Cas. 606, 607, 6 McLean 142, 142, 3 Ohio F.Dec. 228, 228, No. 18,032, 18032 (C.C.D.Ohio Oct Term 1854) ""
- 378 Foote v. Linck, 9 F.Cas. 366, 367, 5 McLean 616, 616, 3 Ohio F.Dec. 115, 115, No. 4913, 4913 (C.C.D.Ohio Oct Term 1853)
- 379 Carroll v. Perry, 5 F.Cas. 167, 168, 4 McLean 25, 25, No. 2456, 2456 (C.C.D.Mich. Jun Term 1845)
- 380 American Deposit Corp. v. Schacht, 84 F.3d 834, 858+, 64 USLW 2725, 2725+ (7th Cir.(Ill.) May 13, 1996) (NO. 95-2462) "" (*in dissent*)
- 381 Christianson v. Colt Industries Operating Corp., 798 F.2d 1051, 1059, 55 USLW 2203, 2203, 230 U.S.P.Q. 840, 840, 1986-2 Trade Cases P 67,252, 67252 (7th Cir.(Ill.) Aug 19, 1986) (NO. 86-1145) (BNA Version)
- 382 Local Division 519, Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO v. LaCrosse Municipal Transit Utility, 585 F.2d 1340, 1345+, 99 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2955, 2955+ (7th Cir.(Wis.) Oct 19, 1978) (NO. 77-1981)
- 383 Strong Delivery Ministry Ass'n v. Board of Appeals of Cook County, 543 F.2d 32, 33+ (7th Cir.(Ill.) Oct 27, 1976) (NO. 76-1451, 76-1721) ""
- 384 Jordan v. Weaver, 472 F.2d 985, 991+ (7th Cir.(Ill.) Jan 18, 1973) (NO. 72-1380, 72-1381)
- 385 Littleton v. Berbling, 468 F.2d 389, 412, 16 Fed.R.Serv.2d 798, 798 (7th Cir.(Ill.) Oct 06, 1972) (NO. 71-1395)
- 386 Akron, C & Y. R. Co. v. Barnes, 215 F.2d 423, 431, 34 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2683, 2683, 26 Lab.Cas. P 68,618, 68618 (7th Cir.(Ill.) Aug 10, 1954) (NO. 11116-11161) (*in dissent*)
- 387 Winsor v. Daumit, 185 F.2d 41, 43, 87 U.S.P.Q. 340, 340 (7th Cir.(Ill.) Nov 08, 1950) (NO. 9993) (BNA Version)
- 388 Toledo, P. & W. R. R. v. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Enterprise Lodge No. 27, 132 F.2d 265, 273 (C.C.A.7 (Ill.) Dec 16, 1942) (NO. 7951) "" (*in dissent*)
- 389 Williamson v. Missouri-Kansas Pipe Line Co., 56 F.2d 503, 507 (C.C.A.7 (Ill.) Feb 29, 1932) (NO. 4676)
- 390 Hiatt v. U.S., 4 F.2d 374, 376 (C.C.A.7 (Ind.) Dec 18, 1924) (NO. 3440)
- 391 Harvey v. Harvey, 290 F. 653, 660 (C.C.A.7 (Wis.) May 03, 1923) (NO. 3188, 3193)
- 392 Kaiser v. Memorial Blood Center of Minneapolis, Inc., 938 F.2d 90, 93, 60 USLW 2107, 2107 (8th Cir.(Minn.) Apr 10, 1991) (NO. 89-5533)
- 393 U.S. v. City of Adair, 539 F.2d 1185, 1190 (8th Cir.(Iowa) Aug 10, 1976) (NO. 75-1608)
- 394 In re Weitzman, 426 F.2d 439, 444 (8th Cir.(Minn.) Apr 07, 1970) (NO. 19446) "" (*in dissent*)
- 395 Wihtol v. Crow, 309 F.2d 777, 781, 135 U.S.P.Q. 385, 385 (8th Cir.(Iowa) Nov 27, 1962) (NO. 16963) (BNA Version)
- 396 Brewer v. Hoxie School Dist. No. 46 of Lawrence County, Ark., 238 F.2d 91, 100 (8th Cir.(Ark.) Oct 25, 1956) (NO. 15510)
- 397 U.S. v. 1,997.66 Acres of Land, More or Less, in Polk County, Iowa, 137 F.2d 8, 14 (C.C.A.8 (Iowa) Jul 07, 1943) (NO. 12483)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 398 Maryland Cas. Co. v. Tindall, 117 F.2d 905, 908 (C.C.A.8 (Mo.) Feb 18, 1941) (NO. 11790)
- 399 Federal Land Bank of Omaha v. U.S. Nat. Bank, 13 F.2d 36, 38 (C.C.A.8 (Neb.) May 25, 1926) (NO. 7155)
- 400 Weeks v. Goltra, 7 F.2d 838, 845, 1926 A.M.C. 175 (C.C.A.8 (Mo.) Jul 23, 1925) (NO. 6871)
- 401 Jackson v. Gates Oil Co., 297 F. 549, 551 (C.C.A.8 (Okla.) Mar 31, 1924) (NO. 6358) ""
- 402 Polk County, Iowa, v. Burns, 247 F. 399, 401, 159 C.C.A. 453, 453 (C.C.A.8 (Iowa) Dec 27, 1917) (NO. 174)
- 403 Aaron v. U.S., 155 F. 833, 836, 84 C.C.A. 67, 67 (C.C.A.8 (Mo.) Jun 29, 1907) (NO. 2161) ""
- 404 Starr v. Chicago, R.I. & P. Ry. Co., 110 F. 3, 7 (C.C.D.Neb. Apr 25, 1901)
- 405 In re Gasser, 104 F. 537, 538, 44 C.C.A. 20, 20 (C.C.A.8 Oct 15, 1900) (NO. 16)
- 406 Minneapolis Brewing Co. v. McGillivray, 104 F. 258, 270 (C.C.D.S.D. Oct 08, 1900)
- 407 In re Fair, 100 F. 149, 151 (C.C.D.Neb. Mar 23, 1900) ""
- 408 In re Stutsman County, 88 F. 337, 342 (C.C.D.N.D. Jun 24, 1898) ""
- 409 Cobb v. Clough, 83 F. 604, 609 (C.C.D.Minn. Jun 24, 1897)
- 410 St. Paul, M. & M. Ry. Co. v. St. Paul & N.P.R. Co., 68 F. 2, 10, 15 C.C.A. 167, 167 (C.C.A.8 (Minn.) May 06, 1895) (NO. 455, 456)
- 411 State of Wisconsin v. City of Duluth, 30 F.Cas. 382, 384, 2 Dill. 406, 406, 5 Am. Law T. Rep. U.S. Cts. 299, 299, 11 Am. Law Reg. (N.S.) 709, 709, 4 Chi.Leg.N. 405, 405, 29 Leg.Int. 268, 268, No. 17,902, 17902, 7 Am. Law Rev. 369, 369 (C.C.D.Minn. Jun 1872)
- 412 Ruud v. U.S. Dept. of Labor, 347 F.3d 1086, 1089, 20 IER Cases 889, 889, 2003 Daily Journal D.A.R. 11,597, 11597 (9th Cir. Oct 22, 2003) (NO. 02-71742)
- 413 Douglas J. CRAWFORD, Appellant, v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, Appellee., 2000 WL 33983585, *33983585+ (Appellate Brief.) (9th Cir. Jun 12, 2000) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 00-70173)
- 414 K.V. Mart Co. v. United Food and Commercial Workers Intern. Union, Local 324, 173 F.3d 1221, 1225+, 161 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2001, 2001+, 138 Lab.Cas. P 10,431, 10431+, 99 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 2714, 2714+, 1999 Daily Journal D.A.R. 3519, 3519+ (9th Cir.(Cal.) Apr 14, 1999) (NO. 97-56055)
- 415 Brockman v. Merabank, 40 F.3d 1013, 1018+ (9th Cir.(Ariz.) Nov 17, 1994) (NO. 93-15505)
- 416 In re Estate of Ferdinand Marcos, Human Rights Litigation, 25 F.3d 1467, 1473 (9th Cir.(Hawai'i) Jun 16, 1994) (NO. 92-15526)
- 417 U.S. v. Simpson, 927 F.2d 1088, 1090, 59 USLW 2603, 2603 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Mar 06, 1991) (NO. 89-50196) ""
- 418 Ethridge v. Harbor House Restaurant, 861 F.2d 1389, 1394, 57 USLW 2337, 2337, 130 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2001, 2001, 110 Lab.Cas. P 10,862, 10862 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Nov 17, 1988) (NO. 87-5776, 87-6379)
- 419 People of State of Cal. v. Mesa, 813 F.2d 960, 968 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Mar 26, 1987) (NO. 86-1525, 86-1500) (*in dissent*)
- 420 U.S. v. Gatto, 763 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Jun 14, 1985) (NO. 84-1121, 84-1133)
- 421 Hunter v. United Van Lines, 746 F.2d 635, 645, 40 Fed.R.Serv.2d 581, 581 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Nov 05, 1984) (NO. 83-5911)
- 422 Demery v. Kupperman, 735 F.2d 1139, 1145 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Jun 22, 1984) (NO. 82-5710)
- 423 McKeel v. Islamic Republic of Iran, 722 F.2d 582, 586 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Dec 30, 1983) (NO. 82-5111, 82-5114, 82-5115, 82-5116, 82-5117, 82-5417)
- 424 Guinasso v. Pacific First Federal Sav. and Loan Ass'n, 656 F.2d 1364, 1367 (9th Cir.(Or.) Sep 21, 1981) (NO. 80-3099)
- 425 State of Ariz. v. Manypenny, 608 F.2d 1197, 1203 (9th Cir.(Ariz.) Jul 09, 1979) (NO. 77-3453) (*in dissent*)
- 426 Keaukaha-Panaewa Community Ass'n v. Hawaiian Homes Commission, 588 F.2d 1216, 1225 (9th Cir.(Hawai'i) Sep 18, 1978) (NO. 77-1044)
- 427 Mailloux v. Mailloux, 554 F.2d 976, 977+ (9th Cir.(Guam) May 31, 1977) (NO. 75-2898, 76-1836)
- 428 Fort Mojave Tribe v. Lafollette, 478 F.2d 1016, 1018, 17 Fed.R.Serv.2d 467, 467 (9th Cir.(Ariz.) May 16, 1973) (NO. 71-1967)
- 429 Murphy v. Kodz, 351 F.2d 163, 166+ (9th Cir.(Ariz.) Sep 21, 1965) (NO. 19508) ""
- 430 Kronberg v. Hale, 180 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Feb 07, 1950) (NO. 12292)

- 431 Columbia Valley R. Co. v. Portland & S. Ry. Co., 162 F. 603, 605+, 89 C.C.A. 361, 361+ (C.C.A.9 (Wash.) May 04, 1908) (NO. 1500)
- 432 State of Oregon v. Three Sisters Irr. Co., 158 F. 346, 350 (C.C.D.Or. Dec 30, 1907) (NO. 3191)
- 433 Miocene Ditch Co v. Moore, 150 F. 483, 493, 80 C.C.A. 301, 301, 2 Alaska Fed. 685, 704 (C.C.A.9 (Alaska) Feb 04, 1907) (NO. 1254)
- 434 Low Foon Yin v. U.S. Immigration Com'r, 145 F. 791, 796, 76 C.C.A. 355, 355 (C.C.A.9 (Cal.) May 14, 1906) (NO. 1256)
- 435 National Bank of Commerce v. Wade, 84 F. 10, 12 (C.C.D.Wash. Dec 04, 1897)
- 436 Wise v. Nixon, 76 F. 3, 5 (C.C.D.Nev. Aug 24, 1896) (NO. 620) ""
- 437 McConnaughy v. Pennoyer, 43 F. 196, 199, 14 Sawy. 584, 584 (C.C.D.Or. Jul 28, 1890)
- 438 Hughes v. Northern Pac. Ry. Co., 18 F. 106, 111+, 9 Sawy. 313, 313+ (C.C.D.Or. Oct 29, 1883)
- 439 San Mateo County v. Southern Pac. R. Co., 13 F. 145, 148, 7 Sawy. 517, 517 (C.C.D.Cal. 1882)
- 440 Bancroft v. Thayer, 2 F.Cas. 580, 581, 5 Sawy. 502, 502, 8 Am. Law Rec. 257, 257, 11 Chi.Leg.N. 304, 304, 25 Int.Rev.Rec. 305, 305, No. 835, 835 (C.C.D.Or. May 14, 1879)
- 441 Adams v. Bradley, 1 F.Cas. 93, 95+, 5 Sawy. 217, 217+, No. 48, 48+ (C.C.D.Nev. Aug 1878)
- 442 Dowell v. Griswold, 7 F.Cas. 996, 998, 5 Sawy. 39, 39, 10 Chi.Leg.N. 107, 107, 24 Int.Rev.Rec. 28, 28, No. 4041, 4041 (C.C.D.Or. Nov 26, 1877) ""
- 443 In re Oregon Bulletin Printing & Publishing Co., 18 F.Cas. 780, 781, 3 Sawy. 529, 529, 14 N.B.R. 394, 394, 8 Chi.Leg.N. 143, 143, No. 10,560, 10560 (C.C.D.Or. Dec 14, 1875)
- 444 Magee v. Union Pac. R. Co., 16 F.Cas. 390, 390, 2 Sawy. 447, 447, No. 8945, 8945 (C.C.D.Nev. Aug 04, 1873)
- 445 Dick v. Hamilton, 7 F.Cas. 660, 662, Deady 322, 322, No. 3890, 3890 (C.C.D.Or. Dec 02, 1867)
- 446 Tal v. Hogan, 453 F.3d 1244, 1254, 2006-1 Trade Cases P 75,319, 75319, RICO Bus.Disp.Guide 11,095, 11095 (10th Cir.(Okla.) Jun 29, 2006) (NO. 03-6293) ""
- 447 Wyoming v. Livingston, 443 F.3d 1211, 1217, 36 Env'tl. L. Rep. 20,071, 20071 (10th Cir.(Wyo.) Apr 06, 2006) (NO. 04-8085, 04-8087) ""
- 448 Simmat v. U.S. Bureau of Prisons, 413 F.3d 1225, 1231+ (10th Cir.(Kan.) Jul 01, 2005) (NO. 03-3361)
- 449 Texaco Inc. v. Phillips Petroleum Co., 481 F.2d 70, 73 (10th Cir.(Okla.) Jul 13, 1973) (NO. 72-1758) (*in dissent*)
- 450 Flora Const. Co. v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co., 307 F.2d 413, 414 (10th Cir.(Colo.) Aug 02, 1962) (NO. 7009)
- 451 Lawrence Nat. Bank v. Rice, 83 F.2d 642, 644+ (C.C.A.10 (Kan.) Apr 30, 1936) (NO. 1254)
- 452 Larabee v. Dolley, 175 F. 365, 384+ (C.C.D.Kan. Dec 23, 1909)
- 453 Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Boyle, 82 F. 705, 710 (C.C.D.Kan. Sep 27, 1897)
- 454 State of Kansas v. Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co., 77 F. 339, 344 (C.C.D.Kan. Dec 07, 1896) (NO. 7391)
- 455 M. Schandler Bottling Co. v. Welch, 42 F. 561, 565 (C.C.D.Kan. Jul 18, 1890)
- 456 Tuchman v. Welch, 42 F. 548, 550 (C.C.D.Kan. Jul 16, 1890)
- 457 Adams Exp. Co. v. Denver & R. G. Ry. Co., 16 F. 712, 716, 4 McCrary 77, 77 (C.C.D.Colo. Jun 06, 1883)
- 458 Myers v. Union Pac R Co, 16 F. 292, 293+, 3 McCrary 578, 578+ (C.C.D.Kan. Feb 1882)
- 459 Schuelenburg v. Martin, 2 F. 747, 750, 1 Ky.L.Rptr. 201, 201, 1 McCrary 348, 348 (C.C.D.Kan. Jun 14, 1880)
- 460 Foss v. First Nat. Bank, 3 F. 185, 187, 1 McCrary 474, 474 (C.C.D.Colo. 1880)
- 461 Ortega v. Bibb County School Dist., 397 F.3d 1321, 1326, 18 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. C 196, 196 (11th Cir.(Ga.) Jan 26, 2005) (NO. 04-10314) ""
- 462 Allapattah Services, Inc. v. Exxon Corp., 362 F.3d 739, 765, 17 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. C 294, 294 (11th Cir.(Fla.) Mar 15, 2004) (NO. 01-15575, 01-16244) (*in dissent*)
- 463 Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta v. Thomas, 220 F.3d 1235, 1240+, 13 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. C 914, 914+ (11th Cir.(Ala.) Jul 31, 2000) (NO. 99-13824)
- 464 Bartels v. Alabama Commercial College, Inc., 54 F.3d 702, 707, 63 USLW 2800, 2800, 100 Ed. Law Rep. 560, 560 (11th Cir.(Ga.) Jun 13, 1995) (NO. 94-8607)
- 465 Jackson v. Georgia Dept. of Transp., 16 F.3d 1573, 1576, 62 USLW 2619, 2619 (11th Cir.(Ga.) Mar 25, 1994) (NO. 92-8334)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 466 Reshard v. Britt, 819 F.2d 1573, 1583, 56 USLW 2030, 2030 (11th Cir.(Fla.) Jun 26, 1987) (NO. 86-3641) (*in dissent*)
- 467 McDougald v. Jenson, 786 F.2d 1465, 1478 (11th Cir.(Fla.) Apr 21, 1986) (NO. 84-3808)
- 468 Central of Georgia Ry. Co. v. Railroad Commission of Alabama, 161 F. 925, 959+ (C.C.M.D.Ala. Mar 21, 1908)
- 469 Louisville & N.R. Co. v. Railroad Commission of Alabama, 157 F. 944, 959 (C.C.M.D.Ala. Sep 04, 1907)
- 470 Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co. v. Railroad Commission of Alabama, 155 F. 792, 808 (C.C.M.D.Ala. Jul 14, 1907)
- 471 Bank of U.S. v. Deveaux, 2 F.Cas. 692, 694, No. 916, 916 (C.C.D.Ga. May Term 1808)
- 472 Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co., 810 F.2d 1561, 1570, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1593, 1593 (Fed.Cir.(Ill.) Jan 23, 1987) (NO. 85-1144) "" (BNA Version)
- 473 Wyden v. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, 807 F.2d 934, 937, 55 USLW 2321, 2321, 231 U.S.P.Q. 918, 918 (Fed.Cir.(Dist.Col.) Nov 25, 1986) (NO. 86-554) "" (*in dissent*) (BNA Version)
- 474 Martin v. Malhoyt, 830 F.2d 237, 250, 56 USLW 2291, 2291, 265 U.S.App.D.C. 89, 102 (D.C.Cir. Sep 29, 1987) (NO. 86-5561, 86-5565)
- 475 Best v. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, 822 F.2d 1198, 1200, 262 U.S.App.D.C. 136, 138 (D.C.Cir. Jul 10, 1987) (NO. 85-6214)
- 476 Tel-Oren v. Libyan Arab Republic, 726 F.2d 774, 787, 233 U.S.App.D.C. 384, 397 (D.C.Cir. Feb 03, 1984) (NO. 81-1870, 81-1871)
- 477 Neidhart v. Neidhart S.A., 510 F.2d 760, 768, 166 U.S.App.D.C. 380, 388, 184 U.S.P.Q. 393, 393 (D.C.Cir. Jan 10, 1975) (NO. 72-1792, 73-1181) (*in dissent*) (BNA Version)
- 478 Spriggs v. Wilson, 467 F.2d 382, 391, 151 U.S.App.D.C. 328, 337 (D.C.Cir. Jul 27, 1972) (NO. 24719)
- 479 Powell v. McCormack, 395 F.2d 577, 589, 129 U.S.App.D.C. 354, 366 (D.C.Cir. Feb 28, 1968) (NO. 20897)
- 480 Communist Party of U. S. A. v. C. I. R., 332 F.2d 325, 328, 118 U.S.App.D.C. 125, 128, 13 A.F.T.R.2d 1167, 1167, 64-1 USTC P 9385, 9385 (D.C.Cir. Apr 09, 1964) (NO. 17564) ""
- 481 Application of President and Directors of Georgetown College, Inc., 331 F.2d 1000, 1003, 9 A.L.R.3d 1367, 1367, 118 U.S.App.D.C. 80, 83 (D.C.Cir. Feb 03, 1964) (NO. MISC. 2189)
- 482 Lapidus v. Clark, 176 F.2d 619, 622, 85 U.S.App.D.C. 101, 104 (D.C.Cir. May 23, 1949) (NO. 9984) "" (*in dissent*)
- 483 Booth v. Fletcher, 101 F.2d 676, 683, 69 App.D.C. 351, 358 (App.D.C. Dec 19, 1938) (NO. 6950)
- 484 Thompson v. Deal, 92 F.2d 478, 483+, 67 App.D.C. 327, 332+ (App.D.C. Jun 28, 1937) (NO. 6695)
- 485 Haskins Bros. & Co. v. Morgenthau, 85 F.2d 677, 683+, 66 App.D.C. 178, 184+, 36-2 USTC P 9395, 9395+, 18 A.F.T.R. 498, 498+ (App.D.C. Jun 30, 1936) (NO. 6710)
- 486 McAdoo v. Ormes, 47 App.D.C. 364, 369, 1918 WL 18240, *3 (App.D.C. Feb 04, 1918) (NO. 3078)
- 487 Champion Coated Paper Co. v. Joint Committee on Printing of Congress, 47 App.D.C. 141, 143, 1917 WL 20133, *2 (App.D.C. Dec 03, 1917) (NO. 3114)
- 488 Goldsmith v. Valentine, 36 App.D.C. 63, 66, 1910 WL 20773, *2 (App.D.C. Dec 05, 1910) (NO. 2223)
- 489 Fried, Krupp Aktiengesellschaft v. Crozier, 32 App.D.C. 1, 5, 1908 WL 27874, *3, 15 Am. Ann. Cas. 1108, 1108 (App.D.C. Oct 07, 1908) (NO. 1877)
- 490 In re Macfarland, 30 App.D.C. 365, 386+, 1908 WL 27947, *13+ (App.D.C. Feb 11, 1908) (NO. 283) ""
- 491 District of Columbia v. Ball, 22 App.D.C. 543, 548, 1903 WL 18625, *3 (App.D.C. Nov 04, 1903) (NO. 1352)
- 492 U.S. ex rel. Deffer v. Kimball, 7 App.D.C. 499, 506, 1896 WL 14751, *4 (App.D.C. Jan 06, 1896) (NO. 498)
- 493 Twin City Nat. Bank of New Brighton v. Nebeker, 3 App.D.C. 190, 193, 1894 WL 11849, *3 (App.D.C. Apr 16, 1894) (NO. 250)

- 494 Tyler v. Walker, 24 F.Cas. 469, 470+, 2 Hay. & Haz. 35, 35+, No. 14311A, 14311A+ (C.C.D.C. Jan 03, 1851)
- H 495 U.S. ex rel. Stokes v. Kendall, 26 F.Cas. 702, 742+, 5 Cranch C.C. 163, 163+, 5 D.C. 163, 163+, No. 15,517, 15517+ (C.C.D.C. Jul 13, 1837) ""
- C 496 Lewis v. Nextel Communications, Inc., 281 F.Supp.2d 1302, 1303 (N.D.Ala. Sep 04, 2003) (NO. CIV.A. 03AR2277S)
- C 497 Wynn ex rel. Alabama v. Philip Morris, Inc., 51 F.Supp.2d 1232, 1240 (N.D.Ala. Apr 28, 1999) (NO. CV 98-BU-1597-S)
- H 498 Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey v. U.S., 25 F.2d 480, 484, 1928 A.M.C. 1134, 1134 (S.D.Ala. Apr 13, 1928)
- C 499 State of Alabama v. Acacia Mut. Life Ass'n, 3 F.2d 697, 700 (M.D.Ala. 1925) (NO. 2220)
- C 500 Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Julian, 169 F. 166, 169 (C.C.N.D.Ala. Apr 19, 1909)
- C 501 Southern Express Co. v. City of Ensley, 116 F. 756, 761 (C.C.N.D.Ala. Jul 26, 1902)
- C 502 Berger v. Ohlson, 1938 WL 1189, *4, 9 Alaska 389, 397 (D.Alaska Terr. 1938)
- Y 503 Territory v. Annette Island Packing Co., 1922 WL 44, *18, 6 Alaska 585, 625 (D.Alaska Terr. Jun 13, 1922) (NO. 2023-A)
- H 504 Bonnifield v. Thorp, 71 F. 924, 927, 1 Alaska Fed. 414, 418 (D.Alaska Jan 25, 1896) (NO. 439)
- C 505 A & W Oil Co. v. Texaco, Inc., 51 F.R.D. 283, 286, 14 Fed.R.Serv.2d 1429 (W.D.Ark. Dec 30, 1970) (NO. FS-70-C-50)
- H 506 State of Ark. ex rel. Bennett by Switzer v. Texas Gas Transmission Corp., 171 F.Supp. 413, 414+ (E.D.Ark. Mar 06, 1959) (NO. CIV 3588) ""
- H 507 Young v. Garrett, 5 F.R.D. 117, 121 (W.D.Ark. Feb 28, 1946) (NO. 163, 164) ""
- T 508 Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Andrews, 154 F. 95, 98+ (C.C.E.D.Ark. Jun 22, 1907)
- C 509 Farmers' Nat. Bank v. Jones, 105 F. 459, 462+ (C.C.E.D.Ark. Dec 29, 1900)
- H 510 Briscoe v. Southern Kansas Ry. Co., 40 F. 273, 277+ (C.C.W.D.Ark. Oct 05, 1889)
- C 511 Buckner v. Street, 4 F.Cas. 578, 582, 1 Dill. 248, 248, 7 N.B.R. 255, 255, 13 Int.Rev.Rec. 114, 114, No. 2098, 2098 (C.C.E.D.Ark. 1871)
- C 512 Reisner v. Regents of University of California, 1991 WL 571161, *2 (C.D.Cal. Aug 22, 1991) (NO. CV-91-1252-JMI (JRX))
- C 513 Johnson v. Smith, 630 F.Supp. 1, 2, 121 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 3320, 3320, 40 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 1044, 1044, 40 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 36,344, 36344, 106 Lab.Cas. P 55,742, 55742 (N.D.Cal. Feb 13, 1986) (NO. C 85-0145 SW)
- C 514 Burton v. U.S. Olympic Committee, 574 F.Supp. 517, 522+ (C.D.Cal. Nov 01, 1983) (NO. CV 83-3088 MRP)
- T 515 Gabel v. Hughes Air Corp., 350 F.Supp. 612, 619, 31 A.L.R. Fed. 253, 253 (C.D.Cal. Oct 12, 1972) (NO. CIV. A. 71-1595-PH, M.D.L.106) ""
- C 516 U. S. to Use of Claude C. Wood Co. v. General Ins. Co. of America, 247 F.Supp. 543, 545 (N.D.Cal. Nov 16, 1965) (NO. CIV. 9146)
- C 517 Adams v. State of Cal., 176 F.Supp. 456, 459 (N.D.Cal. Sep 01, 1959) (NO. CIV. 7806)
- H 518 U.S. v. Public Utilities Commission of Cal., 141 F.Supp. 168, 190, 14 P.U.R.3d 300, 300 (N.D.Cal. Apr 30, 1956) (NO. 35101)
- T 519 Rank v. Krug, 142 F.Supp. 1, 63+ (S.D.Cal. Feb 07, 1956) (NO. 685-ND)
- Y 520 Hartley Pen Co. v. Lindy Pen Co., 16 F.R.D. 141, 152, 102 U.S.P.Q. 151, 151 (S.D.Cal. Jun 28, 1954) (NO. CIV. 15367) (BNA Version)
- T 521 Smith v. Sperling, 117 F.Supp. 781, 796+ (S.D.Cal. Dec 16, 1953) (NO. CIV. 9005)
- H 522 First Nat. Ben. Soc. v. Garrison, 58 F.Supp. 972, 991+ (S.D.Cal. Jan 16, 1945) (NO. CIV. 3895 O'C)
- C 523 U.S. v. Kusche, 56 F.Supp. 201, 238 (S.D.Cal. Jun 13, 1944) (NO. CIV. 2425-PH)
- C 524 Allen v. Clark, 22 F.Supp. 898, 900+ (S.D.Cal. Mar 29, 1938) (NO. 8158-Y)
- C 525 Rosenberg Bros. & Co. v. U.S. Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corp., 295 F. 372, 377+, 1924 A.M.C. 170+ (N.D.Cal. Dec 26, 1923) (NO. 17692, 17693)
- C 526 Huff v. Union Nat. Bank of Oakland, 173 F. 333, 336 (C.C.N.D.Cal. Sep 24, 1909) (NO. 14794)
- C 527 Frank v. Leopold & Feron Co., 169 F. 922, 924 (C.C.N.D.Cal. Mar 29, 1909) (NO. 14850)
- C 528 Dewey Mining Co. v. Miller, 96 F. 1, 2 (C.C.S.D.Cal. Jun 12, 1899) ""

- 529 Crystal Springs Land & Water Co. v. City of Los Angeles, 76 F. 148, 151 (C.C.S.D.Cal. Aug 03, 1896) (NO. 583)
- 530 Pacific Gas Imp. Co. v. Ellert, 64 F. 421, 429+ (C.C.N.D.Cal. Oct 15, 1894)
- 531 In re Pacific Ry. Commission, 32 F. 241, 256, 12 Sawy. 559, 559 (C.C.N.D.Cal. Aug 29, 1887) ""
- 532 Amoco Production Co. v. Aspen Group, 25 F.Supp.2d 1162, 1166, 82 A.F.T.R.2d 98-7433, 98-7433 (D.Colo. Nov 03, 1998) (NO. CIV. A. 97-B-2630)
- 533 Reeves v. Queen City Transp., 10 F.Supp.2d 1181, 1188, 8 A.D. Cases 395, 395, 13 NDLR P 90, 90 (D.Colo. Jun 22, 1998) (NO. CIV.A. 97-B-810)
- 534 Christensen v. Phelan, 607 F.Supp. 470, 472 (D.Colo. Apr 15, 1985) (NO. CIV. A. 84-K-309)
- 535 Runyan v. United Broth. of Carpenters, 566 F.Supp. 600, 604, 115 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 3568, 3568, 100 Lab.Cas. P 10,895, 10895 (D.Colo. Jun 15, 1983) (NO. CIV. 82-K-503)
- 536 Jackson v. State of Colo., 294 F.Supp. 1065, 1071 (D.Colo. Oct 03, 1968) (NO. CIV. C-871)
- 537 Sullivan v. Metro-North R.Co., 179 F.Supp.2d 2, 7 (D.Conn. Jan 08, 2002) (NO. CIV.A.3:01-CV-1123(J))
- 538 Birbeck v. Southern New England Production Credit Ass'n, 606 F.Supp. 1030, 1035 (D.Conn. Mar 29, 1985) (NO. CIV. H-84-593) ""
- 539 Quadrini v. Sikorsky Aircraft Division, United Aircraft Corp., 425 F.Supp. 81, 87, 21 UCC Rep.Serv. 457, 457 (D.Conn. Jan 06, 1977) (NO. CIV B-74-81)
- 540 Fox Film Corp. v. Trumbull, 7 F.2d 715, 721 (D.Conn. Aug 17, 1925)
- 541 Mikkilineni v. Com. of Pennsylvania, 2003 WL 21854754, *4 (D.D.C. Aug 05, 2003) (NO. CIV.A. 02-1205 RMU)
- 542 Ford v. Tait, 163 F.Supp.2d 57, 64 (D.D.C. Sep 25, 2001) (NO. CIV. A. 00-2687 (RMU))
- 543 International Finance Corp. v. GDK Systems, Inc., 711 F.Supp. 15, 18+ (D.D.C. Apr 14, 1989) (NO. CIV. A. 88-1740-OG)
- 544 Walton v. Howard University, 683 F.Supp. 826, 827 (D.D.C. Nov 06, 1987) (NO. CIV. A. 87-1438) ""
- 545 Kalur v. Resor, 335 F.Supp. 1, 7, 3 ERC 1458, 1458, 1 Env'tl. L. Rep. 20,637, 20637 (D.D.C. Dec 21, 1971) (NO. CIV. A. 1331-71)
- 546 Schneider v. Rusk, 218 F.Supp. 302, 317 (D.D.C. May 21, 1963) (NO. CIV. 324-60) (*in dissent*)
- 547 Mine Safety Appliances Co. v. Knox, 59 F.Supp. 733, 736 (D.D.C. Mar 15, 1945) (NO. CIV. 23387)
- 548 Grant v. Cooke, 2 Mackey 165, 165, 1871 WL 14706, *18, 7 D.C. 165, 193 (D.C.Sup. Nov 11, 1871) (NO. 1956)
- 549 Walter v. Division of Revenue for State of Del., 961 F.Supp. 97, 99 (D.Del. Apr 01, 1997) (NO. CIV. A. 96-163-JJF)
- 550 Akzona Inc. v. E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co., 607 F.Supp. 227, 230 (D.Del. Oct 02, 1984) (NO. CIV. A. 84-10-LON)
- 551 Crum v. Veterans of Foreign Wars, 502 F.Supp. 1377, 1382+ (D.Del. Dec 30, 1980) (NO. CIV. 80-231)
- 552 P. De Ronde & Co. v. U.S. Sugar Equalization Board, 299 F. 659, 665 (D.Del. Apr 17, 1924) (NO. 531)
- 553 Jeanty v. Bulger, 204 F.Supp.2d 1366, 1368, 15 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. D 303, 303 (S.D.Fla. May 17, 2002) (NO. 02-20822-CIV) ""
- 554 U.S. Postal Service v. City of Hollywood, Fla., 974 F.Supp. 1459, 1462, 11 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. D 185, 185 (S.D.Fla. Aug 07, 1997) (NO. 967345CVMIDDLEBROOKS)
- 555 Butterworth v. Chances Casino Cruises, Inc., 1997 WL 1068628, *1 (M.D.Fla. Jul 14, 1997) (NO. 97-846-CIV-J-20)
- 556 Laborers Health & Welfare Trust Fund of South Florida v. KMM Const. Co., Inc., 651 F.Supp. 344, 345 (S.D.Fla. Jan 09, 1987) (NO. 86-6521-CIV)
- 557 International Tape Mfrs. Ass'n v. Gerstein, 344 F.Supp. 38, 43, 174 U.S.P.Q. 198, 198 (S.D.Fla. Jun 12, 1972) (NO. 72-164-CIV-JE) (BNA Version)
- 558 Athens Lumber Co., Inc. v. Federal Election Commission, 531 F.Supp. 756, 762 (M.D.Ga. Feb 09, 1982) (NO. CIV. 81-79-ATH)
- 559 Home Ins. Co. v. Ballenger Corp., 74 F.R.D. 93, 97, 24 Fed.R.Serv.2d 253, 253 (N.D.Ga. Feb 25, 1977) (NO. CIV C76-472A)
- 560 Payne v. Griffin, 51 F.Supp. 588, 591 (M.D.Ga. Aug 30, 1943) (NO. CIV 89)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 561 Reese v. Southern Ry. Co., 26 F.2d 367, 367 (N.D.Ga. May 08, 1928) (NO. 1072)
- 562 Hoffman v. Lynch, 23 F.2d 518, 522+ (N.D.Ga. Jan 07, 1928) (NO. 465)
- 563 Central of Georgia Ry. Co. v. Wright, 166 F. 153, 157 (C.C.N.D.Ga. Dec 05, 1908)
- 564 Central of Georgia Ry. Co. v. McLendon, 157 F. 961, 964 (C.C.N.D.Ga. Nov 30, 1907)
- 565 Tift v. Southern Ry. Co., 123 F. 789, 793 (C.C.S.D.Ga. Jul 16, 1903) ""
- 566 Branch v. Macon & B. R. Co., 4 F.Cas. 15, 16, 2 Woods 385, 385, No. 1808, 1808 (C.C.S.D.Ga. May Term 1875)
- 567 State of Georgia v. Atkins, 10 F.Cas. 241, 242, 1 Abb.U.S. 22, 22, 1 Am. Law T. Rep. U.S. Cts. 105, 105, 35 Ga. 315, 315, 8 Int.Rev.Rec. 113, 113, No. 5350, 5350 (C.C.N.D.Ga. 1866)
- 568 Koon v. Bottolfsen, 60 F.Supp. 316, 322 (D.Idaho Apr 16, 1944) (NO. 2333)
- 569 Sunshine Mining Co. v. Carver, 34 F.Supp. 274, 278 (D.Idaho Jul 01, 1940) (NO. 1444)
- 570 Carpenters Fringe Benefits Funds of Illinois v. Royal Builders, Inc., 2007 WL 404038, *1 (N.D.Ill. Feb 02, 2007) (NO. 05 C 1731)
- 571 Estate of Rath v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., 316 F.Supp.2d 684, 687 (S.D.Ill. Apr 14, 2004) (NO. 04-CV-0141-MJR)
- 572 Williams v. National Housing Exchange, Inc., 110 F.Supp.2d 694, 698 (N.D.Ill. Aug 16, 2000) (NO. 95 C 4243) ""
- 573 Kedziora v. Citicorp Nat. Services, Inc., 1995 WL 506061, *8+ (N.D.Ill. Aug 22, 1995) (NO. 91 C 3428)
- 574 National Organization for Women, Inc. v. Scheidler, 897 F.Supp. 1047, 1063+, RICO Bus.Disp.Guide 8892, 8892+ (N.D.Ill. Jul 25, 1995) (NO. 86 C 7888)
- 575 Mr. Frank, Inc. v. Waste Management, Inc., 591 F.Supp. 859, 865+, 1984-1 Trade Cases P 66,024, 66024+ (N.D.Ill. May 23, 1984) (NO. 82 C 4346) ""
- 576 People ex rel. Cosentino v. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, 579 F.Supp. 1261, 1264, 38 Fed.R.Serv.2d 1304, 1304, 38 UCC Rep.Serv. 264, 264 (N.D.Ill. Jan 03, 1984) (NO. 82 C 2714)
- 577 Central Nat. Bank in Chicago v. R. F. C., 134 F.Supp. 873, 875 (N.D.Ill. Jul 13, 1955) (NO. 52 C 2121)
- 578 In re Interstate Commerce Commission, 53 F. 476, 479 (C.C.N.D.Ill. Dec 07, 1892) ""
- 579 Pettilon v. Noble, 19 F.Cas. 390, 392, 7 Biss. 449, 449, 9 Chi.Leg.N. 314, 314, 23 Int.Rev.Rec. 209, 209, No. 11,044, 11044, 2 Browne Nat.Bank Cas. 120, 120 (C.C.N.D.Ill. May 04, 1877)
- 580 Directv v. Edwards, 293 F.Supp.2d 873, 877 (N.D.Ind. Nov 17, 2003) (NO. 2:03CV43AS)
- 581 U.S. v. Clark County, Indiana, 234 F.Supp.2d 934, 940 (S.D.Ind. Dec 17, 2002) (NO. NA99-230CBH)
- 582 In re AT&T Fiber Optic Cable Installation Litigation, 2001 WL 1397295, *9 (S.D.Ind. Nov 05, 2001) (NO. IP 99-9313-CHK, MDL 1313, IP 98-1300-CHG)
- 583 Elliott v. Hinds, 573 F.Supp. 571, 573 (N.D.Ind. Oct 24, 1983) (NO. L 83-38)
- 584 Evans v. International Typographical Union, 76 F.Supp. 881, 884, 21 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2375, 2375, 14 Lab.Cas. P 64,344, 64344 (S.D.Ind. Feb 25, 1948) (NO. CIV. 1587)
- 585 Rapp v. Committee on Professional Ethics and Conduct of Iowa State Bar Ass'n, 504 F.Supp. 1092, 1097 (S.D.Iowa Dec 31, 1980) (NO. CIV. 80-366-D) ""
- 586 Davis v. Synhorst, 217 F.Supp. 492, 503 (S.D.Iowa May 03, 1963) (NO. CIV. 5-1289)
- 587 In re Hartman, 232 F. 797, 799 (N.D.Iowa May 04, 1916) ""
- 588 Greenwich Ins. Co. v. Carroll, 125 F. 121, 127 (C.C.S.D.Iowa Oct 13, 1903) (NO. 2410)
- 589 McCain v. City of Des Moines, 84 F. 726, 729 (C.C.S.D.Iowa Jan 11, 1898) (NO. 2355)
- 590 Chicago & N.W. Ry. Co. v. Dey, 35 F. 866, 869, 1 L.R.A. 744, 744 (C.C.S.D.Iowa Jul 27, 1888)
- 591 Pullman's Palace-Car Co. v. Twombly, 29 F. 658, 663+ (C.C.S.D.Iowa Jan 14, 1887)
- 592 Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. HCA Health Services of Kansas, Inc., 1995 WL 580062, *3 (D.Kan. Sep 19, 1995) (NO. 94-1300-PFK)
- 593 Jones v. National Railroad Passenger Corp., 1994 WL 608597, *1+ (D.Kan. Oct 21, 1994) (NO. 94-2332-JWL)
- 594 Johnston v. U.S., 546 F.Supp. 879, 882+ (D.Kan. Sep 16, 1982) (NO. 81-1060, 81-1061, 81-1100, 81-1101)
- 595 Pearce v. U.S., 450 F.Supp. 613, 615 (D.Kan. May 09, 1978) (NO. CIV. 77-2261)
- 596 U.S. v. Sprinkles, 138 F.Supp. 28, 29 (E.D.Ky. Feb 15, 1956) (NO. 12449) ""

- 597 Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Corp., Owensboro, Ky. v. Badeau, 55 F.Supp. 193, 196+, 14 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 664, 664+, 8 Lab.Cas. P 62,162, 62162+ (W.D.Ky. May 09, 1944) (NO. 132)
- 598 Bromwell Brush & Wire Goods Co. v. State Board of Charities and Corrections, 279 F. 440, 442+ (E.D.Ky. Sep 24, 1921) (NO. 947)
- 599 Beck v. Johnson, 169 F. 154, 159 (C.C.W.D.Ky. Apr 13, 1909) ""
- 600 Claybrook v. City of Owensboro, 16 F. 297, 304, 4 Ky.L.Rptr. 876, 876 (D.Ky. 1883)
- 601 Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. National Railroad Passenger Corp., 2006 WL 2228948, *2 (E.D.La. Aug 02, 2006) (NO. CIV.A. 06-0265, 06-1886, 06-1888)
- 602 Reed v. Johnson, 1995 WL 495899, *1 (E.D.La. Aug 17, 1995) (NO. CIV.A. 93-1652)
- 603 Boone v. DuBose, 718 F.Supp. 479, 481, 30 ERC 1574, 1574 (M.D.La. Aug 11, 1988) (NO. CIV. A. 86-548-B, CIV. A. 86-550-B, CIV. A. 86-551-B, CIV. A. 86-694-B, CIV. A. 87-694-B, CIV. A. 87-695-B, CIV. A. 86-549-B, CIV. A. 87-627-B, CIV. A. 87-1055-B)
- 604 Dombrowski v. Pfister, 227 F.Supp. 556, 580 (E.D.La. Feb 20, 1964) (NO. CIV 14019) (*in dissent*)
- 605 Bowles v. West, 63 F.Supp. 745, 747 (W.D.La. Jan 05, 1946) (NO. CIV. A. 1574, CIV. A. 1582, CIV. A. 1607)
- 606 Iberia Petroleum Corp. v. Acadian Production Corp. of Louisiana, 34 F.Supp. 995, 999 (W.D.La. Sep 13, 1940) (NO. CIV. 349)
- 607 Mercantile Trust Co. v. Texas & P. Ry. Co., 216 F. 225, 231 (C.C.E.D.La. Dec 15, 1908) (NO. 13610)
- 608 Cuban Steamship Co. v. Fitzpatrick, 66 F. 63, 68 (C.C.E.D.La. Feb 16, 1895)
- 609 Leonard v. City of Shreveport, 28 F. 257, 257 (C.C.W.D.La. Aug 1886)
- 610 Levy v. City of Shreveport, 28 F. 209, 213 (C.C.W.D.La. Feb 10, 1886)
- 611 Hans v. State of Louisiana, 24 F. 55, 57 (C.C.E.D.La. May 15, 1885) ""
- 612 Sawyer v. Parish of Concordia, 12 F. 754, 758+, 4 Woods 273, 273+ (C.C.W.D.La. Jun 1882) ""
- 613 Smith v. General Elec. Co., 938 F.Supp. 70, 75 (D.Mass. Sep 06, 1996) (NO. CIV. A. 91-12912-RGS)
- 614 Xuncax v. Gramajo, 886 F.Supp. 162, 193+ (D.Mass. Apr 12, 1995) (NO. CIV.A. 91-11564-DPW, CIV.A. 91-11612-DPW)
- 615 Martin v. Wyzanski, 262 F.Supp. 925, 927 (D.Mass. Jan 16, 1967) (NO. CIV. 66-684-J)
- 616 Textile Workers Union of America (CIO) v. American Thread Co., 113 F.Supp. 137, 140, 23 Lab.Cas. P 67,660, 67660 (D.Mass. Jun 05, 1953) (NO. CIV. 52-503)
- 617 National Rockland Bank of Boston v. City of Boston, 296 F. 743, 746 (D.Mass. Feb 20, 1924) (NO. 1793, 1794, 1828, 1857, 1859, 1861, 1862, 1888)
- 618 Huntington Mfg. Co. v. Bradford Worsted Spinning Co., 37 F.2d 730, 731 (D.Mass. Jun 07, 1915) (NO. 404)
- 619 In re Wireless Telephone Radio Frequency Emissions Products Liability Litigation, 216 F.Supp.2d 474, 481 (D.Md. Jun 21, 2002) (NO. MDL 1421, CIV.A. 01-MD-1421)
- 620 Steigerwald v. Bradley, 2001 WL 357306, *1 (D.Md. Apr 10, 2001) (NO. CIV. CCB-99-2883) ""
- 621 Shanty Town Associates Ltd. Partnership v. E.P.A., 1987 WL 7745, *3, 25 ERC 1702, 1702 (D.Md. Mar 05, 1987) (NO. CIV.A. HAR 86-3631)
- 622 Totaro v. Lyons, 498 F.Supp. 621, 628 (D.Md. Sep 19, 1980) (NO. CIV. M-79-2017)
- 623 Jefferson v. Ametek, Inc., 86 F.R.D. 425, 428, 30 Fed.R.Serv.2d 72, 72 (D.Md. Apr 03, 1980) (NO. CIV B-79-2374) ""
- 624 Letmate v. Baltimore and O. R. R., 311 F.Supp. 1059, 1060, 14 Fed.R.Serv.2d 324, 324 (D.Md. Mar 31, 1970) (NO. CIV. 20949)
- 625 Ashley-Cooper Sales Services, Inc. v. Brentwood Mfg. Co., 168 F.Supp. 742, 745 (D.Md. Dec 23, 1958) (NO. CIV. 10961) ""
- 626 International Refugee Organization v. Republic S.S. Corp., 92 F.Supp. 674, 678+ (D.Md. Jul 08, 1950) (NO. CIV. 4479)
- 627 Colonial Hardwood Flooring Co. v. International Union United Furniture Workers of America, 76 F.Supp. 493, 496, 21 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2340, 2340, 14 Lab.Cas. P 64,325, 64325 (D.Md. Feb 16, 1948) (NO. CIV. 3804)
- 628 Pennell v. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 21 F.Supp. 497, 497 (D.Me. Dec 22, 1937) (NO. 1482)
- 629 Salei v. Boardwalk Regency Corp., 913 F.Supp. 993, 998 (E.D.Mich. Jan 23, 1996) (NO. 94-72239-DT) ""

- 630 Lopez v. Modisitt, 488 F.Supp. 1169, 1175 (W.D.Mich. Apr 04, 1980) (NO. G75-279CA5)
- 631 Freeman v. Kelvinator, Inc., 1979 WL 145, *4, 22 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 1139, 1139, 19 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 8960, 8960 (E.D.Mich. Jan 26, 1979) (NO. 5-72314)
- 632 Luella Hannan Memorial Home v. First Nat. Bank, 31 F.Supp. 276, 279 (E.D.Mich. Feb 05, 1940) (NO. 810)
- 633 Ebersen, Inc. v. City of Minneapolis, 2004 WL 483165, *1 (D.Minn. Mar 11, 2004) (NO. CIV. 03-6482RHKAJB) ""
- 634 Hamblett v. Board of Sav. and Loan Associations of State of Miss., 472 F.Supp. 158, 163, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. P 97,108, 97108 (N.D.Miss. Feb 28, 1979) (NO. DC 76-97-S)
- 635 Latch v. Tennessee Val. Authority, 312 F.Supp. 1069, 1073+ (N.D.Miss. May 12, 1970) (NO. EC 6992)
- 636 Interstate Natural Gas Co. v. Gully, 4 F.Supp. 697, 697 (S.D.Miss. Oct 10, 1933) (NO. 447)
- 637 Young & Jones v. Hiawatha Gin & Mfg. Co., 17 F.2d 193, 194 (S.D.Miss. Jan 22, 1927) (NO. 417)
- 638 Nixon v. N.L.R.B., 559 F.Supp. 1265, 1269 (W.D.Mo. Mar 21, 1983) (NO. 82-1071-CV-W-3)
- 639 Fields v. Community Federal Savings & Loan Ass'n, 37 F.Supp. 367, 367 (W.D.Mo. Feb 15, 1941) (NO. 766)
- 640 Central Transfer Co. v. Commercial Oil Co., 45 F.2d 400, 403 (E.D.Mo. Apr 12, 1930) (NO. 8836)
- 641 Taylor v. De Hart, 22 F.2d 206, 207+ (W.D.Mo. Dec 09, 1926) (NO. 5702) ""
- 642 Griesedieck Bros. Brewery Co. v. Moore, 262 F. 582, 585 (E.D.Mo. Nov 21, 1919) (NO. 5207)
- 643 People's U S Bank v. Goodwin, 160 F. 727, 730 (C.C.E.D.Mo. Apr 23, 1908) (NO. 5529) ""
- 644 Third Nat. Bank v. Harrison, 8 F. 721, 723+, 3 McCrary 162, 162+ (C.C.E.D.Mo. Sep 22, 1881)
- 645 Orner v. Saunders, 18 F.Cas. 829, 830, 3 Dill. 284, 284, 22 Int.Rev.Rec. 48, 48, 2 Cent. L.J. 772, 772, 2 A.F.T.R. 2081, 2081, No. 10,584, 10584, 1 N.Y.Wkly.Dig. 383, 383 (C.C.W.D.Mo. Nov Term 1875)
- 646 Murdock v. Woodson, 17 F.Cas. 1017, 1023, 2 Dill. 188, 188, No. 9942, 9942 (C.C.W.D.Mo. Jun 16, 1873)
- 647 Wilson v. Marchington, 934 F.Supp. 1187, 1192+ (D.Mont. Jan 24, 1996) (NO. CV-92-127-GF)
- 648 U.S. ex rel. Yellowtail v. Little Horn State Bank, 828 F.Supp. 780, 785+ (D.Mont. Apr 09, 1992) (NO. CV 91-24-BLG-JDS) ""
- 649 Fuller v. Scott, 328 F.Supp. 842, 854 (M.D.N.C. Jun 21, 1971) (NO. C-249-D-69) (*in dissent*)
- 650 Southern Ry. Co. v. Greensboro Ice & Coal Co., 134 F. 82, 93+ (C.C.E.D.N.C. Dec 16, 1904)
- 651 Swasey v. North Carolina R. Co., 23 F.Cas. 518, 519, 1 Hughes 17, 17, 1 Am. Law T. Rep. (N.S.) 359, 359, 71 N.C. 571, 571, No. 13,679, 13679 (C.C.E.D.N.C. Jun Term 1874)
- 652 U.S. v. Lenore, 207 F. 865, 870 (D.N.D. Oct 01, 1913) ""
- 653 McGoon v. Northern Pac. Ry. Co., 204 F. 998, 1000+ (D.N.D. May 14, 1913) ""
- 654 Genesis Intern. Holdings Intern. Infrastructure Consortium v. US-Algeria Business Council, 2006 WL 1128729, *1 (D.N.J. Apr 27, 2006) (NO. 05 CV 4487 DMC)
- 655 Genesis Intern. Holdings v. Northrop Grumman Corp., 2006 WL 141902, *1 (D.N.J. Jan 18, 2006) (NO. CIV.A. 05CV4487DMC)
- 656 Dumansky v. U.S., 486 F.Supp. 1078, 1083, 29 Fed.R.Serv.2d 279, 279 (D.N.J. Feb 11, 1980) (NO. CIV. 79-2078)
- 657 Atlantic, Cape May and Parts of Burlington, Ocean and Cumberland Counties Bldg. Trades Council v. City of North Wildwood, N.J., 1979 WL 2018, *3, 88 Lab.Cas. P 33,882, 33882, 27 Cont.Cas.Fed. (CCH) P 80,063, 80063 (D.N.J. May 18, 1979) (NO. 77-2609)
- 658 S. J. Groves & Sons Co. v. New Jersey Turnpike Authority, 268 F.Supp. 568, 574 (D.N.J. May 18, 1967) (NO. CIV 531-66)
- 659 Driscoll v. Burlington-Bristol Bridge Co, 82 F.Supp. 975, 992 (D.N.J. Feb 25, 1949) (NO. CIV. 11907)
- 660 F.X. Hooper Co. v. Samuel M. Langston Co., 56 F.Supp. 577, 583, 63 U.S.P.Q. 165, 165 (D.N.J. Aug 10, 1944) (NO. C-3284) (BNA Version)
- 661 Travelers Ins. Co. v. Young, 18 F.Supp. 450, 454 (D.N.J. Mar 06, 1937)
- 662 Sandoval v. New Mexico Technology Group LLC., 174 F.Supp.2d 1224, 1230 (D.N.M. May 01, 2001) (NO. 00-578-LCS)
- 663 Whitmore v. Bureau of Revenue of State of New Mexico, 64 F.Supp. 911, 914 (D.N.M. Mar 18, 1946) (NO. CIV. 952-954, CIV. 960)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 664 Zelkowska v. Gonzales, 2005 WL 2491490, *1 (S.D.N.Y. Sep 29, 2005) (NO. 05 CIV.8107 LAK)
- 665 Savage Universal Corp. v. Grazier Const., Inc., 2004 WL 1824102, *5 (S.D.N.Y. Aug 13, 2004) (NO. 04 CIV. 1089(GEL))
- 666 General Maritime Management, LLC. v. St. Shipping & Transport, Inc., 2004 WL 1320893, *3, 26 ITRD 1534, 1534, 2004 A.M.C. 1591, 1591 (S.D.N.Y. Jun 10, 2004) (NO. 04 CIV. 4050HB)
- 667 Savino v. Gowing, 2003 WL 21730177, *2+ (W.D.N.Y. Jul 01, 2003) (NO. 03-CV-0170E(SR))
- 668 Beacon Hill Asset Management LLC v. Asset Alliance Corp., 2003 WL 1845208, *2 (S.D.N.Y. Mar 25, 2003) (NO. 03 CIV. 1560 (LAK))
- 669 Ansoumana v. Gristede's Operating Corp., 201 F.R.D. 81, 91+, 143 Lab.Cas. P 34,267, 34267+, 9 Wage & Hour Cas.2d (BNA) 1646, 1646+ (S.D.N.Y. May 24, 2001) (NO. 00 CIV. 253 (AKH)) ""
- 670 Arrey v. Beaux Arts II, LLC, 101 F.Supp.2d 225, 227 (S.D.N.Y. Jun 21, 2000) (NO. 00 CIV. 4426 (LAK))
- 671 Levitt v. F.B.I., 70 F.Supp.2d 346, 348+ (S.D.N.Y. Oct 08, 1999) (NO. 99 CIV. 0584 (LAK))
- 672 Lipton v. Consumers Union of U.S., Inc., 37 F.Supp.2d 241, 244, 160 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2331, 2331, 137 Lab.Cas. P 10,401, 10401, 22 Employee Benefits Cas. 2310, 2310, Pens. Plan Guide (CCH) P 23,951K, 23,951K (S.D.N.Y. Jan 20, 1999) (NO. 98 CIV. 1599 (LAK))
- 673 Eastern States Health & Welfare Fund v. Philip Morris, Inc., 11 F.Supp.2d 384, 389 (S.D.N.Y. Jun 29, 1998) (NO. 97 CIV. 7346 (SS), 97 CIV. 9396 (SS), 97 CIV. 9399 (SS), 97 CIV. 8462 (SS), 97 CIV. 9397 (SS), 97 CIV. 9400 (SS), 97 CIV. 9395 (SS), 97 CIV. 9398 (SS), 97 CIV. 9401 (SS))
- 674 Schulz v. New York State Executive, Pataki, 960 F.Supp. 568, 580+ (N.D.N.Y. Apr 14, 1997) (NO. 96-CV-1595) ""
- 675 Rolex Watch, U.S.A., Inc. v. Bulova Watch Co., Inc., 820 F.Supp. 60, 62, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1951, 1951 (E.D.N.Y. Apr 22, 1993) (NO. 83 CV 2191) "" (BNA Version)
- 676 Lofurno v. Amtrak Nat. R.R. Corp., 1992 WL 170646, *1+ (S.D.N.Y. Jul 08, 1992) (NO. 91 CIV. 5978(PNL))
- 677 Lindner Fund, Inc. v. Waldbaum, Inc., 1989 WL 138762, *1, 1989-2 Trade Cases P 68,851, 68851 (E.D.N.Y. Nov 09, 1989) (NO. CV 89-2852)
- 678 Sears, Roebuck and Co. v. Charles W. Sears Real Estate, Inc., 686 F.Supp. 385, 386 (N.D.N.Y. Jun 23, 1988) (NO. 86-CV-1142)
- 679 Isaacs v. Group Health, Inc., 668 F.Supp. 306, 309, 9 Employee Benefits Cas. 1128, 1128 (S.D.N.Y. Sep 04, 1987) (NO. 87 CIV. 3614 (RJW))
- 680 Heritage Management, Ltd. v. Martin, 1987 WL 8409, *3 (E.D.N.Y. Mar 02, 1987) (NO. 83 CV 5498)
- 681 Society for Good Will to Retarded Children v. Cuomo, 652 F.Supp. 515, 519+ (E.D.N.Y. Jan 27, 1987) (NO. 78-CV-1847 (JBW))
- 682 Society For Good Will To Retarded Children v. Cuomo, 1986 WL 13931, *3+, 55 USLW 2348, 2348+ (E.D.N.Y. Dec 11, 1986) (NO. 78-CV-1847 (JBW))
- 683 Independent Bankers Ass'n of New York State Inc. v. Marine Midland Bank, N.A., 575 F.Supp. 1425, 1427+ (W.D.N.Y. Dec 02, 1983) (NO. CIV-83-1006T) ""
- 684 Union Carbide Corp. v. Air Products & Chemicals, Inc., 1978 WL 21401, *21401, 26 Fed.R.Serv.2d 703, 703, 202 U.S.P.Q. 43, 48 (S.D.N.Y. May 30, 1978) (NO. 77 CIV. 4695) (BNA Version)
- 685 Maltais v. U.S., 439 F.Supp. 540, 546 (N.D.N.Y. Oct 19, 1977) (NO. 77-CV-98)
- 686 Child v. Beame, 412 F.Supp. 593, 599, 22 Fed.R.Serv.2d 802, 802 (S.D.N.Y. Feb 20, 1976) (NO. 75 CIVIL 336)
- 687 Baker v. FCH Services, Inc., 376 F.Supp. 1365, 1367 (S.D.N.Y. Jan 10, 1974) (NO. 73 CIV. 4674) ""
- 688 Frequency Electronics, Inc. v. National Radio Co., 342 F.Supp. 1159, 1160, 174 U.S.P.Q. 282, 282 (S.D.N.Y. May 16, 1972) (NO. 72 CIV. 412) (BNA Version)
- 689 U. S. ex rel. Bruno v. Herold, 271 F.Supp. 491, 496 (N.D.N.Y. Jul 20, 1967) (NO. CIV. 10155)
- 690 Rosen v. Celebrezze, 254 F.Supp. 280, 281 (N.D.N.Y. Jan 23, 1964) (NO. CIV. 9430)
- 691 U.S. v. Eissner, 206 F.Supp. 103, 105, 10 A.F.T.R.2d 5680, 5680, 62-2 USTC P 9720, 9720 (N.D.N.Y. Jun 18, 1962) (NO. CRIM. 33057)
- 692 U.S. v. Crosby, 24 F.R.D. 15, 15 (S.D.N.Y. May 29, 1959)
- 693 Danish v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America, 151 F.Supp. 17, 19 (S.D.N.Y. Mar 13, 1957)

- 694 *Cloth v. Hyman*, 146 F.Supp. 185, 192, 112 U.S.P.Q. 254, 254 (S.D.N.Y. Sep 28, 1956) "" (BNA Version)
- 695 *Kaufman v. Wolfson*, 137 F.Supp. 479, 481 (S.D.N.Y. Jan 26, 1956)
- 696 *Application of Barnes*, 116 F.Supp. 464, 469 (N.D.N.Y. Nov 20, 1953) (NO. CIV. 1494, CIV. 1495)
- 697 *L Fatato, Inc v. Beer Drivers Local Union 24 of Intern Union of Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America CIO*, 93 F.Supp. 481, 482, 27 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2032, 2032, 19 Lab.Cas. P 66,030, 66030 (E.D.N.Y. Oct 31, 1950) (NO. CIV. 10895)
- 698 *Banner Mfg Co v. United Furniture Workers of America*, 90 F.Supp. 723, 724 (S.D.N.Y. Mar 01, 1950)
- 699 *Paper Stylists v. Fitchburg Paper Co.*, 9 F.R.D. 4, 6 (N.D.N.Y. Mar 25, 1949) (NO. CIV. 3026)
- 700 *Wilson & Co. v. United Packinghouse Workers of America*, 83 F.Supp. 162, 165, 23 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2391, 2391 (S.D.N.Y. Feb 18, 1949)
- 701 *Nelson v. Leighton*, 82 F.Supp. 661, 662+ (N.D.N.Y. Jan 11, 1949) (NO. CIV. 3260)
- 702 *Brandstein v. White Lamps*, 20 F.Supp. 369, 370 (S.D.N.Y. Aug 10, 1937) ""
- 703 *Samuel J. Brandstein and Blossom Manufacturing Co. v. White Lamps, Inc., et al.*, 1937 WL 25970, *25970, 35 U.S.P.Q. 244, 244 (S.D.N.Y. Aug 10, 1937) (BNA Version)
- 704 *Richard v. National City Bank of New York*, 6 F.Supp. 156, 157 (S.D.N.Y. Feb 20, 1934)
- 705 *Harry Porter Co. v. U.S. Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation*, 284 F. 397, 397+ (S.D.N.Y. Jan 09, 1922)
- 706 *In re Tidewater Coal Exch.*, 274 F. 1011, 1014 (S.D.N.Y. Jul 26, 1921)
- 707 *Buffalo Gas Co. v. City of Buffalo*, 156 F. 370, 372 (C.C.W.D.N.Y. Oct 07, 1907) (NO. 319)
- 708 *Manhattan Ry. Co. v. City of New York*, 18 F. 195, 199 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. Oct 15, 1883)
- 709 *Cruikshank v. Fourth Nat. Bank*, 65 How. Pr. 280, 280, 16 F. 888, 889, 21 Blatchf. 322, 322 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. May 25, 1883)
- 710 *U.S. v. Curtis*, 12 F. 824, 827+, 4 Ky.L.Rptr. 157, 157+ (C.C.S.D.N.Y. Jul 20, 1882)
- 711 *Stanley v. Board of Sup'rs of Albany Co.*, 6 F. 561, 561, 19 Blatchf. 147, 147 (C.C.N.D.N.Y. Apr 1881)
- 712 *Union Pac. R. Co. v. McComb*, 58 How. Pr. 478, 478, 1 F. 799, 800, 17 Blatchf. 510, 510 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. Feb 21, 1880)
- 713 *Cadle v. Tracy*, 4 F.Cas. 967, 971, 11 Blatchf. 101, 101, No. 2279, 2279 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. Apr 23, 1873)
- 714 *Fisk v. Union Pac. R. Co.*, 9 F.Cas. 164, 165, 10 Abb.Pr.N.S. 457, 457, 8 Blatchf. 243, 243, 3 Alb. L.J. 156, 156, 13 Int.Rev.Rec. 77, 77, No. 4828, 4828, 5 Am. Law Rev. 566, 566 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. Feb 13, 1871)
- 715 *Manufacturers' Nat. Bank v. Baack*, 16 F.Cas. 671, 674, 40 How. Pr. 409, 409, 2 Abb.U.S. 232, 232, 8 Blatchf. 137, 137, 4 Am. Law T. Rep. U.S. Cts. 24, 24, 3 Chi.Leg.N. 169, 169, 13 Int.Rev.Rec. 35, 101, 13 Int.Rev.Rec. 101, No. 9052, 5 Am. Law Rev. 567, 567 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. Jan 10, 1871)
- 716 *Murray v. Patrie*, 17 F.Cas. 1061, 1062, 5 Blatchf. 343, 343, No. 9967, 9967 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. Jul 17, 1866)
- 717 *Cutting v. Gilbert*, 6 F.Cas. 1079, 1080, 5 Blatchf. 259, 259, 2 Int.Rev.Rec. 94, 94, No. 3519, 3519 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. Sep Term 1865)
- 718 *In re Metzger*, 5 N.Y.Leg.Obs. 83, 83, 1 Edm.Sel.Cas. 399, 399, 17 F.Cas. 232, 234, No. 9511, 9511 (S.D.N.Y. Jan 16, 1847)
- 719 *In re Barry*, 42 F. 113, 122, 136 U.S. 597, 597, Brunn.Coll.C. 533, 533, 34 L.Ed. 503, 503, 7 Law Rep. 374, 374, 11 Hunt Mer. Mag. 265, 265 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. May 25, 1844)
- 720 *Gill v. Stebbins*, 10 F.Cas. 379, 380, 2 Paine 417, 417, No. 5431, 5431 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. Jun Term 1828)
- 721 *Lawrence v. Dixon Ticonderoga Co.*, 305 F.Supp.2d 806, 810 (N.D. Ohio Feb 26, 2004) (NO. 3:03CV7117)
- 722 *Mitchell v. Lemmie*, 231 F.Supp.2d 693, 699 (S.D. Ohio May 06, 2002) (NO. C-3-02-76)
- 723 *Scaccia v. Lemmie*, 236 F.Supp.2d 830, 836 (S.D. Ohio May 06, 2002) (NO. C-3-02-53)
- 724 *City of Tipp City v. City of Dayton*, 204 F.R.D. 388, 394 (S.D. Ohio Sep 24, 2001) (NO. C-3-00-454)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- H 725 Long v. American Red Cross, 1992 WL 566292, *2+ (S.D.Ohio Oct 08, 1992) (NO. C2-92-566)
▶ 726 Griffith v. Columbus Area Chapter of the American Red Cross, 678 F.Supp. 182, 185 (S.D.Ohio Feb 01, 1988) (NO. C-2-87-411)
C 727 Jeanne v. Hawkes Hosp. of Mt. Carmel, 1988 WL 168542, *2 (S.D.Ohio Jan 29, 1988) (NO. C-2-87-509)
C 728 Harley v. Carman, 585 F.Supp. 1353, 1356 (N.D.Ohio May 24, 1984) (NO. CIV. C83-4792Y)
C 729 Kucinich v. Forbes, 432 F.Supp. 1101, 1107 (N.D.Ohio Feb 10, 1977) (NO. C76-1317)
C 730 Edward J. Moriarty & Co. v. General Tire & Rubber Co., 289 F.Supp. 381, 385, 18 Ohio Misc. 156, 156, 12 Fed.R.Serv.2d 298, 298 (S.D.Ohio Dec 08, 1967) (NO. 6378)
C 731 Shanks v. Banting Mfg. Co., 9 F.2d 116, 117 (N.D.Ohio Nov 12, 1925) (NO. 516)
H 732 Toledo, A. A. & N. M. Ry. Co. v. Pennsylvania Co., 54 F. 746, 749, 7 Ohio F.Dec. 530, 530, 19 L.R.A. 395, 395 (C.C.N.D.Ohio Mar 25, 1893) (NO. 1139)
C 733 Commercial Nat. Bank of Cleveland v. Simmons, 6 F.Cas. 226, 227, 1 Flip. 449, 449, 10 Alb. L.J. 155, 155, 3 Am. Law Rec. 107, 107, 1 Cin.Law. Bul. 29, 29, 4 Ohio F.Dec. 354, 354, 22 Pitts.L.J. 23, 23, 6 Chi.Leg.N. 344, 164, 8 Chi.Leg.N. 164, 31 Leg.Int. 269, 20 Int.Rev.Rec. 32, 20 Int.Rev.Rec. 79, 22 Int.Rev.Rec. 66, No. 3062, 2 N.Y.Wkly.Dig. 97 (C.C.N.D.Ohio Jan Term 1876)
C 734 Bell v. Ohio Life & Trust Co., 3 F.Cas. 110, 114, 1 Biss. 260, 260, 3 Weekly L. Gaz. 17, 17, 3 Ohio F.Dec. 514, 514, No. 1260, 1260 (C.C.S.D.Ohio Dec Term 1858)
H 735 Federal Home Loan Bank Bd. v. Empie, 628 F.Supp. 223, 228 (W.D.Okla. Jul 25, 1983) (NO. CIV-83-500-W)
▶ 736 Oklahoma Pub. Co. v. Standard Metals Corp., 541 F.Supp. 1109, 1114+, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. P 98,750, 98750+ (W.D.Okla. May 25, 1982) (NO. CIV-81-1059-T) ""
C 737 Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. Co. v. Williamson, 36 F.Supp. 607, 611 (W.D.Okla. Jan 11, 1941) (NO. 1973)
C 738 Boyd v. Great Western Coal & Coke Co., 189 F. 115, 122+ (C.C.E.D.Okla. Jul 17, 1911)
H 739 Kansas Natural Gas Co. v. Haskell, 172 F. 545, 555 (C.C.E.D.Okla. Jul 03, 1909) (NO. 856, 857, 858, 859)
▶ 740 In re Reid, 6 F.Supp. 800, 803 (D.Or. May 03, 1934)
C 741 Rosenberg v. U.S. Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corp., 271 F. 956, 957 (D.Or. Nov 01, 1920) (NO. L8637)
H 742 Culver v. U.S. Dept. of Labor Occupational Safety & Health Admin., 2006 WL 3199138, *5, 21 O.S.H. Cas. (BNA) 1807, 1807 (M.D.Pa. Nov 03, 2006) (NO. 3:06CV438)
H 743 Indemnity Cas. and Property Ltd. v. R.K. Watersports, Ltd., 2000 WL 298968, *9 (E.D.Pa. Mar 14, 2000) (NO. CIV. A. 95-2859)
H 744 Wetherill Associates, Inc. C.M.S. Enterprises, 1997 WL 299378, *1 (E.D.Pa. May 29, 1997) (NO. CIV. A. 97-1733) ""
C 745 Bieber v. Sovereign Bank, 1996 WL 278813, *3+, RICO Bus.Disp.Guide 9052, 9052+ (E.D.Pa. May 23, 1996) (NO. CIV.A. 95-200)
▶ 746 Yohn v. Love, 887 F.Supp. 773, 788+ (E.D.Pa. May 05, 1995) (NO. CIV. A.94-524)
C 747 Boone v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., 1993 WL 93946, *1+ (E.D.Pa. Mar 30, 1993) (NO. CIV. A. 93-0770)
C 748 Ritter v. Consolidated Rail Corp., 1993 WL 29151, *1+ (E.D.Pa. Feb 04, 1993) (NO. CIV. A. 92-7070)
H 749 Doe v. American Red Cross, 727 F.Supp. 186, 188+ (E.D.Pa. Dec 29, 1989) (NO. CIV. A. 89-2673)
▶ 750 Nero v. Amtrak, 714 F.Supp. 753, 755 (E.D.Pa. Jun 13, 1989) (NO. CIV.A.89-1603)
H 751 McManus v. Glassman's Wynnefield, Inc., 710 F.Supp. 1043, 1044 (E.D.Pa. Apr 28, 1989) (NO. CIV.A. 89-0447)
752 Tempo Music, Inc. v. Maxwell's Bar, Inc., 1988 WL 122407, *1 (E.D.Pa. Nov 09, 1988) (NO. CIV.A. 88-4877)
H 753 Pippett v. Bona, 1986 WL 5095, *1 (E.D.Pa. Apr 29, 1986) (NO. CIV.A. 85-1512)
▶ 754 Ram Const. Co., Inc. v. Port Authority of Allegheny County, 49 B.R. 363, 366, 13 Bankr.Ct.Dec. 279, 279 (W.D.Pa. May 14, 1985) (NO. CIV. A. 85-369)
C 755 U.S. v. Strong, 608 F.Supp. 188, 194 (E.D.Pa. Mar 05, 1985) (NO. CR.A. 85-3)
H 756 In re Record Club of America, Inc., 28 B.R. 996, 999 (M.D.Pa. Jan 25, 1983) (NO. 82-1050, 82-1052, 82-1053, 82-1054, 82-1055)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 757 Garrett v. Hoffman, 441 F.Supp. 1151, 1154 (E.D.Pa. Nov 02, 1977) (NO. CIV. 77-150)
- 758 Haas v. Pittsburgh Nat. Bank, 60 F.R.D. 604, 608, 17 Fed.R.Serv.2d 1008 (W.D.Pa. Aug 06, 1973) (NO. CIV. 72-968)
- 759 In re Eastern Supply Co., 170 F.Supp. 246, 249 (W.D.Pa. Jan 08, 1959) (NO. 22947)
- 760 U.S. v. Owlett, 15 F.Supp. 736, 741 (M.D.Pa. Jul 07, 1936) (NO. 1238)
- 761 Wrigley Pharmaceutical Co v. Cameron, 16 F.2d 290, 292 (M.D.Pa. Dec 27, 1926) (NO. 481)
- 762 James v. U.S. Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, 12 F.2d 89, 90 (E.D.Pa. Apr 08, 1926) (NO. 12104) ""
- 763 In re Brashear, 275 F. 481, 485 (W.D.Pa. Sep 16, 1921) (NO. 9287) ""
- 764 Third Nat Bank of Pittsburg v. Mylin, 76 F. 385, 386 (C.C.E.D.Pa. Sep 04, 1896) (NO. 12099996)
- 765 Baring v. Erdman, 2 F.Cas. 784, 786, 14 Haz.Pa.Reg. 129, 129, No. 981, 981 (C.C.E.D.Pa. Aug 04, 1834)
- 766 Atkinson v. Philadelphia & T R Co, 2 F.Cas. 105, 107+, 14 Haz.Pa.Reg. 10, 10+, No. 615, 615+ (C.C.E.D.Pa. 1834)
- 767 Estates of Ungar v. Palestinian Authority, 315 F.Supp.2d 164, 171+ (D.R.I. Apr 23, 2004) (NO. CIV.A.00-105L)
- 768 Briehler v. Sylvia's, Inc., 106 F.R.D. 415, 418 (D.R.I. May 17, 1985) (NO. CIV. A. 83-0173 P)
- 769 Morinville v. Old Colony Co-op. Bank, 579 F.Supp. 1498, 1503 (D.R.I. Feb 10, 1984) (NO. CIV.A. 80-0290 D)
- 770 Schumaker v. Sommer, 386 F.Supp. 618, 620, 19 Fed.R.Serv.2d 1341 (D.S.D. Dec 16, 1974) (NO. CIV. 73-3032, CIV. 73-3033)
- 771 Conroy v. Conroy, 369 F.Supp. 179, 180 (D.S.D. Dec 07, 1973) (NO. CIV 72-5045)
- 772 Brown v. City of Memphis, 440 F.Supp.2d 868, 876 (W.D.Tenn. Jul 07, 2006) (NO. 05-2419 DP)
- 773 Judge v. Continental Cas. Co., 93 F.R.D. 372, 374 (E.D.Tenn. Dec 18, 1981) (NO. CIV-4-81-64)
- 774 Cline v. Richards, 455 F.Supp. 42, 44 (E.D.Tenn. Aug 19, 1977) (NO. CIV-4-77-12) ""
- 775 Western Life Ins. Co. v. Nanney, 296 F.Supp. 432, 434 (E.D.Tenn. Feb 11, 1969) (NO. CIV. 2229)
- 776 Moore v. Russell, 294 F.Supp. 615, 620 (E.D.Tenn. Nov 07, 1968) (NO. CIV. 2180)
- 777 Federal Sav. & Loan Ins. Corp. v. Third Nat. Bank in Nashville, 60 F.Supp. 110, 112 (M.D.Tenn. Apr 05, 1945) (NO. CIV. 337)
- 778 Grant v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 44 F.Supp. 589, 590 (E.D.Tenn. Sep 10, 1941) (NO. 275-284)
- 779 Doe v. Roman Catholic Diocese of Galveston-Houston, 408 F.Supp.2d 272, 280 (S.D.Tex. Dec 22, 2005) (NO. CIV.A.H-05-1047)
- 780 Walker v. Houston County Jail, 2002 WL 32075772, *2 (E.D.Tex. Apr 25, 2002) (NO. 9:01-CV-277)
- 781 Stafford v. Alcatel USA, Inc., 2001 WL 34084368, *5 (E.D.Tex. Dec 20, 2001) (NO. 1:01-CV-85)
- 782 Raybould v. American Red Cross, 1991 WL 496832, *1 (S.D.Tex. May 29, 1991) (NO. CIV. H-91-754)
- 783 Owens v. First City Nat. Bank of Beaumont, 714 F.Supp. 227, 231 (E.D.Tex. May 26, 1989) (NO. B-88-1139-CA)
- 784 Port Drum Co. v. Umphrey, 119 F.R.D. 26, 28 (E.D.Tex. Jan 29, 1988) (NO. CIV A B-87-0510-CA)
- 785 Gatlin v. Countryside Industries, Inc., 564 F.Supp. 1490, 1493 (N.D.Tex. Jun 07, 1983) (NO. CIV. CA-3-82-2018-D) ""
- 786 Adams v. Harris County, Tex., 316 F.Supp. 938, 944+, 1971 A.M.C. 2017, 2017+ (S.D.Tex. Jul 30, 1970) (NO. CIV. 69-H-215)
- 787 Belcher v. Aetna Life Ins. Co., 3 F.Supp. 809, 810 (W.D.Tex. Jun 03, 1933) (NO. 169)
- 788 City of Beaumont v. Texas & N.O.R. Co., 296 F. 523, 525 (E.D.Tex. Jan 26, 1924) (NO. 284) ""
- 789 Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas v. Webster, 287 F. 579, 581 (N.D.Tex. Jun 14, 1922) (NO. 3150)
- 790 Nueces Valley Town-Site Co. v. McAdoo, 257 F. 143, 146 (W.D.Tex. Apr 15, 1919) (NO. 215)
- 791 Hancock v. Walsh, 11 F.Cas. 403, 406+, 3 Woods 351, 351+, 25 Int.Rev.Rec. 160, 160+, 8 Cent. L.J. 393, 393+, No. 6012, 6012+ (C.C.W.D.Tex. Apr 1879)
- 792 Gray v. Davis, 10 F.Cas. 1006, 1009+, 1 Woods 420, 420+, No. 5715, 5715+ (C.C.W.D.Tex. Jan Term 1871)
- 793 Friends of the Earth v. Armstrong, 360 F.Supp. 165, 186, 5 ERC 1481, 1481 (D.Utah Apr 21, 1973) (NO. CIV. 116-71)

- 794 Lehman Bros. Bank, FSB v. Frank T. Yoder Mortg., 415 F.Supp.2d 636, 639 (E.D.Va. Feb 13, 2006) (NO. 1:05CV1398)
- 795 Lilly v. Sisk, 1999 WL 370060, *1 (W.D.Va. Apr 09, 1999) (NO. CIV. A. 99-0023-C)
- 796 Esser v. Roach, 829 F.Supp. 171, 174, 62 USLW 2131, 2131 (E.D.Va. Aug 03, 1993) (NO. 2:92CV1013)
- 797 Zurenda v. Holloman, 616 F.Supp. 212, 215 (E.D.Va. Jun 19, 1985) (NO. CIV. A. 85-52-NN) ""
- 798 WANV, Inc. v. Augusta County Broadcasting Corp., 414 F.Supp. 23, 25 (W.D.Va. Apr 07, 1976) (NO. CIV. 75-0106)
- 799 Appalachian Elec. Power Co. v. Smith, 4 F.Supp. 6, 13 (W.D.Va. Mar 29, 1933) (NO. 494)
- 800 Blevins v. Hines, 264 F. 1005, 1008+ (W.D.Va. May 08, 1920)
- 801 Baltimore & O.R. Co. v. Allen, 17 F. 171, 193+ (C.C.W.D.Va. May 15, 1883) (*in dissent*)
- 802 KVL, Inc. v. Tax Com'n of Washington, 12 F.Supp. 497, 501+ (W.D.Wash. Oct 30, 1935) (NO. 550)
- 803 Port Angeles Western R. Co. v. Clallam County, Wash., 36 F.2d 956, 958 (W.D.Wash. Jan 03, 1930) (NO. 20020)
- 804 In re Bishop, 26 F.2d 148, 148 (W.D.Wash. Dec 31, 1927)
- 805 Bacon v. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, 289 F. 513, 517+ (E.D.Wash. May 10, 1923) (NO. 4205)
- 806 Operating Engineers Local 139 Health Benefit Fund v. Rawson Plumbing, Inc., 130 F.Supp.2d 1022, 1023, 49 Fed.R.Serv.3d 275, 275 (E.D.Wis. Feb 20, 2001) (NO. 00-C-1030)
- 807 Acme Printing Ink Co. v. Menard, Inc., 881 F.Supp. 1237, 1246, 41 ERC 1074, 1074, 25 Envtl. L. Rep. 21,358, 21358 (E.D.Wis. Mar 28, 1995) (NO. 89-C-834) ""
- 808 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. Liberty Trucking Co., 528 F.Supp. 610, 615, 27 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 815, 815, 28 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 32,468, 32468 (W.D.Wis. Dec 17, 1981) (NO. 77-C-440)
- 809 Local Division 519, Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO v. LaCrosse Municipal Transit Utility, 445 F.Supp. 798, 804, 98 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2446, 2446 (W.D.Wis. Jan 27, 1978) (NO. 77-C-292)
- 810 Powerlock Systems, Inc. v. Duo-Lok, Inc., 56 F.R.D. 50, 51 (E.D.Wis. Jul 24, 1972) (NO. 71-C-486)
- 811 Conolly v. Wells, 33 F. 205, 208 (C.C.E.D.Wis. Aug 17, 1887)
- 812 La Mothe v. Fink, 14 F.Cas. 1050, 1052, 8 Biss. 493, 493, 12 Chi.Leg.N. 152, 152, No. 8032, 8032 (C.C.E.D.Wis. Apr 1879)
- 813 Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey v. Fox, 6 F.Supp. 494, 500 (S.D.W.Va. Mar 01, 1934) (NO. 3312)
- 814 Hatfield v. King, 131 F. 791, 794 (C.C.N.D.W.Va. May 17, 1904)
- 815 Morenci Copper Co. v. Freer, 127 F. 199, 203+ (C.C.S.D.W.Va. Nov 30, 1903)
- 816 Teeters v. Henton, 43 F.2d 175, 176 (D.Wyo. Jul 10, 1930) (NO. 1956)
- 817 Utah Const. Co. v. State Highway Commission of Wyoming, 16 F.2d 322, 325 (D.Wyo. Dec 04, 1926) (NO. 1547)
- 818 Roig v. Puerto Rico Nat. Guard, 47 F.Supp.2d 216, 221 (D.Puerto Rico Apr 28, 1999) (NO. CIV. NO. 99-1367-PG)
- 819 Gonzalez v. Chasen, 506 F.Supp. 990, 992 (D.Puerto Rico Nov 17, 1980) (NO. CIV. 80-2197)
- 820 Comtronics, Inc. v. Puerto Rico Telephone Co., 409 F.Supp. 800, 812 (D.Puerto Rico Jun 17, 1975) (NO. CIV 74-1243)
- 821 In re O'Dell, 251 B.R. 602, 615+, 36 Bankr.Ct.Dec. 170, 170+ (Bankr.N.D.Ala. Aug 02, 2000) (NO. 99-43337-JSS-13)
- 822 In re Technologies Intern. Holdings, Inc., 234 B.R. 699, 713, 49 ERC 1416, 1416, 42 Collier Bankr.Cas.2d 792, 792, 34 Bankr.Ct.Dec. 667, 667 (Bankr.E.D.Ky. Jun 11, 1999) (NO. 99-50867, 99-5074, 99-50868, 99-50869)
- 823 In re Douglas, 304 B.R. 223, 233 (Bankr.D.Md. Sep 23, 2003) (NO. 02-58492-JS, ADV.PRO. 02-5899-JS)
- 824 In re Wyatt, 338 B.R. 76, 78 (Bankr.W.D.Mo. Feb 23, 2006) (NO. 05-22054 DRD, 05-2071 DRD)
- 825 In re Bellerive Springs Bldg. Corp., 127 B.R. 219, 220 (Bankr.E.D.Mo. Apr 25, 1991) (NO. 91-42122-293)
- 826 In re Barrett Refining Corp., 221 B.R. 795, 807, 32 Bankr.Ct.Dec. 937, 937 (Bankr.W.D.Okla. Jun 05, 1998) (NO. 96-10919-BH)

- 827 In re Scott, 82 B.R. 760, 762 (Bankr.E.D.Pa. Feb 24, 1988) (NO. 86-01451 T, 87-0609)
- 828 In re Sarah Allen Home, Inc., 7 B.R. 732, 734 (Bankr.E.D.Pa. Dec 16, 1980) (NO. 79-1805EG)
- 829 In re Madison Madison Intern. of Illinois, P.C., 77 B.R. 678, 681, 16 Bankr.Ct.Dec. 453, 453, Bankr. L. Rep. P 71,994, 71994 (Bankr.E.D.Wis. Aug 10, 1987) (NO. 86-03258, 87-0030)
- 830 Matter of Department of Defense Cable Television Franchise Agreements, 35 Fed.Cl. 114, 116 (Fed.Cl. Mar 07, 1996) (NO. 96-133X)
- 831 Cury v. U.S., 1980 WL 114430, *1, 85 Cust.Ct. 120, 121 (Cust.Ct. Sep 15, 1980) (NO. 80-12, 1001-0-000678)
- 832 S.R. Weinstock & Associates, Inc. v. U.S., 650 F.2d 286, 286, 223 Ct.Cl. 677, 679, 27 Cont.Cas.Fed. (CCH) P 80,283, 80283 (Ct.Cl. Mar 21, 1980) (Table, text in WESTLAW, NO. 244-79C)
- 833 RICO Products Co. v. U. S., 191 F.Supp. 954, 959, 46 Cust.Ct. 73, 74 (Cust.Ct. Feb 01, 1961) (NO. CD 2236, PRO. 58/21234)
- 834 Bankers Farm Mortg. Co. v. U.S., 69 F.Supp. 197, 201+, 107 Ct.Cl. 540, 548+ (Ct.Cl. Jan 06, 1947) (NO. 46430)
- 835 State of Alabama v. U.S., 38 F.2d 897, 900, 69 Ct.Cl. 340, 346 (Ct.Cl. Mar 12, 1930) (NO. J-607)
- 836 Yee Chong Lung & Co. v. U.S., 1922 WL 22015, *2, T.D. 39,191, 39191, 11 U.S.Cust.App. 382, 384 (Cust.App. Jun 29, 1922) (NO. 2171)
- 837 Montgomery v. U.S., 1914 WL 1414, *1414+, 49 Ct.Cl. 574, 611+ (Ct.Cl. Jun 01, 1914)
- 838 Chicago & A.R. Co. v. U.S., 1914 WL 1429, *31, 49 Ct.Cl. 463, 512 (Ct.Cl. May 18, 1914)
- 839 Ayres v. U.S., 1908 WL 735, *7, 44 Ct.Cl. 110, 121 (Ct.Cl. Dec 14, 1908) (NO. 11903)
- 840 Ceballos v. U.S., 1907 WL 900, *16, 42 Ct.Cl. 318, 343 (Ct.Cl. Apr 22, 1907)
- 841 McCollum v. U.S., 1800 WL 986, *5, 17 Ct.Cl. 92, 98 (Ct.Cl. Dec Term 1881)
- 842 Wormer v. U.S., 1800 WL 637, *637, 4 Ct.Cl. 258, 262 (Ct.Cl. Dec Term 1868)
- 843 U.S. v. Woods, 1953 WL 1612, *1612+, 8 C.M.R. 3, 14+, 2 USCMA 203, 214+ (CMA Feb 19, 1953) (NO. 1023)
- 844 Martin v. C.I.R., 2000 WL 825673, *4, T.C. Memo. 2000-187, 2000-187, 79 T.C.M. (CCH) 2153, 2153, T.C.M. (RIA) 2000-187, 2000-187 (U.S.Tax Ct. Jun 27, 2000) (NO. 32146-86, 22961-88)
- 845 Backstrom v. C.I.R., 1997 WL 222866, *9, T.C. Memo. 1997-211, 1997-211, 73 T.C.M. (CCH) 2723, 2723, T.C.M. (RIA) 97,211, 97211 (U.S.Tax Ct. May 06, 1997) (NO. 590488)
- 846 Takamoto v. C.I.R., 1996 WL 89629, *3, T.C. Memo. 1996-94, 1996-94, 71 T.C.M. (CCH) 2281, 2281, T.C.M. (RIA) 96,094, 96094 (U.S.Tax Ct. Mar 04, 1996) (NO. 36819-84)
- 847 Gray v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 73 T.C. 639, 647 (U.S.Tax Ct. Jan 07, 1980) (NO. 6483-79) ""
- 848 Ex parte Cranman, 792 So.2d 392, 400 (Ala. Jun 16, 2000) (NO. 1971903)
- 849 Oden v. King, 113 So. 609, 611+, 216 Ala. 504, 508+, 54 A.L.R. 1413, 1413+ (Ala. Jun 30, 1927) (NO. 6 DIV.910)
- 850 Williams v. City of Talladega, 51 So. 330, 332+, 164 Ala. 633, 642+ (Ala. Dec 21, 1909)
- 851 Port of Mobile v. Louisville & N.R. Co., 4 So. 106, 111, 84 Ala. 115, 124, 5 Am.St.Rep. 342, 342 (Ala. May 03, 1888)
- 852 Comer v. Bankhead, 70 Ala. 493, 497, 1881 WL 1295, *4 (Ala. Dec Term 1881)
- 853 Ex parte Grimboll, 61 Ala. 598, 600, 1878 WL 1090, *2 (Ala. Dec Term 1878)
- 854 National Commercial Bank v. City of Mobile, 62 Ala. 284, 292, 1878 WL 1159, *7, 34 Am.Rep. 15, 15 (Ala. Dec Term 1878)
- 855 Reid v. Moulton, 51 Ala. 255, 267, 1874 WL 850, *9 (Ala. Jun Term 1874)
- 856 Bruner v. Bryan, 50 Ala. 522, 528, 1874 WL 1066, *5 (Ala. Jan Term 1874)
- 857 Jones v. Black, 48 Ala. 540, 544, 1872 WL 965, *3 (Ala. Jun Term 1872)
- 858 Ex parte Chase, 43 Ala. 303, 311, 1869 WL 513, *5 (Ala. Jun Term 1869)
- 859 Pearce v. Bank of Mobile, 33 Ala. 693, 699, 1859 WL 628, *4 (Ala. Jan Term 1859)
- 860 Mobile & O.R. Co. v. State, 29 Ala. 573, 579, 1857 WL 289, *4 (Ala. Jan Term 1857)
- 861 Ex parte Greene, 29 Ala. 52, 56+, 1856 WL 332, *3+ (Ala. Jun Term 1856)
- 862 Grady v. Robinson, 28 Ala. 289, 292, 1856 WL 452, *2 (Ala. Jan Term 1856)
- 863 Drake v. Foster, 28 Ala. 649, 653, 1856 WL 507, *3 (Ala. Jan Term 1856)
- 864 Winston v. Westfeldt, 22 Ala. 760, 761, 1853 WL 458, *1, 58 Am.Dec. 278, 278 (Ala. Jun Term 1853)

- C 865 *Mundine v. Pitts' Adm'r*, 14 Ala. 84, 85, 1848 WL 496, *1 (Ala. Jan Term 1848)
C 866 *Curry v. Bank of Mobile*, 8 Port. 360, 374, 1839 WL 824, *6 (Ala. Jun Term 1839)
H 867 *Wilbanks v. State*, 151 So.2d 741, 743, 42 Ala.App. 39, 41 (Ala.App. Nov 06, 1962) (NO. 5 DIV. 610)
C 868 *Etheredge v. Bradley*, 480 P.2d 414, 417 (Alaska Feb 08, 1971) (NO. 1399)
C 869 *Gila Valley Elec., Gas & Water Co. v. Arizona Trust & Sav. Bank*, 215 P. 159, 160, 25 Ariz. 177, 182 (Ariz. May 15, 1923) (NO. 2045)
C 870 *City of Bisbee v. Bisbee Improvement Co.*, 157 P. 228, 236, 18 Ariz. 126, 147 (Ariz. May 12, 1916) (NO. 1497) "" (*in dissent*)
C 871 *State v. Osborne*, 125 P. 884, 886, 14 Ariz. 185, 189 (Ariz. Jul 15, 1912) ""
T 872 *Boydston v. Strole Development Co.*, 962 P.2d 209, 210, 192 Ariz. 135, 136, 258 Ariz. Adv. Rep. 30, 30 (Ariz.App. Div. 1 Dec 18, 1997) (NO. 1 CA-CV 96-0476) ""
C 873 *Maricopa County v. Superior Court In and For County of Maricopa*, 823 P.2d 696, 702, 170 Ariz. 248, 254 (Ariz.App. Div. 1 Dec 31, 1991) (NO. 1 CA-SA 91-156-TX, 1 CA-SA 91-157-TX, 1 CA-SA 91-158-TX, 1 CA-SA 91-159-TX)
T 874 *Bates & Springer of Ariz., Inc. v. Frierwood*, 492 P.2d 1247, 1250, 16 Ariz.App. 309, 312 (Ariz.App. Div. 2 Jan 20, 1972) (NO. 2 CA-CIV 1003)
C 875 *Bussart v. Superior Court In and For Yavapai County*, 464 P.2d 668, 672, 11 Ariz.App. 348, 352 (Ariz.App. Div. 1 Feb 05, 1970) (NO. 1 CA-CIV 1267)
T 876 *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Baysinger*, 812 S.W.2d 463, 470, 306 Ark. 239, 253, 125 Lab.Cas. P 57,335, 57335, 6 IER Cases 961, 961 (Ark. Jul 01, 1991) (NO. 90-234) (*in dissent*)
H 877 *Arkansas Power & Light Co. v. Arkansas Public Service Commission*, 330 S.W.2d 51, 55+, 33 P.U.R.3d 45, 45+, 231 Ark. 142, 149+ (Ark. Nov 02, 1959) (NO. 5-1940) ""
H 878 *E. E. Morgan Co. v. State, for Use and Benefit of Phillips County*, 150 S.W.2d 736, 737, 202 Ark. 404, 404 (Ark. May 05, 1941) (NO. 4-6344) ""
C 879 *Pitcock v. State*, 121 S.W. 742, 749+, 91 Ark. 527, 527+, 134 Am.St.Rep. 88, 88+ (Ark. Jul 12, 1909)
C 880 *McCConnell v. Arkansas Brick & Mfg. Co.*, 69 S.W. 559, 565, 70 Ark. 568, 568 (Ark. May 17, 1902)
T 881 *State v. Curran*, 12 Ark. 321, 350, 1851 WL 60, *18, 7 Eng. 321, 321 (Ark. Jul Term 1851)
C 882 *Tally v. Reynolds*, 1 Ark. 99, 103, 1838 WL 58, *2, 31 Am.Dec. 737, 737, 1 Pike 99, 99 (Ark. Jan Term 1838)
H 883 *Collins v. Excel Specialty Products*, 49 S.W.3d 161, 164, 74 Ark.App. 400, 405 (Ark.App. Jul 05, 2001) (NO. CA01-102) (*in dissent*)
H 884 *Kingston Constructors, Inc. v. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority*, 59 Cal.Rptr.2d 866, 869+, 928 P.2d 581, 584+, 14 Cal.4th 939, 945+, 97 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 248, 248+, 97 Daily Journal D.A.R. 375, 375+ (Cal. Jan 09, 1997) (NO. S053577)
T 885 *Smiley v. Citibank*, 44 Cal.Rptr.2d 441, 464, 900 P.2d 690, 713, 11 Cal.4th 138, 172, 64 USLW 2149, 2149, 95 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 7006, 7006, 95 Daily Journal D.A.R. 11,931, 11931 (Cal. Sep 01, 1995) (NO. S041711) "" (*in dissent*)
C 886 *Eisley v. Mohan*, 192 P.2d 5, 13, 31 Cal.2d 637, 650 (Cal. Apr 03, 1948) (NO. S.F. 17534)
T 887 *San Benito County v. Southern Pac. R. Co.*, 19 P. 827, 827+, 77 Cal. 518, 521+ (Cal. Dec 13, 1888) (NO. 11,201)
H 888 *Spring Valley Water Works v. Schottler*, 10 P.C.L.J. 430, 430, 62 Cal. 69, 112, 1882 WL 287, *24 (Cal. Nov 16, 1882) (NO. 8,052)
C 889 *Central Pac. R. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization*, 8 P.C.L.J. 1072, 1072+, 60 Cal. 35, 48+, 1882 WL 1676, *8+ (Cal. Jan 19, 1882) (NO. 8004)
C 890 *Polack v. Mansfield*, 44 Cal. 36, 36+, 1872 WL 1234, *1+, 13 Am.Rep. 151, 151+ (Cal. Jul Term 1872) (NO. 2616)
C 891 *Appeal of Houghton*, 42 Cal. 35, 42+, 1871 WL 1452, *3+ (Cal. Oct Term 1871) (NO. 2986)
C 892 *Bagley v. Ward*, 37 Cal. 121, 126, 1869 WL 873, *3, 99 Am.Dec. 256, 256 (Cal. Apr Term 1869)
C 893 *Fall v. Sutter County*, 21 Cal. 237, 239, 1862 WL 627, *2 (Cal. Oct Term 1862)
C 894 *Perry v. Washburn*, 20 Cal. 318, 320+, 1862 WL 551, *2+ (Cal. Jul Term 1862)
C 895 *Patten v. Green*, 13 Cal. 325, 326, 1859 WL 993, *1 (Cal. Apr Term 1859)
C 896 *McCauley v. Weller*, 12 Cal. 500, 521, 1859 WL 1166, *16 (Cal. Jan Term 1859)
C 897 *Nogues v. Douglass (Nougues v. Douglass)*, 7 Cal. 65, 74, 1857 WL 649, *7 (Cal. Jan Term 1857)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- H** 898 McGee v. City of Laguna Beach, 65 Cal.Rptr.2d 506, 513, 56 Cal.App.4th 537, 549, 97 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 5677, 5677, 97 Daily Journal D.A.R. 9141, 9141 (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Jul 15, 1997) (NO. G019291)
- T** 899 Paradise v. Nowlin, 195 P.2d 867, 868, 86 Cal.App.2d 897, 899 (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Jul 26, 1948) (NO. CIV 16569)
- C** 900 Kyne v. Kyne, 169 P.2d 272, 277, 74 Cal.App.2d 563, 572 (Cal.App. 1 Dist. May 21, 1946) (NO. CIV. 13008, CIV. 13009)
- T** 901 Swall v. Anderson, 140 P.2d 196, 201 (Cal.App. 1 Dist. Jul 26, 1943) (NO. CIV. 12448) ""
- C** 902 Cargnani v. Cargnani, 116 P. 306, 309, 16 Cal.App. 96, 102 (Cal.App. 3 Dist. Apr 26, 1911) (NO. CIV. 823)
- C** 903 People ex rel. Alexander v. District Court of Tenth Judicial District, 68 P. 242, 253, 29 Colo. 182, 233 (Colo. Oct 29, 1901)
- T** 904 Patterson v. People, 130 P. 618, 623, 23 Colo.App. 479, 491 (Colorado App. Feb 10, 1913)
- C** 905 Dennis v. Dennis, 36 A. 34, 38, 68 Conn. 186, 186, 57 Am.St.Rep. 95, 95, 34 L.R.A. 449, 449 (Conn. Jun 25, 1896)
- C** 906 Sharps' Rifle Mfg. Co. v. Rowan, 34 Conn. 329, 332+, 1867 WL 962, *3+, 91 Am.Dec. 728, 728+ (Conn. Sep Term 1867)
- C** 907 Savings Bank of New Haven v. Davis, 8 Conn. 191, 199+, 1830 WL 34, *6+ (Conn. Jul 1830)
- C** 908 Davison v. Champlin, 7 Conn. 244, 247, 1828 WL 74, *3 (Conn. Jul 1828) ""
- T** 909 Expressway Associates II v. Friendly Ice Cream Corp. of Connecticut, 642 A.2d 62, 65, 34 Conn.App. 543, 547 (Conn.App. May 31, 1994) (NO. 11891)
- C** 910 Landy v. Cohen, 14 Conn.Supp. 268, 270, 1946 WL 721, *3 (Conn.Super. Jul 24, 1946) (NO. 69301)
- T** 911 Baskin v. Kass, 48 A.2d 773, 775 (D.C.Mun.App. Aug 30, 1946) (NO. 401)
- C** 912 Potomac Small Loan Co. v. Myles, 34 A.2d 609, 613 (D.C.Mun.App. Nov 16, 1943) (NO. 122)
- C** 913 Taylor v. Yellow Cab Co. of District of Columbia, 31 A.2d 683, 686 (D.C.Mun.App. Apr 06, 1943) (NO. 57) (*in dissent*)
- H** 914 State ex rel. Hawkins v. Board of Control, 93 So.2d 354, 367 (Fla. Mar 08, 1957) (*in dissent*)
- C** 915 Henderson v. First Trust & Sav. Bank, 144 So. 415, 417, 107 Fla. 212, 217 (Fla. Nov 14, 1932)
- C** 916 McWhorter v. Pensacola & A.R. Co., 5 So. 129, 131, 24 Fla. 417, 460, 12 Am.St.Rep. 220, 220, 2 L.R.A. 504, 504 (Fla. Nov 21, 1888)
- C** 917 Ex parte Henderson, 6 Fla. 279, 296, 1855 WL 1384, *10 (Fla. Feb Term 1855)
- T** 918 Eckles v. Atlanta Technology Group, Inc., 485 S.E.2d 22, 25, 267 Ga. 801, 803, 97 FCDR 1239, 1239 (Ga. Apr 04, 1997) (NO. S96A1507) ""
- T** 919 Eckles v. Atlanta Technology Group, Inc., 483 S.E.2d 99, 101, 97 FCDR 686, 686 (Ga. Mar 03, 1997) (NO. S96A1507) ""
- T** 920 James B. Beam Distilling Co. v. State, 382 S.E.2d 95, 99, 259 Ga. 363, 369, 58 USLW 2067, 2067 (Ga. Jul 14, 1989) (NO. 46642, 46681) ""
- T** 921 Bartow County Bank v. Bartow County Bd. of Tax Assessors, 285 S.E.2d 920, 923, 248 Ga. 703, 706 (Ga. Jan 06, 1982) (NO. 37868, 37869, 37870)
- T** 922 Ramsey v. Hamilton, 182 S.E. 392, 397, 181 Ga. 365, 365 (Ga. Oct 19, 1935) (NO. 11030)
- C** 923 Dennison Mfg. Co. v. Wright, 120 S.E. 120, 124, 156 Ga. 789, 789 (Ga. Nov 17, 1923) (NO. 3802)
- C** 924 Paulk v. City of Sycamore, 30 S.E. 417, 418, 104 Ga. 24, 24, 69 Am.St.Rep. 128, 128, 41 L.R.A. 772, 772 (Ga. Apr 11, 1898) ""
- C** 925 Georgia Penitentiary Companies Nos. 2 & 3 v. Nelms, 71 Ga. 301, 357, 1884 WL 2850, *36 (Ga. Jan 11, 1884)
- C** 926 Dearing v. Bank of Charleston, 5 Ga. 497, 501, 1848 WL 1582, *4, 48 Am.Dec. 300, 300 (Ga. Nov Term 1848) (NO. 58)
- T** 927 White v. State, 125 S.E.2d 239, 247, 105 Ga.App. 616, 627 (Ga.App. Mar 16, 1962) (NO. 39142) (*in dissent*)
- T** 928 Florida State Hospital for Insane v. Durham Iron Co., 17 S.E.2d 842, 846, 66 Ga.App. 350, 350 (Ga.App. Oct 25, 1941) (NO. 29200)
- C** 929 Calhoun v. Central of Ga. Ry. Co., 67 S.E. 274, 274+, 7 Ga.App. 528, 528+ (Ga.App. Mar 05, 1910) (NO. 1,991) ""

- 930 Oahu Plumbing and Sheet Metal, Ltd. v. Kona Const., Inc., 590 P.2d 570, 572, 60 Haw. 372, 374 (Hawai'i Feb 08, 1979) (NO. 6823)
- 931 In re Ellis, 487 P.2d 286, 290, 53 Haw. 23, 29 (Hawai'i Jun 25, 1971) (NO. 5044)
- 932 Seattle Brewing & Malting Co. v. Campbell, 1906 WL 1308, *5, 17 Haw. 364, 371 (Hawai'i Terr. Mar 05, 1906)
- 933 People v. Moore, 1 Idaho 504, 505, 1873 WL 3366, *1 (Idaho Terr. Jan Term 1873)
- 934 Kelsay v. Motorola, Inc., 384 N.E.2d 353, 361, 23 Ill.Dec. 559, 567, 74 Ill.2d 172, 191, 115 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 4371, 4371 (Ill. Dec 04, 1978) (NO. 49950)
- 935 Henrys v. Raboin, 69 N.E.2d 491, 500, 395 Ill. 118, 136, 169 A.L.R. 927, 927 (Ill. Sep 18, 1946) (NO. 29345)
- 936 North Chicago Hebrew Congregation v. Board of Appeals of Cook County, 193 N.E. 519, 524+, 358 Ill. 549, 562+ (Ill. Dec 20, 1934) (NO. 22484) ""
- 937 People v. Bruner, 175 N.E. 400, 405, 343 Ill. 146, 157 (Ill. Feb 18, 1931) (NO. 20603)
- 938 People ex rel. First Nat. Bank v. Brady, 110 N.E. 864, 867+, 271 Ill. 100, 107+, Am. Ann. Cas. 1917C, 1093, 1917C, 1093+ (Ill. Dec 22, 1915) (NO. 10213)
- 939 People v. Pfanschmidt, 104 N.E. 804, 816, 262 Ill. 411, 440, Am. Ann. Cas. 1915A, 1171, 1915A, 1171 (Ill. Feb 21, 1914) ""
- 940 Joos v. Illinois Nat. Guard, 100 N.E. 505, 506+, 257 Ill. 138, 142+, 43 L.R.A.N.S. 1214, 1214+, Am. Ann. Cas. 1914A, 862, 1914A, 862+ (Ill. Dec 17, 1912)
- 941 Burke v. Snively, 70 N.E. 327, 329, 208 Ill. 328, 337 (Ill. Feb 17, 1904)
- 942 City of Mt. Vernon v. People, 35 N.E. 533, 534, 147 Ill. 359, 365, 23 L.R.A. 807, 807 (Ill. Oct 27, 1893)
- 943 People v. Bradley, 39 Ill. 130, 133+, 1866 WL 4372, *1+ (Ill. Jan Term 1866)
- 944 Webster v. French, 11 Ill. 254, 257+, 1849 WL 4283, *2+, 1 Peck (IL) 254, 254+ (Ill. Dec Term 1849)
- 945 People v. Moscatello, 251 N.E.2d 532, 542, 114 Ill.App.2d 16, 38 (Ill.App. 2 Dist. Oct 01, 1969) (NO. 68-154) ""
- 946 In re Village of Harvester, 185 N.E.2d 369, 372, 37 Ill.App.2d 255, 261 (Ill.App. 1 Dist. Sep 19, 1962) (NO. 48707)
- 947 Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co. v. Hart, 34 N.E.2d 88, 90, 310 Ill.App. 351, 356 (Ill.App. 1 Dist. May 19, 1941) (NO. 41578)
- 948 People ex rel. First Nat. Bank v. Kingery, 8 N.E.2d 733, 736, 290 Ill.App. 393, 401 (Ill.App. 1 Dist. May 19, 1937) (NO. 39016)
- 949 Bank of Commerce v. Franklin, for Use of, 88 Ill.App. 198, 203, 1800 WL 2666, *3 (Ill.App. 1 Dist. Apr 04, 1900)
- 950 Hutchins v. Heffran, 56 Ill.App. 581, 583, 1894 WL 2865, *1 (Ill.App. 2 Dist. Jan 24, 1895)
- 951 King v. S.B., 837 N.E.2d 965, 971 (Ind. Nov 23, 2005) (NO. 53S01-0511-JV-606) "" (*in dissent*)
- 952 Peavler v. Board of Com'rs of Monroe County, 528 N.E.2d 40, 41 (Ind. Sep 09, 1988) (NO. 36S01-8809-CV-817, 43S03-8809-CV-818)
- 953 State ex rel. McGarr v. Debaun, 154 N.E. 492, 494, 198 Ind. 661, 661 (Ind. Dec 22, 1926) (NO. 25187)
- 954 Ellingham v. Dye, 99 N.E. 1, 26+, 178 Ind. 336, 336+, Am. Ann. Cas. 1915C, 200, 1915C, 200+ (Ind. Jul 05, 1912) (NO. 22064)
- 955 Board of Com'rs of White County v. Gwin, 36 N.E. 237, 242, 136 Ind. 562, 562, 22 L.R.A. 402, 402 (Ind. Jan 23, 1894)
- 956 Robertson v. State ex rel. Smith, 10 N.E. 582, 583, 109 Ind. 79, 79 (Ind. Feb 23, 1887) ""
- 957 English v. Smock, 34 Ind. 115, 125, 1870 WL 3721, *6, 7 Am. Rep. 215, 215 (Ind. Nov Term 1870) ""
- 958 Thayer v. Hedges, 23 Ind. 141, 146+, 1864 WL 2091, *3+ (Ind. Nov Term 1864)
- 959 Noble v. City of Indianapolis, 16 Ind. 506, 509, 1861 WL 2769, *4 (Ind. May Term 1861)
- 960 Francis v. Porter, 7 Ind. 213, 217, 1855 WL 3741, *2 (Ind. Nov Term 1855)
- 961 State Bank of Indiana v. Bell, 5 Blackf. 127, 128, 1839 WL 2199, *1 (Ind. May Term 1839)
- 962 Vance v. Farmers' & Mechanics' Bank of Indiana, 1 Blackf. 80, 80, 1820 WL 895, *1 (Ind. Jul Term 1820)

- 963 Luke v. Indiana Trust Co., 159 N.E. 769, 771, 86 Ind.App. 717, 717 (Ind.App. Jan 27, 1928) (NO. 13181) ""
- 964 Masten v. Indiana Car & Foundry Co., 57 N.E. 148, 152, 25 Ind.App. 175, 175 (Ind.App. Apr 18, 1900)
- 965 Hawkeye Bank and Trust, Nat. Ass'n v. Baugh, 463 N.W.2d 22, 23, 8 A.L.R.5th 991, 991 (Iowa Nov 21, 1990) (NO. 89-1086) ""
- 966 Linn County v. City of Hiawatha, 311 N.W.2d 95, 98 (Iowa Oct 21, 1981) (NO. 65852)
- 967 Boss v. Polk County, 19 N.W.2d 225, 229, 236 Iowa 384, 393 (Iowa Jun 19, 1945) (NO. 46677)
- 968 Iowa Elec. Co. v. State Bd. of Control, 266 N.W. 543, 545+, 221 Iowa 1050, 1050+ (Iowa Apr 07, 1936) (NO. 42959)
- 969 Home Ins. Co. v. North Western Packet Co., 32 Iowa 223, 237, 1871 WL 121, *7, 7 Am.Rep. 183, 183 (Iowa Jul 28, 1871)
- 970 Buchanan v. Marsh, 17 Iowa 494, 498, 1864 WL 359, *2 (Iowa Dec 10, 1864)
- 971 Jones v. Jones, 13 Iowa 276, 278, 1862 WL 153, *1 (Iowa Jun 05, 1862)
- 972 De France v. Howard, 4 Clarke 524, 524, 4 Iowa 524, 529, 1857 WL 157, *3 (Iowa Sep 10, 1857)
- 973 Clinton v. State Tax Commission, 71 P.2d 857, 864+, 146 Kan. 407, 407+ (Kan. Sep 20, 1937) (NO. 33526)
- 974 Stevenson v. Metsker, 286 P. 673, 689+, 130 Kan. 251, 251+ (Kan. Mar 19, 1930) (NO. 29522) (*in dissent*)
- 975 Long v. Kasebeer, 28 Kan. 226, 233, 1882 WL 957, *4 (Kan. Jan Term 1882)
- 976 Coleman v. Newby, 7 Kan. 82, 87+, 1871 WL 696, *2+ (Kan. Jan Term 1871)
- 977 Leavenworth County Com'rs v. Miller, 7 Kan. 479, 522, 1871 WL 804, *20, 12 Am.Rep. 425, 425 (Kan. Jan Term 1871)
- 978 Wheatley v. Tutt, 4 Kan. 240, 242, 1867 WL 403, *2 (Kan. Jan Term 1867)
- 979 Flynn v. Songer, 399 S.W.2d 491, 494 (Ky. Feb 18, 1966)
- 980 Rohde v. City of Newport, 55 S.W.2d 368, 370+, 246 Ky. 476, 476+, 87 A.L.R. 701, 701+ (Ky. Dec 13, 1932)
- 981 Webster County v. Lutz, 28 S.W.2d 966, 967, 234 Ky. 618, 618 (Ky. Jun 03, 1930)
- 982 B.B. Wilson Co. v. Van Diver, 18 S.W.2d 308, 309, 230 Ky. 27, 27 (Ky. Jun 07, 1929)
- 983 Nichols v. Chesapeake & O. Ry. Co., 105 S.W. 481, 483+, 32 Ky.L.Rptr. 270, 270+, 127 Ky. 310, 310+, 17 L.R.A.N.S. 861, 861+ (Ky. Nov 22, 1907)
- 984 Herr v. Central Kentucky Lunatic Asylum, 30 S.W. 971, 972, 17 Ky.L.Rptr. 320, 320, 97 Ky. 458, 458, 53 Am.St.Rep. 414, 414, 28 L.R.A. 394, 394 (Ky. May 10, 1895)
- 985 Commonwealth v. First Nat. Bank of Louisville, 4 Bush 98, 98, 67 Ky. 98, 99, 1868 WL 52, *1, 96 Am.Dec. 285, 285 (Ky. Oct 08, 1868)
- 986 Edwards v. Ward, 2 Bush 606, 606, 65 Ky. 606, 607, 1866 WL 3580, *1 (Ky. Oct 06, 1866)
- 987 Phillips v. Winslow, 18 B.Mon. 431, 431+, 57 Ky. 431, 434+, 1857 WL 4415, *3+, 68 Am.Dec. 729, 729+ (Ky. Oct 15, 1857)
- 988 Divine v. Harvie, 7 T.B.Mon. 439, 439+, 23 Ky. 439, 441+, 1828 WL 1295, *2+, 18 Am.Dec. 194, 194+ (Ky. Jun 27, 1828)
- 989 Bouldin v. Alexander, 7 T.B.Mon. 424, 424+, 23 Ky. 424, 433+, 1828 WL 1293, *6+ (Ky. Jun 26, 1828) (*in dissent*)
- 990 Board of Com'rs of Port of New Orleans v. Splendour Shipping & Enterprises Co., Inc., 273 So.2d 19, 20 (La. Jan 15, 1973) (NO. 52156)
- 991 State ex rel. Louisiana Trust & Savings Bank v. Board of Liquidation of State Debt, 67 So. 370, 373, 136 La. 571, 581 (La. Jan 11, 1915) (NO. 20854)
- 992 In re Seim, 35 So. 744, 746+, 111 La. 554, 559+ (La. Jun 22, 1903) (NO. 14,691)
- 993 State v. Burke, 35 La. Ann. 185, 193, 1883 WL 8151, *7 (La. Jan 1883) (NO. 8350)
- 994 Succession of Colwell, 34 La. Ann. 265, 270, 1882 WL 8590, *6 (La. Mar 1882) (NO. 8511)
- 995 Johnson v. New Orleans Nat. Banking Ass'n, 33 La. Ann. 479, 480, 1881 WL 8718, *1 (La. Apr 1881) (NO. 6840)
- 996 Cronan v. Peters, 9 La. Ann. 468, 471+, 1854 WL 4245, *4+ (La. Jun 1854)
- 997 First Agr. Nat. Bank of Berkshire County v. State Tax Commission, 229 N.E.2d 245, 252+, 353 Mass. 172, 183+ (Mass. Jul 27, 1967)
- 998 Com. v. Norman, 144 N.E. 66, 67, 249 Mass. 123, 128 (Mass. May 23, 1924)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 999 Mason v. Intercolonial Ry. of Canada, 83 N.E. 876, 876, 197 Mass. 349, 350, 16 L.R.A.N.S. 276, 276, 125 Am.St.Rep. 371, 371, 14 Am.Ann.Cas. 574, 574 (Mass. Feb 26, 1908)
- 1000 Child v. Christian Soc., 11 N.E. 664, 665, 144 Mass. 473, 475 (Mass. May 09, 1887)
- 1001 CENTRAL NATIONAL BANK v. JOSEPH PRATT., 115 Mass. 539, 546+, 1874 WL 13578, *5+ (Mass. Mar 09, 1874)
- 1002 Palfrey v. City of Boston, 1869 WL 5622, *2, 101 Mass. 329, 331, 3 Am.Rep. 364, 364 (Mass. 1869)
- 1003 Briggs v. A Light Boat, 11 Allen 157, 157, 93 Mass. 157, 185, 1865 WL 3258, *18 (Mass. 1865) ""
- 1004 Boston & L.R. Corp. v. Salem & L.R. Co., 2 Gray 1, 1+, 68 Mass. 1, 17+, 1854 WL 5011, *11+ (Mass. 1854)
- 1005 City of Baltimore v. A.S. Abell Co., 145 A.2d 111, 115, 218 Md. 273, 281 (Md. Oct 17, 1958) (NO. 123)
- 1006 McCrea v. Roberts, 43 A. 39, 42, 89 Md. 238, 238, 44 L.R.A. 485, 485 (Md. Mar 16, 1899)
- 1007 Equitable Gas Light Co. of Baltimore City v. Baltimore Coal Tar & Mfg. Co., 63 Md. 285, 293, 1885 WL 3251, *4 (Md. Mar 11, 1885)
- 1008 Eichelberger v. Hardesty, 15 Md. 548, 549, 1860 WL 4506, *2 (Md. May 16, 1860)
- 1009 Lucas v. Attorney General ex rel. McBlair, 11 G. & J. 490, 505, 1841 WL 1967, *8 (Md. Dec Term 1841)
- 1010 Miller v. Ratner, 688 A.2d 976, 998, 114 Md.App. 18, 62 (Md.App. Feb 07, 1997) (NO. 821 SEPT.TERM 1996) ""
- 1011 Harvey F. Gamage, Shipbuilder, Inc. v. Halperin, 359 A.2d 72, 76 (Me. Jun 14, 1976)
- 1012 Bale v. Ryder, 286 A.2d 344, 346 (Me. Jan 21, 1972)
- 1013 Farnsworth v. Whiting, 76 A. 909, 911, 106 Me. 430, 430 (Me. Mar 01, 1910)
- 1014 Sumner v. Richardson Lake Dam Co., 71 Me. 106, 107, 1880 WL 4103, *4103 (Me. Mar 15, 1880)
- 1015 Emery v. Hobson, 63 Me. 33, 38+, 1873 WL 3100, *3100+ (Me. 1873)
- 1016 York & C.R. Co. v. Myers, 41 Me. 109, 115+, 1856 WL 2095, *5+ (Me. 1856)
- 1017 Moor v. Veazie, 31 Me. 360, 367, 1849 WL 2007, *6 (Me. 1849)
- 1018 Jenney v. Delesdernier, 20 Me. 183, 188, 1841 WL 1018, *4, 2 App. 183, 183 (Me. Jul Term 1841)
- 1019 Penobscot Boom Corp. v. Lamson, 16 Me. 224, 229, 1839 WL 733, *3, 33 Am.Dec. 656, 656, 4 Shep. 224, 224 (Me. Jul Term 1839)
- 1020 People v. Fields, 199 N.W.2d 217, 224, 388 Mich. 66, 80 (Mich. Jul 26, 1972) (NO. 6) (*in dissent*)
- 1021 Moyses v. Spartan Asphalt Paving Co., 174 N.W.2d 797, 801+, 383 Mich. 314, 326+ (Mich. Mar 12, 1970) (NO. 10)
- 1022 Rushton ex rel. Commissioner of Banking Department v. Michigan Nat. Bank, 299 N.W. 129, 135+, 298 Mich. 417, 432+, 136 A.L.R. 458, 458+ (Mich. Jun 30, 1941) (NO. 66)
- 1023 Dolby v. Dillman, 278 N.W. 694, 713, 283 Mich. 609, 660, 117 A.L.R. 538, 538 (Mich. Apr 04, 1938) (NO. 52 OCT. TERM 1937) "" (*in dissent*)
- 1024 Wilson v. Michigan State Board of Registration in Medicine, 199 N.W. 643, 644, 228 Mich. 25, 27 (Mich. Jul 24, 1924) (NO. 285) ""
- 1025 Fellows v. First Nat. Bank of Bay City, 159 N.W. 335, 339, 192 Mich. 640, 653 (Mich. Sep 26, 1916) (NO. 296)
- 1026 Lenawee County Sav. Bank v. City of Adrian, 33 N.W. 304, 306, 66 Mich. 273, 276 (Mich. Jun 09, 1887)
- 1027 McElroy v. Swart, 24 N.W. 766, 766, 57 Mich. 500, 500 (Mich. Sep 29, 1885)
- 1028 Youngblood v. Sexton, 32 Mich. 406, 410, 1875 WL 6459, *2, 20 Am.Rep. 654, 654 (Mich. Oct 12, 1875)
- 1029 People ex rel. La Grange Tp. v. State Treasurer, 24 Mich. 468, 474, 1872 WL 5948, *4 (Mich. Apr 16, 1872)
- 1030 Ryan v. Brown, 18 Mich. 196, 196+, 1869 WL 3592, *3592+, 100 Am.Dec. 154, 154+ (Mich. Apr 20, 1869)
- 1031 Bagg v. City of Detroit, 5 Mich. 336, 341, 1858 WL 4483, *3 (Mich. Jul 12, 1858)
- 1032 Farmers' & Mechanics' Bank v. Troy City Bank, 1 Doug. 457, 464, 1844 WL 3087, *5 (Mich. Jan Term 1844)
- 1033 President, etc. of Michigan State Bank v. Hastings, 1 Doug. 225, 241+, 1844 WL 1322, *9+, 41 Am.Dec. 549, 549+ (Mich. Jan Term 1844)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1034 Nicollet Restoration, Inc. v. Turnham, 486 N.W.2d 753, 754 (Minn. Jul 02, 1992) (NO. C3-91-991) ""
- 1035 State v. Northern Pac. Ry. Co., 22 N.W.2d 569, 585, 221 Minn. 400, 433 (Minn. Mar 29, 1946) (NO. 34093) "" (*in dissent*)
- 1036 Contemporary Systems Design v. Commissioner of Jobs and Training, 431 N.W.2d 133, 134 (Minn.App. Nov 01, 1988) (NO. C7-88-806)
- 1037 White v. State, 742 So.2d 1126, 1137+ (Miss. Jun 24, 1999) (NO. 97-KA-01239-SCT) ""
- 1038 Kelly v. Mississippi Valley Gas Co., 397 So.2d 874, 877, 115 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 4631, 4631, 32 A.L.R.4th 1214, 1214 (Miss. Feb 04, 1981) (NO. 52,337) ""
- 1039 Davis v. Little, 362 So.2d 642, 643 (Miss. Sep 13, 1978) (NO. 50638)
- 1040 Sistrunk v. Graham, 61 So.2d 335, 336, 215 Miss. 552, 557 (Miss. Dec 01, 1952) (NO. 38510) ""
- 1041 Mississippi State Tax Commission v. Brown, 193 So. 794, 799+, 188 Miss. 483, 483+, 127 A.L.R. 919, 919+ (Miss. Feb 19, 1940) (NO. 33932)
- 1042 State Mineral Lease Commission v. Lawrence, 157 So. 897, 899, 171 Miss. 442, 442 (Miss. Dec 03, 1934) (NO. 31468) ""
- 1043 Hirsch Bros. & Co. v. R.E. Kennington Co., 124 So. 344, 349, 155 Miss. 242, 242, 88 A.L.R. 1, 1 (Miss. Oct 28, 1929) (NO. 28013)
- 1044 State v. Cumberland Telephone & Telegraph Co., 81 So. 404, 406+, 120 Miss. 325, 325+ (Miss. Apr 21, 1919) (NO. 20703)
- 1045 Fulton v. Woodman, 54 Miss. 158, 161, 1876 WL 5141, *2 (Miss. Oct Term 1876)
- 1046 Williams v. Creswell, 51 Miss. 817, 819+, 1876 WL 7296, *1+ (Miss. Apr Term 1876)
- 1047 Lanier v. Booth, 50 Miss. 410, 412, 1874 WL 6517, *1 (Miss. Oct Term 1874)
- 1048 Memphis & C.R. Co. v. Scruggs, 50 Miss. 284, 288+, 1874 WL 4596, *2+ (Miss. Oct Term 1874)
- 1049 Newman v. Elam, 1853 WL 3709, *1, 4 Cushm. 474, 474, 26 Miss. 474, 475 (Miss.Err. & App. Dec Term 1853)
- 1050 Anderson v. State, 1 Cushm. 459, 459, 23 Miss. 459, 474, 1852 WL 1966, *11 (Miss.Err. & App. Jan Term 1852)
- 1051 Grand Gulf Bank v. Archer, 8 Smedes & M. 151, 151, 16 Miss. 151, 195, 1847 WL 2649, *28 (Miss.Err. & App. Jan Term 1847) (*in dissent*)
- 1052 Commercial Bank of Rodney v. State, 1845 WL 1992, *37, 4 Smedes & M. 439, 439, 12 Miss. 439, 497 (Miss.Err. & App. Jan Term 1845)
- 1053 Fitch v. Stamps, 6 Howard 487, 487, 7 Miss. 487, 496, 1842 WL 3042, *7 (Miss.Err. & App. Jan Term 1842)
- 1054 Campbell v. Mississippi Union Bank, 6 Howard 625, 625, 7 Miss. 625, 645, 1842 WL 3050, *15 (Miss.Err. & App. Jan Term 1842)
- 1055 State v. Wynne, 204 S.W.2d 927, 934, 356 Mo. 1095, 1107 (Mo. Oct 13, 1947) (NO. 40111) ""
- 1056 Nokol Co. of Missouri v. Becker, 300 S.W. 1108, 1118, 318 Mo. 292, 315 (Mo. Dec 02, 1927) (NO. 26733) ""
- 1057 State ex rel. Burnes Nat. Bank of St. Joseph v. Duncan, 257 S.W. 784, 786, 302 Mo. 130, 138 (Mo. Jan 04, 1924) (NO. 24208)
- 1058 City of St. Louis v. United Rys. Co. of St. Louis, 174 S.W. 78, 86, 263 Mo. 387, 387 (Mo. Dec 19, 1914) (NO. 17254)
- 1059 Cass County v. Green, 66 Mo. 498, 503, 1877 WL 9249, *3 (Mo. Oct Term 1877)
- 1060 Brion v. Brown, 340 P.2d 539, 543, 135 Mont. 356, 364 (Mont. Jun 12, 1959) (NO. 9799)
- 1061 Kujich v. Lillie, 260 P.2d 383, 390, 127 Mont. 125, 138 (Mont. Jul 02, 1953) (NO. 9064, 9065)
- 1062 Chovanak v. Matthews, 188 P.2d 582, 585, 120 Mont. 520, 526 (Mont. Jan 14, 1948) (NO. 8742)
- 1063 Mitchell v. McDonald, 136 P.2d 536, 548, 114 Mont. 292, 292 (Mont. Apr 06, 1943) (NO. 8356) (*in dissent*)
- 1064 Stillwell v. Rankin, 174 P. 186, 188, 55 Mont. 130, 130 (Mont. Jun 28, 1918) (NO. 4054)
- 1065 Ford v. City of Great Falls, 127 P. 1004, 1008+, 46 Mont. 292, 292+ (Mont. Nov 11, 1912)
- 1066 Chumasero v. Potts, 2 Mont. 242, 260, 1875 WL 373, *11 (Mont.Terr. Jan Term 1875)
- 1067 Sykes v. Blakey, 200 S.E. 910, 911, 215 N.C. 61, 61 (N.C. Feb 01, 1939) (NO. 764)
- 1068 State v. Sauls, 130 S.E. 848, 850, 190 N.C. 810, 810 (N.C. Dec 23, 1925) (NO. 43)
- 1069 Gardner v. May (State Report Title: Gardiner v. May), 89 S.E. 955, 959, 172 N.C. 192, 192 (N.C. Oct 11, 1916) (NO. 181)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1070 Hensley v. McDowell Furniture Co., 80 S.E. 154, 155, 164 N.C. 148, 148 (N.C. Dec 03, 1913)
- 1071 Yount v. Setzer, 71 S.E. 209, 211, 155 N.C. 213, 213 (N.C. May 11, 1911) ""
- 1072 State v. Southern Ry. Co., 59 S.E. 570, 580+, 145 N.C. 495, 495+, 13 L.R.A.N.S. 966, 966+ (N.C. Dec 04, 1907)
- 1073 Jarrett v. High Point Trunk & Bag Co., 55 S.E. 338, 339, 142 N.C. 466, 466 (N.C. Oct 30, 1906)
- 1074 Currie v. Jones, 50 S.E. 560, 561, 138 N.C. 189, 189 (N.C. Apr 18, 1905)
- 1075 Layden v. Endowment Rank K.P. of the World, 39 S.E. 47, 49+, 128 N.C. 546, 546+ (N.C. Jun 07, 1901)
- 1076 White v. Worth, 36 S.E. 132, 143, 126 N.C. 570, 570 (N.C. Apr 22, 1900) "" (*in dissent*)
- 1077 Martin v. Worth, 91 N.C. 45, 47, 1884 WL 1934, *2 (N.C. Oct Term 1884)
- 1078 Setzer v. Douglass, 91 N.C. 426, 429, 1884 WL 2008, *3 (N.C. Oct Term 1884)
- 1079 First Nat. Bank v. Jenkins, 64 N.C. 719, 724, 1870 WL 1878, *4 (N.C. Jun Term 1870)
- 1080 Gatlin v. Walton, 1 Win. 333, 333, 60 N.C. 325, 359, 1864 WL 1053, *13 (N.C. Jun Term 1864)
- 1081 Allen v. Rupard, 397 S.E.2d 330, 333, 100 N.C.App. 490, 495 (N.C.App. Oct 30, 1990) (NO. 9021SC146)
- 1082 Musgrave v. Mutual Sav. & Loan Ass'n, 168 S.E.2d 497, 499, 5 N.C.App. 439, 443 (N.C.App. Jul 23, 1969) (NO. 6922SC317)
- 1083 State v. McClelland, 10 N.W.2d 798, 810, 72 N.D. 665, 692 (N.D. Mar 01, 1943) (NO. CRIM 186) "" (*in dissent*)
- 1084 State ex rel. Shafer v. Lowe, 210 N.W. 501, 504, 54 N.D. 637, 637 (N.D. Oct 05, 1926) (NO. 5198)
- 1085 Boales v. Ferguson, 76 N.W. 18, 19, 55 Neb. 565, 565 (Neb. Jun 23, 1898)
- 1086 Goodman v. Goodman, 236 P.2d 305, 306, 68 Nev. 484, 488 (Nev. Oct 10, 1951) (NO. 3669) ""
- 1087 Stephens v. First Nat. Bank of Nev., 196 P.2d 756, 763, 65 Nev. 352, 366 (Nev. Aug 10, 1948) (NO. 3479)
- 1088 State ex rel. Teeter v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court in and for Clark County, 180 P.2d 590, 593, 64 Nev. 256, 263 (Nev. May 19, 1947) (NO. 3487) ""
- 1089 State v. Reno Traction Co., 171 P. 375, 380, 41 Nev. 405, 405, L.R.A. 1918D,847, 1918D,847 (Nev. Mar 15, 1918) (NO. 2314) ""
- 1090 State v. Dickerson, 113 P. 105, 113, 33 Nev. 540, 540 (Nev. Dec 31, 1910) (NO. 1,892) ""
- 1091 Elder v. Shaw, 12 Nev. 78, 79, 1877 WL 4330, *1 (Nev. Apr Term 1877)
- 1092 State v. Settle, 523 A.2d 124, 128, 129 N.H. 171, 177 (N.H. Mar 06, 1987) (NO. 86-317)
- 1093 Boody v. Watson, 9 A. 794, 820, 64 N.H. 162, 162 (N.H. Mar 11, 1887) (*in dissent*)
- 1094 Barker v. Rochester Nat. Bank, 59 N.H. 310, 311, 1879 WL 4221, *1 (N.H. 1879)
- 1095 Leavitt v. Wallace, 12 N.H. 489, 491, 1842 WL 2073, *2 (N.H. 1842)
- 1096 State v. Royster, 273 A.2d 574, 587, 57 N.J. 472, 495 (N.J. Feb 11, 1971) (*in dissent*)
- 1097 Collopy v. Newark Eye and Ear Infirmary, 141 A.2d 276, 294, 27 N.J. 29, 60 (N.J. Apr 28, 1958) (NO. A-86) "" (*in dissent*)
- 1098 State by Parsons v. Standard Oil Co., 74 A.2d 565, 578, 5 N.J. 281, 308 (N.J. Jun 27, 1950) (NO. A-134)
- 1099 McFeely v. Board of Pension Com'rs of City of Hoboken, 62 A.2d 686, 688, 1 N.J. 212, 215 (N.J. Dec 13, 1948) (NO. A-30)
- 1100 Public Service R. Co. v. Reinhardt, 115 A. 747, 749, 93 N.J. Eq. 461, 464, 8 B.Stockton 461, 461 (N.J.Err. & App. Dec 05, 1921) (NO. 60-62) (*in dissent*)
- 1101 State v. Richards, 2006 WL 871004, *1 (N.J.Super.A.D. Apr 05, 2006) (NO. A-2246-04T4) ""
- 1102 State v. Madan, 840 A.2d 874, 881, 366 N.J.Super. 98, 109 (N.J.Super.A.D. Jan 28, 2004) (NO. A-0918-02T4) ""
- 1103 Hintenberger v. City of Garfield, 146 A.2d 123, 125, 52 N.J.Super. 526, 531 (N.J.Super.A.D. Nov 14, 1958) (NO. A-377)
- 1104 Amo v. Genovese, 85 A.2d 529, 530, 17 N.J.Super. 109, 111 (N.J.Super.A.D. Dec 21, 1951) (NO. A-644-50) ""
- 1105 Smith v. Smith, 85 A.2d 523, 524, 17 N.J.Super. 128, 132 (N.J.Super.A.D. Dec 12, 1951) (NO. A-455) ""
- 1106 Barr v. Essex Trades Council, 30 A. 881, 893, 53 N.J. Eq. 101, 134, 8 Dickinson 101, 101 (N.J.Ch. Dec 26, 1894)

- C 1107 Scudder v. Trenton Delaware Falls Co., 1 N.J. Eq. 694, 717, 1832 WL 2274, *16, 23 Am.Dec. 756, 756, Saxt. Ch. 694, 694 (N.J.Ch. 1832)
- C 1108 In re Law, 186 A. 528, 529, 14 N.J. Misc. 593, 594 (N.J.Cir.Ct. Jul 21, 1936)
- C 1109 State v. Public Service Elec. & Gas Co., 291 A.2d 32, 35, 119 N.J.Super. 264, 269 (N.J.Super.Ch. May 17, 1972)
- H 1110 Ferger v. Local 483 of Intern. Ass'n of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers, AFL-CIO, 229 A.2d 532, 539+, 94 N.J.Super. 554, 566+ (N.J.Super.Ch. Apr 04, 1967) (NO. C-2474)
- Y 1111 City of Bayonne v. Palmer, 217 A.2d 141, 161, 90 N.J.Super. 245, 282 (N.J.Super.Ch. Feb 04, 1966) (NO. C-3136-63, C-313-64)
- T 1112 State v. Winne, 91 A.2d 65, 78, 21 N.J.Super. 180, 208 (N.J.Super.L. Aug 18, 1952)
- C 1113 Ward v. Price, 25 N.J.L. 225, 229, 1855 WL 4316, *4, 1 Dutch. 225, 225 (N.J.Sup. 1855)
- C 1114 State ex rel. Evans v. Field, 201 P. 1059, 1062, 27 N.M. 384, 384 (N.M. Nov 26, 1921) (NO. 2434)
- T 1115 Locke v. Trustees of New Mexico Reform School, 169 P. 304, 305+, 23 N.M. 487, 487+ (N.M. Dec 07, 1917) (NO. 1951)
- C 1116 Coler v. Board of County Com'rs of Santa Fe County, 27 P. 619, 624+, 6 N.M. 88, 88+, 6 Gild. 88, 88+ (N.M.Terr. Aug 12, 1891)
- H 1117 Production Credit Ass'n of Eastern N.M. v. Taxation and Revenue Dept. of State of N.M., 999 P.2d 1031, 1035+, 128 N.M. 799, 803+, 2000-NMCA-021, 021+ (N.M.App. Feb 01, 2000) (NO. 20078)
- H 1118 Sanders v. Saxton, 75 N.E. 529, 529, 20 Bedell 477, 182 N.Y. 477, 478, 1 L.R.A.N.S. 727, 727, 108 Am.St.Rep. 826, 826 (N.Y. Oct 24, 1905)
- H 1119 Flood v. Van Wormer, 41 N.E. 569, 570, 1 E.H. Smith 284, 147 N.Y. 284, 289 (N.Y. Oct 22, 1895)
- H 1120 Rochester, H. & L.R. Co. v. New York, L.E. & W.R. Co., 17 N.E. 680, 682, 65 Sickels 128, 110 N.Y. 128, 134 (N.Y. Jun 19, 1888)
- H 1121 Sipple v. State, 16 Abb. N. Cas. 429, 429, 1 N.E. 892, 892, 54 Sickels 284, 99 N.Y. 284, 284 (N.Y. Jun 09, 1885)
- C 1122 UNITED STATES v. CURTIS., 11 Abb. N. Cas. 1, 18+ (N.Y. Jul 1882)
- H 1123 Robinson v. National Bank of Newberne, 36 Sickels 385, 81 N.Y. 385, 385, 59 How. Pr. 218, 223, 37 Am.Rep. 508, 508 (N.Y. 1880)
- C 1124 Attorney General v. Guardian Mut. Life Ins. Co., 32 Sickels 272, 272, 77 N.Y. 272, 275, 1879 WL 9412, *2 (N.Y. 1879)
- H 1125 Sperry v. Reynolds, 20 Sickels 179, 179, 65 N.Y. 179, 184, 1875 WL 10949, *4 (N.Y. 1875) ""
- H 1126 Cooke v. State Nat. Bank, 7 Sickels 96, 96+, 52 N.Y. 96, 96+, 1873 WL 10243, *1+, 11 Am.Rep. 667, 667+ (N.Y. 1873)
- C 1127 Middlebrook v. Broadbent, 2 Sickels 443, 47 N.Y. 443, 446, 1872 WL 9745, *9745, 7 Am.Rep. 457, 457 (N.Y. 1872)
- H 1128 First Nat. Bank v. Lamb, 5 Sickels 95, 50 N.Y. 95, 105, 1872 WL 9988, *9988, 10 Am.Rep. 438, 438 (N.Y. 1872)
- C 1129 Brown v. Nichols, 3 Hand 26, 26, 42 N.Y. 26, 26, 9 Abb.Pr.N.S. 1, 8 (N.Y. 1870) ""
- T 1130 People ex rel. National Broadway Bank v. Hoffman, 1867 WL 581, *5+, 10 Tiffany 9, 9+, 37 N.Y. 9, 15+ (N.Y. Mar 1867)
- H 1131 People ex rel. Bank of Commonwealth v. Commissioners of Assessments and Taxes of City of New York, 9 E.P. Smith 192, 192+, 23 N.Y. 192, 192+, 1861 WL 5569, *1+ (N.Y. 1861)
- H 1132 Teall v. Felton, 1 N.Y. 537, 542, 1 Comst. 537, 537, 49 Am.Dec. 352, 352 (N.Y. 1848)
- C 1133 Delafield v. Illinois, 2 Hill 159, 168+, 26 Wend. 192, 192+ (N.Y. 1841)
- C 1134 In re Hershey Farms, 24 N.Y.S.2d 163, 166, 175 Misc. 641, 644 (N.Y.Gen.Sess. Jan 02, 1941) ""
- H 1135 Travelers Indem. Co. v. Sarkisian, 530 N.Y.S.2d 680, 681, 139 A.D.2d 27, 29, RICO Bus.Disp.Guide 7001, 7001 (N.Y.A.D. 3 Dept. Jul 07, 1988) (NO. 56286)
- H 1136 Mayer v. Hansen, 20 N.Y.S.2d 698, 699, 260 A.D. 150, 152 (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Jun 19, 1940)
- Y 1137 A. Victor & Co. v. Sleining, 9 N.Y.S.2d 323, 325, 255 A.D. 673, 675 (N.Y.A.D. 4 Dept. Jan 05, 1939) ""
- H 1138 C.A. Gambrill Mfg. Co. v. E.R. Sherburne Co., 185 N.Y.S. 502, 507, 194 A.D. 425, 432 (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Dec 17, 1920) ""
- H 1139 People ex rel. Cropsey v. Court of Special Sessions of City of New York, 156 N.Y.S. 61, 62, 34 N.Y.Crim.R. 138, 138, 170 A.D. 575, 577 (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Dec 03, 1915) ""
- H 1140 Tyack v. Brumley, 1 Barb.Ch. 519, 534 (N.Y.Ch. 1846)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1141 Balchen v. Crawford, 1 Sand. Ch. 380, 383 (N.Y.Ch. 1844)
- 1142 Tyack v. Bromley, 4 Edw.Ch. 258, 273 (N.Y.Ch. 1843)
- 1143 Haub v. Inspectors of Election In and For 12th Election Dist. of 37th Assembly Dist. of State of N.Y., 482 N.Y.S.2d 680, 681, 126 Misc.2d 458, 460 (N.Y.Sup. Nov 29, 1984) (NO. E 100/84)
- 1144 Van Berkel v. Power, 254 N.Y.S.2d 74, 77, 44 Misc.2d 506, 508 (N.Y.Sup. Oct 30, 1964) ""
- 1145 U.S. Housing Corporation v. City of Watertown, 186 N.Y.S. 309, 311, 113 Misc. 679, 683 (N.Y.Sup. Dec 1920)
- 1146 In re Jackson, 107 N.Y.S. 799, 802, 57 Misc. 1, 7 (N.Y.Sup. Dec 20, 1907) ""
- 1147 Sanders v. Saxton, 67 N.Y.S. 680, 681+, 33 Misc. 389, 390+ (N.Y.Sup. Dec 1900) ""
- 1148 Hiscock v. Lacy, 62 N.Y.St.Rep. 228, 228, 30 N.Y.S. 860, 873, 9 Misc. 578, 598 (N.Y.Sup. Sep 1894)
- 1149 MAHR v. NORWICH FIRE INS. SOCIETY., 23 Abb. N. Cas. 436, 451 (N.Y.Sup. Mar Term 1889)
- 1150 Hatch v. American Union Tel. Co., 9 Abb. N. Cas. 223, 233 (N.Y.Sup. 1881) ""
- 1151 Ulster County Sav. Inst. v. Fourth Nat. Bank, 59 How. Pr. 482, 485+ (N.Y.Sup. 1880)
- 1152 Stockwell v. Bates, 10 Abb.Pr.N.S. 381, 382 (N.Y.Sup. 1871)
- 1153 City of Utica v. Churchill, 43 Barb. 550, 556, 6 Tiffany 693, 693, 33 N.Y. 693, 693 (N.Y.Sup. 1865)
- 1154 HON. PLATT POTTER AND WINSOR B. FRENCH, ESQ., 55 Barb. 625, 655 (N.Y.Sup. 1864)
- 1155 Thompson v. Commissioners of Canal Fund, 2 Abb.Pr. 248, 248 (N.Y.Sup. 1855)
- 1156 Aberdeen Bindery v. Eastern States Printing & Pub. Co., 3 N.Y.S.2d 419, 422, 166 Misc. 904, 906 (N.Y.Sup.App.Term Mar 04, 1938) ""
- 1157 McMahan v. State, 19 N.Y.S.2d 639, 642, 173 Misc. 1004, 1006 (N.Y.Ct.Cl. Apr 22, 1940)
- 1158 Carlo v. Yorro, 761 N.Y.S.2d 766, 769, 195 Misc.2d 762, 766, 2003 N.Y. Slip Op. 23550, 23550 (N.Y.Dist.Ct. Apr 30, 2002) (NO. SP1147/03)
- 1159 Benjamin v. Murray, 28 How. Pr. 193, 195 (N.Y.Sup.Gen.Term 1865)
- 1160 Rock River Bank v. Hoffman, 22 How. Pr. 510, 512, 14 Abb.Pr. 72, 72 (N.Y.Sup.Gen.Term 1862)
- 1161 People ex rel. Hanover Bank v. Commissioners of Taxes and Assessments of City and County of New York, 37 Barb. 635, 636+ (N.Y.Sup.Gen.Term 1862)
- 1162 Town of Guilford v. Cornell, 18 Barb. 615, 626 (N.Y.Sup.Gen.Term 1854)
- 1163 State ex rel. Maurer v. Sheward, 644 N.E.2d 369, 380, 71 Ohio St.3d 513, 527, 1994-Ohio-496, 496 (Ohio Dec 30, 1994) (NO. 92-1350, 93-1165) ""
- 1164 Mominee v. Scherbarth, 503 N.E.2d 717, 738, 28 Ohio St.3d 270, 298, 28 O.B.R. 346, 346 (Ohio Dec 22, 1986) (NO. 85-688, 85-1039) "" (*in dissent*)
- 1165 Union Sav. Ass'n v. Home Owners Aid, Inc., 262 N.E.2d 558, 559, 23 Ohio St.2d 60, 62, 52 O.O.2d 329, 329 (Ohio Sep 16, 1970) (NO. 69-345)
- 1166 Overholser v. National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, 67 N.E. 487, 489+, 68 Ohio St. 236, 247+, 48 W.L.B. 578, 578+, 96 Am.St.Rep. 658, 658+, 1 Ohio Law Rep. 22, 321+, 1 Ohio Law Rep. 321+, 62 L.R.A. 936, 936+ (Ohio Apr 28, 1903) (NO. 7759) ""
- 1167 Secor v. Witter, 1883 WL 169, *11, 39 Ohio St. 218, 236, 10 W.L.B. 7, 7 (Ohio Jan Term 1883) ""
- 1168 First Nat. Bank of Columbus v. Garlinghouse, 1872 WL 31, *8, 22 Ohio St. 492, 505, 10 Am.Rep. 751, 751 (Ohio Dec Term 1872)
- 1169 Atlantic & G.W. Ry. Co. v. Koblentz, 1871 WL 66, *2, 21 Ohio St. 334, 336 (Ohio Dec Term 1871)
- 1170 Sinks v. Reese, 1869 WL 58, *3+, 19 Ohio St. 306, 311+, 2 Am.Rep. 397, 397+ (Ohio Dec Term 1869)
- 1171 Candee, for Use of Marsh, v. Webster, 1859 WL 18, *2+, 9 Ohio St. 452, 454+ (Ohio Dec Term 1859)
- 1172 Mechanics' & Traders' Branch of State Bank of Ohio v. Debolt, 1853 WL 57, *2, 1 Ohio St. 591, 594 (Ohio Jan Term 1853)
- 1173 Knoup v. Piqua Branch of State Bank of Ohio, 1853 WL 58, *5+, 1 Ohio St. 603, 611+ (Ohio Jan Term 1853) ""
- 1174 Griffith v. Crawford County Com'rs, 1851 WL 54, *4+, 20 Ohio 609, 615+ (Ohio Dec Term 1851)
- 1175 State v. Great Miami Turnpike Co., 1846 WL 45, *1, 14 Ohio 405, 406 (Ohio Jan Term 1846)
- 1176 Weeden v. Lake Erie & M.R.R. Co., 1846 WL 72, *10, 14 Ohio 563, 580 (Ohio Jan Term 1846)
- 1177 Beall v. Price, 1844 WL 46, *20, 13 Ohio 368, 398, 42 Am.Dec. 204, 204 (Ohio Dec Term 1844) ""

- C** 1178 McCoy v. Corp. of Chillicothe, 1828 WL 12, *2+, 3 Ohio 370, 372+, 17 Am.Dec. 607, 607+, 3 Hammond 370, 370+ (Ohio Dec Term 1828)
- C** 1179 Burnet v. Corp. of Cincinnati, 1827 WL 28, *10, 3 Ohio 73, 88, 17 Am.Dec. 582, 582, 3 Hammond 73, 73 (Ohio Dec Term 1827)
- C** 1180 Sargent v. Corbley, 18 Ohio C.D. 125, 126, 28 Ohio C.C. 125, 125, 7 Ohio C.C.(N.S.) 226, 226, 1905 WL 670, *1 (Ohio Cir. Dec 18, 1905)
- P** 1181 Parker v. Siebern, 3 Ohio Dec.Reprint 441, 447+, 5 Am. Law Reg. (N.S.) 526, 526+, 1863 WL 2443, *6+ (Ohio Super. 1863)
- C** 1182 Cincinnati Gaslight & Coke Co. v. Bowman, 12 Ohio Dec.Reprint 147, 159, 1 Handy 289, 289, 1855 WL 3906, *14 (Ohio Super. Jan 1855)
- H** 1183 Levensgood v. Transfuel, Inc., 1996 WL 73999, *2 (Ohio App. 5 Dist. Jan 23, 1996) (NO. 95 AP 060049, 95 AP 060050)
- C** 1184 Burger dba A.A. Zinc Company v. Higginson Capital Management, Inc., dba Great Lakes Warehouse Company, 1981 WL 5667, *5 (Ohio App. 6 Dist. Jun 26, 1981) (NO. 80-261)
- P** 1185 Purcell v. Summers, 34 F.Supp. 421, 429 (E.D.S.C. Jul 25, 1940) (NO. 328)
- H** 1186 Gill v. Reese, 4 N.E.2d 273, 274, 53 Ohio App. 134, 136, 22 Ohio Law Abs. 1, 1 (Ohio App. 8 Dist. Mar 17, 1936) (NO. 14920)
- P** 1187 Thompson v. Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, 60 F.2d 162, 163+ (E.D.S.C. Nov 10, 1931) (NO. 2595)
- 1188 CITIMORTGAGE, Plaintiff, v. VICKSBURG PROPERTIES, Defendants., 2003 WL 25511153, *25511153 (Trial Order) (Ohio Com.Pl. Oct 16, 2003) **Decision and Entry Granting Motion of Plaintiff ...** (NO. 03-CV-3526)
- C** 1189 Ley v. Kirtley, 18 Ohio Dec. 280, 282, 5 Ohio N.P.(N.S.) 529, 529, 1907 WL 766, *2 (Ohio Com.Pl. Sep 23, 1907)
- P** 1190 Baldwin v. Hillsborough & C.R. Co., 10 West.L.J. 337, 337, 1 Ohio Dec.Reprint 532, 535, 1852 WL 2631, *3 (Ohio Com.Pl. 1852)
- C** 1191 Beard v. Viene, 826 P.2d 990, 998, 1992 OK 28, 28 (Okla. Feb 25, 1992) (NO. 77,023)
- H** 1192 Matter of Protest of First Federal Sav. and Loan Ass'n of Claremore, 743 P.2d 640, 643, 1987 OK 44, 44 (Okla. May 26, 1987) (NO. 64,673, 64,674)
- C** 1193 McAnally v. Ideal Federal Credit Union, 428 P.2d 322, 325, 1967 OK 116, 116 (Okla. May 09, 1967) (NO. 41367)
- P** 1194 Brown v. State Election Bd., 369 P.2d 140, 142+, 1962 OK 36, 36+ (Okla. Feb 13, 1962) (NO. 39930) ""
- C** 1195 Reed v. State Election Bd., 369 P.2d 156, 157, 1962 OK 37, 37 (Okla. Feb 13, 1962) (NO. 39938) ""
- C** 1196 Severson v. Home Owners Loan Corp., 88 P.2d 344, 347, 184 Okla. 496, 496, 1939 OK 64, 64 (Okla. Jan 31, 1939) (NO. 28559)
- P** 1197 Rose v. Arnold, 82 P.2d 293, 301, 183 Okla. 286, 286, 1938 OK 445, 445 (Okla. Aug 10, 1938) (NO. 28718) ""
- C** 1198 Antrim Lumber Co. v. Sneed, 52 P.2d 1040, 1043, 175 Okla. 47, 47, 1935 OK 1144, 1144 (Okla. Nov 26, 1935) (NO. 23783)
- C** 1199 Oklahoma Cotton Ginners' Ass'n v. State, 51 P.2d 327, 337, 174 Okla. 243, 243, 1935 OK 1004, 1004 (Okla. Oct 17, 1935) (NO. 26638)
- C** 1200 Shabino v. Dolese Bros. Co., 49 P.2d 686, 690, 174 Okla. 69, 69, 1935 OK 773, 773 (Okla. Sep 10, 1935) (NO. 25659) ""
- P** 1201 Taber v. Indian Territory Illuminating Oil Co., 57 P.2d 1167, 1173+, 177 Okla. 67, 67+, 1935 OK 254, 254+ (Okla. Mar 12, 1935) (NO. 25794) (*in dissent*)
- C** 1202 Belt v. Morris, 34 P.2d 581, 584, 168 Okla. 528, 528, 1934 OK 391, 391 (Okla. Jun 29, 1934) (NO. 22755)
- C** 1203 Magnolia Petroleum Co. v. McDonald, 32 P.2d 909, 912+, 168 Okla. 255, 255+, 1934 OK 293, 293+ (Okla. May 15, 1934) (NO. 21972) ""
- C** 1204 Phelan v. Stockyards Bank, 32 P.2d 270, 272, 168 Okla. 232, 232, 1934 OK 218, 218 (Okla. Apr 03, 1934) (NO. 22069)
- C** 1205 Loffland Bros. Co. v. Velvin, 3 P.2d 855, 860, 152 Okla. 83, 83, 1931 OK 589, 589 (Okla. Oct 06, 1931) (NO. 22038)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1206 City of Tulsa v. Harman, 299 P. 462, 465, 148 Okla. 117, 117, 1931 OK 73, 73 (Okla. Mar 10, 1931) (NO. 19774) ""
- 1207 Ratzlaff v. State, 229 P. 278, 278+, 102 Okla. 263, 263+, 1924 OK 746, 746+ (Okla. Sep 16, 1924) (NO. 15081) ""
- 1208 State v. Wells, 223 P. 694, 700+, 98 Okla. 169, 169+, 1923 OK 1054+ (Okla. Nov 27, 1923) (NO. 14354)
- 1209 Quaker Oil & Gas Co. v. Jane Oil & Gas Co., 164 P. 671, 674, 63 Okla. 234, 234, 1917 OK 192, 192 (Okla. Apr 17, 1917) (NO. 8235)
- 1210 Liston v. Nail, 164 P. 467, 469, 63 Okla. 212, 212, 1917 OK 184, 184 (Okla. Apr 10, 1917) (NO. 8408)
- 1211 Vickers v. Phillip Carey Co., 151 P. 1023, 1028, 49 Okla. 231, 231, 1915 OK 557, 557, L.R.A. 1916C,1155, 1916C,1155 (Okla. Jul 13, 1915) (NO. 7014)
- 1212 Chicago, R.I. & P. Ry. Co. v. Moore, 124 P. 989, 992, 34 Okla. 199, 199, 1912 OK 451, 451 (Okla. Jun 25, 1912) ""
- 1213 Coyle v. Smith, 113 P. 944, 958, 28 Okla. 121, 121, 1911 OK 64, 64 (Okla. Feb 09, 1911)
- 1214 Smith v. State, 113 P. 932, 939, 28 Okla. 235, 235, 1910 OK 304, 304 (Okla. Nov 15, 1910)
- 1215 Rawls v. State, 190 P.2d 159, 166, 86 Okla.Crim. 119, 134 (Okla.Crim.App. Feb 18, 1948) (NO. A-10790) ""
- 1216 Dodge v. Davies, 179 P.2d 735, 741+, 181 Or. 13, 28+ (Or. Apr 15, 1947)
- 1217 United Contracting Co. v. Duby, 292 P. 309, 312, 134 Or. 1, 12 (Or. Sep 23, 1930)
- 1218 Butterfield v. State Indus. Acc. Commission, 226 P. 216, 218, 111 Or. 149, 160 (Or. May 13, 1924)
- 1219 Riverside Portland Cement Co. v. Masson, 139 P. 723, 726, 69 Or. 502, 510, Am. Ann. Cas. 1916A,127, 1916A,127 (Or. Mar 17, 1914) ""
- 1220 State v. Southern Pac. Co., 31 P. 960, 962, 23 Or. 424, 431 (Or. Jan 16, 1893)
- 1221 Applegate v. Dowell, 16 P. 651, 659, 15 Or. 513, 527 (Or. Dec 19, 1887) ""
- 1222 Dunn v. State University, 1881 WL 1394, *4, 9 Or. 357, 362 (Or. Mar Term 1881)
- 1223 Christianson v. Commission, 1964 WL 150, *3, 2 Or. Tax 43, 47 (Or. Tax Sep 25, 1964)
- 1224 Phoenix Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Radcliffe on the Delaware, Inc., 266 A.2d 698, 701, 439 Pa. 159, 166 (Pa. Jul 02, 1970)
- 1225 Com. ex rel. Fox v. Swing, 186 A.2d 24, 26, 409 Pa. 241, 246 (Pa. Nov 28, 1962)
- 1226 Smith v. Gallagher, 185 A.2d 135, 147, 408 Pa. 551, 575 (Pa. Oct 26, 1962)
- 1227 Com. v. Garland, 142 A.2d 14, 17, 393 Pa. 45, 51 (Pa. May 26, 1958) ""
- 1228 Com. ex rel. Truscott v. Yiddisher Kultur Farband, 116 A.2d 555, 561, 382 Pa. 553, 565 (Pa. Jun 27, 1955) ""
- 1229 In re Dravo's Estate, 61 A.2d 337, 340, 360 Pa. 115, 122 (Pa. Sep 27, 1948)
- 1230 In re Philadelphia County Grand Jury, April 1943, 32 A.2d 199, 204, 347 Pa. 316, 326 (Pa. May 10, 1943) ""
- 1231 Moore v. Moore, 25 A.2d 130, 133, 344 Pa. 324, 332, 139 A.L.R. 1225, 1225 (Pa. Jan 29, 1942) (*in dissent*)
- 1232 Appeal of Boyer, 13 W.N.C. 269, 269, 103 Pa. 387, 391, 1883 WL 13413, *4 (Pa. 1883)
- 1233 Bullock v. Gaffigan, 100 Pa. 276, 280, 1882 WL 14261, *4, 39 Leg. Int. 338, 338 (Pa. 1882)
- 1234 Appeal of Masson, 70 Pa. 26, 31, 1872 WL 11375, *5, 2 Leg. Op. 165, 165, 19 Pitts. L.J. 113, 113, 20 P.F. Smith 26, 26 (Pa. 1872)
- 1235 Eckman v. Eckman, 55 Pa. 269, 272, 1867 WL 7524, *4, 5 P.F. Smith 269, 269 (Pa. 1867)
- 1236 City of Pittsburgh v. First Nat. Bank, 55 Pa. 45, 48, 1867 WL 7491, *3, 5 P.F. Smith 45, 45 (Pa. 1867)
- 1237 Hodgson v. Millward, 3 Grant 412, 416, 1863 WL 4689, *5 (Pa. 1863)
- 1238 Freeze v. Donegal Mut. Ins. Co., 447 A.2d 999, 1008, 301 Pa. Super. 344, 361 (Pa. Super. Jul 09, 1982) (NO. 234) "" (*in dissent*)
- 1239 Com. v. Opara, 362 A.2d 305, 309+, 240 Pa. Super. 511, 518+ (Pa. Super. Mar 29, 1976)
- 1240 Com. v. Franklin, 92 A.2d 272, 287, 172 Pa. Super. 152, 183 (Pa. Super. Nov 12, 1952)
- 1241 Adelman v. John McShain, Inc., 24 A.2d 703, 705, 148 Pa. Super. 138, 142 (Pa. Super. Feb 28, 1942)
- 1242 Melnick v. Melnick, 25 A.2d 111, 115, 147 Pa. Super. 564, 571 (Pa. Super. Feb 28, 1942)
- 1243 Bloomington v. Shapiro, 195 A. 642, 643, 129 Pa. Super. 218, 222 (Pa. Super. Dec 17, 1937) ""

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- C 1244 Tonkonogy v. Levin, 162 A. 315, 316, 106 Pa.Super. 448, 452 (Pa.Super. Oct 10, 1932) ""
H 1245 City of Philadelphia to Use of Union Paving Co. v. U.S. Housing Corp. of Pennsylvania, 82 Pa.Super. 343, 346, 1923 WL 3809, *2 (Pa.Super. 1923)
P 1246 Augustine v. Wolf, 29 Pa.Super. 336, 338, 1905 WL 3841, *1 (Pa.Super. 1905) ""
C 1247 Solyan v. Fontana, 1988 WL 159920, *5, 49 Pa. D. & C.3d 84, 93 (Pa.Com.Pl. Aug 11, 1988) (NO. 1640-A-1987) ""
H 1248 First Stroudsburg Nat. Bank v. Nixon, 1971 WL 17985, *2, 53 Pa. D. & C.2d 672, 675, 10 UCC Rep.Serv. 852, 852 (Pa.Com.Pl. Dec 14, 1971)
C 1249 Driscoll v. Keller, 1969 WL 7806, *2, 59 Luz.L.R. 208, 208, 48 Pa. D. & C.2d 95, 98 (Pa.Com.Pl. 1969)
C 1250 Industrial Val. Bank & Trust Co. v. Miller Realty Development Co., 1968 WL 6658, *1, 44 Pa. D. & C.2d 207, 208 (Pa.Com.Pl. 1968)
C 1251 McFeaters v. Cooper-Bessemer Corp., 1945 WL 1789, *4, 51 Pa. D. & C. 404, 408 (Pa.Com.Pl. 1945)
1252 Petition of Northampton Trust Co., 1930 WL 4588, *4588+, 14 Pa. D. & C. 352, 356+, 22 Northam. 277, 277+ (Pa.Com.Pl. 1930)
C 1253 In re Additional Law Judge, 1927 WL 5771, *4, 10 Pa. D. & C. 577, 580 (Pa.Com.Pl. 1927)
C 1254 Wetherhold v. Rex, 1922 WL 3995, *1, 3 Pa. D. & C. 382, 382, 10 Leh.L.J. 148, 148 (Pa.Com.Pl. 1922)
C 1255 In re Grand Jury Investigation of Registration Commission, 1960 WL 6367, *7, 22 Pa. D. & C.2d 285, 297 (Pa.Quar.Sess. 1960)
C 1256 In re Petition to Reduce Membership in Bangor Borough Council, 1959 WL 5072, *4, 15 Pa. D. & C.2d 588, 593, 34 Northam. 235, 235 (Pa.Quar.Sess. 1959)
P 1257 Kaya v. Partington, 681 A.2d 256, 268 (R.I. Aug 01, 1996) (NO. 94-523-APPEAL) "" (*in dissent*)
C 1258 Aquidneck Nat. Bank of Newport v. Jennings, 117 A. 743, 744+, 44 R.I. 435, 435+ (R.I. Jul 06, 1922) (NO. 373)
P 1259 Federal Land Bank of Columbia v. State Highway Dept., 173 S.E. 284, 289, 172 S.C. 174, 174 (S.C. Feb 23, 1934) (NO. 13789)
C 1260 Ware Shoals Mfg. Co. v. Jones, 58 S.E. 811, 813, 78 S.C. 211, 211 (S.C. Sep 21, 1907)
C 1261 Butler v. Ellerbe, 22 S.E. 425, 429+, 44 S.C. 256, 256+ (S.C. Jul 06, 1895)
H 1262 Columbia Water Power Co. v. Columbia Elec. St. Ry., Light & Power Co., 20 S.E. 1002, 1007, 43 S.C. 154, 154 (S.C. Feb 18, 1895)
C 1263 Holmes & Durham v. National Bank of Wilmington, 18 S.C. 31, 31, 1882 WL 5636, *1, 44 Am.Rep. 558, 558 (S.C. Aug 01, 1882)
C 1264 Robb & Lowndes v. Parker, 3 S.C. 60, 71, 1871 WL 4577, *9, 3 Richardson 60, 60 (S.C. Sep 15, 1871)
C 1265 State v. Tax Collector of St. Philips & St. Michael's, 2 Bail. 654, 654+, 18 S.C.L. 654, 655+, 1831 WL 1614, *2+ (S.C.App. Feb 1831)
C 1266 Price v. White, Bail.Eq. 244, 244, 8 S.C.Eq. 244, 261, 1828 WL 813, *15 (S.C.App. Mar 1828)
C 1267 Robertson v. Bingley, 1 McCord Eq. 333, 333, 6 S.C.Eq. 333, 342, 1826 WL 755, *6 (S.C.App. Apr Term 1826)
C 1268 Haskell v. Raoul, 1 McCord Eq. 22, 22, 6 S.C.Eq. 22, 27, 1825 WL 786, *3 (S.C.App. May 1825)
P 1269 Kylo v. Panzer, 535 N.W.2d 896, 898+ (S.D. Aug 16, 1995) (NO. 18713, 18739)
C 1270 Rosebud Federal Credit Union v. Mathis Implement, Inc., 515 N.W.2d 241, 244 (S.D. Apr 20, 1994) (NO. 18451)
P 1271 State v. Black, 494 N.W.2d 377, 382 (S.D. Jan 06, 1993) (NO. 17551) ""
C 1272 State v. Auen, 342 N.W.2d 236, 239 (S.D. Jan 11, 1984) (NO. 14191) "" (*in dissent*)
C 1273 State v. Husman, 287 N.W. 30, 39, 66 S.D. 530, 530 (S.D. Jul 15, 1939) (NO. 8203) "" (*in dissent*)
C 1274 City of Sioux Falls v. Marshall, 204 N.W. 999, 1002, 48 S.D. 378, 378, 45 A.L.R. 447, 447 (S.D. Jul 14, 1925) (NO. 6002)
C 1275 Mullen v. Dwight, 173 N.W. 645, 646, 42 S.D. 171, 171 (S.D. Jul 22, 1919) (NO. 4399)
C 1276 Johnson v. Hacker, 55 Tenn. 388, 406, 1874 WL 4152, *8, 8 Heisk. 388, 388 (Tenn. Oct 22, 1874)
C 1277 Van Pelt v. P. and L. Federal Credit Union, 282 S.W.2d 794, 799, 39 Tenn.App. 363, 374 (Tenn.Ct.App. Jul 07, 1955)
H 1278 State v. Texas & P. Ry. Co., 98 S.W. 834, 834+, 100 Tex. 279, 281+ (Tex. Jan 02, 1907)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1279 Texas & P.R. Co. v. Huber, 92 S.W. 832, 835, 100 Tex. 1, 8 (Tex. May 02, 1906)
- 1280 Hughes v. State, 41 Tex. 10, 15, 1874 WL 7971, *3 (Tex. 1874)
- 1281 Bosworth v. State, 510 S.W.2d 334, 344 (Tex.Crim.App. Mar 13, 1974) (NO. 47746) "" (*in dissent*)
- 1282 Terrell v. Middleton, 187 S.W. 367, 369 (Tex.Civ.App.-San Antonio Jun 14, 1916) (NO. 5689)
- 1283 Conley v. Daughters of the Republic of Texas, 151 S.W. 877, 882+ (Tex.Civ.App.-San Antonio Nov 13, 1912)
- 1284 Redmond v. Smith, 54 S.W. 636, 636, 22 Tex.Civ.App. 323, 324 (Tex.Civ.App. Dec 13, 1899)
- 1285 San Antonio Public Service Co. v. Alexander, 280 S.W. 753, 758 (Tex.Com.App. Feb 10, 1926) (NO. (NO. 572-4391))
- 1286 Nickles v. Wells, 2 Utah 167, 167, 1877 WL 12188, *1 (Utah Terr. 1877)
- 1287 General Board of State Hospitals for the Insane v. Robertson, 79 S.E. 1064, 1067, 115 Va. 527, 527 (Va. Nov 20, 1913)
- 1288 Johnson v. Trustees of Hampton Normal & Agricultural Institute, 54 S.E. 31, 32, 105 Va. 319, 319 (Va. Jun 14, 1906)
- 1289 McClanahan v. Western Lunatic Asylum, 13 S.E. 977, 978, 88 Va. 466, 466 (Va. Dec 03, 1891)
- 1290 Board of Public Works of City of Richmond v. Gannt, 76 Va. 455, 459+, 1882 WL 6042, *2+ (Va. Dec 10, 1882)
- 1291 Williams v. State, 589 A.2d 840, 845+, 156 Vt. 42, 49+ (Vt. Nov 09, 1990) (NO. 88-309, 89-042)
- 1292 State v. Hunt, 485 A.2d 109, 119, 145 Vt. 34, 53 (Vt. May 11, 1984) (NO. 83-451) "" (*in dissent*)
- 1293 Brown v. Perry, 156 A. 910, 914, 104 Vt. 66, 66, 77 A.L.R. 1294, 1294 (Vt. Nov 05, 1931)
- 1294 Baker v. Central Vermont R. Co., 56 Vt. 302, 303, 1883 WL 6959, *6959 (Vt. Oct 1883)
- 1295 Stevens v. Rutland & Burlington R. Co., 29 Vt. 545, 565, 1857 WL 4322, *4322, 3 Williams 545, 545 (Vt. 1857)
- 1296 Porter v. Bank of Rutland, 19 Vt. 410, 416, 1847 WL 1729, *3 (Vt. Feb Term 1847)
- 1297 Proprietors of Eight Thousand Acre Tract v. Bishop, 2 Vt. 231, 232, 1829 WL 1095, *1095 (Vt. Jan 1829)
- 1298 Federal Land Bank of Spokane v. Statelen, 70 P.2d 1053, 1054+, 191 Wash. 155, 159+ (Wash. Aug 09, 1937) (NO. 26421)
- 1299 State v. Wiles, 199 P. 749, 749+, 116 Wash. 387, 389+, 18 A.L.R. 1163, 1163+ (Wash. Jul 27, 1921) (NO. 16506)
- 1300 City of Seattle v. McDonald, 66 P. 145, 147, 26 Wash. 98, 106 (Wash. Sep 11, 1901)
- 1301 State v. Mendoza, 258 N.W.2d 260, 270, 80 Wis.2d 122, 147 (Wis. Oct 04, 1977) (NO. 75-806-CR)
- 1302 State v. Frost, 89 N.W. 915, 920, 113 Wis. 623, 623 (Wis. Apr 01, 1902)
- 1303 State v. Superior Court of Milwaukee County, 81 N.W. 1046, 1053, 105 Wis. 651, 651, 48 L.R.A. 819, 819 (Wis. Feb 27, 1900)
- 1304 State ex rel. Lamb v. Cunningham, 53 N.W. 35, 53, 83 Wis. 90, 90, 35 Am.St.Rep. 27, 27, 17 L.R.A. 145, 145 (Wis. Oct 07, 1892) ""
- 1305 Gaertner v. City of Fond du Lac, 34 Wis. 497, 502, 1874 WL 3340, *2 (Wis. Jan Term 1874)
- 1306 Jones v. Keep's Estate, 19 Wis. 369, 375, 1865 WL 2989, *4 (Wis. Jan Term 1865)
- 1307 Blair v. Maynard, 324 S.E.2d 391, 394, 174 W.Va. 247, 251 (W.Va. Dec 21, 1984) (NO. 16488) ""
- 1308 State ex rel. Gordon v. State Board of Control, 102 S.E. 688, 690, 85 W.Va. 739, 739 (W.Va. Mar 09, 1920) (NO. 4053)
- 1309 U.S. Blowpipe Co. v. Spencer, 33 S.E. 342, 345, 46 W.Va. 590, 590 (W.Va. Apr 22, 1899) "" (*in dissent*)
- 1310 Miller v. State Board of Agriculture, 32 S.E. 1007, 1008, 46 W.Va. 192, 192, 76 Am.St.Rep. 811, 811 (W.Va. Apr 01, 1899)
- 1311 Chesapeake & O.R. Co. v. Miller, 19 W.Va. 408, 414+, 1882 WL 131, *5+ (W.Va. Apr 22, 1882)
- 1312 Quarrier v. Peabody Ins. Co., 10 W.Va. 507, 510, 1877 WL 3470, *4, 27 Am.Rep. 582, 582 (W.Va. May 01, 1877)
- 1313 Slack v. Jacob, 8 W.Va. 612, 663+, 1875 WL 3439, *21+ (W.Va. Sep 13, 1875)
- 1314 Wheeling Gas Co. v. City of Wheeling, 5 W.Va. 448, 470, 1872 WL 2919, *17 (W.Va. Jul Term 1872)
- 1315 Gardner v. Walker, 373 P.2d 598, 600 (Wyo. Jul 31, 1962) (NO. 3067)

- C 1316 Tobin v. Town Council of Town of City of Sundance, 17 P.2d 666, 672, 45 Wyo. 219, 219, 84 A.L.R. 902, 902 (Wyo. Jan 04, 1933) (NO. 1768, 1769) ""
- C 1317 B. Munoz, Inc. v. Prod. Puertorriquena, 109 D.P.R. 825, 831, 1981 JTS 53, 53, 9 P.R. Offic. Trans. 1109, 1109 (P.R. May 28, 1980) (NO. O-80-104)
- ▶ 1318 Terceiro v. Division de Hogares Seguros, 53 D.P.R. 598, 598 (P.R. Jul 23, 1938) (NO. 7500)
- H 1319 Luce & Co., S. en C., v. Registrador de Guayama, 34 D.P.R. 913, 913+ (P.R. Jul 02, 1925) (NO. 594)
- ▶ 1320 Jamestown & Newport Ferry Co. v. C.I.R., 1929 WL 488, *488, 16 B.T.A. 638, 646 (B.T.A. May 23, 1929) (NO. 19412, 25013) ""
- ▶ 1321 Coronado Oil & Gas Co. v. C.I.R., 1929 WL 968, *968+, 14 B.T.A. 1214, 1228+ (B.T.A. Jan 14, 1929) (NO. 10503)

★ **Mentioned**

- ▶ 1322 Finley v. U.S., 109 S.Ct. 2003, 2012, 490 U.S. 545, 559, 104 L.Ed.2d 593, 593, 57 USLW 4557, 4557, 1989 A.M.C. 2112, 2112, 13 Fed.R.Serv.3d 1105, 1105 (U.S.Cal. May 22, 1989) (NO. 87-1973) (*in dissent*)
- H 1323 American Bank and Trust Co. v. Dallas County, 103 S.Ct. 3369, 3381, 463 U.S. 855, 874, 77 L.Ed.2d 1072, 1072 (U.S.Tex. Jul 05, 1983) (NO. 81-1717) (*in dissent*)
- ▶ 1324 Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 102 S.Ct. 2858, 2872+, 458 U.S. 50, 72+, 73 L.Ed.2d 598, 598+, 6 Collier Bankr.Cas.2d 785, 785+, Bankr. L. Rep. P 68,698, 68698+ (U.S.Minn. Jun 28, 1982) (NO. 81-150, 81-546)
- ▶ 1325 Glidden Co. v. Zdanok, 82 S.Ct. 1459, 1476+, 370 U.S. 530, 556+, 8 L.Ed.2d 671, 671+, 50 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2693, 2693+, 45 Lab.Cas. P 17,685, 17685+ (U.S.N.Y. Jun 25, 1962) (NO. 242, 481)
- ▶ 1326 Federal Land Bank of Wichita v. Board of County Com'rs of Kiowa County, State of Kan., 82 S.Ct. 282, 284, 368 U.S. 146, 149, 7 L.Ed.2d 199, 199 (U.S.Kan. Dec 11, 1961) (NO. 25)
- ▶ 1327 U.S. v. Allegheny County, Pa., 64 S.Ct. 908, 911, 322 U.S. 174, 177, 88 L.Ed. 1209, 1209 (U.S.Pa. May 01, 1944) (NO. 417)
- ▶ 1328 Brady v. Roosevelt S.S. Co., 63 S.Ct. 425, 429, 317 U.S. 575, 582, 87 L.Ed. 471, 471, 1943 A.M.C. 1 (U.S.N.Y. Jan 18, 1943) (NO. 269)
- ▶ 1329 Indian Motorcycle Co. v. U.S., 51 S.Ct. 601, 603, 283 U.S. 570, 576, 75 L.Ed. 1277, 1277, 2 USTC P 744, 744, 9 A.F.T.R. 1460, 1460 (U.S.Ct.Cl. May 25, 1931) (NO. 5)
- ▶ 1330 Susquehanna Power Co. v. State Tax Commission of Md., 51 S.Ct. 434, 435, 283 U.S. 291, 294, 75 L.Ed. 1042, 1042 (U.S.Md. Apr 13, 1931) (NO. 368)
- ▶ 1331 First Nat. Bank of San Jose v. State of Cal., 43 S.Ct. 602, 603, 262 U.S. 366, 370, 67 L.Ed. 1030, 1030 (U.S.Cal. Jun 04, 1923) (NO. 276)
- C 1332 Bank of California, National Ass'n, v. Richardson, 39 S.Ct. 165, 166, 248 U.S. 476, 482, 63 L.Ed. 372, 372 (U.S.Cal. Jan 27, 1919) (NO. 262)
- H 1333 Luria v. U.S., 34 S.Ct. 10, 13, 231 U.S. 9, 22, 58 L.Ed. 101, 101 (U.S.N.Y. Oct 20, 1913) (NO. 27)
- ▶ 1334 Williams v. City of Talladega, 33 S.Ct. 116, 119, 226 U.S. 404, 419, 57 L.Ed. 275, 275 (U.S.Ala. Dec 23, 1912) (NO. 44)
- ▶ 1335 State of North Dakota ex rel. Flaherty v. Hanson, 30 S.Ct. 179, 182, 215 U.S. 515, 524, 54 L.Ed. 307, 307 (U.S.N.D. Jan 17, 1910) (NO. 47)
- H 1336 Wilson v. Shaw, 27 S.Ct. 233, 235, 204 U.S. 24, 34, 51 L.Ed. 351, 351 (U.S.Dist.Col. Jan 07, 1907) (NO. 43)
- C 1337 State of South Dakota v. State of North Carolina, 24 S.Ct. 269, 282, 192 U.S. 286, 333, 48 L.Ed. 448, 448 (U.S.N.C. Feb 01, 1904) (NO. 8 ORIGINAL) (*in dissent*)
- C 1338 U.S. v. Rickert, 23 S.Ct. 478, 481, 188 U.S. 432, 439, 47 L.Ed. 532, 532 (U.S.S.D. Feb 23, 1903) (NO. 216)
- ▶ 1339 Easton v. State of Iowa, 23 S.Ct. 288, 290, 188 U.S. 220, 229, 47 L.Ed. 452, 452 (U.S.Iowa Feb 02, 1903) (NO. 92)
- ▶ 1340 State of Minnesota v. Northern Securities Co., 22 S.Ct. 308, 322, 184 U.S. 199, 236, 46 L.Ed. 499, 499 (U.S.Minn. Feb 24, 1902)
- H 1341 Owensboro Nat. Bank v. City of Owensboro, 19 S.Ct. 537, 538, 173 U.S. 664, 667, 43 L.Ed. 850, 850, 3 A.F.T.R. 2670, 2670 (U.S.Ky. Apr 03, 1899) (NO. 148)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1342 State of South Carolina v. Wesley, 15 S.Ct. 230, 231, 155 U.S. 542, 544, 39 L.Ed. 254, 254 (U.S.S.C. Jan 07, 1895) (NO. 796)
- 1343 Luxton v. North River Bridge Co., 14 S.Ct. 891, 892, 153 U.S. 525, 529, 38 L.Ed. 808, 808 (U.S.N.J. May 14, 1894) (NO. 1,040)
- 1344 U.S. v. "Old Settlers", 13 S.Ct. 650, 667, 148 U.S. 427, 468, 37 L.Ed. 509, 509 (U.S.Ct.Cl. Apr 03, 1893) (NO. 1031, 1032)
- 1345 Talbott v. Board of Com'rs of Silver Bow County, 11 S.Ct. 594, 595, 139 U.S. 438, 440, 35 L.Ed. 210, 210 (U.S.Mont. Mar 30, 1891)
- 1346 State of California v. Central Pac. R. Co., 8 S.Ct. 1073, 1081, 127 U.S. 1, 41, 32 L.Ed. 150, 150 (U.S.Cal. Apr 30, 1888) (NO. 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 1157)
- 1347 Antoni v. Greenhow, 2 S.Ct. 91, 125, 107 U.S. 769, 809, 17 Otto 769, 769, 27 L.Ed. 468, 468 (U.S.Va. Mar 05, 1883)
- 1348 First Nat. Bank v. Commonwealth of Kentucky, 1869 WL 11457, *4, 76 U.S. 353, 357, 19 L.Ed. 701, 701, 9 Wall. 353, 353 (U.S.Ky. Dec Term 1869)
- 1349 Hipp for Use of Cuesta v. Babin, 1856 WL 8698, *3, 60 U.S. 271, 273, 19 How. 271, 271, 15 L.Ed. 633, 633 (U.S.La. Dec Term 1856)
- 1350 Piqua Branch of State Bank of Ohio v. Knoop, 1853 WL 7693, *35, 57 U.S. 369, 409, 16 How. 369, 369, 14 L.Ed. 977, 977, 3 Ohio F.Dec. 133, 133 (U.S.Ohio Dec Term 1853) (*in dissent*)
- 1351 In re Kaine, 1852 WL 6768, *14, 55 U.S. 103, 119, 14 How. 103, 103, 14 L.Ed. 345, 345 (U.S.N.Y. Dec Term 1852)
- 1352 Com. of Pennsylvania v. Wheeling & Belmont Bridge Co., 1851 WL 6676, *3, 54 U.S. 518, 522, 13 How. 518, 518, 14 L.Ed. 249, 249 (U.S.Pa. Dec Term 1851)
- 1353 Kennedy v. Bank of State of Ga., 1850 WL 6800, *8, 49 U.S. 586, 593, 8 How. 586, 586, 12 L.Ed. 1209, 1209 (U.S.Ga. Jan Term 1850)
- 1354 Smith v. Turner, 1849 WL 6405, *203, 48 U.S. 283, 537, 7 How. 283, 283, 12 L.Ed. 702, 702 (U.S.N.Y. Jan Term 1849)
- 1355 Planters' Bank v. Sharp, 1848 WL 6448, *12, 47 U.S. 301, 314, 6 How. 301, 301, 12 L.Ed. 447, 447 (U.S.Miss. Jan Term 1848)
- 1356 In re Metzger, 1847 WL 5979, *7, 46 U.S. 176, 183, 5 How. 176, 176, 12 L.Ed. 104, 104 (U.S.N.Y. Jan Term 1847)
- 1357 Bank of U.S. v. Owens, 1829 WL 3157, *5, 27 U.S. 527, 531, 2 Pet. 527, 527, 7 L.Ed. 508, 508 (U.S.Ky. Jan Term 1829)
- 1358 Weston v. City Council of Charleston, 1829 WL 3180, *7, 27 U.S. 449, 458, 2 Pet. 449, 449, 7 L.Ed. 481, 481 (U.S.S.C. Jan Term 1829)
- 1359 Blondet v. Hadley, 144 F.2d 370, 372 (C.C.A.1 (Puerto Rico) Aug 25, 1944) (NO. 3924)
- 1360 Jamestown & Newport Ferry Co. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 41 F.2d 920, 922, 2 USTC P 546, 546, 8 A.F.T.R. 11,022, 11022 (C.C.A.1 Jun 05, 1930) (NO. 2428)
- 1361 Brown University v. Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, 56 F. 55, 55 (C.C.D.R.I. May 31, 1893) (NO. 2377)
- 1362 U.S. v. American Bell Tel. Co., 32 F. 591, 592+ (C.C.D.Mass. Sep 26, 1887)
- 1363 Sweatt v. Boston, H. & E.R. Co., 23 F.Cas. 530, 535, 3 Cliff. 339, 339, 6 Am. Law T. 174, 174, 1 Am. Law T. Rep. Bankr. 273, 273, 5 N.B.R. 234, 234, No. 13,684, 13684, 6 Am. Law Rev. 168, 168 (C.C.D.Mass. Sep 07, 1871)
- 1364 Day v. Buffinton, 7 F.Cas. 222, 226, 3 Cliff. 376, 376, 2 Leg.Gaz. 249, 249, 11 Int.Rev.Rec. 205, 205, 2 A.F.T.R. 2032, 2032, No. 3675, 3675, 5 Am. Law Rev. 176, 176 (C.C.D.Mass. May Term 1871)
- 1365 Merchants' Nat Bank of Boston v. State Nat Bank of Boston, 17 F.Cas. 54, 55, 3 Cliff. 205, 205, No. 9449, 9449 (C.C.D.Mass. Oct Term 1868)
- 1366 Orr v. Littlefield, 18 F.Cas. 837, 838, 1 Woodb. & M. 13, 13, 8 Law Rep. 314, 314, No. 10,590, 10590 (C.C.D.N.H. Oct Term 1845)
- 1367 Guiseppi v. Walling, 144 F.2d 608, 615, 155 A.L.R. 761, 761 (C.C.A.2 Jun 27, 1944) (NO. 361, 362, 363)
- 1368 New Rock Asset Partners, L.P. v. Preferred Entity Advancements, Inc., 101 F.3d 1492, 1505, 65 USLW 2402, 2402 (3rd Cir.(N.J.) Dec 10, 1996) (NO. 95-5306)



































- 1369 Halderman v. Pennhurst State School & Hospital, 673 F.2d 647, 657 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Feb 26, 1982) (NO. 78-1490, 78-1564, 78-1602)
- 1370 Scott v. Plante, 641 F.2d 117, 133 (3rd Cir.(N.J.) Feb 05, 1981) (NO. 80-1314, 80-1315, 80-1596)
- 1371 Transamerica Corp. v. Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System, 206 F.2d 163, 171 (3rd Cir. Jul 16, 1953) (NO. 10768)
- 1372 Public Service R Co v. Herold, 229 F. 902, 910, 144 C.C.A. 184, 184, 1 A.F.T.R. 600, 600 (C.C.A.3 (N.J.) Jan 21, 1916) (NO. 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019-2027)
- 1373 Bains v. the James & Catherine, 2 F.Cas. 410, 419, Baldw. 544, 544, 11 Int.Rev.Rec. 62, 62, No. 756, 756, 10 Hunt Mer. Mag. 81, 81 (C.C.D.Pa. Oct Term 1832)
- 1374 McCready v. Blue Shield of Virginia, 649 F.2d 228, 236, 1981-1 Trade Cases P 64,014, 64014 (4th Cir.(Va.) May 12, 1981) (NO. 78-1883) (*in dissent*)
- 1375 Whittington v. Sewer Const. Co., Inc., 541 F.2d 427, 441+, 1976 A.M.C. 967, 967+ (4th Cir.(W.Va.) May 12, 1976) (NO. 74-1234) (*in dissent*)
- 1376 Bowles v. American Brewery, 146 F.2d 842, 847 (C.C.A.4 (Md.) Jan 03, 1945) (NO. 5267)
- 1377 Blease v. Safety Transit Co., 50 F.2d 852, 854 (C.C.A.4 (S.C.) Jun 17, 1931) (NO. 3137)
- 1378 Powers v. South Central United Food & Commercial Workers Unions and Employers Health & Welfare Trust, 719 F.2d 760, 763, 4 Employee Benefits Cas. 2552, 2552 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Oct 31, 1983) (NO. 82-2319)
- 1379 Ruiz v. Estelle, 679 F.2d 1115, 1157, 10 Fed. R. Evid. Serv. 1483, 1483 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Jun 23, 1982) (NO. 81-2224, 81-2380, 81-2390)
- 1380 Jagnandan v. Giles, 538 F.2d 1166, 1173 (5th Cir.(Miss.) Sep 20, 1976) (NO. 74-3467)
- 1381 Transamerica Ins. Co. v. Red Top Metal, Inc., 384 F.2d 752, 754, 4 A.L.R. Fed. 674, 674 (5th Cir.(Tex.) Oct 18, 1967) (NO. 22707)
- 1382 Thames v. State of Mississippi, for Use and Benefit of Shoemaker, 117 F.2d 949, 957, 136 A.L.R. 926, 926 (C.C.A.5 (Miss.) Feb 27, 1941) (NO. 9632) (*in dissent*)
- 1383 U.S. v. Dolla, 177 F. 101, 104, 100 C.C.A. 521, 521, 21 Am. Ann. Cas. 665, 665 (C.C.A.5 (Ga.) Mar 01, 1910) (NO. 2007)
- 1384 Stapylton v. Thaggard, 91 F. 93, 95, 33 C.C.A. 353, 353 (C.C.A.5 (Fla.) Dec 20, 1898) (NO. 772)
- 1385 Western Assur. Co. of Toronto, Canada, v. Ward, 75 F. 338, 342, 21 C.C.A. 378, 378 (C.C.A.5 (Fla.) Jun 02, 1896) (NO. 477)
- 1386 Warner v. Ford Motor Co., 46 F.3d 531, 535, 63 USLW 2496, 2496, 66 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 1680, 1680, 18 Employee Benefits Cas. 2847, 2847, 1995 Fed.App. 0045P, 7, Pens. Plan Guide (CCH) P 23905A, 23905A (6th Cir.(Mich.) Feb 06, 1995) (NO. 93-1312)
- 1387 Dale E. Frankfurth, D.D.S., v. City of Detroit, 829 F.2d 38, 38 (6th Cir.(Mich.) Sep 17, 1987) (Table, text in WESTLAW, NO. 86-1476, 86-1825)
- 1388 Commissioner of Internal Revenue v. Liberty Bank & Trust Co., 59 F.2d 320, 323, 3 USTC P 932, 932, 11 A.F.T.R. 488, 488 (C.C.A.6 May 12, 1932) (NO. 5780, 5867)
- 1389 Coulter v. Weir, 127 F. 897, 905, 62 C.C.A. 429, 429 (C.C.A.6 (Ky.) Feb 13, 1904) (NO. 1224)
- 1390 Aliotta v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., 315 F.3d 756, 758, 60 Fed. R. Evid. Serv. 290, 290 (7th Cir.(Ill.) Jan 03, 2003) (NO. 02-1041)
- 1391 Ktsanes v. Underwood, 552 F.2d 740, 743 (7th Cir.(Ill.) Mar 23, 1977) (NO. 76-1623)
- 1392 National Grain Yeast Corp. v. City of Crystal Lake, 147 F.2d 711, 715 (C.C.A.7 (Ill.) Mar 01, 1945) (NO. 8730)
- 1393 First Federal Savings & Loan Ass'n of Wisconsin v. Loomis, 97 F.2d 831, 841, 121 A.L.R. 99, 99 (C.C.A.7 (Wis.) May 20, 1938) (NO. 6381) (*in dissent*)
- 1394 Weir v. U.S., 92 F.2d 634, 636, 114 A.L.R. 481, 481 (C.C.A.7 (Ind.) Oct 21, 1937) (NO. 6243, 6245, 6248, 6250, 6252, 6253)
- 1395 State of Indiana ex rel. Wolf, Auditor v. Pullman Palace-Car Co., 16 F. 193, 204, 11 Biss. 561, 561 (C.C.D.Ind. Mar 08, 1883)
- 1396 Mowrey v. Indianapolis & C.R. Co., 17 F.Cas. 930, 934, 4 Biss. 78, 78, No. 9891, 9891 (C.C.D.Ind. Jun Term 1866)
- 1397 Treleven v. University of Minnesota, 73 F.3d 816, 819, 106 Ed. Law Rep. 96, 96 (8th Cir.(Minn.) Jan 12, 1996) (NO. 95-2019)
- 1398 Doherty v. U.S., 94 F.2d 495, 496 (C.C.A.8 (Neb.) Jan 29, 1938) (NO. 10998)
- 1399 Langer v. U.S., 76 F.2d 817, 825 (C.C.A.8 (N.D.) May 07, 1935) (NO. 10204)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- H 1400 Buder v. First Nat. Bank, 16 F.2d 990, 992 (C.C.A.8 (Mo.) Jan 04, 1927) (NO. 7309)
C 1401 Berry v. Davis, 15 F.2d 488, 489 (C.C.A.8 (Okla.) Oct 29, 1926) (NO. 7068, 7069)
C 1402 King v. Lawson, 84 F. 209, 210 (C.C.D.S.D. Dec 15, 1897)
1403 Smith v. Union Pac. R. Co., 22 F.Cas. 694, 694, 2 Dill. 278, 278, No. 13,121, 13121 (C.C.D.Neb. 1872)
H 1404 Union Pac. R. Co. v. Lincoln County, 24 F.Cas. 631, 632, 1 Dill. 314, 314, 10 Am. Law Reg. (N.S.) 458, 458, No. 14,378, 14378 (C.C.D.Neb. 1871)
▶ 1405 Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho v. State of Idaho, 42 F.3d 1244, 1254 (9th Cir.(Idaho) Dec 09, 1994) (NO. 92-36703)
H 1406 Carroll v. U.S., 923 F.2d 752, 753 (9th Cir. Jan 18, 1991) (NO. 89-15178) (*in dissent*)
H 1407 Fahey v. O'Melveny & Myers, 200 F.2d 420, 445 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Nov 06, 1952) (NO. 12591)
▶ 1408 Maricopa County v. Valley Nat. Bank of Phoenix, 130 F.2d 356, 359 (C.C.A.9 (Ariz.) Aug 07, 1942) (NO. 10025)
▶ 1409 Santa Clara County v. Southern Pac. R. Co., 18 F. 385, 446+, 9 Sawy. 165, 165+ (C.C.D.Cal. Sep 17, 1883)
H 1410 Railroad Tax Cases, 13 F. 722, 786, 8 Sawy. 238, 238 (C.C.D.Cal. Sep 25, 1882)
C 1411 Hudspeth v. Melville, 127 F.2d 373, 375 (C.C.A.10 (Kan.) Nov 12, 1941) (NO. 2305)
C 1412 Read v. National Equity Life Ins. Co., 114 F.2d 977, 979 (C.C.A.10 (Okla.) Oct 17, 1940) (NO. 2088)
C 1413 State of Kansas v. Walruff, 26 F. 178, 179 (C.C.D.Kan. Jan 22, 1886)
C 1414 State of Kansas v. Bradley, 26 F. 289, 289 (C.C.D.Kan. Dec 31, 1885)
▶ 1415 National R.R. Passenger Corp. v. Rountree Transport and Rigging, Inc., 286 F.3d 1233, 1259, 15 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. C 419, 419 (11th Cir.(Fla.) Mar 26, 2002) (NO. 00-13811, 00-13986)
▶ 1416 Palazzo v. Gulf Oil Corp., 764 F.2d 1381, 1385, 1985-2 Trade Cases P 66,679, 66679 (11th Cir.(Fla.) Jul 05, 1985) (NO. 83-3219)
▶ 1417 Forshey v. Principi, 284 F.3d 1335, 1352 (Fed.Cir. Apr 01, 2002) (NO. 99-7064)
▶ 1418 Auction Co. of America v. F.D.I.C., 132 F.3d 746, 751, 328 U.S.App.D.C. 45, 45 (D.C.Cir. Dec 19, 1997) (NO. 96-5343)
▶ 1419 LaShawn A. v. Barry, 87 F.3d 1389, 1396, 65 USLW 2049, 2049, 318 U.S.App.D.C. 380, 387 (D.C.Cir. Jul 09, 1996) (NO. 94-7044)
▶ 1420 LaShawn A. v. Barry, 69 F.3d 556, 575, 314 U.S.App.D.C. 392, 411 (D.C.Cir. Oct 31, 1995) (NO. 94-7044) (*in dissent*)
▶ 1421 Feldman v. Gardner, 661 F.2d 1295, 1314, 213 U.S.App.D.C. 119, 138, 1982-1 Trade Cases P 64,562, 64562 (D.C.Cir. Jul 23, 1981) (NO. 78-2235, 79-1233)
C 1422 Powers v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 439 F.2d 605, 608, 142 U.S.App.D.C. 95, 98 (D.C.Cir. Jan 20, 1971) (NO. 22618)
C 1423 National Ass'n of Government Emp. v. White, 418 F.2d 1126, 1130, 71 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2209, 2209, 135 U.S.App.D.C. 290, 294 (D.C.Cir. May 13, 1969) (NO. 22630)
H 1424 Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Coe, 96 F.2d 518, 521, 68 App.D.C. 246, 249, 36 U.S.P.Q. 461, 461 (App.D.C. Feb 28, 1938) (NO. 6894) (BNA Version)
C 1425 New Orleans Commercial Corp v. City of Albertville, Ala, 32 F.Supp. 9, 10 (N.D.Ala. Mar 14, 1940) (NO. 388)
H 1426 U.S. v. Beebee, 17 F. 36, 41, 4 McCrary 12, 12 (C.C.E.D.Ark. Jun 1883)
C 1427 Connor v. Scott, 6 F.Cas. 313, 315, 4 Dill. 242, 242, 3 Cent. L.J. 305, 305, No. 3119, 3119 (C.C.W.D.Ark. 1876)
H 1428 Serban's Background Music v. Chynoweth, 2006 WL 2527955, *4, 98 A.F.T.R.2d 2006-8064, 2006-8064, 2007-1 USTC P 50,153, 50153 (E.D.Cal. Aug 31, 2006) (NO. CVF 05-1476 OWW DLB)
▶ 1429 Environmental Sound Solutions, Inc. v. Chynoweth, 2006 WL 547998, *1 (E.D.Cal. Mar 07, 2006) (NO. CVF05-1431RECLJO)
▶ 1430 Fall v. Keasler, 1991 WL 340182, *1 (N.D.Cal. Dec 18, 1991) (NO. C 90 20643 SW (ARB))
▶ 1431 Contemporary Services Corp. v. Universal City Studios, Inc., 655 F.Supp. 885, 890, RICO Bus.Disp.Guide 6630, 6630 (C.D.Cal. Mar 02, 1987) (NO. CV 86-7120 WJR)
▶ 1432 Aanestad v. Air Canada, Inc., 382 F.Supp. 550, 553 (C.D.Cal. Sep 30, 1974) (NO. CIV. 71-2227, CIV. 71-2228, MDL. 103)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1433 Klim v. Jones, 315 F.Supp. 109, 116 (N.D.Cal. Jul 17, 1970) (NO. CIV. 52332)
- 1434 U.S. v. State of Cal., 208 F.Supp. 861, 863 (S.D.Cal. Sep 14, 1962) (NO. CIV. 62-521-WM)
- 1435 Security-First Nat. Bank of Los Angeles v. Republic Pictures Corp., 97 F.Supp. 360, 369, 89 U.S.P.Q. 231, 231 (S.D.Cal. Apr 26, 1951) (NO. 12260) (BNA Version)
- 1436 Mackay v. Gabel, 117 F. 873, 878 (C.C.S.D.Cal. Jul 10, 1902)
- 1437 First Union Nat. Bank v. Burke, 48 F.Supp.2d 132, 138 (D.Conn. Apr 07, 1999) (NO. 3:98CV2171 JBA)
- 1438 Walton v. Howard University, 1988 WL 8841, *1 (D.D.C. Jan 19, 1988) (NO. CIV.A. 87-1438)
- 1439 Faruki v. Rogers, 349 F.Supp. 723, 728, 6 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 303, 303, 5 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 8015, 8015 (D.D.C. Oct 06, 1972) (NO. CIV. A. 175-72)
- 1440 In re Investigation of World Arrangements with Relation to Production, Transp., Refining & Distribution of Petroleum, 13 F.R.D. 280, 289 (D.D.C Nov 10, 1952) (NO. 19-52)
- 1441 Rechsteiner v. Madison Fund, Inc., 75 F.R.D. 499, 506, 15 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 216, 216 (D.Del. Jun 27, 1977) (NO. CIV. 76-293)
- 1442 Jupiter Wreck, Inc. v. Unidentified, Wrecked and Abandoned Sailing Vessel, 691 F.Supp. 1377, 1394, 1988 A.M.C. 2705, 2705 (S.D.Fla. Jul 15, 1988) (NO. 87-8548-CIV, 87-8619-CIV)
- 1443 U.S. v. Fischer, 48 F.Supp. 7, 8 (S.D.Fla. Dec 16, 1942) (NO. 729-M)
- 1444 Jones v. Florida, C. & P.R. Co., 41 F. 70, 71 (C.C.S.D.Fla Dec 14, 1889)
- 1445 U.S. v. Shaw, 39 F. 433, 434, 3 L.R.A. 232, 232 (C.C.S.D.Ga. Jan 15, 1889)
- 1446 Reconstruction Finance Corp. v. Central Republic Trust Co., 17 F.Supp. 263, 290 (N.D.Ill. Nov 07, 1936) (NO. 14189)
- 1447 In re Illinois Fireworks & Display Co., 4 F.Supp. 200, 202 (E.D.Ill. Feb 01, 1933) (NO. 2059-D)
- 1448 State of Illinois ex rel. Hunt v. Illinois Cent. R. Co., 33 F. 721, 725 (C.C.N.D.Ill. Feb 23, 1888)
- 1449 Iowa Loan & Trust Co. v. Fairweather, 252 F. 605, 606 (S.D.Iowa Sep 16, 1918)
- 1450 Davis v. Berry, 216 F. 413, 415 (S.D.Iowa Jun 24, 1914) (NO. 9-A)
- 1451 Perez v. Rhiddlehoover, 247 F.Supp. 65, 73 (E.D.La. Oct 19, 1965) (NO. CIV. 15914-B)
- 1452 Harrington v. Grayson, 764 F.Supp. 464, 471 (E.D.Mich. Apr 30, 1991) (NO. CIV.A.90-CV-70336-DT)
- 1453 Blodgett v. Holden, 11 F.2d 180, 189, 5 A.F.T.R. 5820, 5820 (W.D.Mich. Feb 17, 1926)
- 1454 Connor v. Winter, 519 F.Supp. 1337, 1348 (S.D.Miss. Aug 12, 1981) (NO. CIV. 3830 (A)) (*in dissent*)
- 1455 U.S. v. State of Miss., 229 F.Supp. 925, 958 (S.D.Miss. Mar 06, 1964) (NO. CIV. 3312)
- 1456 City of Hattiesburg v. First Nat. Bank, 8 F.Supp. 157, 168 (S.D.Miss. Aug 22, 1934) (NO. 7761)
- 1457 United Missouri Bank of Kansas City, N. A. v. Danforth, 394 F.Supp. 774, 786 (W.D.Mo. Apr 29, 1975) (NO. 75 CV 38-C, 75 CV 47-C, 75 CV 41-C, 75 CV 50-C, 75 CV 43-C)
- 1458 First Nat. Bank v. Buder, 8 F.2d 883, 887 (E.D.Mo. Oct 02, 1925) (NO. 6949)
- 1459 In re Goldberg, 269 F. 392, 393 (E.D.Mo. Dec 17, 1920) (NO. 9010)
- 1460 Fidelity Nat. Bank & Trust Co. of Kansas City v. Enright, 264 F. 236, 239 (W.D.Mo. Mar 26, 1920) (NO. 225)
- 1461 U.S. v. Ginsberg, 244 F. 209, 213 (W.D.Mo. Jul 13, 1914) (NO. 11)
- 1462 Weed Sewing-Mach. Co. v. Wicks, 29 F.Cas. 573, 575, 3 Dill. 261, 261, 2 Cent. L.J. 475, 475, No. 17,348, 17348 (C.C.W.D.Mo. Apr Term 1875)
- 1463 Purnell v. Page, 128 F. 496, 496 (C.C.E.D.N.C. Apr 28, 1903)
- 1464 U.S. v. Doherty, 18 F.Supp. 793, 794 (D.Neb. Apr 15, 1937) (NO. 408)
- 1465 Dewar v. Brooks, 16 F.Supp. 636, 638 (D.Nev. Oct 21, 1936) (NO. H-167)
- 1466 La Caisse Populaire Ste-Marie (St. Mary's Bank) v. U. S., 425 F.Supp. 512, 515, 39 A.F.T.R.2d 77-485, 77-485, 77-1 USTC P 9137, 9137 (D.N.H. Dec 10, 1976) (NO. CIV 75-383)
- 1467 Wojciechowski v. Harriman, 607 F.Supp. 631, 635, 53 USLW 2562, 2562 (D.N.M. Apr 26, 1985) (NO. CIV. 84-948 BB)
- 1468 Bakal v. Ambassador Const., 1995 WL 447784, *4 (S.D.N.Y. Jul 28, 1995) (NO. 94 CIV. 584 (JSM))
- 1469 Fraass Survival Systems, Inc. v. Absentee Shawnee Economic Development Authority, 817 F.Supp. 7, 9+ (S.D.N.Y. Apr 01, 1993) (NO. 91 CIV. 3705 (MJL))
- 1470 Matter of Holliday's Tax Services, Inc., 417 F.Supp. 182, 183 (E.D.N.Y. Jun 24, 1976) (NO. 75 B 2910)

-  1471 Home Title Ins. Co. of New York v. Keith, 230 F. 905, 909, 1 USTC P 9, 9, 4 A.F.T.R. 4216, 4216 (E.D.N.Y. Mar 03, 1916)
-  1472 Rutledge v. Waldo, 94 F. 265, 265 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. May 12, 1899)
-  1473 Edye v. Robertson, 18 F. 135, 143, 21 Blatchf. 460, 460 (C.C.E.D.N.Y. Sep 05, 1883)
-  1474 Laubscher v. Fay, 197 F. 879, 880, 10 Ohio Law Rep. 456, 456 (N.D. Ohio Jan 24, 1912) (NO. 8014)
-  1475 Popp v. Cincinnati, H. & D.R. Co., 96 F. 465, 467, 10 Ohio F.Dec. 4, 4 (C.C.S.D. Ohio May 22, 1899) (NO. 5281)
-  1476 Mercantile Nat. Bank v. Shields, 59 F. 952, 954, 8 Ohio F.Dec. 111, 111 (C.C.N.D. Ohio Jan 03, 1894) (NO. 5122)
-  1477 Edison Elec. Light Co. v. Packard Elec. Co., 61 F. 1002, 1003 (C.C.N.D. Ohio Sep 06, 1893) (NO. 5141)
-  1478 Exchange Nat. Bank v. Miller, 19 F. 372, 382+, 5 Ohio F.Dec. 247, 247+ (C.C.S.D. Ohio Feb 07, 1884)
-  1479 Reinach v. Atlantic & G.W.R. Co., 58 F. 33, 38, 6 Ohio F.Dec. 454, 454 (C.C.S.D. Ohio Jan 1878)
-  1480 Grand River Dam Authority v. Going, 29 F.Supp. 316, 320 (N.D. Okla. Sep 22, 1939) (NO. 211)
-  1481 Drew v. Burley, 287 F. 916, 918 (D.Or. May 17, 1920) (NO. 8475)
-  1482 Hicks v. Amtrak Corp., 1989 WL 71274, *1 (E.D.Pa. Jun 26, 1989) (NO. CIV.A. 89-2429)
-  1483 MOVE Organization v. U.S. Dept. of Justice, 555 F.Supp. 684, 693 (E.D.Pa. Jan 10, 1983) (NO. CIV. 82-143)
-  1484 Weiner v. Bank of King of Prussia, 358 F.Supp. 684, 690, 17 Fed.R.Serv.2d 1536, 1536, 1973-2 Trade Cases P 74,845, 74845 (E.D.Pa. Apr 30, 1973) (NO. CIV. A. 72-1444)
-  1485 Grove Press, Inc. v. City of Philadelphia, 300 F.Supp. 281, 292 (E.D.Pa. May 20, 1969) (NO. CIV. 69-972, CIV. 69-934)
-  1486 Com. of Pa. v. Brown, 260 F.Supp. 323, 334, 10 Fed.R.Serv.2d 390, 390 (E.D.Pa. Sep 02, 1966) (NO. CIV. 39404)
-  1487 Koster v. Turchi, 79 F.Supp. 268, 273 (E.D.Pa. Apr 08, 1948) (NO. CIV.7755)
-  1488 Second Nat Bank of Titusville, Pa v. Caldwell, 13 F. 429, 433+ (W.D.Pa. Oct Term 1882)
-  1489 Camblos v. Philadelphia & R R Co, 4 F.Cas. 1089, 1095, 4 Brewst. 563, 563, 9 Phila. 411, 411, 30 Leg.Int. 149, 149, No. 2331, 2331 (C.C.E.D.Pa. Apr 25, 1873)
-  1490 Ex parte Poulson, 19 F.Cas. 1205, 1207, 15 Haz.Pa.Reg. 380, 380, No. 11,350, 11350 (C.C.E.D.Pa. 1835)
-  1491 Davis v. Memphis City Ry. Co., 22 F. 883, 886 (C.C.W.D.Tenn. Feb 06, 1885)
- 1492 Memphis & L. R. R. Co. v. Nolan, 14 F. 532, 536 (C.C.W.D.Tenn. Sep 09, 1882)
-  1493 Drawhorn v. Qwest Communications Intern., Inc., 121 F.Supp.2d 554, 566 (E.D.Tex. May 30, 2000) (NO. CIV. A. 1:99-CV-415)
-  1494 Turner v. American Bar Ass'n, 407 F.Supp. 451, 476 (N.D.Tex. Nov 05, 1975) (NO. CIV.A. 5-74-42, CIV.A. 74-480, CIV.A. S74-84, CIV.A. S74-29, CIV.A. S75-74, CIV.A. 4-74-190, CIV.A. 74-426-P)
-  1495 Group No. One Oil Corp. v. Bass, 38 F.2d 680, 685, 8 A.F.T.R. 10,358, 10358 (W.D.Tex. Feb 19, 1930) (NO. 1176)
-  1496 State of Texas v. Lewis, 14 F. 65, 67 (C.C.N.D.Tex. Oct Term 1882)
-  1497 State of Texas v. Lewis, 12 F. 1, 5 (C.C.N.D.Tex. Apr 1882)
-  1498 Harper v. Norfolk & W.R. Co., 36 F. 102, 104 (C.C.W.D.Va. Nov 05, 1887)
-  1499 Union Timber Products Co. v. United States Shipping Bd. Emergency Fleet Corp., 252 F. 320, 321 (W.D.Wash. Jul 19, 1918) (NO. 4102)
-  1500 In re Sonnyco Coal, Inc., 89 B.R. 658, 666 (Bankr.S.D. Ohio Mar 31, 1988) (NO. 2-85-0277, 2-85-02570)
-  1501 James v. U.S., 1902 WL 1128, *3, 38 Ct.Cl. 615, 620 (Ct.Cl. May 25, 1903) (NO. 21959)
-  1502 Behan v. U.S., 1800 WL 1361, *1361, 18 Ct.Cl. 687, 696 (Ct.Cl. May 28, 1883) (NO. 12966)
-  1503 Rothhammer v. C.I.R., 2001 WL 193670, *3, T.C. Memo. 2001-46, 2001-46, 81 T.C.M. (CCH) 1213, 1213, T.C.M. (RIA) 2001-046, 2001-046 (U.S.Tax Ct. Feb 27, 2001) (NO. 22961-88)
-  1504 Kittrell v. Hatter, 10 So.2d 827, 831, 243 Ala. 472, 477 (Ala. Nov 27, 1942) (NO. 1 DIV. 180)
-  1505 American Union Tel. Co. v. Western Union Tel. Co., 67 Ala. 26, 33, 1880 WL 1117, *5, 42 Am.Rep. 90, 90 (Ala. Dec Term 1880)

- 1506 Thompson's Adm'r v. Christian, 28 Ala. 399, 405, 1856 WL 465, *4 (Ala. Jan Term 1856)
- 1507 Merchants' Ins. Co. v. Mazange, 22 Ala. 168, 173, 1853 WL 361, *4 (Ala. Jan Term 1853)
- 1508 State ex rel. O'Neil v. Hall, 110 P.2d 960, 963, 57 Ariz. 63, 68 (Ariz. Mar 03, 1941) (NO. 4360)
- 1509 Cook v. Wilson, 187 S.W.2d 7, 10, 208 Ark. 459, 463 (Ark. Apr 02, 1945) (NO. 4-7527)
- 1510 Upham v. Scoville, 40 Ark. 170, 170, 1882 WL 1614, *1 (Ark. Nov Term 1882)
- 1511 Vaughan v. Bowie, 30 Ark. 278, 279, 1875 WL 1441, *1 (Ark. Nov Term 1875)
- 1512 McHenry v. Downer, 47 P. 779, 780, 116 Cal. 20, 25 (Cal. Feb 03, 1897) (NO. 158)
- 1513 California State Tel. Co. v. Alta Tel. Co., 22 Cal. 398, 405, 1863 WL 581, *6 (Cal. Jul Term 1863)
- 1514 People ex rel. McCauley v. Brooks, 16 Cal. 11, 18, 1860 WL 895, *4 (Cal. Jul Term 1860)
- 1515 California School Employees Ass'n v. Fremont Newark Community College Dist., 2002 WL 31656137, *9 (Cal.App. 1 Dist. Nov 26, 2002) (NO. A093857)
- 1516 Ex parte Flesher, 252 P. 1057, 1059, 81 Cal.App. 128, 133 (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Jan 28, 1927) (NO. CR 1451)
- 1517 Cersosimo v. Cersosimo, 449 A.2d 1026, 1031, 188 Conn. 385, 393 (Conn. Sep 14, 1982)
- 1518 Hamilton v. State, 110 A. 54, 55, 94 Conn. 648, 648 (Conn. May 07, 1920)
- 1519 Stamford Bank v. Benedict, 15 Conn. 437, 445, 1843 WL 387, *7 (Conn. Jun 1843)
- 1520 Aiken v. Armistead, 198 S.E. 237, 247, 186 Ga. 368, 387 (Ga. Jun 24, 1938) (NO. 12258)
- 1521 Linton v. Childs, 32 S.E. 617, 619, 105 Ga. 567, 567 (Ga. Feb 10, 1899)
- 1522 Wood v. Macon and Brunswick R. Co., 68 Ga. 539, 549, 1882 WL 3174, *7 (Ga. Feb Term 1882)
- 1523 W. H. Greenwell, Limited v. Department of Land and Natural Resources, 436 P.2d 527, 528, 50 Haw. 207, 209 (Hawai'i Jan 10, 1968) (NO. 4508)
- 1524 Cassels v. Wilder, 1916 WL 1445, *1, 23 Haw. 358, 360 (Hawai'i Terr. Jun 17, 1916) (NO. 928)
- 1525 Gray v. First Nat. Bank of Chicago, 57 N.E.2d 363, 366, 388 Ill. 124, 129 (Ill. Sep 19, 1944) (NO. 27877)
- 1526 People v. Gould, 178 N.E. 133, 143, 345 Ill. 288, 309 (Ill. Oct 23, 1931) (NO. 20250)
- 1527 People ex rel. First Nat. Bank v. Russel, 119 N.E. 617, 618, 283 Ill. 520, 522 (Ill. Apr 17, 1918) (NO. 12026)
- 1528 Archer v. Terre Haute & I.R. Co., 102 Ill. 493, 497, 1882 WL 10256, *2 (Ill. Jan 18, 1882)
- 1529 Fagan v. City of Chicago, 84 Ill. 227, 233, 1876 WL 10482, *3 (Ill. Sep Term 1876)
- 1530 Parker v. Garrison, 61 Ill. 250, 254, 1871 WL 8240, *2 (Ill. Sep Term 1871)
- 1531 Davidson v. Waldron, 31 Ill. 120, 125, 1863 WL 3081, *2, 83 Am.Dec. 206, 206 (Ill. Apr Term 1863)
- 1532 Bannon v. People, 1 Ill.App. 496, 498, 1877 WL 9932, *1, 1 Bradw. 496 (Ill.App. 2 Dist. Dec Term 1877)
- 1533 Bannon v. People, 1 Ill.App. 496, 498, 1877 WL 9932, *1, 1 Bradw. 496, 496 (Ill.App. 2 Dist. Dec Term 1877)
- 1534 Robison v. Fishback, 93 N.E. 666, 668, 175 Ind. 132, 132, Am. Ann. Cas. 1913B, 1271, 1913B, 1271, L.R.A. 1917B, 1179, 1917B, 1179 (Ind. Jan 27, 1911) (NO. 21673)
- 1535 Pittsburgh, C., C. & St. L. Ry. Co. v. Mitchell, 91 N.E. 735, 738, 175 Ind. 196, 196 (Ind. Apr 26, 1910) (NO. 21,494)
- 1536 Fesler v. Brayton, 44 N.E. 37, 37, 145 Ind. 71, 71, 32 L.R.A. 578, 578 (Ind. May 15, 1896)
- 1537 Wasson v. First Nat. Bank, 8 N.E. 97, 100, 107 Ind. 206, 206 (Ind. Jun 25, 1886)
- 1538 Lafayette, M. & B. R. Co. v. Geiger, 34 Ind. 185, 213, 1870 WL 3728, *17 (Ind. Nov Term 1870)
- 1539 First Nat. Bank v. City Council of Albia, 52 N.W. 334, 336, 86 Iowa 28, 28 (Iowa May 28, 1892)
- 1540 Harshey v. Blackmarr, 20 Iowa 161, 171, 1866 WL 138, *5, 89 Am.Dec. 520, 520 (Iowa Apr 06, 1866)
- 1541 Prager v. State, Dept. of Revenue, 20 P.3d 39, 49, 271 Kan. 1, 12 (Kan. Mar 23, 2001) (NO. 83,714)
- 1542 Mitchelson v. Travelers Ins. Co., 629 P.2d 143, 146, 229 Kan. 567, 571 (Kan. Jun 10, 1981) (NO. 52,258)
- 1543 First Nat. Bank of Leoti v. Fisher, 26 P. 482, 483, 45 Kan. 726, 726 (Kan. Apr 11, 1891)
- 1544 Kansas Pac. Ry. Co. v. Russell, 8 Kan. 558, 559, 1871 WL 833, *1 (Kan. Jul Term 1871)
- 1545 State ex rel. St. Joseph & D.C.R. Co. v. Nemaha County Com'rs, 7 Kan. 542, 560, 1871 WL 806, *9 (Kan. Jan Term 1871) (*in dissent*)

- C 1546 Hickman v. Frerking, 609 P.2d 682, 685, 4 Kan.App.2d 590, 592 (Kan.App. Apr 18, 1980) (NO. 50518)
- C 1547 Budd v. Houston, 36 La. Ann. 959, 961, 1884 WL 8102, *2 (La. Dec 1884) (NO. 9168)
- Y 1548 Stafford v. Twitchell, 33 La. Ann. 520, 520, 1881 WL 8726, *1 (La. Apr 1881) (NO. 7729)
- C 1549 State v. Dubuclet, 28 La. Ann. 698, 708, 1876 WL 8658, *8 (La. May 1876) (NO. 5828) (*in dissent*)
- C 1550 Crescent City Gaslight Co. v. New Orleans Gaslight Co., 27 La. Ann. 138, 143, 1875 WL 7051, *4 (La. Feb 1875) (NO. 5430)
- C 1551 U.S. v. Smith, 7 La. Ann. 185, 186, 1852 WL 3763, *2 (La. Apr 1852)
- C 1552 Whatley v. Love, 13 So.2d 719, 723 (La.App.Orleans May 24, 1943) (NO. 17920)
- C 1553 New Hampshire Ins. Guar. Ass'n v. Markem Corp., 676 N.E.2d 809, 815, 424 Mass. 344, 354 (Mass. Mar 04, 1997) (NO. SJC-07225)
- Y 1554 Russell v. Foley, 179 N.E. 619, 621, 278 Mass. 145, 148 (Mass. Jan 28, 1932)
- Y 1555 Norris v. Massachusetts Mut. Life Ins. Co., 131 Mass. 294, 296, 1881 WL 5987, *2 (Mass. 1881)
- C 1556 Crocker v. Marine Nat. Bank of City of New York, 101 Mass. 240, 241, 1869 WL 7750, *1 (Mass. Mar Session 1869)
- C 1557 Providence Institution for Sav. v. City of Boston, 1869 WL 5674, *2, 101 Mass. 575, 575, 3 Am.Rep. 407, 407 (Mass. 1869)
- C 1558 Flint v. Board of Aldermen of City of Boston, 99 Mass. 141, 143, 1868 WL 5367, *2, 96 Am.Dec. 713, 713 (Mass. 1868)
- C 1559 Hall v. Young, 3 Pick. 80, 80, 20 Mass. 80, 88, 1825 WL 1531, *2, 15 Am.Dec. 180, 180 (Mass. 1825)
- C 1560 Spear v. Ladd, 11 Mass. 94, 97, 1814 WL 971, *2 (Mass. 1814)
- C 1561 State Tax Commission v. Baltimore Nat. Bank, 199 A. 119, 123+, 174 Md. 403, 412+ (Md. Apr 27, 1938) (NO. 7)
- C 1562 Broniszewski v. Baltimore & O. R. Co., 144 A. 345, 347, 156 Md. 447, 447 (Md. Jan 17, 1929) (NO. 55)
- P 1563 Clark v. Harford Agricultural & Breeders' Ass'n, 85 A. 503, 506, 118 Md. 608, 608 (Md. Nov 15, 1912)
- H 1564 Chesapeake & Potomac Tel. Co. v. City of Baltimore, 43 A. 784, 789, 89 Md. 689, 689 (Md. Jun 22, 1899)
- C 1565 State v. National Bank of Baltimore, 33 Md. 75, 79, 1870 WL 3969, *2 (Md. Jun 27, 1870)
- C 1566 McCreery v. Sutherland, 23 Md. 471, 476, 1865 WL 1961, *3, 87 Am.Dec. 578, 578 (Md. Jul 12, 1865)
- C 1567 Harwood v. Jones, 10 G. & J. 404, 415, 1839 WL 1595, *5, 32 Am.Dec. 180, 180 (Md. Dec Term 1839)
- C 1568 Land Management, Inc. v. Department of Environmental Protection, 368 A.2d 602, 604 (Me. Jan 26, 1977)
- C 1569 Inhabitants of York Harbor Village Corp. v. Libby, 140 A. 382, 389, 126 Me. 537, 537 (Me. Jan 31, 1928)
- C 1570 Miller v. Ewer, 27 Me. 509, 513, 1847 WL 1472, *1472, 46 Am.Dec. 619, 619, 14 Shep. 509, 509 (Me. Jul Term 1847)
- H 1571 National Wildlife Federation v. Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., 684 N.W.2d 800, 811, 471 Mich. 608, 623 (Mich. Jul 30, 2004) (NO. 121890)
- C 1572 Forest Hill Cemetery Co. v. City of Ann Arbor, 5 N.W.2d 564, 569, 303 Mich. 56, 68 (Mich. Sep 08, 1942) (NO. 19)
- C 1573 Manufacturers Nat. Bank of Detroit v. City of Detroit, 280 N.W. 760, 766, 285 Mich. 273, 290 (Mich. Jun 30, 1938) (NO. 34) (*in dissent*)
- Y 1574 McDowell v. Fuller, 135 N.W. 265, 266, 169 Mich. 332, 335 (Mich. Mar 29, 1912)
- C 1575 City of Detroit v. Donovan, 86 N.W. 1032, 1032, 127 Mich. 604, 605 (Mich. Jul 10, 1901)
- Y 1576 Palmer v. Rich, 12 Mich. 414, 416, 1864 WL 1291, *1 (Mich. May 10, 1864)
- C 1577 Barnes v. Pike County Sup'rs, 51 Miss. 305, 305, 1875 WL 4694, *1 (Miss. Oct Term 1875)
- C 1578 Farmers' & Merchants' Bank v. Tappan, 1845 WL 3156, *3, 5 Smedes & M. 112, 112, 13 Miss. 112, 116 (Miss.Err. & App. Jan Term 1845)
- C 1579 Planters' Bank v. Sharp, 4 Smedes & M. 75, 75, 12 Miss. 75, 81, 1844 WL 3224, *5, 43 Am.Dec. 470, 470 (Miss.Err. & App. Nov Term 1844)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1580 Haeussler v. City of St. Louis, 103 S.W. 1034, 1042, 205 Mo. 656, 656 (Mo. Jul 02, 1907)
- 1581 State ex rel. Craig v. Dougherty, 45 Mo. 294, 295, 1870 WL 5832, *1 (Mo. Jan Term 1870)
- 1582 McLaurine v. Monroe's Adm'rs, 30 Mo. 462, 467, 1860 WL 6167, *3 (Mo. Jul Term 1860)
- 1583 Munhall v. Mitchell, 163 S.W. 912, 913, 178 Mo.App. 494, 494 (Mo.App. Feb 12, 1914)
- 1584 Sinclair v. Narragansett Lead & Zinc Co., 87 Mo.App. 268, 269, 1901 WL 1599, *1 (Mo.App. Mar 04, 1901)
- 1585 State v. Thomas Cruse Sav. Bank, 52 P. 733, 734+, 21 Mont. 50, 50+, 45 L.R.A. 760, 760+ (Mont. Apr 11, 1898)
- 1586 Ervin v. Conn, 34 S.E.2d 402, 406, 225 N.C. 267, 274 (N.C. Jun 06, 1945) (NO. 527, 528)
- 1587 Merchants' & Farmers' Nat. Bank v. Myers, 74 N.C. 514, 516, 1876 WL 2654, *1 (N.C. Jan Term 1876)
- 1588 Federal Land Bank of St. Paul v. State, 274 N.W.2d 580, 581 (N.D. Jan 22, 1979) (NO. CIV. 9543)
- 1589 State v. Wallace, 187 N.W. 728, 732, 48 N.D. 803, 803 (N.D. Feb 21, 1922)
- 1590 State v. Northern Pac. Ry. Co., 172 N.W. 324, 344, 43 N.D. 556, 556 (N.D. Apr 01, 1919) (*in dissent*)
- 1591 Bartles Northern Oil Co. v. Jackman, 150 N.W. 576, 579, 29 N.D. 236, 236 (N.D. Jan 07, 1915)
- 1592 Crete Mills v. Nebraska State Bd. of Agriculture, 271 N.W. 684, 688, 132 Neb. 244, 244 (Neb. Feb 26, 1937) (NO. 29766)
- 1593 Central Nat. Bank of Lincoln v. First Nat. Bank, 214 N.W. 75, 78, 115 Neb. 444, 444 (Neb. May 24, 1927) (NO. 25214)
- 1594 Bressler v. Wayne County, 41 N.W. 356, 357, 25 Neb. 468, 468 (Neb. Jan 04, 1889)
- 1595 Fremont Ferry & Bridge Co. v. Board of Com'rs of Dodge County, 6 Neb. 18, 23, 1877 WL 4247, *3 (Neb. Oct Term 1877)
- 1596 Lake v. Lake, 30 P. 878, 880, 17 Nev. 230, 230 (Nev. Oct 1882) (NO. 1128) ""
- 1597 Gage v. Gage, 29 A. 543, 552, 66 N.H. 282, 282, 28 L.R.A. 829, 829 (N.H. Jul 25, 1890) (*in dissent*)
- 1598 Citizens Coach Co. v. Camden Horse Railroad Co., 33 N.J. Eq. 267, 269, 6 Stewart 267, 267, 1880 WL 209, *2, 36 Am.Rep. 542, 542 (N.J.Err. & App. Nov Term 1880)
- 1599 Bachman v. First-Mechanics Nat. Bank of Trenton, 60 A.2d 291, 297, 41 Backes 389, 389, 142 N.J. Eq. 389, 397 (N.J.Ch. Jul 22, 1948) (NO. 147/622)
- 1600 Josephson v. First Nat. Bank of Bordentown, 127 A.2d 210, 213, 42 N.J.Super. 461, 465 (N.J.Super.Ch. Nov 08, 1956)
- 1601 O'Neill v. Board of Chosen Freeholders of Hudson County, 41 N.J.L. 161, 163, 12 Vroom 161, 161, 1879 WL 159, *2 (N.J.Sup. Mar Term 1879)
- 1602 Thurman v. Grimes, 1 P.2d 972, 974, 35 N.M. 498, 498 (N.M. Jul 28, 1931) (NO. 3647)
- 1603 Territory of New Mexico v. Ortiz, 1 N.M. 5, 13, 1 Gild. 5, 5, 1852 WL 1670, *5 (N.M.Terr. Jan Term 1852)
- 1604 Inces S.S. Co. v. International Maritime Workers Union, 219 N.Y.S.2d 21, 29, 176 N.E.2d 719, 725, 10 N.Y.2d 218, 229, 48 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2639, 2639, 1963 A.M.C. 297, 43 Lab.Cas. P 17,079, 17079 (N.Y. Jul 07, 1961) (*in dissent*)
- 1605 In re Workmen's Compensation Fund, 119 N.E. 1027, 1028, 224 N.Y. 13, 16 (N.Y. May 28, 1918)
- 1606 Metropolitan Bank v. Van Dyck, 13 E.P. Smith 400, 400, 27 N.Y. 400, 537, 1863 WL 4455, *76 (N.Y. 1863)
- 1607 Judd v. Seaver, 8 Paige Ch. 548, 554 (N.Y.Ch. 1841)
- 1608 People ex rel. East Side Harlem Storekeepers' Ass'n v. Hylan, 194 N.Y.S. 179, 181, 118 Misc. 341, 343 (N.Y.Sup. Mar 1922)
- 1609 Higginson v. Higginson, 158 N.Y.S. 92, 93, 96 Misc. 457, 458 (N.Y.Sup. Feb 17, 1916)
- 1610 People ex rel. Pacific Mail S.S. Co. v. Commissioners of Taxes and Assessments, 46 How. Pr. 315, 325, 1 Thomp. & C. 611, 611 (N.Y.Sup.Gen.Term 1873)
- 1611 People ex rel. United States & Brazil Steamship Co. v. Commissioners of Taxes and Assessments of City and County of New York, 48 Barb. 157, 160+ (N.Y.Sup.Gen.Term 1866)
- 1612 Schroepel v. Shaw, 5 Barb. 580, 590 (N.Y.Sup.Gen.Term 1849)
- 1613 Board of Education of City of Cincinnati v. Volk, 74 N.E. 646, 650, 72 Ohio St. 469, 486, 3 Ohio Law Rep. 42, 42 (Ohio May 23, 1905) (NO. 8943)
- 1614 Frazer v. Siebern, 1866 WL 26, *1, 16 Ohio St. 614, 615 (Ohio Dec Term 1866)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- C 1615 Debolt v. Ohio Life Ins. & Trust Co., 1853 WL 56, *15, 1 Ohio St. 563, 589 (Ohio Jan Term 1853)
H 1616 Wolf v. Ohio State University Hospital, 158 N.E.2d 909, 910, 80 Ohio Law Abs. 315, 315 (Ohio App. 10 Dist. Nov 25, 1958) (NO. 5969)
P 1617 South Carolina Power Co. v. South Carolina Tax Commission, 52 F.2d 515, 527 (E.D.S.C. Sep 07, 1931) (NO. 1634)
H 1618 Miller v. First Nat. Bank of Cincinnati, 8 Ohio Dec.Reprint 785, 788, 9 W.L.B. 353, 353, 1883 WL 6745, *5 (Ohio Com.Pl. 1883)
C 1619 Ft. Smith & W. R. Co. v. Awbrey & Semple, 134 P. 1117, 1119, 39 Okla. 270, 270, 1913 OK 531, 531 (Okla. Sep 02, 1913)
C 1620 Shellenbarger v. Fewel, 124 P. 617, 619, 34 Okla. 79, 79, 1912 OK 277, 277 (Okla. Mar 19, 1912)
C 1621 State v. Huston, 113 P. 190, 192, 27 Okla. 606, 606, 34 L.R.A.N.S. 380, 380, 1910 OK 259, 259 (Okla. Jul 27, 1910)
C 1622 Board of Educ. of Territory v. Territory, 70 P. 792, 796, 12 Okla. 286, 286, 1902 OK 78, 78 (Okla.Terr. Oct 04, 1902)
C 1623 In re Oregon Laws 1967, Chapter 364, Section 4, Ballot Title, 431 P.2d 1, 2, 247 Or. 488, 493 (Or. Aug 23, 1967)
C 1624 West v. Kozer, 206 P. 542, 546, 104 Or. 94, 106 (Or. Apr 27, 1922)
H 1625 Sperry & Hutchinson Co. v. O'Connor, 412 A.2d 539, 548, 488 Pa. 340, 358 (Pa. Mar 20, 1980) (*in dissent*)
P 1626 Peoples-Pittsburgh Trust Co. v. Blickle, 199 A. 213, 215, 330 Pa. 398, 401 (Pa. May 09, 1938)
C 1627 Insurance Co. of North America v. Commonwealth, 6 W.N.C. 177, 177, 87 Pa. 173, 183, 1878 WL 13335, *9, 30 Am.Rep. 352, 352 (Pa. 1878)
C 1628 Strode v. Commonwealth, 52 Pa. 181, 182, 1866 WL 6214, *1, 2 P.F. Smith 181, 181 (Pa. 1866)
C 1629 Shollenberger v. Brinton, 3 Am. Law Reg. (N.S.) 591, 591, 52 Pa. 9, 36, 1866 WL 6076, *21, 2 P.F. Smith 9, 9 (Pa. 1866)
C 1630 Grissinger v. Miller, 180 A. 904, 906, 119 Pa.Super. 283, 290 (Pa.Super. Oct 02, 1935)
C 1631 Pratt v. Hollenbeck, 1943 WL 2935, *5+, 25 Erie C.L.J. 126, 126+, 48 Pa. D. & C. 303, 310+, 91 Pitts.L.J. 234, 234+ (Pa.Com.Pl. 1943)
1632 South Brownsville Borough v. U.S., 1924 WL 5094, *2, 17 Mun.L.R. 38, 38, 3 Som. L.J. 97, 97, 6 Pa. D. & C. 411, 412, 73 Pitts.L.J. 380, 380 (Pa.Com.Pl. 1924)
C 1633 Gardner v. Hope Ins. Co., 9 R.I. 194, 196, 1869 WL 2040, *2, 11 Am.Rep. 238, 238 (R.I. Mar Term 1869)
C 1634 Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Query, 142 S.E. 509, 511, 144 S.C. 234, 234 (S.C. Dec 20, 1927) (NO. 12338)
H 1635 Terrell v. Middleton, 191 S.W. 1138, 1144, 108 Tex. 14, 27 (Tex. Feb 20, 1917)
T 1636 Ex parte Towles, 48 Tex. 413, 433, 1878 WL 9115, *12 (Tex. 1877)
C 1637 Tooke v. Taylor, 31 Tex. 1, 2, 1868 WL 4633, *1 (Tex. 1868)
T 1638 Moody v. Louwein, 300 S.W. 957, 958 (Tex.Civ.App.-Texarkana Dec 17, 1927) (NO. 3460)
H 1639 State v. Haldeman, 163 S.W. 1020, 1021 (Tex.Civ.App.-Austin Jul 05, 1913)
C 1640 Brooks v. State, 58 S.W. 1032, 1034 (Tex.Civ.App. Jun 02, 1900)
T 1641 Grayburg Oil Co. v. State, 3 S.W.2d 427, 428 (Tex.Com.App. Mar 07, 1928) (NO. 1074-4709)
C 1642 U.S. Smelting, Refining & Min. Co. v. Haynes, 176 P.2d 622, 626, 111 Utah 172, 180 (Utah Jan 06, 1947) (NO. 6931)
C 1643 Kerr v. Woolley, 24 P. 831, 834, 3 Utah 456, 456 (Utah Terr. Nov Term 1866)
C 1644 Sheltman v. Taylor's Committee, 82 S.E. 698, 699, 116 Va. 762, 762 (Va. Sep 07, 1914)
C 1645 First Nat. Bank of Montpelier v. Hubbard, 49 Vt. 1, 2, 1876 WL 7515, *7515, 24 Am.Rep. 97, 97 (Vt. Aug Term 1876)
P 1646 Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lakin, 101 P. 1094, 1097, 53 Wash. 326, 334, 17 Am. Ann.Cas. 718, 718 (Wash. May 28, 1909)
C 1647 Nash v. Fries, 108 N.W. 210, 211, 129 Wis. 120, 120 (Wis. Jun 21, 1906)
P 1648 State ex rel. Attorney General v. Cunningham, 51 N.W. 724, 729, 81 Wis. 440, 440, 15 L.R.A. 561, 561 (Wis. Mar 22, 1892)
C 1649 Attorney General v. Chicago & N.W. Ry. Co., 35 Wis. 425, 469, 1874 WL 3392, *11 (Wis. Jun Term 1874)
C 1650 Tallman v. City of Janesville, 17 Wis. 71, 71, 1863 WL 1101, *1 (Wis. Jan Term 1863)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- C** 1651 Smith v. Odell, 1 Pin. 449, 455, 1844 WL 1317, *3 (Wis.Terr. Jul Term 1844)
- C** 1652 Coal & Coke Ry. Co. v. Conley, 67 S.E. 613, 620, 67 W.Va. 129, 129 (W.Va. Mar 08, 1910)
- ▶** 1653 Bettman v. Harness, 26 S.E. 271, 272, 42 W.Va. 433, 433, 36 L.R.A. 566, 566 (W.Va. Nov 25, 1896)
- C** 1654 Baltimore & O. R. Co. v. Pittsburg, W. & K. R. Co., 17 W.Va. 812, 826, 1881 WL 3801, *10 (W.Va. May 07, 1881)
- 1655 Registration of Veterinary Surgeons., 1924 WL 6887, *2, 5 Pa. D. & C. 689, 690 (Pa.Dept.Just. Dec 18, 1924)

Administrative Decisions (U.S.A.)

Comptroller General Decisions

- C** 1656 ACTING COMPTROLLER GENERAL ELLIOTT TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, 1940 WL 412, *3, 19 Comp. Gen. 735, 737, B- 8296, 8296 (Comp.Gen. Feb 20, 1940) ""★

DOT Administrative Decisions

- 1657 Tower Air, Fitness Investigation, 103 Civil Aeronautics Board Reports 111 (1983)★★

General Services Board of Contract Appeals

- C** 1658 Appeal of Index, Inc., 1986 WL 20338 (G.S.B.C.A.), *20338+, 87-1 BCA P 19498, 19498+, GSBICA No. 6548, 6548+ (G.S.B.C.A. Nov 21, 1986) (NO. GS05B-13611) ""★★

International Trade Commission Decisions

- 1659 US International Trade Commission Investigation No 337-TA-333, Order No. 30, IN THE MATTER OF CERTAIN WOODWORKING ACCESSORIES ORDER NO. 30: ORDER DENYING THE STAFF'S MOTION NO. 333-9 FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER NO. 9 (1992)★
- 1660 US International Trade Commission Investigation No 337-TA-333, Order No. 33, IN THE MATTER OF CERTAIN WOODWORKING ACCESSORIES ORDER NO. 30: ORDER DENYING THE STAFF'S MOTION NO. 333-9 FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER NO. 9 (1992)★
- 1661 US International Trade Commission Investigation No 337-TA-330, Order No. 6, IN THE MATTER OF CERTAIN COMPUTER SYSTEM STATE SAVE/RESTORE SOFTWARE AND ASSOCIATED BACKUP POWER SUPPLIES FOR USE IN POWER OUTAGES ORDER NO. 6: ORDER DENYING RESPONDENTS' MOTION TO STRIKE THE APPEARANCE OF RODNEY E. ARMS (1991)★

National Transportation Safety Board Decisions

- 1662 COMMANDANT v. RICHARD G. FIFER, II, APPELLANT, 4 National Transportation Safety Board Decisions 1989 (1984)★★
- 1663 COMMANDANT v. GREGORY JAMES HODGMAN, APPELLANT, 4 National Transportation Safety Board Decisions 1918 (1983)★★

U.S. Attorney General Opinions

- 1664 SURVEY OF THE LAW OF EXPATRIATION, 2002 WL 32899774 (O.L.C.), *11+ (2002)★★
- 1665 5 U.S. Op. Off. Legal Counsel 271, Constitutionality of Legislation Authorizing Permanent Resident Status for Certain Nonimmigrant Aliens (1981)★★
- 1666 38 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 258, VALIDITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT (1935)★★
- 1667 34 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 23, DEBENTURES ISSUED BY FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS-TAX EXEMPTIONS. (1923)★
- 1668 33 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 447, VETERINARY INSPECTORS OF THE BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY-STATE STATUTE REQUIRING REGISTRATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES. (1923)★★
- 1669 31 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 103, FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT. (1917)★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1670 28 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 604, STATE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES PURCHASED FOR PRESIDENT. (1911)★★
- 1671 25 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 234, NORFOLK HARBOR POWDER OFFICER-JURISDICTION. (1904)★★
- 1672 23 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 299, STATE TOLL ON GOVERNMENT PROPERTY-WHARFAGE CHARGES. (1900)★★
- 1673 21 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 430, NAVIGABLE WATERS-DELEGATION OF LEGISLATIVE FUNCTIONS. (1896)★
- 1674 19 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 161, TAXATION OF INDIAN LANDS. (1888)★

Administrative Guidelines and Bulletins (U.S.A.)

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency Materials

- 1675 15 Off. of the Comptroller of the Currency Quarterly 147, Authority of a national bank to conduct fiduciary activities nationwide through trust offices in various states (1996)★
- 1676 Off. of Comptroller Currency Interpretive Letter 695, (1995)★
- 1677 Off. of Comptroller Currency Interpretive Letter 695, A national bank with trust powers may exercise those powers in an y state, including at trust offices in any state, provided that within each state, the state may bar the exercise of such fiduciary powers as the state ba (1995)★

State Administrative Materials (U.S.A.)

- 1678 1980 Fla. Op. Atty. Gen. 133, Randy Miller (1980)★★
- 1679 Mr. G. Kenner Ellis, Jr., 1989 WL 504335 (Miss.A.G.), *7 (1989)★★
- 1680 1943 N.Y. Op. Atty. Gen. No. 402, Department of Taxation and Finance (1943)★
- 1681 TINKERS CREEK LAND CONSERVANCY, APPELLANT v. SUMMIT COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION AND THE SUMMIT COUNTY AUDITOR, APPELLEES, 2004 WL 2569707 (Ohio Bd.Tax.App.), *2 (2004)★★
- HUBBARD EXEMPTED VILLAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION, APPELLANT v. TRUMBULL COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, TRUMBULL COUNTY AUDITOR AND J. GARY BURKE/OKKE, INC., APPELLEES, 2004 WL 482132 (Ohio Bd.Tax.App.), *3 (2004)★★
- 1683 The Bissett Steel Company v. Cuyahoga County Board of Revision, The Cuyahoga County Auditor, 1998 WL 119448 (Ohio Bd.Tax.App.), *4 (1998)★★
- 1684 Board of Education of Orange City School District v. Cuyahoga County Board of Revision, 1997 WL 728108 (Ohio Bd.Tax.App.), *5 (1997)★★
- 1685 Mirge Corp. d/b/a Electrical Mechanics v. Hamilton County Board of Revision, 1997 WL 684275 (Ohio Bd.Tax.App.), *2 (1997)★★
- C** 1686 65 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 430, THE HONORABLE NICHOLAS C. PETRIS (1982)★★
- 1687 45 W. Va. Op. Atty. Gen. 532, Honorable Lee M. Kenna (1953)★★

Other Administrative Materials (U.S.A.)

- 1688 FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE HOMESTEADS, 54 Decisions of the Department of the Interior 498 (1934)★★
- 1689 17 GAO-RB pt. B, s. 8, 8. CLAIMS AND LAWSUITS (2001)★★★
- 1690 Civil Rights Authority and Responsibility of the Board, 1972 WL 125725 (O.T.S.), *45 (1972)★

Secondary Sources (U.S.A.)

- C** 1691 Construction and Application of Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA), 28 U.S.C.A. ss1602 et seq.--Supreme Court Cases, 16 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 563 (2007)
- C** 1692 Immunity of State from Civil Suits Under Eleventh Amendment--Supreme Court Cases, 187 A.L.R. Fed. 175 (2003)
- H** 1693 Modern status of pendent federal jurisdiction, under 28 U.S.C.A. sec. 1338(b), over state claim of unfair competition when joined with related claim under federal trademark laws, 62 A.L.R. Fed. 428 (1983)

- H** 1694 Modern status of pendent federal jurisdiction, under 28 U.S.C.A. sec. 1338(b), over state claim of unfair competition when joined with related claim under federal patent laws, 57 A.L.R. Fed. 418 (1982)
- H** 1695 Modern status of pendent federal jurisdiction, under 28 U.S.C.A. sec. 1338(b), over state claim of unfair competition when joined with related claim under federal copyright laws, 58 A.L.R. Fed. 875 (1982)
- C** 1696 Recovery of attorneys' fees in Miller Act (40 USC secs. 270a-270e) litigation, 4 A.L.R. Fed. 685 (1970)
- C** 1697 Matters Constituting Unauthorized Practice of Law in Bankruptcy Proceedings, 2003 A.L.R.5th 8 (2003)
- H** 1698 Propriety and effect of corporation's appearance pro se through agent who is not attorney, 8 A.L.R.5th 653 (1992)
- C** 1699 Right of litigant in civil action either to assistance of counsel where appearing pro se or to assist counsel where represented, 67 A.L.R.2d 1102 (1959)
- C** 1700 Allowance of interest on interpleaded or impleaded disputed funds, 15 A.L.R.2d 473 (1951)
- C** 1701 What actions arise under Constitution, laws, and treaties of United States; general principles, 12 A.L.R.2d 5 (1950)
- C** 1702 What actions arise under the laws and treaties of the United States so as to vest jurisdiction of Federal courts, 14 A.L.R.2d 992 (1950)
- C** 1703 Suit against public officer to recover possession of property as suit against state or Federal government, 160 A.L.R. 332 (1946)
- C** 1704 Injunction as proper remedy against tax on exempt property, 84 A.L.R. 1315 (1933)
- C** 1705 Attack on constitutionality of statute under which officer acts, as affecting question whether action or suit against him is to be deemed an action or suit against the state, 43 A.L.R. 408 (1926)
- P** 1706 Admissibility of evidence of pleadings as containing admissions against interest, 14 A.L.R. 22 (1921)
- C** 1707 SOME JURISDICTIONAL PITFALLS IN DIVERSITY CASES, 2 F.R.D. 388, 404 (1942)
- 1708 Annotated Patent Digest (Matthews) s 33:42, s 33:42. Pro se litigants (2007)
- 1709 Annotated Patent Digest (Matthews) s 36:2, s 36:2. Subject-matter jurisdiction of patent actions under 28 U.S.C.A. s1338(a) (2007)
- 1710 BNA Tax Management State Portfolios No. 1800 WS 3, Worksheet 3 Welcome to the Brave New World of Financial Services: Unexpected State Tax Ramifications of Gramm-Leach-Bliley
- 1711 Callmann on Unfair Compet., TMs, & Monopolies s 24:9, s 24:9. Subject matter jurisdiction--Federal jurisdiction (and removal from state court)--Pendent, ancillary and supplemental jurisdiction in unfair competition cases (2007)
- 1712 3A Connecticut Practice Series FORM G, Form G. Notice of removal based on federal law (2007)
- 1713 Davis and Shulman's Georgia Practice and Procedure s 4:1, s 4:1. Definitions (2006)
- 1714 Federal Procedural Forms s 1:448, s 1:448. Procedural guide -- appearance, generally (2006)
- 1715 Federal Procedural Forms s 1:472, s 1:472. Procedural guide (2006)
- 1716 Federal Procedure, Lawyers Edition s 1:381, s 1:381. Marshall's outcome-determinative test (2007)
- 1717 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 121, s 121. Congressional powers--Federal corporations (2007)
- 1718 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 4043, s 4043. Corporations created by Congress--In general (2007)
- 1719 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 4216, s 4216. Authority to institute or defend suit (2007)
- 1720 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 4314, s 4314. Federal corporations--In general (2007)
- 1721 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 4327, s 4327. Grounds of federal jurisdiction--Federal question (2007)
- 1722 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 4470, s 4470. Actions by corporations--Defendants (2007)
- 1723 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 4495, s 4495. Capacity to sue or defend (2007)
- 1724 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 4866, s 4866. Protection of corporate franchises (2007)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1725 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 6943, s 6943. Corporations created, owned, or aided by, or dealing with, federal government (2007)
- 1726 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 92, s 92. Corporations created under acts of Congress (2007)
- 1727 Govt. Contracts Under the Fed. Acquisition Reg. s 50.4, s 50.4. Indemnities (2007)
- 1728 Law And Regulation of Financial Institutions, The P 1.02(2), SECOND BANK OF THE UNITED STATES (2006)
- 1729 46 Mass. Prac. Series s 3.4, s 3.4. Federal-question jurisdiction--Arising under (2006)
- 1730 McDonald & Carlson Texas Civil Practice s 5:3, s 5:3. The plaintiff (2006)
- 1731 McDonald & Carlson Texas Civil Practice s 5:8, s 5:8. Overview of governing principles (2006)
- 1732 Modern Tort Law: Liability and Litigation 2d s 14:12, s 14:12. Jurisdiction over the person; constitutional requirements -- Requirement of notice and opportunity to be heard (2006)
- 1733 2002 Norton Annual Survey of Bankruptcy Law 659, Recent Developments in Chapter 11 (2002)
- 1734 1996 Norton Bankruptcy Law Adviser 1, SEMINOLE AND SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: IT'S WORSE THAN YOU THOUGHT (1996)
- 1735 1996 Norton Bankruptcy Law Adviser 1, A TALE OF TWO SOVEREIGNS: WILL THE BANKRUPTCY CODE SURVIVE SEMINOLE? (1996)
- 1736 Ohio Jurisprudence Pleading and Practice Forms s 3:11, s 3:11. Client's grant of authority (2005)
- 1737 Oppression of Min. Shareholders and LLC Members s 7:30, s 7:30. Combining federal and state claims in one action; Pendent jurisdiction; Bringing a class action (2007)
- 1738 Restatement (Third) of Law Governing Law s 4, Unauthorized Practice By Non-Lawyer (1998)
- 1739 Restatement (Third) of Law Governing Law s 4, Unauthorized Practice By A Nonlawyer (2000)
- 1740 Securities Law of Public Finance, The s 11:3.1, Suits Against Public Officials (2002)
- 1741 Securities Litigation: Damages s 9:5, s 9:5. Implication of private right of action under Rule 10b-5--Constitutionality of s10(b) implied rights of action--Unconstitutionality of the judicial creation and perpetuation of the s10(b) privat (2007)
- 1742 Treatise on Constitutional Law s 2.12, s 2.12. The Eleventh Amendment (2007)
- 1743 Treatise on Constitutional Law s 2.2, s 2.2. The Historical Development of the Jurisdictional Framework of the Supreme Court (2007)
- 1744 Treatise on Constitutional Law s 22.5, s 22.5. Involuntary Expatriation of One Born or Naturalized in the United States (2007)
- 1745 Treatise on Constitutional Law s 3.2, s 3.2. McCulloch v. Maryland and the Basis of Federal Power (2007)
- 1746 2 West's Federal Forms s 1066, s 1066. Generally (2007)
- 1747 20A West's Pennsylvania Practice s 1571:14, s 1571:14. Practice note--Representation of a corporation by counsel (2006)
- 1748 Will Contests s 3:2, s 3:2. Standing to Bring Will Contest -- In General (2006)
- 1749 13 Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 3521, s 3521. Constitutional Basis of the Judicial Power of the Federal Courts (2007)
- 1750 20 Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 114, s 114. Review of State-Court Decisions (2007)
- 1751 20 Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 18, s 18. The Meaning of "Arising Under" (2007)
- 1752 20 Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 20, s 20. Pendent Claims and Supplemental Jurisdiction (2007)
- 1753 20 Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 21, s 21. "Protective Jurisdiction" (2007)
- 1754 20 Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 31, s 31. Parties Considered in Determining Diversity (2007)
- 1755 20 Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 50, s 50. Federal Actions to Restrain State Officers (2007)
- 1756 13B Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 3561, s 3561. Federal Question Jurisdiction--In General (2007)
- 1757 13B Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 3562, s 3562. The Meaning of "Arising Under" (2007)
- 1758 13B Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 3565, s 3565. "Protective Jurisdiction" (2007)
- 1759 13B Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 3567, s 3567. Pendent Jurisdiction--The Background (2007)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- C 1760 13B Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 3571, s 3571. Banks and Other Corporations (2007)
- C 1761 13B Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 3606, s 3606. Parties Considered in Determining Diversity (2007)
- C 1762 13B Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 3627, s 3627. Federally Chartered Corporations (2007)
- C 1763 14A Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 3662, s 3662. Actions Involving Foreign Nations (2007)
- C 1764 17A Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 4231, s 4231. Ex Parte Young (2007)
- 1765 19A Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. PT. I APP. A, Appendix A Reporter's Memorandum on the Claim-Specific Nature of the Original Jurisdiction of the District Courts (2007)
- C 1766 Am. Jur. 2d Attorneys at Law s 160, s 160. Presumption of authority (2007)
- C 1767 Am. Jur. 2d Attorneys at Law s 6, s 6. Necessity that litigant appear by counsel (2007)
- C 1768 Am. Jur. 2d Corporations s 1874, s 1874. Requirement, generally (2007)
- C 1769 CJS Attorney and Client s 216, s 216. Evidence of authority; burden of proof--Admissibility (2007)
- C 1770 CJS Banks and Banking s 101, s 101. Agents (2007)
- C 1771 CJS Federal Courts s 281, s 281. Generally; Congressional exceptions and regulations (2007)
- 1772 NY Jur. 2d Actions s 82, s 82. Generally (2007)
- C 1773 THE NEOCLASSICAL REVIVAL IN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, 44 Admin. L. Rev. 567, 627+ (1992)
- C 1774 SUPPLEMENTAL SERENDIPITY: CONGRESS' ACCIDENTAL IMPROVEMENT OF SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION, 37 Akron L. Rev. 653, 716+ (2004)
- C 1775 JUDICIAL FAITHFULNESS OR WANDERING INDULGENCE? ORIGINAL INTENTIONS AND THE HISTORY OF MARBURY V. MADISON, 57 Ala. L. Rev. 1041, 1080+ (2006)
- C 1776 CONSTITUTIONAL STATUTORY SYNTHESIS, 54 Ala. L. Rev. 1281, 1373 (2003)
- C 1777 PRIVATE RIGHTS VERSUS PUBLIC POWER: THE ROLE OF STATE ACTION IN ALASKA CONSTITUTIONAL JURISPRUDENCE, 7 Alaska L. Rev. 299, 332 (1990)
- C 1778 THE GREEN MOUNTAIN BOYS STILL LOVE THEIR FREEDOM: CRIMINAL JURISPRUDENCE OF THE VERMONT SUPREME COURT, 60 Alb. L. Rev. 1799, 1844 (1997)
- C 1779 SEMINOLE TRIBE OF FLORIDA v. FLORIDA: A CLOSER LOOK, 15-JUN Am. Bankr. Inst. J. 10, 12 (1996)
- C 1780 FROM FICTIONALISM TO FUNCTIONALISM IN STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: THE BANKRUPTCY DISCHARGE AS STATUTORY EX PARTE YOUNG RELIEF AFTER HOOD, 13 Am. Bankr. Inst. L. Rev. 59, 60+ (2005)
- C 1781 ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY OF A STATE IN BANKRUPTCY CASES: A NEW JURISPRUDENTIAL APPROACH, 7 Am. Bankr. Inst. L. Rev. 269, 334 (1999)
- C 1782 THE UNIFORMITY POWER: WHY BANKRUPTCY IS DIFFERENT, 77 Am. Bankr. L.J. 129, 189+ (2003)
- C 1783 OF STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND PROSPECTIVE REMEDIES: THE BANKRUPTCY DISCHARGE AS STATUTORY EX PARTE YOUNG RELIEF: A RESPONSE, 77 Am. Bankr. L.J. 23, 34+ (2003)
- C 1784 OF STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND PROSPECTIVE REMEDIES: THE BANKRUPTCY DISCHARGE AS STATUTORY EX PARTE YOUNG RELIEF, 76 Am. Bankr. L.J. 461, 485+ (2002)
- C 1785 EX PARTE YOUNG: RELATIVITY IN PRACTICE, 72 Am. Bankr. L.J. 455, 496+ (1998)
- C 1786 CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE BANKRUPTCY AMENDMENTS AND FEDERAL JUDGESHIP ACT OF 1984, 63 Am. Bankr. L.J. 109, 197 (1989)
- C 1787 FOREIGN NATIONALS IN THE UNITED STATES WITNESS SECURITY PROGRAM: A REMEDY FOR EVERY WRONG?, 40 Am. Crim. L. Rev. 1235, 1269 (2003)
- C 1788 PERMANENT INJUNCTIONS INTRADE SECRET ACTIONS: IS A PROPER UNDERSTANDING OF THE ROLE OF THE INADEQUATE AT LAW/ IRREPARABLE HARM REQUIREMENT THE KEY TO CONSISTENT DECISIONS?, 28 AIPLA Q.J. 113, 139 (2000)
- C 1789 COMPROMISSORY CLAUSES AND THE JURISDICTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE, 81 Am. J. Int'l L. 855, 887+ (1987)

- 1790 PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT The Mathias Bill, 79 Am. J. Int'l L. 770, 784+ (1985)
- 1791 CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORICISM: AN EXAMINATION OF THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT EVOLVING STANDARDS OF DECENCY TEST, 54 Am. U. L. Rev. 1355, 1448 (2005)
- 1792 ARTICLE III AND THE ADEQUATE AND INDEPENDENT STATE GROUNDS DOCTRINE, 48 Am. U. L. Rev. 1053, 1100 (1999)
- 1793 SECTION 1500 AND THE JURISDICTIONAL PITFALLS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LITIGATION, 47 Am. U. L. Rev. 301, 349 (1997)
- 1794 CHRISTIANSON v. COLT INDUSTRIES OPERATING CORP.: THE APPLICATION OF FEDERAL QUESTION PRECEDENT TO FEDERAL CIRCUIT JURISDICTION DECISIONS, 45 Am. U. L. Rev. 1835, 1901+ (1996)
- 1795 AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF FORUM CHOICES IN REMOVAL CASES UNDER DIVERSITY AND FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION, 41 Am. U. L. Rev. 369, 449 (1992)
- 1796 FINLEY v. UNITED STATES: IS PENDENT PARTY JURISDICTION STILL A VALID DOCTRINE?, 39 Am. U. L. Rev. 811, 814+ (1990)
- 1797 THE APPLICABILITY OF ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY UNDER THE COPYRIGHT ACTS OF 1909 AND 1976, 36 Am. U. L. Rev. 163, 191 (1986)
- 1798 PULLIAM v. ALLEN: HARMONIZING JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS ABUSES WITH JUDICIAL IMMUNITY, 34 Am. U. L. Rev. 523, 556+ (1985)
- 1799 EXAMINING THE EXTRA BURDEN IMPOSED ON A PATENTEE WHO SEEKS A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, 32 Am. U. L. Rev. 985, 1008+ (1983)
- 1800 PROBLEMS "ARISING UNDER" VERLINDEN B.V. v. CENTRAL BANK OF NIGERIA, 31 Am. U. L. Rev. 1039, 1042+ (1982)
- 1801 FEDERALISM AND THE COURT: CONGRESS AS THE AUDIENCE?, 574 Annals Am. Acad. Pol. & Soc. Sci. 145, 157 (2001)
- 1802 THE OCC'S PREEMPTION RULES EXCEED THE AGENCY'S AUTHORITY AND PRESENT A SERIOUS THREAT TO THE DUAL BANKING SYSTEM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION, 23 Ann. Rev. Banking & Fin. L. 225, 240+ (2004)
- 1803 THE COURSE OF FEDERAL PRE-EMPTION OF STATE BANKING LAW, 18 Ann. Rev. Banking L. 221, 289+ (1999)
- 1804 SECTION 1730(K)(1): RESOLVING THE AMBIGUITIES, 4 Ann. Rev. Banking L. 337, 360 (1985)
- 1805 DIVERSITY JURISDICTION AND FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS: TOWARDS A NEW THEORY OF STATE CITIZENSHIP, 3 Ann. Rev. Banking L. 243, 262 (1984)
- 1806 STATE TAXATION OF BANK SHARES: AMERICAN BANK & TRUST CO. v. DALLAS COUNTY, 3 Ann. Rev. Banking L. 391, 422 (1984)
- 1807 NATIONAL STATE BANK v. LONG: REDLIGHT FOR STATE REDLINING LAWS, 1 Ann. Rev. Banking L. 281, 309+ (1982)
- 1808 UPSIDE DOWN AND INSIDE OUT: APPELLATE REVIEW OF DISCRETION UNDER THE SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION STATUTE, 28 U.S.C. S 1367, 1997 Ann. Surv. Am. L. 661, 693 (1997)
- 1809 REPORT OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION SECTION OF ANTITRUST LAW TASK FORCE TO REVIEW THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN CALIFORNIA v. ARC AMERICAN CORP., 59 Antitrust L.J. 273, 304+ (1990)
- 1810 A DAMAGED REMEDY: DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION CLAIMS AGAINST STATE ENTITIES UNDER THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AFTER SEMINOLE TRIBE AND FLORES, 41 Ariz. L. Rev. 651, 752+ (1999)
- 1811 COOPERATIVE FEDERALISM, THE DELEGATION OF FEDERAL POWER, AND THE CONSTITUTION, 39 Ariz. L. Rev. 205, 281 (1997)
- 1812 SANCTIONING A TYRANNY: THE DIMINISHMENT OF EX PARTE YOUNG, EXPANSION OF HANS IMMUNITY, AND DENIAL OF INDIAN RIGHTS IN COEUR D'ALENE TRIBE, 31 Ariz. St. L.J. 787, 944+ (1999)
- 1813 THE FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION STATUTE--A CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY ANALYSIS, 24 Ariz. St. L.J. 849, 993+ (1992)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1814 A TRIO OF SMALL, CONVERSATION-INSPIRED BANKRUPTCY ISSUES, 1999 Ark. L. Notes 79, 89 (1999)
- 1815 UPDATE: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE ARKANSAS LAW OF GARNISHMENT 1992 ARK. L. NOTES 39 DOES A CORPORATE GARNISHEE NEED A LAWYER TO ANSWER THE WRIT?, 1997 Ark. L. Notes 95, 101 (1997)
- 1816 RECONSTRUCTING MARBURY, 57 Ark. L. Rev. 729, 833+ (2005)
- 1817 SWIMMING UPSTREAM: A FINAL ATTEMPT AT PERSUASION ON THE ISSUE OF CORPORATE PRO SE REPRESENTATION IN ARKANSAS STATE COURT, 54 Ark. L. Rev. 475, 521+ (2001)
- 1818 A SOLDIER'S ROAD TO U.S. CITIZENSHIP-IS A CONVICTION A SPEED BUMP OR A STOP SIGN?, 2004-JUN Army Law. 20, 32 (2004)
- 1819 FEDERAL COURTS AND CHOICE OF LAW: SHOULD STATE OR FEDERAL CHOICE OF LAW PREVAIL IN THE EXERCISE OF JURISDICTION UNDER 12 U.S.C. S 632?, 122 Banking L.J. 821, 828+ (2005)
- 1820 FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION OVER INTERNATIONAL BANKING TRANSACTIONS, 110 Banking L.J. 118, 129 (1993)
- 1821 BANK EXPANSION: THE POLITICS OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS, 91 Banking L.J. 748, 763 (1974)
- 1822 CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY TO REGULATE THE STATE TAXATION OF STATE BANKS-THE FEDERAL RESERVE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN ALTERNATIVE TO PL-156, 89 Banking L.J. 330, 343+ (1972)
- 1823 MASSACHUSETTS RULES NATIONAL BANKS SUBJECT TO STATE SALES AND USE TAXES, 85 Banking L.J. 58, 68+ (1968)
- 1824 ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF FEDERAL BANKRUPTCY LAW AND STILL CLINGING TO AN IN REM MODEL OF BANKRUPTCY JURISDICTION, 15 Bankr. Dev. J. 261, 284+ (1999)
- 1825 Supplemental Bankruptcy Jurisdiction (2007)
- 1826 SPALLONE v. UNITED STATES: ONE LESS BRICK IN THE WALL OF FEDERALISM, 43 Baylor L. Rev. 211, 233 (1991)
- 1827 GOVERNMENT CONTRACT DEFENSE: SHARING THE PROTECTIVE CLOAK OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AFTER MCKAY v. ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL CORP., 37 Baylor L. Rev. 181, 226 (1985)
- 1828 THE ROLE OF FEDERAL COMMON LAW IN ALIEN TORT STATUTE CASES, 14 B.C. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 29, 51+ (1991)
- 1829 IN DEFENSE OF OUR LAW OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, 42 B.C. L. Rev. 485, 519+ (2001)
- 1830 "NATURAL BORN" IN THE USA: THE STRIKING UNFAIRNESS AND DANGEROUS AMBIGUITY OF THE CONSTITUTION'S PRESIDENTIAL QUALIFICATIONS CLAUSE AND WHY WE NEED TO FIX IT, 85 B.U. L. Rev. 53, 154 (2005)
- 1831 HOLMES GROUP, INC. V. VORNADO AIR CIRCULATION SYSTEMS, INC.: NECROMANCY, JUDICIAL ACTIVISM, AND THE WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT RULE, 84 B.U. L. Rev. 1103, 1133+ (2004)
- 1832 WHEN COURTS DECIDE ELECTIONS: THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF BUSH V. GORE, 82 B.U. L. Rev. 609, 666 (2002)
- 1833 THE NEWEST FRONTIER OF JUDICIAL ACTIVISM: REMOVAL UNDER THE ALL WRITS ACT, 80 B.U. L. Rev. 773, 883 (2000)
- 1834 HUMANITY, UTILITY, AND LOGIC IN SOUTHERN LEGAL THOUGHT: HARRIET BEECHER STOWE'S VISION IN DRED: A TALE OF THE GREAT DISMAL SWAMP, 78 B.U. L. Rev. 1113, 1161 (1998)
- 1835 THE DECLINE OF FEDERAL COMMON LAW, 76 B.U. L. Rev. 895, 1017+ (1996)
- 1836 CITIZENSHIP AND THE TREATMENT OF AMERICAN CITIZEN TERRORISTS IN THE UNITED STATES, 42 Brandeis L.J. 805, 822 (2004)
- 1837 CHOICE OF LAW IN FEDERAL COURTS: A REEVALUATION, 37 Brandeis L.J. 21, 62 (1999)
- 1838 THE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY OF STATES IN THEIR OWN COURTS, 37 Brandeis L.J. 319, 414 (1998)
- 1839 THE PRESIDENCY AND THE MEANING OF CITIZENSHIP, 2005 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 927, 997 (2005)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1840 "ARISING UNDER" JURISDICTION IN THE FEDERALISM RENAISSANCE: VERIZON MARYLAND INC. V. PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND, 2002 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 717, 743+ (2002)
- 1841 INTRINSIC LIMITS OF CONGRESS' POWER REGARDING THE JUDICIAL BRANCH, 1999 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 75, 175+ (1999)
- 1842 CONGRESSIONAL POWER OVER FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION: A DEFENSE OF THE NEO-FEDERALIST INTERPRETATION OF ARTICLE III, 1997 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 847, 897 (1997)
- 1843 THE DISCRETIONARY EXERCISE OF SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION UNDER THE SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION STATUTE, 1995 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 1263, 1265+ (1995)
- 1844 THE POWER OF CONGRESS OVER COURTS IN NONFEDERAL CASES, 1995 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 731, 781+ (1995)
- 1845 THE ALI, SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION, AND THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL CASE, 1995 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 819, 877+ (1995)
- 1846 THE ROLE OF PUBLIC OPINION IN CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATION, 1993 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 1037, 1138+ (1993)
- 1847 THE MONROE MYSTERY SOLVED: BEYOND THE "UNHAPPY HISTORY" THEORY OF CIVIL RIGHTS LITIGATION, 1991 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 737, 765+ (1991)
- 1848 ABSTENTION AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS OF THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES, 1991 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 811, 857+ (1991)
- 1849 AN ANALYSIS OF SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION AND ABSTENTION WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION, 1990 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 321, 376 (1990)
- 1850 DEFINING THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL COURTS, 1990 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 67, 95 (1990)
- 1851 COMMENTARY FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY IN THE SECOND CIRCUIT AFTER TEXAS TRADING AND VERLINDEN, 48 Brook. L. Rev. 979, 1008+ (1982)
- 1852 SWIMMING THE MURKY WATERS: THE SECOND CIRCUIT AND SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION IN COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT CASES, 42 Buff. L. Rev. 119, 145+ (1994)
- 1853 THE SUPREME COURT COMES FULL CIRCLE: COERCION AS THE TOUCHSTONE OF AN ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE VIOLATION, 42 Buff. L. Rev. 147, 185 (1994)
- 1854 PUBLIC RIGHTS AND THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL POWER: FROM MURRAY'S LESSEE THROUGH CROWELL TO SCHOR, 35 Buff. L. Rev. 765, 869 (1986)
- 1855 PENNHURST v. HALDERMAN: THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, ERIE AND PENDENT STATE LAW CLAIMS, 34 Buff. L. Rev. 227, 295+ (1985)
- 1856 TO BE OR NOT TO BE: THE VALIDITY OF PENDENT PARTY JURISDICTION REMAINS UNANSWERED AFTER FINLEY v. UNITED STATES, 4 BYU J. Pub. L. 439, 452+ (1990)
- 1857 POPULAR CONSTITUTIONALISM, DEPARTMENTALISM, AND JUDICIAL SUPREMACY, 92 Cal. L. Rev. 1027, 1043 (2004)
- 1858 BUSH V. GORE THROUGH THE LENS OF CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY, 89 Cal. L. Rev. 1721, 1765 (2001)
- 1859 COEUR D'ALENE AND EXISTENTIAL CATEGORIES FOR SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY CASES, 86 Cal. L. Rev. 879, 917 (1998)
- 1860 COMPLETE PREEMPTION-REMOVING THE MYSTERY FROM REMOVAL, 86 Cal. L. Rev. 363, 395 (1998)
- 1861 WHO MEASURES THE CHANCELLOR'S FOOT? THE INHERENT REMEDIAL AUTHORITY OF THE FEDERAL COURTS, 84 Cal. L. Rev. 1121, 1129+ (1996)
- 1862 RECONCEPTUALIZING VAGUENESS: LEGAL RULES AND SOCIAL ORDERS, 82 Cal. L. Rev. 491, 507 (1994)
- 1863 RETHINKING THE SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION IN STATE-PARTY CASES, 82 Cal. L. Rev. 555, 659+ (1994)
- 1864 TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENTS AND THE LIMITS OF FORMALISM, 78 Cal. L. Rev. 853, 887+ (1990)
- 1865 PENDENT JURISDICTION AND THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 75 Cal. L. Rev. 129, 168 (1987)
- 1866 REDISCOVERING "ONE CONSTITUTIONAL CASE": PROCEDURAL RULES AND THE REJECTION OF THE GIBBS TEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION, 71 Cal. L. Rev. 1399, 1407+ (1983)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1867 CONSTITUTIONAL JURISPRUDENCE OF HISTORY AND NATURAL LAW: COMPLEMENTARY OR RIVAL MODES OF DISCOURSE?, 24 Cal. W. L. Rev. 287, 335+ (1988)
- 1868 TAMING THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT WITHOUT OVERRULING HANS v. LOUISIANA, 40 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 931, 995+ (1990)
- 1869 CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION: A DEFENSE OF THE TRADITIONAL VIEW, 46 Cath. U. L. Rev. 671, 765+ (1997)
- 1870 FINLEY v. UNITED STATES: PENDENT PARTY JURISDICTION UNDER THE FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT, 39 Cath. U. L. Rev. 859, 893+ (1990)
- 1871 JUDICIAL RESTRAINT REAPPRAISED, 31 Cath. U. L. Rev. 181, 190+ (1982)
- 1872 PATRIOT ACT II AND DENATIONALIZATION: AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ATTEMPT TO REVIVE STRIPPING AMERICANS OF THEIR CITIZENSHIP, 52 Clev. St. L. Rev. 593, 621 (2004)
- 1873 MR. JUSTICE HOLMES'S CONSTITUTIONALLY CROKED PATH PART II: THE STATE SOVEREIGNTY JURISDICTIONAL STOPGAP, 47 Clev. St. L. Rev. 497, 515+ (1999)
- 1874 SUING A STATE IN FEDERAL COURT UNDER A PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION: AN ELEVENTH AMENDMENT PRIMER, 37 Clev. St. L. Rev. 417, 448 (1989)
- 1875 THE LOST LANGUAGE OF THE IRISHGAYMALE: TEXTUALIZATION IN IRELAND'S LAW AND LITERATURE (OR THE MOST HIDDEN IRELAND), 26 Colum. Hum. Rts. L. Rev. 553, 677 (1995)
- 1876 SHIELDS FOR THE KING'S MEN: OFFICIAL IMMUNITY AND OTHER OBSTACLES TO EFFECTIVE PROSECUTION OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CRIMES, 16 Colum. J. Envtl. L. 1, 72 (1991)
- 1877 REFORMING THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT, 40 Colum. J. Transnat'l L. 489, 617 (2002)
- 1878 ADJUDICATION IN THE POLITICAL BRANCHES, 107 Colum. L. Rev. 559, 627 (2007)
- 1879 THE SAFE-CONDUCT THEORY OF THE ALIEN TORT STATUTE, 106 Colum. L. Rev. 830, 908 (2006)
- 1880 "SALVAGE OPERATIONS ARE ORDINARILY PREFERABLE TO THE WRECKING BALL": BARRING CHALLENGES TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, 105 Colum. L. Rev. 2369, 2408 (2005)
- 1881 UNDER THE LAW OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION: ALLOCATING CASES BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE COURTS, 104 Colum. L. Rev. 1211, 1279+ (2004)
- 1882 SUPREME COURT REVIEW OF STATE-COURT DETERMINATIONS OF STATE LAW IN CONSTITUTIONAL CASES, 103 Colum. L. Rev. 1919, 1991 (2003)
- 1883 PRIVATIZATION AS DELEGATION, 103 Colum. L. Rev. 1367, 1502 (2003)
- 1884 DERIVING RULES OF STATUTORY INTERPRETATION FROM THE CONSTITUTION, 101 Colum. L. Rev. 1648, 1680 (2001)
- 1885 ALL ABOUT WORDS: EARLY UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE "JUDICIAL POWER" IN STATUTORY INTERPRETATION, 1776-1806, 101 Colum. L. Rev. 990, 1106+ (2001)
- 1886 TEXTUALISM AND THE EQUITY OF THE STATUTE, 101 Colum. L. Rev. 1, 127+ (2001)
- 1887 "SOME EFFECTUAL POWER": THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF DECISIONMAKING REQUIRED OF ARTICLE III COURTS, 98 Colum. L. Rev. 696, 887+ (1998)
- 1888 SUING THE PRESIDENT: NONSTATUTORY REVIEW REVISITED, 97 Colum. L. Rev. 1612, 1709+ (1997)
- 1889 JUDICIAL RESTRAINT AND CONSTITUTIONAL FEDERALISM: THE SUPREME COURT'S LOPEZ AND SEMINOLE TRIBE DECISIONS, 96 Colum. L. Rev. 2213, 2247 (1996)
- 1890 INSECURITY INTERESTS: WHERE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND COMMERCIAL LAW COLLIDE, 96 Colum. L. Rev. 1645, 1752 (1996)
- 1891 EQUAL CITIZENS OF EQUAL AND TERRITORIAL STATES: THE CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS OF CHOICE OF LAW, 92 Colum. L. Rev. 249, 337 (1992)
- 1892 FEDERAL STATUTORY REVIEW UNDER SECTION 1983 AND THE APA, 91 Colum. L. Rev. 233, 260+ (1991)

- 1893 MORE PLENARY THAN THOU: A POST-WELCH COMPROMISE THEORY OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO ABROGATE STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, 88 Colum. L. Rev. 1022, 1036+ (1988)
- 1894 REMOVAL OF SUITS AGAINST FEDERAL OFFICERS: DOES THE MALFEASANT MAILMAN MERIT A FEDERAL FORUM?, 88 Colum. L. Rev. 1098, 1113 (1988)
- 1895 THE CONTINUITY OF LEGISLATURES: OF CONTRACTS AND THE CONTRACTS CLAUSE, 88 Colum. L. Rev. 647, 722 (1988)
- 1896 THE CONSPIRACY THEORY OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT The Judicial Power of the United States-The Eleventh Amendment in American History. By John V. Orth. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. Pp. ix, 231. \$25.95., 88 Colum. L. Rev. 212, 219+ (1988)
- 1897 PROCEDURAL COMMON LAW, FEDERAL JURISDICTIONAL POLICY, AND ABANDONMENT OF THE ADEQUATE AND INDEPENDENT STATE GROUNDS DOCTRINE, 86 Colum. L. Rev. 1291, 1390+ (1986)
- 1898 THE TRANSFORMATION OF IMMIGRATION LAW, 84 Colum. L. Rev. 1, 90 (1984)
- 1899 THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT AND STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: A REINTERPRETATION, 83 Colum. L. Rev. 1889, 2005+ (1983)
- 1900 VERLINDEN B. V. v. CENTRAL BANK OF NIGERIA: FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER CASES BETWEEN ALIENS AND FOREIGN STATES, 82 Colum. L. Rev. 1057, 1086+ (1982)
- 1901 COULD ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER RUN FOR PRESIDENT NOW?, 6 Fla. Coastal L. Rev. 331, 360 (2005)
- 1902 TRANSCENDING CONVENTIONAL SUPREMACY: A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE, 24 Conn. L. Rev. 829, 891 (1992)
- 1903 BACKGROUND NORMS FOR FEDERAL STATUTORY INTERPRETATION, 22 Conn. L. Rev. 721, 732 (1990)
- 1904 RESOLVING POLITICAL QUESTIONS INTO JUDICIAL QUESTIONS: TOCQUEVILLE'S THESIS REVISITED, 21 Const. Comment. 485, 545 (2004)
- 1905 THE STORY OF MCCULLOCH: BANKING ON NATIONAL POWER, 20 Const. Comment. 679, 716+ (2004)
- 1906 THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING FINAL, 20 Const. Comment. 359, 368 (2003)
- 1907 COEUR D'ALENE, FEDERAL COURTS AND THE SUPREMACY OF FEDERAL LAW: THE COMPETING PARADIGMS OF CHIEF JUSTICES MARSHALL AND REHNQUIST, 15 Const. Comment. 301, 324+ (1998)
- 1908 THE DANGERS OF THE UNION, 12 Const. Comment. 249, 276+ (1995)
- 1909 AN ORTHODOX VIEW OF THE TWO-TIER ANALYSIS OF CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER FEDERAL JURISDICTION, 7 Const. Comment. 89, 96 (1990)
- 1910 DIRECTOR LIABILITY UNDER FIRREA REDUX: MOVING TOWARDS SYNTHESIS, 49 Consumer Fin. L.Q. Rep. 139, 144+ (1995)
- 1911 ELEVENTH AMENDMENT MAYHEM: WILL COPYRIGHTS SURVIVE WELCH?, 5 Cooley L. Rev. 39, 43+ (1988)
- 1912 THE THIRD WAVE OF FEDERAL TORT REFORM: PROTECTING THE PUBLIC OR PUSHING THE CONSTITUTIONAL ENVELOPE?, 8 Cornell J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 591, 659 (1999)
- 1913 JUSTICIABILITY AND SEPARATION OF POWERS: A NEO-FEDERALIST APPROACH, 81 Cornell L. Rev. 393, 512 (1996)
- 1914 GOVERNMENTAL LIABILITY FOR NEGLIGENT FAILURE TO DETAIN DRUNK DRIVERS, 77 Cornell L. Rev. 873, 904 (1992)
- 1915 THE FRAILTIES OF ALDEN V. MAINE: A DECISION CONTRARY TO THE CONSTITUTION, PRECEDENT, AND ANCIENT PROPOSITIONS OF LAW, 33 Creighton L. Rev. 643, 717+ (2000)
- 1916 THE INDIAN GAMING REGULATORY ACT: WHAT CONGRESS GIVETH, THE COURT TAKETH AWAY -SEMINOLE TRIBE OF FLORIDA v. FLORIDA, 30 Creighton L. Rev. 569, 604+ (1997)
- 1917 THE INVOLUNTARY LOSS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP OF PUERTO RICANS UPON ACCESSION TO INDEPENDENCE BY PUERTO RICO, 19 Denv. J. Int'l L. & Pol'y 139, 161+ (1990)

- 1918 WHY BIVENS WON'T DIE: THE LEGACY OF PEOPLES v. CCA DETENTION CENTERS, 83 Denv. U. L. Rev. 685, 717 (2006)
- 1919 JUSTICE SCALIA'S FOOTPRINTS ON THE PUBLIC LANDS, 83 Denv. U. L. Rev. 259, 297 (2005)
- 1920 HOW AN INSTRUMENTAL VIEW OF LAW CORRODES THE RULE OF LAW, 56 DePaul L. Rev. 469, 505 (2007)
- 1921 MASS TORT LITIGATION AND THE DILEMMA OF FEDERALIZATION, 44 DePaul L. Rev. 755, 795 (1995)
- 1922 DEVELOPING STATE CONSTITUTIONAL JURISPRUDENCE AFTER MICHIGAN V. LONG: SUGGESTIONS FOR OPINION WRITING AND SYSTEMIC CHANGE, 1998 Det. C.L. Mich. St. U. L. Rev. 807, 856+ (1998)
- 1923 UNITED STATES TERM LIMITS, INC. v. THORTON: THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF STATE IMPOSED CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITS, 1996 Det. C.L. Mich. St. U. L. Rev. 63, 97 (1996)
- 1924 HESS v. PORT AUTHORITY TRANS-HUDSON CORPORATION: EROSION OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 1995 Det. C.L. Mich. St. U. L. Rev. 1417, 1464+ (1995)
- 1925 UNITED STATES V. O'HAGAN: THE MISAPPROPRIATION THEORY UNDER SECTION 10(B) AND RULE 10B-5-CAN THE JUDICIAL OAK GROW ANY HIGHER?, 102 Dick. L. Rev. 277, 326+ (1998)
- 1926 STATE COURTS HEARING PATENT CASES: A CRY FOR HELP TO THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT, 101 Dick. L. Rev. 41, 69+ (1996)
- 1927 STATUTORY REASONING, 46 Drake L. Rev. 299, 382 (1997)
- 1928 DEFINING THE PARAMETERS OF SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION AFTER 28 U.S.C. s 1367, 43 Drake L. Rev. 391, 393+ (1994)
- 1929 SUPER-STATUTES, 50 Duke L.J. 1215, 1276+ (2001)
- 1930 THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE BANK BILL: THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S FIRST CONSTITUTIONAL LAW OPINIONS, 44 Duke L.J. 110, 133 (1994)
- 1931 JUSTICE SCALIA, STANDING, AND PUBLIC LAW LITIGATION, 42 Duke L.J. 1141, 1169+ (1993)
- 1932 THE USE AND ABUSE OF HUMANISTIC THEORY IN LAW: REEXAMINING THE ASSUMPTIONS OF INTERDISCIPLINARY LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP, 41 Duke L.J. 191, 272+ (1991)
- 1933 THE EARLY ROLE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IN OUR CONSTITUTIONAL SCHEME: IN THE BEGINNING THERE WAS PRAGMATISM, 1989 Duke L.J. 561, 653+ (1989)
- 1934 A PRINCIPLED STATUTORY APPROACH TO SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION, 1987 Duke L.J. 34, 77+ (1987)
- 1935 TEACHING FEDERAL COURTS FROM A LITTLE RED BOOK FEDERAL JURISDICTION: POLICY AND PRACTICE. BY HOWARD FINK AND MARK v. TUSHNET. (FNaa) THE MICHIE CO., CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., 1984. PP. XX, 907. \$32.50., 1985 Duke L.J. 833, 842 (1985)
- 1936 JUDICIALIZATION: THE TWILIGHT OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, 1985 Duke L.J. 427, 466 (1985)
- 1937 THE CONSTITUTION IN THE SUPREME COURT: CONTRACTS AND COMMERCE, 1836-1864, 1983 Duke L.J. 471, 513 (1983)
- 1938 APPLYING THE INTERNATIONAL LAW OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY TO THE STATES OF THE UNION, 1981 Duke L.J. 449, 476 (1981)
- 1939 SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: A MODERN RATIONALE IN LIGHT OF THE 1976 AMENDMENTS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT, 1981 Duke L.J. 116, 140 (1981)
- 1940 THE INADEQUACY OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2005, 55 Emory L.J. 487, 533+ (2006)
- 1941 DUAL NATIONALITY AND THE MEANING OF CITIZENSHIP, 46 Emory L.J. 1411, 1485 (1997)
- 1942 AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS V. S.G. & A.E. : AN OPEN DOOR TO THE FEDERAL COURTS FOR FEDERALLY CHARTERED CORPORATIONS, 45 Emory L.J. 771, 804+ (1996)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 1943 THE DEBATE OVER s 1367: DEFINING THE POWER TO DEFINE FEDERAL JUDICIAL POWER, 41 Emory L.J. 13, 29 (1992)
- 1944 COMPOUNDING CONFUSION AND HAMPERING DIVERSITY: LIFE AFTER FINLEY AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION STATUTE, 40 Emory L.J. 445, 487 (1991)
- 1945 SUPREME COURT'S 2003-04 TERM EMPLOYMENT LAW CASES: CLARIFYING ASPECTS OF ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LAW AND ERISA, 8 Employee Rts. & Emp. Pol'y J. 195, 234 (2004)
- 1946 INADEQUATE ANALYSIS LEADING TO AN ACCURATE CONCLUSION: THE NINTH CIRCUIT'S CURSORY TREATMENT OF THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LACEY ACT IN UNITED STATES V. SENCHENKO, 29 Envtl. L. 743, 761+ (1999)
- 1947 GWALTNEY OF SMITHFIELD v. CHESAPEAKE BAY FOUNDATION: A NEW FORM OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION UNDER SECTION 505 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT?, 19 Envtl. L. 119, 139+ (1988)
- 1948 THE CONSTITUTIONAL LIABILITY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: BIVENS CLAIMS, 41 Fed. B. News & J. 342, 348 (1994)
- 1949 DIVERSITY JURISDICTION AND PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS A LOOK AT THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE 1988 AMENDMENT TO 28 U.S.C. S 1332, 38 Fed. B. News & J. 284, 288 (1991)
- 1950 ARTICLE III AS A GRANT OF POWER: PROTECTIVE JURISDICTION, FEDERALISM AND THE FEDERAL COURTS, 54 Fla. L. Rev. 361, 393+ (2002)
- 1951 WHY DOES A CONSERVATIVE COURT RULE IN FAVOR OF A LIBERAL GOVERNMENT? THE COHEN-SPITZER ANALYSIS AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL SCHEME, 28 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 427, 458+ (2000)
- 1952 THE "ARISING UNDER' JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR UNIFORMITY IN PATENT LAW, 14 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 229, 233+ (1986)
- 1953 TAKING HISTORY SERIOUSLY: MUNICIPAL LIABILITY UNDER 42 U.S.C. S 1983 AND THE DEBATE OVER RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR, 73 Fordham L. Rev. 2183, 2249 (2005)
- 1954 A DIFFERENT VIEW OF HABEAS: INTERPRETING AEDPA'S "ADJUDICATED ON THE MERITS" CLAUSE WHEN HABEAS CORPUS IS UNDERSTOOD AS AN APPELLATE FUNCTION OF THE FEDERAL COURTS, 72 Fordham L. Rev. 2593, 2629+ (2004)
- 1955 JURISDICTIONAL LINE-DRAWING IN A TIME WHEN SO MUCH LITIGATION IS "RELATED TO" BANKRUPTCY: A PRACTICAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL SOLUTION, 72 Fordham L. Rev. 1091, 1124+ (2004)
- 1956 ADOPTING A JURISDICTIONAL APPROACH TO THE RIGHTS OF ASSET PURCHASERS FROM THE FDIC, 69 Fordham L. Rev. 287, 327+ (2000)
- 1957 STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND THE FALSE CLAIMS ACT: RESPECTING THE LIMITATIONS CREATED BY THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT UPON THE FEDERAL COURTS, 68 Fordham L. Rev. 189, 224+ (1999)
- 1958 STATUTORY INTERPRETATION OF FEDERAL JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES: JURISDICTION OF THE PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION UNDER THE TCPA, 66 Fordham L. Rev. 1895, 1937 (1998)
- 1959 AN UNCOMMON STATE OF CONFUSION: THE COMMON ENTERPRISE ELEMENT OF INVESTMENT CONTRACT ANALYSIS, 63 Fordham L. Rev. 2135, 2175+ (1995)
- 1960 THE CASE AGAINST SUPPLEMENTAL BANKRUPTCY JURISDICTION: A CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY, AND POLICY ANALYSIS, 62 Fordham L. Rev. 721, 740 (1994)
- 1961 A COMPREHENSIVE THEORY OF PROTECTIVE JURISDICTION: THE MISSING "INGREDIENT" OF "ARISING UNDER" JURISDICTION, 61 Fordham L. Rev. 1235, 1238+ (1993)
- 1962 COMPLEX LITIGATION REFORM AND ARTICLE III JURISDICTION, 59 Fordham L. Rev. 169, 225+ (1990)
- 1963 SENDING NOTICE TO POTENTIAL PLAINTIFFS IN CLASS ACTIONS UNDER THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT: THE TRIAL COURT'S ROLE, 54 Fordham L. Rev. 631, 659 (1986)

- C 1964 A CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY ANALYSIS OF STATE TAXATION OF EDGE ACT CORPORATE BRANCHES, 51 Fordham L. Rev. 991, 1018 (1983)
- C 1965 REMOVING THE CLOAK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION FROM CHOICE OF LAW ANALYSIS: PENDENT JURISDICTION AND NATIONWIDE SERVICE OF PROCESS, 51 Fordham L. Rev. 127, 167+ (1982)
- C 1966 THE EFFECT OF THE FERES DOCTRINE ON TORT ACTIONS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES BY FAMILY MEMBERS OF SERVICEMEN, 50 Fordham L. Rev. 1241, 1267 (1982)
- C 1967 PENDENT PARTY JURISDICTION AND SECTION 1983: WHEN HAS CONGRESS "BY IMPLICATION NEGATED" JURISDICTION?, 14 Fordham Urb. L.J. 873, 894+ (1986)
- 1968 SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND THE RULE OF LAW: ASPIRING TO A HIGHEST-RANKED VIEW OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 1 Geo. Mason Indep. L. Rev. 1, 31 (1992)
- C 1969 HANS, AYERS, AND ELEVENTH AMENDMENT JURISPRUDENCE: ON JUSTIFICATION, RATIONALIZATION, AND SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, 10 Geo. Mason L. Rev. 251, 291 (2001)
- C 1970 THE ORIGINAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE "EFFECTS CLAUSE" OF ARTICLE IV, SECTION 1 AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT, 6 Geo. Mason L. Rev. 307, 337 (1998)
- C 1971 UNDER THE WESTFALL ACT, A PLAINTIFF CAN OBTAIN JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CERTIFICATION THAT THE DEFENDANT-EMPLOYEE WAS ACTING WITHIN THE SCOPE OF HER EMPLOYMENT: GUTIERREZ DE MARTINEZ V. LAMAGNO, 4 Geo. Mason L. Rev. 485, 519 (1996)
- 1972 MARBURY V. MADISON AND CANADIAN CONSTITUTIONALISM: RHETORIC AND PRACTICE, 36 Geo. Wash. Int'l L. Rev. 515, 541+ (2004)
- 1973 SUING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT: SOVEREIGNTY, IMMUNITY, AND JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE, 35 Geo. Wash. Int'l L. Rev. 521, 609+ (2003)
- C 1974 ELUSIVE FOUNDATION: JOHN MARSHALL, JAMES WILSON, AND THE PROBLEM OF RECONCILING POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY AND NATURAL LAW JURISPRUDENCE IN THE NEW FEDERAL REPUBLIC, 72 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 113, 193 (2003)
- C 1975 FEDERAL JUDICIAL POWER AND THE CHALLENGES OF MULTIJURISDICTIONAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT PURCHASER ANTITRUST LITIGATION, 69 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 860, 901+ (2001)
- C 1976 WHAT STATUTORY DRAFTING ERRORS TEACH US ABOUT STATUTORY INTERPRETATION, 69 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 309, 366 (2001)
- C 1977 RECONSTRUCTING THE JURISDICTIONAL FOUNDATION OF ANTITRUST FEDERALISM, 61 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 657, 676+ (1993)
- C 1978 AIDS CASES IN FEDERAL COURT: A FEDERAL QUESTION?, 61 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 490, 492+ (1993)
- C 1979 CONGRESS'S PREROGATIVE OVER AGENCIES AND AGENCY DECISIONMAKERS: THE RISE AND DEMISE OF THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION'S THEORY OF THE UNITARY EXECUTIVE, 57 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 627, 702 (1989)
- C 1980 THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE U.S. SENTENCING COMMISSION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF THE JUDICIARY, 57 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 704, 731 (1989)
- C 1981 CHARACTERIZING FEDERAL CLAIMS: PREEMPTION, REMOVAL, AND THE ARISING-UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL COURTS, 54 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 812, 870 (1986)
- C 1982 THE FORMATIVE ESSAYS OF JUSTICE HOLMES: THE MAKING OF AN AMERICAN LEGAL PHILOSOPHY BY FREDERIC ROGERS KELLOGG. WESTPORT, CONN.: GREENWOOD (1984) xii, 289 pp. \$29.95. JUSTICE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES & UTILITARIAN JURISPRUDE, 53 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 870, 875 (1985)
- C 1983 JUDICIAL REVIEW IN IMMIGRATION CASES AFTER AADC: LESSONS FROM CIVIL PROCEDURE, 14 Geo. Immigr. L.J. 385, 452 (2000)
- C 1984 U.S. DUAL CITIZEN VOTING RIGHTS: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF ALEINIKOFF'S SOLUTION, 13 Geo. Immigr. L.J. 573, 595 (1999)
- 1985 A NEW APPROACH TO CONGRESSIONAL POWER: REVISITING THE LEGAL TENDER CASES, 95 Geo. L.J. 119, 170+ (2006)

- C 1986 CONGRESSIONAL POWER AND STATE COURT JURISDICTION, 94 Geo. L.J. 949, 1013+ (2006)
- C 1987 THE ROLE OF THE OATH OF RENUNCIATION IN CURRENT U.S. NATIONALITY POLICY--TO ENFORCE, TO OMIT, OR MAYBE TO CHANGE?, 88 Geo. L.J. 329, 379 (2000)
- C 1988 NIGHT AND DAY: COEUR D'ALENE, BREARD, AND THE UNRAVELING OF THE PROSPECTIVE-RETROSPECTIVE DISTINCTION IN ELEVENTH AMENDMENT DOCTRINE, 87 Geo. L.J. 1, 101+ (1998)
- C 1989 PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES AND THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 78 Geo. L.J. 1723, 1751 (1990)
- C 1990 A SIX-THREE RULE: REVIVING CONSENSUS AND DEFERENCE ON THE SUPREME COURT, 37 Ga. L. Rev. 893, 1019 (2003)
- C 1991 AMERICAN-STYLE JUSTICE IN NO MAN'S LAND, 36 Ga. L. Rev. 895, 1073+ (2002)
- C 1992 JURISTIC GIANTS: A GEORGIA STUDY IN REPUTATION, 34 Ga. L. Rev. 1311, 1342 (2000)
- C 1993 POSITIVISM AND ANTIPOSITIVISM IN FEDERAL COURTS LAW, 29 Ga. L. Rev. 655, 692+ (1995)
- C 1994 FELIX FRANKFURTER: THE ARCHITECT OF "OUR FEDERALISM", 27 Ga. L. Rev. 697, 788+ (1993)
- C 1995 EXCLUDING THE INCOME OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS: THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION, 26 Ga. L. Rev. 421, 502 (1992)
- C 1996 EXPRESS WAIVER OF ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY, 17 Ga. L. Rev. 513, 538 (1983)
- 1997 PEBBLES FROM THE PATHS BEHIND Chapter VI, 9 Green Bag 2d 271, 284 (2006)
- 1998 FEDERAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION OVER QUESTIONS OF STATE LAW IN STATE COURTS, 7 Green Bag 2d 353, 360+ (2004)
- C 1999 STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY TRUMPS THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE: DOES FEDERAL LAW APPLY TO THE STATES IN THE WAKE OF ALDEN V. MAINE 119 S.CT. 2240 (1999), 23 Hamline L. Rev. 177, 248+ (1999)
- C 2000 DISTORTED FEDERALISM: THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION AND LOCAL SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS, 15 Hamline L. Rev. 327, 358 (1992)
- C 2001 UNSAFE HAVENS: THE CASE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION OF FOSTER CHILDREN FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT, 23 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev. 199, 280 (1988)
- C 2002 CONSTITUTIONAL REMEDIES FOR UNDERINCLUSIVE STATUTES: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF HECKLER v. MATHEWS, 20 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev. 79, 151 (1985)
- C 2003 TOWARD A BASAL TENTH AMENDMENT: A RIPOSTE TO NATIONAL BANK PREEMPTION OF STATE CONSUMER PROTECTION LAWS, 29 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 981, 1034+ (2006)
- C 2004 THE RULE OF LAW PROBLEM: UNCONSTITUTIONAL CLASS ACTIONS AND OPTIONS FOR REFORM, 28 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 855, 888+ (2005)
- C 2005 ALDEN TRILOGY: PRAISE AND PROTEST, 23 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 323, 409 (2000)
- C 2006 A LAWYER LECTURES A JUDGE, 18 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 851, 865 (1995)
- C 2007 THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE FALSE CLAIMS ACT'S QUI TAM PROVISION, 16 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 701, 768 (1993)
- C 2008 A SCRUPULOUS REGARD FOR THE RIGHTFUL INDEPENDENCE OF THE STATES: JUSTICE STONE AND THE LIMITS OF THE FEDERAL EQUITY POWER, 7 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 507, 519 (1984)
- C 2009 THE PHOENIX PRECEDENTS: THE UNEXPECTED REBIRTH OF REGIONAL CIRCUIT JURISDICTION OVER PATENT APPEALS AND THE NEED FOR A CONSIDERED CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSE, 16 Harv. J.L. & Tech. 411, 472 (2003)
- C 2010 DEMOCRACY IN THE DETAILS: A PLEA FOR SUBSTANCE OVER FORM IN STATUTORY INTERPRETATION, 37 Harv. J. on Legis. 187, 211+ (2000)
- C 2011 FEDERALISM AND FEDERAL LIABILITY REFORM: THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SUPPORTS REFORM, 36 Harv. J. on Legis. 269, 322 (1999)

- 2012 FEDERAL PREEMPTION - STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL POWER - SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK REBUFFS NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL'S BID TO REGULATE NATIONAL BANKS. - OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY V. SPITZER, 396 F. SUPP. 2, 120 Harv. L. Rev. 627, 634 (2006)
- 2013 STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY - BANKRUPTCY, 120 Harv. L. Rev. 125, 134 (2006)
- 2014 ARTICLE I TRIBUNALS, ARTICLE III COURTS, AND THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES, 118 Harv. L. Rev. 643, 776+ (2004)
- 2015 FOREWORD: FASHIONING THE LEGAL CONSTITUTION: CULTURE, COURTS, AND LAW, 117 Harv. L. Rev. 4, 112 (2003)
- 2016 MR. SMITH GOES TO FEDERAL COURT: FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION OVER STATE LAW CLAIMS POST-MERRELL DOW, 115 Harv. L. Rev. 2272, 2293+ (2002)
- 2017 SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AS A DOCTRINE OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION, 115 Harv. L. Rev. 1559, 1654 (2002)
- 2018 III. FEDERAL STATUTES AND REGULATIONS C. Civil Rights Acts, 112 Harv. L. Rev. 303, 313 (1998)
- 2019 EX PARTE YOUNG DOCTRINE., 111 Harv. L. Rev. 269, 279+ (1997)
- 2020 THE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY "EXCEPTION", 110 Harv. L. Rev. 102, 133 (1996)
- 2021 EXECUTIVE REVISION OF JUDICIAL DECISIONS, 109 Harv. L. Rev. 2020, 2037 (1996)
- 2022 FEDERAL CIVIL PROCEDURE - CHOICE OF LAW - D.C. CIRCUIT APPLIES FORUM CHOICE-OF-LAW RULES IN EDGE ACT SUTI - A.I. TRADE FINANCE, INC. v. PETRA INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORP., 62 F.3d 1454 (D.C. CIR. 1995)., 109 Harv. L. Rev. 1156, 1161 (1996)
- 2023 CONSTITUTIONAL DOCTRINE, 107 Harv. L. Rev. 1140, 1157 (1994)
- 2024 DECONSTITUTIONALIZING JUSTICIABILITY: THE EXAMPLE OF MOOTNESS, 105 Harv. L. Rev. 603, 669+ (1992)
- 2025 OVER-PROTECTIVE JURISDICTION?: A STATE SOVEREIGNTY THEORY OF FEDERAL QUESTIONS, 102 Harv. L. Rev. 1948, 1949+ (1989)
- 2026 THE DIVERSITY OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT: A CRITICAL EVALUATION, 102 Harv. L. Rev. 1372, 1396 (1989)
- 2027 CONSTITUTIONAL MYSTICISM: THE ASPIRATIONAL DEFENSE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW ON WHAT THE CONSTITUTION MEANS. By SOTIRIOS A. BARBER. BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS. 1984. Pp. viii, 245. \$17.50. THE SUPREME COURT A, 98 Harv. L. Rev. 1331, 1345+ (1985)
- 2028 WRONG TURNS: THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT AND THE PENNHURST CASE, 98 Harv. L. Rev. 61, 63+ (1984)
- 2029 1. ARTICLE III FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION, 97 Harv. L. Rev. 208, 208+ (1983)
- 2030 8. TENURE AND SALARY CLAUSE RESTRICTIONS ON THE JURISDICTION OF ARTICLE I COURTS, 96 Harv. L. Rev. 257, 268 (1982)
- 2031 A CLOSER LOOK AT PENDENT AND ANCILLARY JURISDICTION: TOWARD A THEORY OF INCIDENTAL JURISDICTION, 95 Harv. L. Rev. 1935, 1954+ (1982)
- 2032 BANKRUPTCY AND THE LIMITS OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION, 95 Harv. L. Rev. 703, 722 (1982)
- 2033 CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS ON CONGRESS' AUTHORITY TO REGULATE THE JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL COURTS, 95 Harv. L. Rev. 17, 89 (1981)
- 2034 4. IMMUNITY OF FEDERAL EXECUTIVE OFFICIALS, 92 Harv. L. Rev. 265, 276 (1978)
- 2035 FEDERAL COURTS - JURISDICTION - ORIGINAL FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER PRIVATE ACTION UNDER EXEMPTED STATE TRUTH IN LENDING LAW. Ives v. W. T. Grant Co., 522 F.2d 749 (2d Cir. 1975)., 89 Harv. L. Rev. 998, 1006 (1976)
- 2036 INTERGOVERNMENTAL IMMUNITIES IN LITIGATION, TAXATION, AND REGULATION: SEPARATION OF POWERS ISSUES IN CONTROVERSIES ABOUT FEDERALISM, 89 Harv. L. Rev. 682, 713+ (1976)
- 2037 ATTORNEYS' FEES AND THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 88 Harv. L. Rev. 1875, 1902+ (1975)
- 2038 THE TAX RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON THE BANKRUPTCY LAWS - TAX PROCEDURES, 88 Harv. L. Rev. 1360, 1481 (1975)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- C** 2039 6. APPLICABILITY AND WAIVER OF STATES' ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY, 88 Harv. L. Rev. 243, 251+ (1974)
- C** 2040 HYBRID STATE LAW IN THE FEDERAL COURTS, 83 Harv. L. Rev. 289, 326 (1969)
- C** 2041 II. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 81 Harv. L. Rev. 126, 138+ (1967)
- C** 2042 JOSEPH STORY: THE MIDDLE YEARS, 80 Harv. L. Rev. 1679, 1709 (1967)
- C** 2043 2. PENDENT JURISDICTION., 80 Harv. L. Rev. 220, 221+ (1966)
- C** 2044 CORPORATIONS AND DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP JURISDICTION: A SUPREME COURT FICTION REVISITED, 77 Harv. L. Rev. 1426, 1451+ (1964)
- C** 2045 SUITS AGAINST GOVERNMENTS AND OFFICERS: SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, 77 Harv. L. Rev. 1, 39+ (1963)
- C** 2046 PROPOSED REFORMS IN FEDERAL "NONSTATUTORY" JUDICIAL REVIEW: SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, INDISPENSABLE PARTIES, MANDAMUS, 75 Harv. L. Rev. 1479, 1531 (1962)
- C** 2047 FEDERAL COURTS - ANCILLARY JURISDICTION - UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF PENDENT JURISDICTION A FEDERAL COURT MAY DISPOSE OF A CASE ON THE BASIS OF THE STATE CLAIM WITHOUT DECIDING THE MERITS OF THE FEDERAL QUESTIONS, 74 Harv. L. Rev. 1660, 1662 (1961)
- C** 2048 THE UNTENABLE NONFEDERAL GROUND IN THE SUPREME COURT, 74 Harv. L. Rev. 1375, 1395 (1961)
- C** 2049 INVOLUNTARY LOSS OF AMERICAN NATIONALITY, 73 Harv. L. Rev. 1510, 1531 (1960)
- C** 2050 JUDGE MAGRUDER AND THE LABOR CONTRACT, 72 Harv. L. Rev. 1268, 1300 (1959)
- C** 2051 THE STATUS OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS UNDER THE LAW OF THE UNITED STATES, 71 Harv. L. Rev. 1300, 1305+ (1958)
- C** 2052 PROBLEMS OF PARALLEL STATE AND FEDERAL REMEDIES, 71 Harv. L. Rev. 513, 514+ (1958)
- C** 2053 LEGISLATIVE PURPOSE AND THE JUDICIAL PROCESS: THE LINCOLN MILLS CASE, 71 Harv. L. Rev. 1, 39 (1957)
- C** 2054 FEDERAL COURTS - JURISDICTION: IN GENERAL - FEDERAL COURT HAS PENDENT JURISDICTION OVER CLAIM FOR UNFAIR COMPETITION IN USING UNCOPYRIGHTED MATERIAL WHEN JOINED WITH CLAIM FOR INFRINGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT ON RELATED PICTORI, 70 Harv. L. Rev. 1469, 1471 (1957)
- C** 2055 REMEDIES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES AND ITS OFFICIALS, 70 Harv. L. Rev. 827, 852+ (1957)
- C** 2056 THE CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS., 68 Harv. L. Rev. 527, 535+ (1955)
- C** 2057 FROM JUDICIAL GRANT TO LEGISLATIVE POWER: THE ADMIRALTY CLAUSE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY., 67 Harv. L. Rev. 1214, 1237 (1954)
- C** 2058 DEVELOPMENTS IN THE LAW IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY, 66 Harv. L. Rev. 643, 745 (1953)
- C** 2059 THE FEDERAL COURTS' HOSPITABLE BACK DOOR - REMOVAL OF "SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT" NON-FEDERAL CAUSES OF ACTION, 66 Harv. L. Rev. 423, 442 (1953)
- C** 2060 FEDERAL COURTS - REMOVAL JURISDICTION - SUIT ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT HELD REMOVABLE ALTHOUGH EFFECT ON COMMERCE NOT PLEADED., 65 Harv. L. Rev. 1443, 1444 (1952)
- C** 2061 THE DOLLAR LITIGATION: A STUDY IN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY., 65 Harv. L. Rev. 466, 478 (1952)
- C** 2062 CITIZENS - STATUTE TERMINATING NATIONALITY OF NATURALIZED CITIZEN UPON HIS CONTINUOUS FIVE YEARS' RESIDENCE ABROAD HELD CONSTITUTIONAL., 63 Harv. L. Rev. 885, 886 (1950)
- C** 2063 CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY TO INDUCE WAIVERS OF STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: THE CONDITIONAL SPENDING POWER (AND BEYOND), 29 Hastings Const. L.Q. 439, 525 (2002)
- C** 2064 PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES: THE MISSING LINK IN ESTABLISHING CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO ABROGATE STATE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY, 28 Hastings Const. L.Q. 235, 304+ (2001)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2065 EXERCISING THE AMENDMENT POWER TO DISAPPROVE OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS: A PROPOSAL FOR A "REPUBLICAN VETO", 22 *Hastings Const. L.Q.* 325, 357 (1995)
- 2066 THE CONSTITUTIONAL FEDERAL QUESTION IN THE LOWER FEDERAL COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, 17 *Hastings Int'l & Comp. L. Rev.* 143, 181+ (1993)
- 2067 DUAL NATIONALITY IN FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES, 15 *Hastings Int'l & Comp. L. Rev.* 447, 473+ (1992)
- 2068 RESCUING DOLE: LIMITING THE INTRUSION OF THE FEDERAL COMMON LAW OF FOREIGN RELATIONS INTO THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT, 57 *Hastings L.J.* 601, 618+ (2006)
- 2069 THE SCOPE OF APPELLATE JURISDICTION: PENDENT APPELLATE JURISDICTION BEFORE AND AFTER SWINT, 49 *Hastings L.J.* 1337, 1490 (1998)
- 2070 THE "CONSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTION" AS A CRISIS IN ADAPTIVITY, 48 *Hastings L.J.* 867, 912 (1997)
- 2071 THE POLITICS OF FACTS: "THE ILLUSION OF CERTAINTY", 46 *Hastings L.J.* 1723, 1781 (1995)
- 2072 GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED ENTERPRISES ARE "TOO BIG TO FAIL": BALANCING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INTERESTS, 44 *Hastings L.J.* 991, 1008+ (1993)
- 2073 RECONSIDERING THE ARTFUL PLEADING DOCTRINE, 44 *Hastings L.J.* 273, 335 (1993)
- 2074 "ARISING UNDER" JURISDICTION AND THE COPYRIGHT LAWS, 44 *Hastings L.J.* 337, 398 (1993)
- 2075 THE CONGRESSIONAL RESURRECTION OF SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION IN THE POST-FINLEY ERA, 42 *Hastings L.J.* 1611, 1666+ (1991)
- 2076 WHEN TO BELIEVE A LEGAL FICTION: FEDERAL INTERESTS AND THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 40 *Hastings L.J.* 1123, 1185+ (1989)
- 2077 THERE'S NO REASON FOR IT; IT'S JUST OUR POLICY: WHY THE WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT RULE SABOTAGES THE PURPOSES OF FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION, 38 *Hastings L.J.* 597, 598+ (1987)
- 2078 RIGHTS REQUIRE REMEDIES: A NEW APPROACH TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF RIGHTS IN THE FEDERAL COURTS, 38 *Hastings L.J.* 665, 728 (1987)
- 2079 ENSURING THE SUPREMACY OF FEDERAL LAW: WHY THE DISTRICT COURT WAS WRONG IN WESTSIDE MOTHERS V. HAVEMAN, 12 *Health Matrix* 139, 156 (2002)
- 2080 COUNTERCLAIMS, THE WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT, AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION, 33 *Hofstra L. Rev.* 1, 50+ (2004)
- 2081 RECONCILING THE GOALS OF FEDERALISM WITH THE POLICY OF TITLE VII: SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION IN JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT OF EEOC CONCILIATION AGREEMENTS, 13 *Hofstra L. Rev.* 257, 307+ (1985)
- 2082 SUPREME COURT EQUITY, 1789-1835, AND THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN JUDGING, 34 *Hous. L. Rev.* 1425, 1486+ (1998)
- 2083 ACTIONS TO COLLECT UNPAID ACCOUNTS IN BANKRUPTCY COURT, 26 *Hous. L. Rev.* 603, 675+ (1989)
- 2084 EXPANDING STATE SOVEREIGNTY: IDAHO V. COEUR D'ALENE TRIBE OF IDAHO, 35 *Idaho L. Rev.* 599, 646+ (1999)
- 2085 OF RULES AND STANDARDS: RECONCILING STATUTORY LIMITATIONS ON "ARISING UNDER" JURISDICTION, 82 *Ind. L.J.* 309, 344+ (2007)
- 2086 COMMENT ON THE SUPPLEMENTAL-JURISDICTION STATUTE: 28 U.S.C. S 1367, 74 *Ind. L.J.* 223, 239 (1998)
- 2087 WHOSE LAW IS IT, ANYWAY? A RECONSIDERATION OF FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION OVER CASES OF MIXED STATE AND FEDERAL LAW, 60 *Ind. L.J.* 17, 22+ (1985)
- 2088 A RESPONSE TO D.A.J. RICHARDS' DEFENSE OF FREEWHEELING CONSTITUTIONAL ADJUDICATION, 59 *Ind. L.J.* 339, 376 (1984)
- 2089 JUSTICE REHNQUIST, STATUTORY INTERPRETATION, THE POLICIES OF CLEAR STATEMENT, AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION, 58 *Ind. L.J.* 211, 227+ (1983)

- 2090 FEDERALISM RE-CONSTRUCTED: THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT'S ILLOGICAL IMPACT ON CONGRESS' POWER, 37 Ind. L. Rev. 345, 373+ (2004)
- 2091 RETHINKING THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM: A MONETARIST PLAN FOR A MORE CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM OF CENTRAL BANKING, 34 Ind. L. Rev. 371, 375+ (2001)
- 2092 SEMINOLE TRIBE AND SUPERFUND: A FEDERALISM GAMBLE, 31 Ind. L. Rev. 183, 217 (1998)
- 2093 ARTICLE III AND THE CAUSE OF ACTION, 89 Iowa L. Rev. 777, 862+ (2004)
- 2094 QUO VADIS, "QUI TAM" ? THE FUTURE OF PRIVATE FALSE CLAIMS ACT SUITS AGAINST STATES AFTER VERMONT AGENCY OF NATURAL RESOURCES V. UNITED STATES EX REL. STEVENS, 87 Iowa L. Rev. 283, 326+ (2001)
- 2095 CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT AND RELATED THEORIES OF SECONDARY LIABILITY FOR TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT, 80 Iowa L. Rev. 101, 143 (1994)
- 2096 STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AGAINST PRIVATE CITIZENS, THE COMMERCE CLAUSE POWER, AND THE SUPREME COURT, 74 Iowa L. Rev. 593, 627 (1989)
- 2097 ORIGINAL UNDERSTANDING, LEGAL REALISM, AND THE INTERPRETATION OF "THIS CONSTITUTION", 72 Iowa L. Rev. 1177, 1279 (1987)
- 2098 THE UNHAPPY HISTORY OF FEDERAL QUESTION REMOVAL, 71 Iowa L. Rev. 717, 724+ (1986)
- 2099 JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS IN EMERGING FEDERAL SYSTEMS: THE MARSHALL COURT AND THE EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE, 33 J. Marshall L. Rev. 1063, 1108+ (2000)
- 2100 CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN MARSHALL AND THE COURSE OF AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY, 33 J. Marshall L. Rev. 743, 779+ (2000)
- 2101 RECOVERING THE WORLD OF THE MARSHALL COURT, 33 J. Marshall L. Rev. 781, 821 (2000)
- 2102 JOHN MARSHALL, MCCULLOCH V. MARYLAND, AND THE SOUTHERN STATES' RIGHTS TRADITION, 33 J. Marshall L. Rev. 875, 934+ (2000)
- 2103 THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT'S FORGOTTEN LESSONS?: ANNEALING NEW FORMS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY THROUGH CONSOLIDATED APPELLATE JURISDICTION, 32 J. Marshall L. Rev. 581, 616 (1999)
- 2104 CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN MARSHALL IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE, 31 J. Marshall L. Rev. 137, 170+ (1997)
- 2105 CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIVERSITY v. COHILL: THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT UPHOLDS THE AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL COURTS TO REMAND PROPERTY REMOVED PENDENT JURISDICTION CLAIMS, 22 J. Marshall L. Rev. 389, 402+ (1988)
- 2106 THE BANKRUPTCY AMENDMENTS AND FEDERAL JUDGESHIP ACT OF 1984: A STEP BACKWARD IN REDUCING JURISDICTIONAL DELAY, 19 J. Marshall L. Rev. 219, 227 (1985)
- 2107 PRIVATELY FUNDED COURTS AND THE HOMELESS: A CRITICAL LOOK AT COMMUNITY COURTS, 14-WTR J. Affordable Housing & Community Dev. L. 170, 184+ (2005)
- 2108 "STANDARDS AND PRACTICES": THE JUDICIARY'S ROLE IN PROMOTING SAFETY IN THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM, 55 J. Air L. & Com. 1117, 1157 (1990)
- 2109 STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND THE BANKRUPTCY CODE (PART TWO), 8 J. Bankr. L. & Prac. 3, 99 (1998)
- 2110 SUING STATES FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT-AN ELEVENTH AMENDMENT BAR?, 15 J.C. & U.L. 269, 288 (1989)
- 2111 THE FEDERAL LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM A UNIFIED APPROACH, 10 J. Corp. L. 185, 228 (1984)
- 2112 INTELLECTUAL AUTHORITY AND INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY, 42 J. Legal Educ. 151, 185 (1992)
- 2113 SEMINOLE TRIBE V. FLORIDA: THE SUPREME COURT'S BOTCHED SURGERY OF THE INDIAN GAMING REGULATORY ACT, 24 J. Legis. 149, 163 (1998)
- 2114 IT'S JUST WATER: TOWARD THE NORMALIZATION OF ADMIRALTY, 35 J. Mar. L. & Com. 469, 521 (2004)

- C 2115 SUPPLEMENTAL, PENDENT AND ANCILLARY JURISDICTION IN ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME CASES: THE ALI FEDERAL JUDICIAL CODE REVISION PROJECT AND ADMIRALTY PRACTICE, 32 J. Mar. L. & Com. 567, 572+ (2001)
- C 2116 LIMITATION OF SHIPOWNER LIABILITY: ITS AMERICAN ROOTS AND SOME PROBLEMS PARTICULAR TO COLLISION, 32 J. Mar. L. & Com. 241, 277 (2001)
- C 2117 THE PRISM OF COGSA, 30 J. Mar. L. & Com. 543, 593 (1999)
- 2118 CITIZEN SUITS AGAINST STATES: THE EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION DILEMMA, 45 J. Copyright Soc'y U.S.A. 63, 117+ (1997)
- 2119 KBA FILES LAWSUIT REGARDING CONSTITUTIONALITY OF 1999 LAW, 69-MAR J. Kan. B.A. 3, 3 (2000)
- C 2120 RESORTING TO EXTERNAL NORMS AND PRINCIPLES IN CONSTITUTIONAL DECISION-MAKING, 92 Ky. L.J. 703, 766 (2004)
- C 2121 RECONSIDERING THE FRANKFURTERIAN PARADIGM: REFLECTIONS ON HISTORIES OF LOWER FEDERAL COURTS Felix Frankfurter and James M. Landis. 1928. *The Business of the Supreme Court: A Study in the Federal Judicial System*. New York, 24 Law & Soc. Inquiry 679, 749 (1999)
- C 2122 22 Law and Society Review 801, THE PUBLIC/PRIVATE DISTINCTION: APPROACHES TO THE CRITIQUE OF LEGAL IDEOLOGY (1988)
- C 2123 DEFINING THE LIMITS OF SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. S 1367: A HEARTY WELCOME TO PERMISSIVE COUNTERCLAIMS, 9 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 295, 310 (2005)
- C 2124 THE ERIE DOCTRINE IN EQUITY, 60 La. L. Rev. 173, 232 (1999)
- C 2125 BANKRUPTCY, 43 La. L. Rev. 327, 342 (1982)
- C 2126 2 Loy. Mar. L.J. 1, OF COMITY: AEROSPATIALE AS LEX MARITIMA (2003)
- C 2127 III. FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION, 37 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 1443, 1500+ (2004)
- 2128 THE HYPOCRISY OF ALDEN V. MAINE: JUDICIAL REVIEW, SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND THE REHNQUIST COURT, 33 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 1283, 1308 (2000)
- C 2129 JUDICIAL V. CONGRESSIONAL FEDERALISM: THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW FEDERALISM DECISIONS ON MASS TORT CASES AND OTHER COMPLEX LITIGATION, 33 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 1559, 1627+ (2000)
- 2130 LEARNING TO FOLLOW DIRECTIONS: WHEN DISTRICT COURTS SHOULD DECLINE TO EXERCISE SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. S 1367(C), 31 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 995, 1032 (1998)
- C 2131 THE CURIOUS CASE OF DISAPPEARING FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL LAW: A VEHICLE FOR REASSESSMENT OF THE TRIBAL EXHAUSTION/ABSTENTION DOCTRINE, 80 Marq. L. Rev. 531, 622 (1997)
- C 2132 THE PHANTOM PHILOSOPHY? AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF LEGAL INTERPRETATION, 65 Md. L. Rev. 841, 906+ (2006)
- C 2133 SEMINOLE TRIBE v. FLORIDA, 56 Md. L. Rev. 1411, 1446+ (1997)
- 2134 JUDICIAL DECISION MAKING: A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE TENNESSEE SUPREME COURT--1992 TERM, 24 Mem. St. U. L. Rev. 325, 354 (1994)
- C 2135 BANKRUPTCY, 53 Mercer L. Rev. 1199, 1313 (2002)
- C 2136 CITY OF CHICAGO V. INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS: THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION AND CROSS-SYSTEM APPEALS, AND THE IMPACT ON FEDERALISM, 50 Mercer L. Rev. 1137, 1154 (1999)
- C 2137 DOES HISTORY DEFEAT STANDING DOCTRINE?, 102 Mich. L. Rev. 689, 732+ (2004)
- C 2138 ROAD WORK: RACIAL PROFILING AND DRUG INTERDICTION ON THE HIGHWAY, 101 Mich. L. Rev. 651, 754 (2002)
- C 2139 SUSPECTING THE STATES: SUPREME COURT REVIEW OF STATE-COURT STATE-LAW JUDGMENTS, 101 Mich. L. Rev. 80, 178+ (2002)
- C 2140 NO LONGER SAFE AT HOME: PREVENTING THE MISUSE OF FEDERAL COMMON LAW OF FOREIGN RELATIONS AS A DEFENSE TACTIC IN PRIVATE TRANSNATIONAL LITIGATION, 100 Mich. L. Rev. 2408, 2450 (2002)
- C 2141 HOLMES' FAILURE, 96 Mich. L. Rev. 691, 723 (1997)

- C** 2142 SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS BY PLAINTIFFS IN DIVERSITY CASES: MAKING SENSE OF 28 U.S.C. S 1367(B), 93 Mich. L. Rev. 2133, 2170+ (1995)
- C** 2143 THE MEANING OF "UNDER COLOR OF" LAW, 91 Mich. L. Rev. 323, 418+ (1992)
- C** 2144 DOES A COPYRIGHT COOWNER'S DUTY TO ACCOUNT ARISE UNDER FEDERAL LAW?, 90 Mich. L. Rev. 1998, 2034 (1992)
- C** 2145 THE RISE OF THE SUPREME COURT REPORTER: AN INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON MARSHALL COURT ASCENDANCY, 83 Mich. L. Rev. 1291, 1391 (1985)
- C** 2146 "ARISING UNDER" JURISDICTION AND UNIFORMITY IN PATENT LAW, 9 Mich. Telecomm. & Tech. L. Rev. 253, 311+ (2003)
- C** 2147 THE MARSHALL COURT AND THE ORIGINALIST'S DILEMMA, 90 Minn. L. Rev. 612, 677+ (2006)
- C** 2148 TAKING "PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES" SERIOUSLY: A CALL TO EXPAND THE CONSTITUTIONAL CANON, 87 Minn. L. Rev. 153, 232 (2002)
- C** 2149 SHEDDING NEW LIGHT ON AN OLD DEBATE: A FEDERAL INDIAN LAW PERSPECTIVE ON CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY TO LIMIT FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION, 75 Minn. L. Rev. 65, 121 (1990)
- C** 2150 FEDERAL QUESTIONS AND THE HUMAN RIGHTS PARADIGM, 73 Minn. L. Rev. 349, 363+ (1988)
- C** 2151 TEL-OREN v. LIBYAN ARAB REPUBLIC: REDEFINING THE ALIEN TORT CLAIMS ACT, 70 Minn. L. Rev. 211, 240 (1985)
- C** 2152 DO THE CRIME, DO THE TIME, BUT THE TIME SHOULD FIT THE CRIME: DOES MISSISSIPPI NEED SENTENCING GUIDELINES? *White v. State*, 742 So. 2d 1126 (Miss. 1999), 21 Miss. C. L. Rev. 121, 151 (2001)
- C** 2153 CORPORATIONS PRACTICING LAW THROUGH LAWYERS: WHY THE UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW DOCTRINE SHOULD NOT APPLY, 65 Mo. L. Rev. 151, 207+ (2000)
- C** 2154 THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES APPLIES TO INDIAN TRIBES: A REPLY TO PROFESSOR JENSEN, 60 Mont. L. Rev. 17, 34 (1999)
- C** 2155 THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES APPLIES TO INDIAN TRIBES, 59 Mont. L. Rev. 51, 80+ (1998)
- 2156 FEDERAL JURISDICTION IS ADDRESSED, 8/31/92 Nat'l L.J. S4, col. 1, S4, col. 1+ (1992)
- C** 2157 SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND THE USES OF HISTORY, 81 Neb. L. Rev. 1, 114 (2002)
- C** 2158 "BEAM ME UP, THERE'S NO INTELLIGENT LIFE HERE": A DIALOGUE ON THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT WITH LAWYERS FROM MARS, 75 Neb. L. Rev. 551, 573 (1996)
- 2159 133 New Jersey Law Journal 204, ROWLAND V. CALIFORNIA MEN'S ADVISORY COUNCIL, 91-1188 (1993)
- 2160 131 New Jersey Law Journal 734, AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS, PETITIONER V. S.G. AND A.E., 91-594 (1992)
- 2161 FOR THIS RIGHT THERE IS A REMEDY: THE NEW MEXICO SUPREME COURT'S APPLICATION OF EX PARTE YOUNG TO ALLOW SUITS AGAINST THE STATE IN GILL V. PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT BOARD, 35 N.M. L. Rev. 501, 533 (2005)
- 2162 OF HAMMERS AND SAWS: THE TOOLBOX OF FEDERALISM AND SOURCES OF LAW FOR THE WEB, 33 N.M. L. Rev. 115, 144 (2003)
- C** 2163 THE NEW MEXICO TORT CLAIMS ACT: THE KING CAN DO "LITTLE" WRONG, 21 N.M. L. Rev. 441, 479 (1991)
- 2164 DECISION OF INTEREST Southern District Infringing Use of Trademarks to 'Cybersquat' Is a 'Tortious Act' Outside NY, Causing Harm in NY, 8/23/2004 N.Y. L.J. 25, col. 1, 25, col. 1 (2004)
- 2165 DECISION OF INTEREST Southern District 'Mere Presence' of Federal Statute in Statute in Dispute Does Not Confer Subject Matter Jurisdiction, 6/22/2004 N.Y. L.J. 21, col. 1, 21, col. 1 (2004)
- 2166 DECISION OF INTEREST Southern District 'Mere Presence' of Federal Statute in Statute in Dispute Does Not Confer Subject Matter Jurisdiction, 6/22/2004 N.Y. L.J. 21, col. 1, 21, col. 1 (2004)
- 2167 Second Circuit DECISION OF INTEREST U.S. Court of Appeals Court Clarifies Supplemental Jurisdiction Requirement for Permissive Counterclaims, 2/13/2004 N.Y. L.J. 20, col. 3, 20, col. 3 (2004)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2168 District Court DECISION OF INTEREST Nassau County, 5/7/2003 N.Y. L.J. 25, col. 2, 25, col. 2 (2003)
- 2169 DECISION OF INTEREST Richmond County Civil Court, 9/27/2002 N.Y. L.J. 22, col. 3, 22, col. 3 (2002)
- 2170 ANSOUMANA V. GRISTEDE'S OPERATING CORP., 6/5/2001 N.Y. L.J. 26, col. 5, 26, col. 5+ (2001)
- 2171 ARREY V. BEAUX ARTS II, LLC QDS:02762602, 6/29/2000 N.Y. L.J. 35, col. 3, 35, col. 3 (2000)
- 2172 LIPTON V. THE CONSUMERS UNION OF THE UNITED STATES, INC. QDS:02760334, 1/27/99 N.Y. L.J. 34, col. 6, 34, col. 6 (1999)
- 2173 THE AMTRAK DECISION, 3/21/95 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1 (1995)
- 2174 "ONLY A SITH THINKS LIKE THAT": LLEWELLYN'S "DUELING CANONS," ONE TO SEVEN, 50 N.Y.L. Sch. L. Rev. 919, 992 (2006)
- 2175 POSTMODERN ARGUMENTATION: DECONSTRUCTING THE PRESIDENTIAL AGE LIMITATION, 43 N.Y.L. Sch. L. Rev. 451, 521 (1999)
- C** 2176 LEGISLATIVE INTENT: FACT OR FABRICATION? Dynamic Statutory Interpretation by William N. Eskridge. (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1994), 41 N.Y.L. Sch. L. Rev. 1329, 1389 (1997)
- 2177 A QUESTION OF DIGNITY: THE RENEWED SIGNIFICANCE OF JAMES WILSON'S WRITINGS ON POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY IN THE WAKE OF ALDEN V. MAINE, 61 N.Y.U. Ann. Surv. Am. L. 591, 627 (2005)
- C** 2178 THE SEPTEMBER 11 VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND: LEGISLATIVE JUSTICE SUI GENERIS, 59 N.Y.U. Ann. Surv. Am. L. 513, 562+ (2004)
- C** 2179 INDEPENDENT JUDGES, DEPENDENT JUDICIARY: INSTITUTIONALIZING JUDICIAL RESTRAINT, 77 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 962, 1039+ (2002)
- C** 2180 REVIVING HUGO BLACK? THE COURT'S "JOT FOR JOT" ACCOUNT OF SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS, 73 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1086, 1121 (1998)
- C** 2181 AGAINST CONSTITUTIONAL THEORY, 73 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1, 22 (1998)
- C** 2182 SEMINOLE TRIBE, THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, AND THE POTENTIAL EVISCERATION OF EX PARTE YOUNG, 72 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 495, 546+ (1997)
- C** 2183 EX PARTE YOUNG AFTER SEMINOLE TRIBE, 72 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 547, 551+ (1997)
- C** 2184 "ROOT, ROOT, ROOT FOR THE HOME TEAM": PETE ROSE, NOMINAL PARTIES, AND DIVERSITY JURISDICTION, 66 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 148, 188+ (1991)
- C** 2185 THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT: A CASE STUDY IN SPECIALIZED COURTS, 64 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1, 76 (1989)
- C** 2186 RETHINKING COMPULSORY JOINDER: A PROPOSAL TO RESTRUCTURE FEDERAL RULE 19, 60 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1061, 1111+ (1985)
- C** 2187 EXPLAINING HABEAS CORPUS, 60 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 991, 1060 (1985)
- C** 2188 JURISDICTION AND DISCRETION, 60 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 543, 567+ (1985)
- C** 2189 THE THEORY OF PROTECTIVE JURISDICTION, 57 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 933, 965+ (1982)
- C** 2190 SUSPECT CHOICES: LINEUP PROCEDURES AND THE ABDICATION OF JUDICIAL AND PROSECUTORIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPROVING THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM, 27 N.Y.U. Rev. L. & Soc. Change 507, 542+ (2002)
- C** 2191 IN SEARCH OF THE WELCOME MAT: THE SCOPE OF STATUTORY FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION AFTER GRABLE & SONS METAL PRODUCTS, INC. V. DARUE ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING, 84 N.C. L. Rev. 1394, 1413+ (2006)
- C** 2192 THE PARTICULARLY DUBIOUS CASE OF HANS V. LOUISIANA: AN ESSAY ON LAW, RACE, HISTORY, AND "FEDERAL COURTS", 81 N.C. L. Rev. 1927, 2059+ (2003)
- C** 2193 II. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW THE KING CAN DO NO WRONG: HOW THE HARTER v. VERNON COURT IGNORED CONFUSING PRECEDENT AND SIMPLIFIED THE ANALYSIS REQUIRED TO DETERMINE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY, 75 N.C. L. Rev. 2281, 2314 (1997)
- C** 2194 THE POLITICAL GRAMMAR OF EARLY CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 71 N.C. L. Rev. 949, 1009 (1993)

- 2195 THE IDEOLOGIES OF FORUM SHOPPING-WHY DOESN'T A CONSERVATIVE COURT PROTECT DEFENDANTS?, 71 N.C. L. Rev. 649, 720+ (1993)
- 2196 DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN INDIAN COUNTRY: HARMONIZING NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, IOWA MUTUAL, AND THE ABSTENTION DOCTRINE IN THE FEDERAL COURTS, 71 N.D. L. Rev. 519, 540 (1995)
- 2197 PARITY AND THE LITIGATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND GERMANY: EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF CHEMERINSKY'S LITIGANT CHOICE PRINCIPLE, 15 N. Ill. U. L. Rev. 747, 781 (1995)
- 2198 THE TWO FACES OF MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL PRACTICE, 29 N. Ky. L. Rev. 251, 278 (2002)
- 2199 RECONSTRUCTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL JURISPRUDENCE OF SALMON P. CHASE, 21 N. Ky. L. Rev. 41, 89+ (1993)
- 2200 PENDENT PARTY JURISDICTION'S FLIGHT INTO OBLIVION: FINLEY v. UNITED STATES, 18 N. Ky. L. Rev. 315, 336 (1991)
- 2201 A THEORY OF FEDERAL COMMON LAW, 100 Nw. U. L. Rev. 585, 654+ (2006)
- 2202 MAKING SENSE OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT: INTERNATIONAL LAW AND STATE SOVEREIGNTY, 96 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1027, 1098+ (2002)
- 2203 IS JURISDICTION JURISDICTIONAL?, 95 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1207, 1278+ (2001)
- 2204 INTERPRETIVE COMMUNITIES: THE MISSING ELEMENT IN STATUTORY INTERPRETATION, 95 Nw. U. L. Rev. 629, 689 (2001)
- 2205 POLITICAL SCIENCE AND THE NEW LEGAL REALISM: A CASE OF UNFORTUNATE INTERDISCIPLINARY IGNORANCE, 92 Nw. U. L. Rev. 251, 326 (1997)
- 2206 SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND THE RIGHT TO PETITION: TOWARD A FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PURSUE JUDICIAL CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT, 91 Nw. U. L. Rev. 899, 1014+ (1997)
- 2207 CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO EXTEND FEDERAL JURISDICTION TO DISPUTES OUTSIDE ARTICLE III: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF BANKRUPTCY, 87 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1188, 1208+ (1993)
- 2208 IMMUNITY UNDER 42 U.S.C. s 1983: INTERPRETIVE APPROACH AND THE SEARCH FOR THE LEGISLATIVE WILL, 86 Nw. U. L. Rev. 497, 549+ (1992)
- 2209 TAKING ARTICLE III SERIOUSLY: A REPLY TO PROFESSOR FRIEDMAN, 85 Nw. U. L. Rev. 442, 453 (1991)
- 2210 A DIFFERENT DIALOGUE: THE SUPREME COURT, CONGRESS AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION, 85 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1, 61+ (1990)
- 2211 JUDICIAL DISCRETION IN THE ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE UNDER THE FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE, 79 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1097, 1121 (1984)
- 2212 SERIOUS MISCHIEFS: EXXON MOBIL CORP. V. ALLAPATTAH SERVICES, INC., SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION, AND BREAKING THE PROMISE OF FINLEY, 81 Notre Dame L. Rev. 2013, 2058+ (2006)
- 2213 CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE, JUDICIAL DISCRETION, AND THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT, 81 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1149, 1202+ (2006)
- 2214 THE TIDEWATER PROBLEM: ARTICLE III AND CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE, 79 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1925, 1980+ (2004)
- 2215 OF SOVEREIGNTY AND UNION: THE LEGENDS OF ALDEN, 76 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1113, 1182+ (2001)
- 2216 INTERSYSTEMIC REDUNDANCY AND FEDERAL COURT POWER: PROPOSING A ZERO TOLERANCE SOLUTION TO THE DUPLICATIVE LITIGATION PROBLEM, 75 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1347, 1376+ (2000)
- 2217 ONCE MORE UNTO THE BREACH: ELEVENTH AMENDMENT SCHOLARSHIP AND THE COURT, 75 Notre Dame L. Rev. 817, 842+ (2000)
- 2218 PRINCIPLE AND COMPROMISE IN CONSTITUTIONAL ADJUDICATION: THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT AND STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, 75 Notre Dame L. Rev. 953, 1010+ (2000)
- 2219 EDWARD T. YOUNG STILL LIVING THE GOOD LIFE: COEUR D'ALENE TRIBE v. IDAHO, 73 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1077, 1117+ (1998)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2220 ARTICLE III'S CASE/CONTROVERSY DISTINCTION AND THE DUAL FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL COURTS, 69 Notre Dame L. Rev. 447, 532+ (1994)
- 2221 "INCORPORATING" LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS INTO FEDERAL DIVERSITY JURISDICTION: CORRECTING CARDEN v. ARKOMA ASSOCIATES, 65 Notre Dame L. Rev. 287, 307+ (1990)
- 2222 FORMS OF ACTION UNDER THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, 63 Notre Dame L. Rev. 628, 644 (1988)
- 2223 TORT LAW-BARRETT v. UNITED STATES: ABSOLUTE IMMUNITY WRONGFULLY EXTENDED TO ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL DEFENDING THE STATE IN A CIVIL ACTION, 62 Notre Dame L. Rev. 286, 303 (1987)
- 2224 THE RICO CIVIL FRAUD ACTION IN CONTEXT: REFLECTIONS ON BENNETT v. BERG, 58 Notre Dame L. Rev. 237, 349 (1982)
- 2225 THE EXPANDED FEDERAL QUESTION: ON THE "INDEPENDENT VIABILITY" OF DECLARATORY CLAIMS, 57 Notre Dame Law. 809, 827+ (1982)
- 2226 REVISITING THE PAST AND RETHINKING THE FUTURE OF INCIDENTAL JURISDICTION, 17 Ohio N.U. L. Rev. 65, 98+ (1990)
- 2227 THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL STUB OF SECTION 1441(C), 54 Ohio St. L.J. 1059, 1086+ (1993)
- 2228 THE SUPREME COURT AND THE INTERPRETATION OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE, 53 Ohio St. L.J. 1307, 1339 (1992)
- 2229 PREROGATIVE LOST: THE TROUBLE WITH STATUTORY FEDERAL QUESTION DOCTRINE AFTER MERRELL DOW, 52 Ohio St. L.J. 1477, 1570+ (1991)
- 2230 INTRODUCTION TO THE BANKING LAW SYMPOSIUM: A 200 YEAR JOURNEY FROM ANARCHY TO OLIGARCHY, 50 Ohio St. L.J. 1059, 1065 (1989)
- 2231 PRIVATE CONCURRENT LITIGATION IN LIGHT OF YOUNGER, PENNZOIL, AND COLORADO RIVER, 14 Okla. City U. L. Rev. 185, 262+ (1989)
- 2232 FEDERAL QUESTION DOCTRINES AND AMERICAN INDIAN LAW, 14 Okla. City U. L. Rev. 263, 389+ (1989)
- 2233 CERTIORARI AND THE SUPREME COURT AGENDA: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS, 54 Okla. L. Rev. 727, 773 (2001)
- 2234 GUSTAFSON: ONE SMALL STEP (BACKWARD) FOR PRIVATE PLAINTIFFS, ONE GIANT LEAP (BACKWARD) FOR THE SECURITIES BAR, 49 Okla. L. Rev. 425, 454 (1996)
- 2235 FEDERAL JURISDICTION AND PRACTICE: THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS AND THE INTERPRETATION OF "SUE AND BE SUED" CLAUSES, 45 Okla. L. Rev. 739, 746+ (1992)
- 2236 BREAKING THE "UNBREAKABLE RULE": FEDERAL COURTS, ARTICLE I, AND THE PROBLEM OF "RELATED TO" BANKRUPTCY JURISDICTION, 85 Or. L. Rev. 59, 121+ (2006)
- 2237 THE FRANK NASH INAUGURAL LECTURE UNDER CONSTRUCTION: THE CONSTITUTION AND THE MISSOURI CONTROVERSY, 77 Or. L. Rev. 381, 403 (1998)
- 2238 SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. s 1367, 72 Or. L. Rev. 695, 728 (1993)
- 2239 THE STATE AS A "NON-PERSON" UNDER SECTION 1983: SOME COMMENTS ON WILL AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE, 70 Or. L. Rev. 1, 56 (1991)
- 2240 GENERAL LEGITIMACY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW AND THE FUNDAMENTAL BASIS OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 23 Oxford J. Legal Stud. 525, 562 (2003)
- 2241 JUDGES' BENCH MEMORANDUM 2004 Judges' edition Civ. App. No. 03-713 IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TWELFTH CIRCUIT NEW UNION FLY FISHERMEN'S FEDERATION, INC., Appellant, v. NEW UNION POWER & ELECTRIC CO., A, 21 Pace Envtl. L. Rev. 355, 388 (2004)
- 2242 JUDGES' BENCH MEMORANDUM, 12 Pace Envtl. L. Rev. 751, 773+ (1995)
- 2243 SUPERVISORY POWER OF THE NEW YORK COURTS, 14 Pace L. Rev. 41, 110 (1994)
- 2244 BANKRUPTCY AND DIVORCE: THE COURTS SEND A MESSAGE TO CONGRESS, 13 Pace L. Rev. 643, 719 (1993)
- 2245 AMERICAN PARENT BANK LIABILITY FOR FOREIGN BRANCH DEPOSITS: WHICH PARTY BEARS SOVEREIGN RISK?, 18 Pepp. L. Rev. 561, 588 (1991)
- 2246 HOW TO EDIT EFFECTIVELY AND EFFICIENTLY, 37 NO. 2 Prac. Law. 45, 66+ (1991)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2247 WHAT IF THE UNITED NATIONS SUED THE UNITED STATES?: A HYPOTHETICAL CASE ANALYZING THE UN CHARTER AS A GOVERNMENT CONTRACT, 30 Pub. Cont. L.J. 525, 543+ (2001)
- 2248 THE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR DEFENSE IN TORT LIABILITY: A CONTINUING GENESIS, 19 Pub. Cont. L.J. 116, 145 (1989)
- 2249 THE CONSTITUTION'S FINAL INTERPRETER: WE THE PEOPLE, 8 Regent U. L. Rev. 13, 32 (1997)
- 2250 COURTS OF GENERAL JURISDICTION: JUDICIAL POWER EXTENDING TO CASES ARISING UNDER THE "LAWS OF NATURE AND OF NATURE'S GOD", 7 Regent U. L. Rev. 1, 37+ (1996)
- 2251 FEDERAL STATUTORY PROCEDURAL AMENDMENTS - 1990, 34 Res Gestae 546, 547 (1991)
- 2252 JURISDICTIONAL AND TRANSFER PROPOSALS FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION, 10 Rev. Litig. 325, 400 (1991)
- 2253 "ARM OF THE STATE" ANALYSIS IN ELEVENTH AMENDMENT JURISPRUDENCE, 6 Rev. Litig. 193, 226+ (1987)
- 2254 THE TERRITORIAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO AND ITS EFFECT ON THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF THE ISLAND, 39 Rev. Juridica U. Inter. P.R. 13, 66+ (2004)
- 2255 EXPANSION, COMPRESSION AND RELIEF: AN ANALYSIS OF THE JURY'S ROLE IN PATENT INFRINGEMENT CASES EMPLOYING THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS, 2 Roger Williams U. L. Rev. 91, 121 (1996)
- 2256 BALANCING, JUSTICE, AND THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT: JUSTICE STEVENS' THEORY OF STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, 27 Rutgers L.J. 563, 604 (1996)
- 2257 THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U.S. BANKING SYSTEM: FROM COLONIAL CONVENIENCE TO NATIONAL NECESSITY, 28 Rutgers L. Rec. 4, 4+ (2004)
- 2258 THE HALF-OPEN DOOR: ARTICLE III, THE INJURY-IN-FACT RULE, AND THE FRAMERS' PLAN FOR FEDERAL COURTS OF LIMITED JURISDICTION, 54 Rutgers L. Rev. 1, 134 (2001)
- 2259 JUST COMPENSATION OR UNJUST ENRICHMENT? CRITIQUING ATTEMPTS TO CIRCUMVENT STATE SOVEREIGNTY IN REGULATORY TAKINGS LAW, 54 Rutgers L. Rev. 323, 349 (2001)
- 2260 CONSTITUTIONALIZING STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: EX PARTE YOUNG AND THE CONSERVATIVE WING'S ATTEMPT TO RESTORE FEDERALISM AND EMPOWER STATES, 51 Rutgers L. Rev. 229, 273+ (1998)
- 2261 SHAVER v. WOOLWORTH: ENFORCED FEDERALIZATION OF PENDENT CLAIMS, 42 Rutgers L. Rev. 607, 629+ (1990)
- 2262 LAPIDES V. BOARD OF REGENTS AND THE UNTRUSTWORTHINESS OF UNANIMOUS SUPREME COURT DECISIONS, 41 San Diego L. Rev. 1057, 1098+ (2004)
- 2263 EXPATRIATION IN THE UNITED STATES: PRECEPT AND PRACTICE TODAY AND YESTERDAY, 27 San Diego L. Rev. 853, 905 (1990)
- 2264 THE BANKRUPTCY AMENDMENTS AND FEDERAL JUDGESHIP ACT OF 1984: AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL VESTING OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, 23 San Diego L. Rev. 939, 946+ (1986)
- 2265 ERISA: THE SAVINGS CLAUSE, S 502 IMPLIED PREEMPTION, COMPLETE PREEMPTION, AND STATE LAW REMEDIES, 42 Santa Clara L. Rev. 105, 183 (2001)
- 2266 REMOVAL OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS: RETURNING TO THE ORIGINAL INTENT OF CONGRESS, 29 Santa Clara L. Rev. 21, 65+ (1989)
- 2267 SEPARATION OF POWERS-PRESIDENTIAL IMMUNITY-THE PRESIDENT DOES NOT HAVE IMMUNITY FROM CIVIL LIABILITY FOR ACTS TAKEN IN HIS UNOFFICIAL CAPACITY-CLINTON v. JONES, 117 S. CT. 1636 (1997)., 8 Seton Hall Const. L.J. 557, 588 (1998)
- 2268 2 Seton Hall Circuit Review 533, THE MORE THINGS CHANGE, THE MORE THEY STAY THE SAME: GRABLE & SONS v. DARUE ENGINEERING DOES NOT RESOLVE THE SPLIT OVER MERRELL DOW v. THOMPSON (2006)

- © 2269 RESPECTING A STATE'S TORT LAW, WHILE CONFINING ITS REACH TO THAT STATE, 31 Seton Hall L. Rev. 698, 733 (2001)
- © 2270 THE FEDERALISTS AND THE FEDERALIST: A FORGOTTEN HISTORY, 31 Seton Hall L. Rev. 18, 29+ (2000)
- © 2271 WHEN A MAJORITY LOSES ON THE MERITS: MILLER V. ALBRIGHT AND THE PROBLEM OF SPLINTERED JUDGMENTS, 29 Seton Hall L. Rev. 816, 842+ (1998)
- © 2272 STATE IMMUNITY IN BANKRUPTCY AFTER SEMINOLE TRIBE v. FLORIDA, 28 Seton Hall L. Rev. 29, 74+ (1997)
- © 2273 CONSTITUTIONAL LAW-SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY-STATES MAY NOT IMPOSE CIVIL PENALTIES ON THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR VIOLATIONS OF STATE STATUTES PROMULGATED UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND THE RESOURCE, 23 Seton Hall L. Rev. 762, 789 (1993)
- © 2274 HISTORICIZING JUDICIAL SCRUTINY, 57 S.C. L. Rev. 1, 83+ (2005)
- © 2275 THE NEW BREED OF PERMISSIVE COUNTERCLAIM: SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION AFTER 28 U.S.C. S 1367, 56 S.C. L. Rev. 607, 625+ (2005)
- © 2276 FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS: TOLLING STATE STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS AND THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF 28 U.S.C. S 1367(D), 54 S.C. L. Rev. 1047, 1068+ (2003)
- © 2277 FULL FAITH AND CREDIT IN THREE FEDERATIONS, 46 S.C. L. Rev. 979, 1025 (1995)
- © 2278 TOWARD A TRUER SENSE OF SOVEREIGNTY: FIDUCIARY DUTY IN INDIAN CORPORATIONS, 39 S.D. L. Rev. 49, 92 (1994)
- © 2279 THE INEVITABILITY OF INSEPARABILITY: RELIGION, ETHICS, AND FEDERAL JUDICIAL POLITICS, 43 S. Tex. L. Rev. 35, 72+ (2001)
- © 2280 THE PROMISE AND PERILS OF ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY IN SUITS AGAINST PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 36 S. Tex. L. Rev. 85, 108 (1995)
- © 2281 THE DECONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION OF HABEAS, 78 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1125, 1220 (2005)
- © 2282 THE COMMON LAW'S CASE AGAINST NON-PRECEDENTIAL OPINIONS, 76 S. Cal. L. Rev. 755, 797+ (2003)
- © 2283 POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY IN EVIDENCE LAW, 63 S. Cal. L. Rev. 937, 1013+ (1990)
- © 2284 UNDERSTANDING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY CONTRACT CLAUSE: THE ROLE OF THE PROPERTY-PRIVILEGE DISTINCTION AND "TAKINGS" CLAUSE JURISPRUDENCE, 60 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1, 108 (1986)
- © 2285 MENDING THE WEATHERED JURISDICTIONAL FENCES IN THE SUPREME COURT'S SECURITIES FRAUD DECISIONS, 49 SMU L. Rev. 159, 221 (1996)
- © 2286 CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN MARSHALL AND FEDERALISM, 16 St. John's J. Legal Comment. 351, 370+ (2002)
- © 2287 NO WELCOME MAT, NO PROBLEM?: FEDERAL-QUESTION JURISDICTION AFTER GRABLE, 80 St. John's L. Rev. 621, 653+ (2006)
- © 2288 SEMINOLE SPEAKS TO SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AND EX PARTE YOUNG, 71 St. John's L. Rev. 739, 766 (1997)
- © 2289 IT'S MORE THAN A CONSTITUTION, 49 St. Louis U. L.J. 749, 775 (2005)
- © 2290 JUDICIAL EPOCHS IN SUPREME COURT HISTORY: SIFTING THROUGH THE FOSSIL RECORD FOR STITCHES IN TIME AND SWITCHES IN NINE, 47 St. Louis U. L.J. 677, 735 (2003)
- © 2291 THE CONSTITUTION AND RECONSTITUTION OF THE STANDING DOCTRINE, 30 St. Mary's L.J. 471, 547+ (1999)
- © 2292 THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S MACHIAVELLIAN IMPEDIMENT OF THE STATES' COLLECTION OF PROPERTY TAXES THROUGH THE FDIC'S REGULATION OF FAILED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS: DOES THE END JUSTIFY THE LIENS?, 25 St. Mary's L.J. 493, 532+ (1993)
- © 2293 THE EVOLVING CONCEPT OF PREEMPTION REMOVAL: AN EXPANSION OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION, 20 St. Mary's L.J. 189, 210+ (1988)
- © 2294 THINKING ABOUT FEDERAL JURISDICTION-OF SERPENTS AND SWALLOWS, 17 St. Mary's L.J. 239, 271 (1986)

- 2295 BEYOND RFRA: FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION COMES OF AGE IN THE STATE COURTS, 10 St. Thomas L. Rev. 235, 279+ (1998)
- 2296 OVERCOMING IMMUNITY: THE CASE OF FEDERAL REGULATION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, 53 Stan. L. Rev. 1331, 1391 (2001)
- 2297 DEMODELING HABEAS, 45 Stan. L. Rev. 575, 592+ (1993)
- 2298 THE IDEA OF A CASE, 42 Stan. L. Rev. 227, 319+ (1990)
- 2299 BLYEW: VARIATIONS ON A JURISDICTIONAL THEME, 41 Stan. L. Rev. 469, 535+ (1989)
- 2300 THE METAPHOR OF STANDING AND THE PROBLEM OF SELF-GOVERNANCE, 40 Stan. L. Rev. 1371, 1516+ (1988)
- 2301 A HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT: A NARROW CONSTRUCTION OF AN AFFIRMATIVE GRANT OF JURISDICTION RATHER THAN A PROHIBITION AGAINST JURISDICTION, 35 Stan. L. Rev. 1033, 1084+ (1983)
- 2302 TORTURE AS A TORT IN VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW: FILARTIGA v. PE NA-IRALA, 33 Stan. L. Rev. 353, 369+ (1981)
- 2303 RESERVED WATER RIGHTS, INDIAN RIGHTS AND THE NARROWING SCOPE OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION: THE COLORADO RIVER DECISION, 30 Stan. L. Rev. 1111, 1148+ (1978)
- 2304 THE NEW JUDICIAL FEDERALISM, 29 Stan. L. Rev. 1191, 1244 (1977)
- 2305 VENUE IN ACTIONS FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT, 25 Stan. L. Rev. 551, 585 (1973)
- 2306 THE NEW PENDENT JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL COURTS, 20 Stan. L. Rev. 262, 286 (1968)
- 2307 THE SUPREME COURT AND THE ATTRITION OF STATE POWER, 10 Stan. L. Rev. 274, 296 (1958)
- 2308 MCCULLOCH v. MARYLAND RIGHT PRINCIPLE, WRONG CASE, 9 Stan. L. Rev. 710, 730+ (1957)
- 2309 RULE X-10B-5: AN UNLIKELY BASIS FOR EXPANDING FEDERAL JURISDICTION, 9 Stan. L. Rev. 589, 597+ (1957)
- 2310 JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ARMY DISCHARGE PROCEDURES, 9 Stan. L. Rev. 170, 182+ (1956)
- 2311 IMMUNITY OF GOVERNMENT OFFICERS: EFFECTS OF THE LARSON CASE, 8 Stan. L. Rev. 683, 693+ (1956)
- 2312 FEDERALISM AND BREACH OF THE LABOR AGREEMENT, 7 Stan. L. Rev. 445, 479 (1955)
- 2313 CITIZENSHIP LOST BY FOREIGN RESIDENCE, 2 Stan. L. Rev. 582, 588+ (1950)
- 2314 ON THE FEDERALIZATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE, 23 Stetson L. Rev. 651, 694 (1994)
- 2315 6 J. High Tech. L. 165, THE PLENARY POWER OF STATES TO INFRINGE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY UNDER THE CLOAK OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY (2006)
- 2316 SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION-ACTION UNDER ANTICYBERSQUATTING CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT DOES NOT VIOLATE ARTICLE III OF CONSTITUTION-SALLEN v. CORINTHIANS LICENCIAMENTOS LTDA, 273 F.3D 14 (1ST CIR. 2001), 36 Suffolk U. L. Rev. 899, 905+ (2003)
- 2317 INTERNATIONAL LAW--ALIEN TORT STATUTE FEDERAL SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OVER EXTRATERRITORIAL TORT CLAIMS INVOLVING OFFICIAL TORTURE--TRAJANO v. MARCOS, 978 F.2D 493 (9TH CIR. 1992), 27 Suffolk U. L. Rev. 282, 291 (1993)
- 2318 CIVIL PROCEDURE-AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL DISTRICT COURTS TO AUTHORIZE NOTICE TO POTENTIAL PLAINTIFFS IN ADEA ACTIONS-HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE, INC. v. SPERLING, 110 S. CT. 484 (1989), 24 Suffolk U. L. Rev. 205, 212 (1990)
- 2319 THE FESTO DECISION AND THE RETURN OF THE SUPREME COURT TO THE BAR OF PATENTS, 2002 Sup. Ct. Rev. 273, 342+ (2002)
- 2320 THE COURT AND THE CORPORATION: JURISPRUDENCE, LOCALISM, AND FEDERALISM, 1997 Sup. Ct. Rev. 403, 437+ (1997)
- 2321 JOHN MARSHALL'S JUDICIAL RHETORIC, 1996 Sup. Ct. Rev. 439, 457+ (1996)
- 2322 UBI REMEDIUM IBI JUS, OR, WHERE THERE'S A REMEDY, THERE'S A RIGHT: A SKEPTIC'S CRITIQUE OF EX PARTE YOUNG, 54 Syracuse L. Rev. 215, 367+ (2004)

- 2323 WHITHER WELTOVER: HAS THE U.S. SUPREME COURT CLARIFIED OR CONFUSED THE EXCEPTIONS ENUMERATED IN THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT?, 9 Temp. Int'l & Comp. L.J. 1, 25 (1995)
- 2324 BRINGING INTERNET INFORMATION TO COURT: OF "LEGISLATIVE FACTS", 75 Temp. L. Rev. 99, 123 (2002)
- 2325 WHAT IS AUTHORITY? CREATION AND USE OF CASE LAW BY PENNSYLVANIA'S APPELLATE COURTS, 72 Temp. L. Rev. 303, 380 (1999)
- 2326 THE \$50,000 QUESTION: DOES SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION EXTEND TO CLAIMS BETWEEN DIVERSE PARTIES WHICH DO NOT MEET S 1332'S AMOUNT-IN-CONTROVERSY REQUIREMENT?, 68 Temp. L. Rev. 107, 141 (1995)
- 2327 FISCAL FEDERALISM: WHO CONTROLS THE STATES PURSE STRINGS?, 63 Temp. L. Rev. 251, 268+ (1990)
- 2328 THE SCHIAVO LITIGATION: A CASE STUDY FOR FEDERALISM, 15 Temp. Pol. & Civ. Rts. L. Rev. 423, 448+ (2006)
- 2329 JOINDER AND JURISDICTION IN THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURTS: THE STATE OF THE UNION OF RULES AND STATUTES, 69 Tenn. L. Rev. 35, 64 (2001)
- 2330 IS THE SKY FALLING ON THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT? STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, THE SECTION FIVE POWER, AND THE FEDERAL BALANCE Narrowing the Nation's Power: The Supreme Court Sides with the States. By John T. Noonan, Jr. Berkel, 81 Tex. L. Rev. 1551, 1608 (2003)
- 2331 SEPARATION OF POWERS AS A SAFEGUARD OF FEDERALISM, 79 Tex. L. Rev. 1321, 1459 (2001)
- 2332 THE ARTICLE III BOX: THE POWER OF "CONGRESS" TO ATTACK THE "JURISDICTION" OF "FEDERAL COURTS", 78 Tex. L. Rev. 1405, 1431 (2000)
- 2333 ARTFUL PLEADING: A DOCTRINE IN SEARCH OF DEFINITION, 76 Tex. L. Rev. 1781, 1828 (1998)
- 2334 FEDERAL JURISDICTION AND THE PROBLEM OF THE LITIGATIVE UNIT: WHEN DOES WHAT "ARISE UNDER" FEDERAL LAW?, 76 Tex. L. Rev. 1829, 1861+ (1998)
- 2335 RIOTOUS UNCERTAINTY: A QUARREL WITH THE "COMMENTATORS' RULE" AGAINST SECTION 1441(C) REMOVAL FOR COUNTERCLAIM, CROSS-CLAIM, AND THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANTS, 75 Tex. L. Rev. 659, 686+ (1997)
- 2336 STATE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: AMERICAN LESSONS FOR AUSTRALIAN ADVENTURES, 63 Tex. L. Rev. 1225, 1267 (1985)
- 2337 FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER PREEMPTION CLAIMS: A POST-FRANCHISE TAX BOARD ANALYSIS, 62 Tex. L. Rev. 893, 896+ (1984)
- 2338 JURIES, JURISDICTION, AND RACE DISCRIMINATION: THE LOST PROMISE OF STRAUDEY v. WEST VIRGINIA, 61 Tex. L. Rev. 1401, 1445+ (1983)
- 2339 3 Tex. Tech. J. Tex. Admin. L. 225, IS TEXAS WAIVING GOOD-BYE TO SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY? (2002)
- 2340 THE REHNQUIST COURT'S FEDERALISM DECISIONS IN PERSPECTIVE, 15 J.L. & Pol. 127, 194 (1999)
- 2341 PANEL FOUR RELIMITING FEDERAL JUDICIAL POWER: SHOULD CONGRESS PLAY A ROLE?, 13 J.L. & Pol. 627, 668 (1997)
- 2342 THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE AND THE POPULAR VOTE, 12 J.L. & Pol. 665, 747+ (1996)
- 2343 CIVIL PROCEDURE-FREE V. ABBOTT LABORATORIES: SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION FOR PENDENT PLAINTIFFS BECOMES MORE AFFORDABLE, 27 U. Mem. L. Rev. 229, 245+ (1996)
- 2344 FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT UPHOLDS STATE BAR IN ALLSTATE CASE, 2001-JAN W. Va. Law. 20, 23 (2001)
- 2345 THE CURTAILMENT OF FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION: SEMINOLE TRIBE OF FLORIDA V. FLORIDA, 24 T. Marshall L. Rev. 109, 127+ (1998)
- 2346 THE LEGACY OF THURGOOD MARSHALL IN STRAWBERRY SEASON, 23 T. Marshall L. Rev. 19, 43 (1997)
- 2347 COMMENTARY ON REPRESENTATIVE JUSTICE, 16 T. Marshall L. Rev. 57, 74 (1990)

- 2348 INDIAN SOVERIEGNTY--BEYOND THE "WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT RULE", 15 T. Marshall L. Rev. 169, 169+ (1990)
- 2349 PRIOR WRITTEN NOTICE STATUTES IN NEW YORK STATE: THE RESURRECTION OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, 10 Touro L. Rev. 705, 725+ (1994)
- 2350 INTERSECTIONS OF STATE AND FEDERAL POWER: STATE JUDGES, FEDERAL LAW, AND THE "RELIANCE PRINCIPLE", 81 Tul. L. Rev. 283, 329 (2006)
- 2351 ERIE AND CHOICE OF LAW AFTER THE CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT, 80 Tul. L. Rev. 1723, 1770 (2006)
- 2352 DEMOCRATIC THEORY AND THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS: MOURNING THE DEATH OF ORIGINALISM IN STATUTORY INTERPRETATION, 68 Tul. L. Rev. 803, 881 (1994)
- 2353 WILLY v. COASTAL CORP.: THE FIFTH CIRCUIT BLOWS THE WHISTLE ON REMOVAL JURISDICTION, 63 Tul. L. Rev. 1230, 1232+ (1989)
- 2354 LAMKIN v. BROOKS: EXPANDING MUNICIPAL TORT LIABILITY BEYOND THE CITY LIMITS, 61 Tul. L. Rev. 1556, 1563 (1987)
- 2355 LOUISIANA'S BANKING REVOLUTION: RECODIFICATION AND MULTIBANKING, 59 Tul. L. Rev. 602, 650 (1985)
- 2356 FEDERAL JURISDICTION-FOREIGN PLAINTIFFS MAY SUE FOREIGN SOVEREIGNS IN FEDERAL COURTS ON NON-FEDERAL CAUSES OF ACTION, 58 Tul. L. Rev. 1534, 1547+ (1984)
- 2357 CIVIL LIBERTIES, NATIONAL SECURITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES: A SNAPSHOT IN CONTEXT, 3 U.C. Davis J. Int'l L. & Pol'y 143, 158 (1997)
- 2358 PAY NO ATTENTION TO THE MEN BEHIND THE CURTAIN: THE SUPREME COURT, POPULAR CULTURE, AND THE COUNTERMAJORITARIAN PROBLEM, 73 UMKC L. Rev. 53, 82 (2004)
- 2359 PROSPECTUS FOR THE AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE'S FEDERAL JUDICIAL CODE REVISION PROJECT, 31 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 855, 1034+ (1998)
- 2360 NATIONAL RULEMAKING THROUGH TRIAL COURTS: THE BIG CASE AND INSTITUTIONAL REFORM, 51 UCLA L. Rev. 1015, 1078 (2004)
- 2361 AN INTERMEDIATE SOLUTION TO STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: FEDERAL APPELLATE COURT REVIEW OF STATE-COURT JUDGMENTS AFTER SEMINOLE TRIBE, 46 UCLA L. Rev. 161, 229+ (1998)
- 2362 THE EFFECTS OF CASE CONSOLIDATION ON THE PROCEDURAL RIGHTS OF LITIGANTS: WHAT THEY ARE, WHAT THEY MIGHT BE PART 1: JUSTICIABILITY AND JURISDICTION (ORIGINAL AND APPELLATE), 42 UCLA L. Rev. 717, 836+ (1995)
- 2363 PARITY RECONSIDERED: DEFINING A ROLE FOR THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY, 36 UCLA L. Rev. 233, 240+ (1988)
- 2364 JUDICIAL PARITY, LITIGANT CHOICE, AND DEMOCRATIC THEORY: A COMMENT ON FEDERAL JURISDICTION AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, 36 UCLA L. Rev. 329, 368 (1988)
- 2365 THE PROTECTIVE JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL COURTS, 30 UCLA L. Rev. 542, 547+ (1983)
- 2366 THE PRESIDENT, THE SUPREME COURT, AND THE FOUNDING FATHERS: A REPLY TO PROFESSOR ACKERMAN, 73 U. Chi. L. Rev. 469, 485 (2006)
- 2367 THE ILLEGITIMACY OF PROTECTIVE JURISDICTION OVER FOREIGN AFFAIRS, 70 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1487, 1512+ (2003)
- 2368 THE "CONSERVATIVE" PATHS OF THE REHNQUIST COURT'S FEDERALISM DECISIONS, 69 U. Chi. L. Rev. 429, 494 (2002)
- 2369 THE CASE AGAINST RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT OF 1976, 68 U. Chi. L. Rev. 253, 277 (2001)
- 2370 ARTICLE III AND THE WESTFALL ACT: IDENTIFYING "FEDERAL INGREDIENTS", 64 U. Chi. L. Rev. 925, 952+ (1997)
- 2371 THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO LIMIT THE JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL COURTS AND THE TEXT OF ARTICLE III, 64 U. Chi. L. Rev. 203, 256 (1997)
- 2372 RULE 11 AND FEDERAL SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: RESPECTING THE EXPLICIT WAIVER REQUIREMENT, 60 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1043, 1070 (1993)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2373 THE STATES CAN WAIT: THE IMMEDIATE APPEALABILITY OF ORDERS DENYING ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY, 59 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1617, 1643+ (1992)
- 2374 THE STANDING OF QUI TAM RELATORS UNDER THE FALSE CLAIMS ACT, 57 U. Chi. L. Rev. 543, 571 (1990)
- 2375 EXCHANGE ON THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 57 U. Chi. L. Rev. 118, 122+ (1990)
- 2376 EXCHANGE ON THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 57 U. Chi. L. Rev. 131, 140 (1990)
- 2377 THE DIVERSITY EXPLANATION OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT: A REPLY TO CRITICS, 56 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1261, 1299 (1989)
- 2378 MARBURY, SECTION 13, AND THE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT, 56 U. Chi. L. Rev. 443, 499+ (1989)
- 2379 SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, THE OFFICER SUIT FICTION, AND ENTITLEMENT BENEFITS, 56 U. Chi. L. Rev. 295, 302+ (1989)
- 2380 STATE SOVEREIGNTY AND THE TENTH AND ELEVENTH AMENDMENTS, 56 U. Chi. L. Rev. 61, 122+ (1989)
- 2381 THE CONSTITUTION IN THE SUPREME COURT: THE NEW DEAL, 1931-1940, 54 U. Chi. L. Rev. 504, 555 (1987)
- 2382 THE CONSTITUTION IN THE SUPREME COURT: THE PROTECTION OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS, 1889-1910, 52 U. Chi. L. Rev. 324, 388+ (1985)
- 2383 THE COMMON LAW POWERS OF FEDERAL COURTS, 52 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1, 72 (1985)
- 2384 THE CONSTITUTION IN THE SUPREME COURT: LIMITATIONS ON STATE POWER, 1865-1873, 51 U. Chi. L. Rev. 329, 365 (1984)
- 2385 FEDERAL PREEMPTION, REMOVAL JURISDICTION, AND THE WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT RULE, 51 U. Chi. L. Rev. 634, 667+ (1984)
- 2386 THE CONSTITUTION IN THE SUPREME COURT: CIVIL WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION, 1865-1873, 51 U. Chi. L. Rev. 131, 148+ (1984)
- 2387 THE CONSTITUTION IN THE SUPREME COURT: STATE AND CONGRESSIONAL POWERS, 1801-1835, 49 U. Chi. L. Rev. 887, 975+ (1982)
- 2388 THE CONSTITUTION IN THE SUPREME COURT: THE POWERS OF THE FEDERAL COURTS, 1801-1835, 49 U. Chi. L. Rev. 646, 647+ (1982)
- 2389 JURISDICTION AND DISCRETION IN HYBRID LAW CASES, 75 U. Cin. L. Rev. 145, 203+ (2006)
- 2390 ABSURD RESULTS, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, AND STATUTORY INTERPRETATION, 75 U. Cin. L. Rev. 25, 85 (2006)
- 2391 IN THE NAME OF FEDERALISM: THE SUPREME COURT'S ASSAULT ON DEMOCRACY AND CIVIL RIGHTS, 70 U. Cin. L. Rev. 367, 432 (2002)
- 2392 CONSTITUTIONAL LAW-FEDERAL JURISDICTION-FEDERALISM-THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT PROHIBITS A FEDERAL COURT FROM ENJOINING STATE OFFICIALS ON THE BASIS OF A PENDENT STATE LAW CLAIM WHEN THE REQUESTED RELIEF HAS A DIRECT IMPACT O, 53 U. Cin. L. Rev. 877, 888+ (1984)
- 2393 FEDERALISM AND THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 48 U. Colo. L. Rev. 139, 155+ (1977)
- 2394 FEDERAL SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION: WHEN DOES A CASE INVOLVING THE BREACH OF A COPYRIGHT LICENSING CONTRACT "ARISE UNDER" THE COPYRIGHT ACT?, 19 U. Dayton L. Rev. 165, 171+ (1993)
- 2395 ALDINGER v. HOWARD, TITLE VII AND PENDENT JURISDICTION: HAS THE TAIL BEEN CUT FROM THE DOG?, 63 U. Det. L. Rev. 723, 749+ (1986)
- 2396 REINVENTING THE GOVERNMENT CORPORATION, 1995 U. Ill. L. Rev. 543, 551+ (1995)
- 2397 THE TRUE COMPASS: NO FEDERAL QUESTION IN A STATE LAW CLAIM, 55 U. Kan. L. Rev. 1, 60+ (2006)
- 2398 BEWARE OF BANKS BEARING GIFTS: GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY AND THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL PRIVACY LEGISLATION, 55 U. Miami L. Rev. 163, 235+ (2001)
- 2399 DEMOCRACY AND DETERMINACY: AN ESSAY ON LEGAL INTERPRETATION, 43 U. Miami L. Rev. 541, 576 (1989)

- 2400 AGENT ORANGE AND THE GOVERNMENT CONTRACT DEFENSE: ARE MILITARY MANUFACTURERS IMMUNE FROM PRODUCTS LIABILITY?, 36 U. Miami L. Rev. 489, 532 (1982)
- 2401 IGARTÚA DE LA ROSA V. UNITED STATES THE RIGHT OF THE UNITED STATES CITIZENS OF PUERTO RICO TO VOTE FOR THE PRESIDENT AND THE NEED TO RE-EVALUATE AMERICA'S TERRITORIAL POLICY, 4 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 141, 183+ (2001)
- 2402 THE PUZZLE OF COMPLETE PREEMPTION, 155 U. Pa. L. Rev. 537, 579+ (2007)
- 2403 DEFINING THE OFFICE: JOHN MARSHALL AS CHIEF JUSTICE, 154 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1421, 1461+ (2006)
- 2404 JURISDICTION STRIPPING, CONSTITUTIONAL SUPREMACY, AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF EX PARTE YOUNG, 153 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1677, 1708 (2005)
- 2405 REMOVAL JURISDICTION AND THE ALL WRITS ACT, 148 U. Pa. L. Rev. 401, 471+ (1999)
- 2406 SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION AND SECTION 1367: THE CASE FOR A SYMPATHETIC TEXTUALISM, 148 U. Pa. L. Rev. 109, 161 (1999)
- 2407 FEDERAL COMMON LAW: A STRUCTURAL REINTERPRETATION, 144 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1245, 1376+ (1996)
- 2408 THE TWO-TIERED STRUCTURE OF THE JUDICIARY ACT OF 1789, 138 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1499, 1567+ (1990)
- 2409 THE HISTORY AND STRUCTURE OF ARTICLE III, 138 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1569, 1632+ (1990)
- 2410 TEXT, STRUCTURE, AND COMMON SENSE IN THE INTERPRETATION OF ARTICLE III, 138 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1633, 1649 (1990)
- 2411 REPORTS OF MY DEATH ARE GREATLY EXAGGERATED: A REPLY, 138 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1651, 1673 (1990)
- 2412 FEDERAL COMMON LAW POWER TO REMAND A PROPERLY REMOVED CASE, 136 U. Pa. L. Rev. 583, 624+ (1987)
- 2413 DYNAMIC STATUTORY INTERPRETATION, 135 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1479, 1555 (1987)
- 2414 ORIGINS OF FEDERAL COMMON LAW: PART TWO, 133 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1231, 1333+ (1985)
- 2415 ABUSING STANDING: A COMMENT ON ALLEN v. WRIGHT, 133 U. Pa. L. Rev. 635, 659 (1985)
- 2416 ON BLAZING TRAILS: JUDGE FRIENDLY AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION, 133 U. Pa. L. Rev. 5, 9 (1984)
- 2417 THE STAGES OF THE DECLINE OF THE PUBLIC/PRIVATE DISTINCTION, 130 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1349, 1357+ (1982)
- 2418 CIVIL RIGHTS ATTORNEYS' FEES IN CASES RESOLVED ON STATE PENDENT AND FEDERAL STATUTORY GROUNDS, 130 U. Pa. L. Rev. 488, 520+ (1981)
- 2419 ASSUMING JURISDICTION ARGUENDO: THE RATIONALE AND LIMITS OF HYPOTHETICAL JURISDICTION, 127 U. Pa. L. Rev. 712, 754 (1979)
- 2420 THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT AND OTHER SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY DOCTRINES: CONGRESSIONAL IMPOSITION OF SUIT OPON THE STATES, 126 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1203, 1280+ (1978)
- 2421 THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE PURSE, 126 U. Pa. L. Rev. 715, 794 (1978)
- 2422 THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT AND OTHER SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY DOCTRINES: PART ONE, 126 U. Pa. L. Rev. 515, 518+ (1978)
- 2423 ABSTENTION IN CONSTITUTIONAL CASES: THE SCOPE OF THE PULLMAN ABSTENTION DOCTRINE, 122 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1071, 1187+ (1974)
- 2424 REGULATION OF WHITE HOUSE DEMONSTRATIONS, 119 U. Pa. L. Rev. 668, 683 (1971)
- 2425 THE BROKEN COMPASS: THE REQUIREMENT THAT A CASE ARISE "DIRECTLY" UNDER FEDERAL LAW, 115 U. Pa. L. Rev. 890, 916+ (1967)
- 2426 STATUTE LIMITING TORT ACTIONS AGAINST MUNICIPALITIES TO STATE COURTS DEPRIVES FEDERAL COURT OF DIVERSITY JURISDICITON, 109 U. Pa. L. Rev. 428, 433+ (1961)
- 2427 LAW AND PERSUASION: THE LANGUAGE-BEHAVIOR OF LAWYERS, 108 U. Pa. L. Rev. 35, 58 (1959)

- 2428 EXPATRIATION FOR VOTING IN FOREIGN POLITICAL ELECTION HELD NECESSARY AND PROPER TO CONGRESS' FOREIGN AFFAIRS POWER, 107 U. Pa. L. Rev. 118, 122 (1958)
- 2429 INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF SECTION 301(a) OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 103 U. Pa. L. Rev. 902, 904+ (1955)
- 2430 AMERICAN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS UNTIL 1860, 103 U. Pa. L. Rev. 125, 132 (1954)
- 2431 FEDERAL JURISDICTION--ACTION BASED ON GEORGIA LAW FOR INJURIES IN CEDED AREA PRESENTS FEDERAL QUESTION, 101 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1076, 1078 (1953)
- 2432 ARTICLE III AND THE "RELATED TO" BANKRUPTCY JURISDICTION: A CASE STUDY IN PROTECTIVE JURISDICTION, 11 U. Puget Sound L. Rev. 1, 5+ (1987)
- C** 2433 ADVANCING TRIBAL SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AS A PATHWAY TO POWER, 27 U.S.F. L. Rev. 419, 475 (1993)
- C** 2434 THE SUPREME COURT'S ANALYSIS IN IDAHO V. COEUR D'ALENE TRIBE OF IDAHO: IS THE YOUNG EXCEPTION TO THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT INAPPLICABLE TO INDIAN TRIBE CLAIMS?, 30 U. Tol. L. Rev. 131, 158+ (1998)
- C** 2435 A USER'S GUIDE TO SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION, 27 U. Tol. L. Rev. 85, 97 (1995)
- 2436 TENTH CIRCUIT JUDICIAL CONFERENCE, 2005 Utah L. Rev. 141, 164+ (2005)
- C** 2437 A CIVIC-REPUBLICAN VISION OF "DOMESTIC DEPENDENT NATIONS" IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY RE-ENVISIONED, REINVIGORATED, AND RE-EMPOWERED, 2005 Utah L. Rev. 443, 571 (2005)
- 2438 EX PARTE YOUNG AND CONGRESSIONAL ABROGATION: CAN THE TWO PEACEFULLY COEXIST?, 2003 Utah L. Rev. 949, 982 (2003)
- C** 2439 TAKING EXCEPTION TO TRADITIONAL EXCEPTIONS CLAUSE JURISPRUDENCE: ON CONGRESS'S POWER TO LIMIT THE COURT'S JURISDICTION, 2001 Utah L. Rev. 125, 187+ (2001)
- C** 2440 HOW THE JUDICIARY STOLE THE RIGHT TO PETITION, 31 UWLA L. Rev. 257, 306 (2000)
- C** 2441 IT'S ALL IN THE TIMING: RETHINKING REMAND OF SUPPLEMENTAL CLAIMS TO PRESERVE COURT RESOURCES, 38 Val. U. L. Rev. 1459, 1467+ (2004)
- C** 2442 HOW TO SUE THE PRESIDENT: A PROPOSAL FOR LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING THE EXTENT OF PRESIDENTIAL IMMUNITY, 30 Val. U. L. Rev. 283, 333 (1995)
- C** 2443 FOREIGN RELATIONS AND FEDERAL QUESTIONS: RESOLVING THE JUDICIAL SPLIT ON FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION, 35 Vand. J. Transnat'l L. 1637, 1678 (2002)
- C** 2444 BEYOND MARBURY: JURISDICTIONAL SELF-DEALING IN SEMINOLE TRIBE, 52 Vand. L. Rev. 407, 487+ (1999)
- C** 2445 LATE NIGHT CONFESSIONS IN THE HART AND WECHSLER HOTEL, 47 Vand. L. Rev. 993, 1018 (1994)
- C** 2446 TWINS SEPARATED AT BIRTH: A COMPARATIVE HISTORY OF THE CIVIL AND CRIMINAL ARISING UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL COURTS AND SOME PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE, 19 Vt. L. Rev. 673, 793+ (1995)
- C** 2447 STEALTH PREEMPTION: THE PROPOSED FEDERALIZATION OF STATE COURT PROCEDURES, 44 Vill. L. Rev. 1, 65+ (1999)
- C** 2448 SEPARATION OF POWERS AND THE SEPARATE TREATMENT OF CONTRACT CLAIMS AGAINST THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE, 43 Vill. L. Rev. 155, 218 (1998)
- C** 2449 A JURISDICTIONAL "NIGHTMARE": DETERMINING WHEN AN INTERDEPENDENT COPYRIGHT AND CONTRACT CLAIM "ARISES UNDER" THE COPYRIGHT ACT IN SCHOLASTIC ENTERTAINMENT, INC. V. FOX ENTERTAINMENT GROUP, INC., 11 Vill. Sports & Ent. L.J. 271, 302+ (2004)
- C** 2450 THE DIVERSITY THEORY OF THE ALIEN TORT STATUTE, 42 Va. J. Int'l L. 649, 685 (2002)
- C** 2451 TREATIES AND THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 42 Va. J. Int'l L. 713, 742 (2002)
- C** 2452 TREATIES, SELF-EXECUTION, AND THE PUBLIC LAW LITIGATION MODEL, 42 Va. J. Int'l L. 757, 788 (2002)
- C** 2453 INTERNATIONAL UNIFORM LAWS IN NATIONAL COURTS: THE INFLUENCE OF DOMESTIC LAW IN CONFLICTS OF INTERPRETATION, 27 Va. J. Int'l L. 729, 802+ (1987)
- C** 2454 JUDICIAL TAKINGS AND THE COURSE PURSUED, 90 Va. L. Rev. 1487, 1535 (2004)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- C 2455 OUR MARBURY, 89 Va. L. Rev. 1235, 1412+ (2003)
- C 2456 THE CONSTITUTIONAL JOURNEY OF MARBURY V. MADISON, 89 Va. L. Rev. 1463, 1573+ (2003)
- C 2457 STATES AS NATIONS: DIGNITY IN CROSS-DOCTRINAL PERSPECTIVE, 89 Va. L. Rev. 1, 107+ (2003)
- C 2458 REDISTRIBUTIVE LITIGATION-JUDICIAL INNOVATION, PRIVATE EXPECTATIONS, AND THE SHADOW OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, 88 Va. L. Rev. 789, 878 (2002)
- C 2459 HOW GREAT WERE THE "GREAT" MARSHALL COURT DECISIONS?, 87 Va. L. Rev. 1111, 1184 (2001)
- C 2460 STARE DECISIS AND DEMONSTRABLY ERRONEOUS PRECEDENTS, 87 Va. L. Rev. 1, 84+ (2001)
- C 2461 PREEMPTION, 86 Va. L. Rev. 225, 305+ (2000)
- C 2462 JUSTICE SCALIA AND ANCILLARY JURISDICTION: TEACHING A LAME DUCK NEW TRICKS IN KOKKONEN V. GUARDIAN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA, 81 Va. L. Rev. 1631, 1663+ (1995)
- C 2463 STATE STANDING, 81 Va. L. Rev. 387, 520+ (1995)
- C 2464 THE PRINCIPLES OF '98: AN ESSAY IN HISTORICAL RETRIEVAL, 80 Va. L. Rev. 689, 743 (1994)
- C 2465 STATUTES REVOLVING IN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW ORBITS, 79 Va. L. Rev. 1, 83 (1993)
- C 2466 REASSESSING THE ALLOCATION OF JUDICIAL BUSINESS BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS: FEDERAL JURISDICTION AND "THE MARTIAN CHRONICLES", 78 Va. L. Rev. 1769, 1832 (1992)
- C 2467 REFLECTIONS ON THE ALLOCATION OF JURISDICTION BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS: A RESPONSE TO "REASSESSING THE ALLOCATION OF JUDICIAL BUSINESS BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS", 78 Va. L. Rev. 1839, 1848 (1992)
- C 2468 VOLS. 3-4 THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE HISTORY OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: THE MARSHALL COURT AND CULTURAL CHANGE, 1815-35. BY G. EDWARD WHITE. MACMILLAN PUBLISHING CO., NEW YORK, 1988, pp. xxi, 1009,, 75 Va. L. Rev. 1429, 1460+ (1989)
- C 2469 BIVENS, CHILICKY, AND CONSTITUTIONAL DAMAGES CLAIMS, 75 Va. L. Rev. 1117, 1154 (1989)
- C 2470 THE IDEOLOGIES OF FEDERAL COURTS LAW, 74 Va. L. Rev. 1141, 1251+ (1988)
- C 2471 THE ANTI-JUDGE: WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS AND THE AMBIGUITIES OF INDIVIDUALITY, 74 Va. L. Rev. 17, 86 (1988)
- C 2472 THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT AND STATE DAMAGE LIABILITY UNDER THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973, 71 Va. L. Rev. 655, 684+ (1985)
- C 2473 BEYOND PENNHURST-PROTECTIVE JURISDICTION, THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, AND THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO ENLARGE FEDERAL JURISDICTION IN RESPONSE TO THE BURGER COURT, 71 Va. L. Rev. 343, 402+ (1985)
- C 2474 FEDERALISM AND FEDERAL QUESTIONS: PROTECTING CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER THE REGIME OF SWIFT v. TYSON, 70 Va. L. Rev. 267, 275+ (1984)
- C 2475 THE WORKING LIFE OF THE MARSHALL COURT, 1815-1835, 70 Va. L. Rev. 1, 52 (1984)
- C 2476 SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT OF 1976, 68 Va. L. Rev. 893, 918+ (1982)
- 2477 REASSESSING THE PURPOSES OF FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION, 42 Wake Forest L. Rev. 247, 301+ (2007)
- C 2478 JUDICIAL REVIEW AND ITS ALTERNATIVES: AN AMERICAN TALE, 38 Wake Forest L. Rev. 415, 449+ (2003)
- C 2479 FEDERALISM'S PARADOX: THE SPENDING POWER AND WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, 37 Wake Forest L. Rev. 141, 216 (2002)
- C 2480 THE BANKRUPTCY TRUST AS A LEGAL PERSON, 35 Wake Forest L. Rev. 251, 293+ (2000)
- C 2481 THE CONSTITUTION IN CONGRESS: THE MOST ENDANGERED BRANCH, 1801-1805, 33 Wake Forest L. Rev. 219, 260 (1998)
- C 2482 THE COMPLETE PREEMPTION DILEMMA : A LEGAL PROCESS PERSPECTIVE, 31 Wake Forest L. Rev. 927, 999+ (1996)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2483 PRESERVING FEDERALISM OR PERVERTING CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES: A CONSERVATIVE CRITIQUE OF THE CONSERVATIVE MAJORITY (FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION V. SOUTH CAROLINA STATE PORTS AUTHORITY, 122 S. CT. 1864 (2002)), 42 Washburn L.J. 385, 412 (2003)
- 2484 UNAUTHORIZED CORPORATE LAW PRACTICES IN SMALL CLAIMS COURT: SHOULD ANYBODY CARE?, 33 Washburn L.J. 345, 363 (1994)
- 2485 THE COLLISION OF THE TAKINGS AND STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY DOCTRINES, 63 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 493, 585+ (2006)
- 2486 SAVING SECTION 5: LESSONS FROM CONSENT DECREES AND EX PARTE YOUNG, 62 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 1001, 1069 (2005)
- 2487 IN THE 1990'S THE GOVERNMENT MUST BE A REASONABLE PERSON IN ITS WORKPLACES: THE DISCRETIONARY FUNCTION IMMUNITY SHIELD MUST BE TRIMMED, 46 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 359, 371 (1989)
- 2488 JURISDICTION AND MERITS, 80 Wash. L. Rev. 643, 704 (2005)
- 2489 EX PARTE YOUNG AND FEDERAL REMEDIES FOR HUMAN RIGHTS TREATY VIOLATIONS, 75 Wash. L. Rev. 1103, 1203 (2000)
- 2490 GIVING NOTICE: AN ARGUMENT FOR NOTIFICATION OF PUTATIVE PLAINTIFFS IN COMPLEX LITIGATION, 66 Wash. L. Rev. 775, 808 (1991)
- 2491 CONFRONTING THE FICTIONS OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT: PENNHURST STATE SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL v. HALDERMAN, 104 S.CT. 900 (1984)., 60 Wash. L. Rev. 407, 430 (1985)
- 2492 FEDERALISM IN THE SECOND REPUBLIC'S THIRD CENTURY, 50 Wash. U. J. Urb. & Contemp. L. 95, 123 (1996)
- 2493 FIGHTING FICTION WITH FICTION-THE NEW FEDERALISM IN (A TOBACCO COMPANY) BANKRUPTCY, 78 Wash. U. L.Q. 1271, 1339 (2000)
- 2494 CONSTITUTIONAL FEDERALISM, INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY, AND THE SECURITIES LITIGATION UNIFORM STANDARDS ACT OF 1998, 78 Wash. U. L.Q. 435, 496 (2000)
- 2495 UNDERSTANDING MERRELL DOW: FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION FOR STATE-FEDERAL HYBRID CASES, 77 Wash. U. L.Q. 219, 247 (1999)
- 2496 PREEMPTION OF BIVENS CLAIMS: HOW CLEARLY MUST CONGRESS SPEAK?, 70 Wash. U. L.Q. 1087, 1129 (1992)
- 2497 "TAKING' INFORMATIONAL PROPERTY THROUGH DISCOVERY, 66 Wash. U. L.Q. 703, 744+ (1988)
- 2498 PROTECTING FEDERALISM INTERESTS AFTER THE CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2005: A RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR VAIRO, 51 Wayne L. Rev. 1417, 1459 (2005)
- 2499 THE JURISDICTIONAL AND DISCOVERY ISSUES IN TRANSFUSION-ASSOCIATED AIDS LITIGATION INVOLVING THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS, 39 Wayne L. Rev. 207, 213+ (1992)
- 2500 IS THERE A LAW OF FEDERAL COURTS?, 96 W. Va. L. Rev. 147, 167 (1993)
- 2501 EMINENT DOMAIN, POLICE POWER, AND BUSINESS REGULATION: ECONOMIC LIBERTY AND THE CONSTITUTION, 92 W. Va. L. Rev. 51, 124 (1989)
- 2502 UNITED STATES v. STANLEY: HAS THE SUPREME COURT GONE A STEP TOO FAR?, 90 W. Va. L. Rev. 473, 498 (1988)
- 2503 CODIFICATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION: ANATOMY OF A LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL, 14 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 1, 4+ (1992)
- 2504 STATES' ELEVENTH AMENDMENT DEFENSE AGAINST COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT AND PLAINTIFFS' ALTERNATIVE REMEDIES, 11 Whittier L. Rev. 885, 908+ (1990)
- 2505 UNITED STATES v. DIXON: THE "JEOPARDIZING" OF JUDICIAL CONTEMPT POWER, 5 Widener J. Pub. L. 179, 236 (1995)
- 2506 ANTEBELLUM PERSPECTIVES ON FREE SPEECH, 10 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 779, 811 (2002)
- 2507 FEDERAL POWER, STATES' RIGHTS, INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS: MENTALLY DISABLED PRISONERS AND THE SUPREME COURT'S NEW ACTIVISM, 10 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 861, 896 (2002)

- C 2508 BRIDGING THE ENFORCEMENT GAP IN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: A CRITIQUE OF THE SUPREME COURT'S THEORY THAT SELF-RESTRAINT PROMOTES FEDERALISM, 46 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1289, 1316+ (2005)
- C 2509 JOHN MARSHALL, MCCULLOCH V. MARYLAND, AND "WE THE PEOPLE": REVISIONS IN NEED OF REVISING, 43 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1339, 1397 (2002)
- C 2510 ON THE NATURE OF FEDERAL BANKRUPTCY JURISDICTION: A GENERAL STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONAL THEORY, 41 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 743, 941+ (2000)
- C 2511 STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AFTER PENNSYLVANIA v. UNION GAS CO.: THE DEMISE OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, 32 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 439, 474 (1991)
- C 2512 THE IMPACT OF SUBSTANTIVE INTERESTS ON THE LAW OF FEDERAL COURTS, 30 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 499, 540+ (1989)
- C 2513 PULLMAN ABSTENTION AFTER PENNHURST: A COMMENT ON JUDICIAL FEDERALISM, 27 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 449, 506+ (1986)
- C 2514 STATE JUDGES, STATE OFFICERS, AND FEDERAL COMMANDS AFTER SEMINOLE TRIBE AND PRINTZ, 1998 Wis. L. Rev. 1465, 1545 (1998)
- C 2515 ARTICLE III CASES, STATE COURT DUTIES, AND THE MADISONIAN COMPROMISE, 1995 Wis. L. Rev. 39, 197+ (1995)
- C 2516 JOHN MARSHALL'S SELECTIVE USE OF HISTORY IN MARBURY v. MADISON, 1986 Wis. L. Rev. 301, 337+ (1986)
- C 2517 WHAT KIND OF IMMUNITY? FEDERAL OFFICERS, STATE CRIMINAL LAW, AND THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE, 112 Yale L.J. 2195, 2259+ (2003)
- C 2518 SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, DUE PROCESS, AND THE ALDEN TRILOGY, 109 Yale L.J. 1927, 1981 (2000)
- C 2519 THE COMMON LAW ORIGINS OF CONSTITUTIONALLY COMPELLED REMEDIES, 107 Yale L.J. 77, 164 (1997)
- C 2520 WHAT IS ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY?, 106 Yale L.J. 1683, 1806+ (1997)
- C 2521 DRAFTING A FEDERAL BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT THAT DOES WHAT IT IS SUPPOSED TO DO (AND NO MORE), 106 Yale L.J. 1449, 1536+ (1997)
- C 2522 THE BILL OF RIGHTS AND THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT, 101 Yale L.J. 1193, 1284 (1992)
- C 2523 THE ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1866: A LEGISLATIVE HISTORY IN LIGHT OF RUNYON v. McCRARY, 98 Yale L.J. 565, 595+ (1989)
- C 2524 THE SUPREME COURT, THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, AND STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, 98 Yale L.J. 1, 44+ (1988)
- C 2525 THE NATURAL-BORN CITIZEN CLAUSE AND PRESIDENTIAL ELIGIBILITY: AN APPROACH FOR RESOLVING TWO HUNDRED YEARS OF UNCERTAINTY, 97 Yale L.J. 881, 899 (1988)
- C 2526 OF SOVEREIGNTY AND FEDERALISM, 96 Yale L.J. 1425, 1487+ (1987)
- C 2527 IN DEFENSE OF ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY AUTONOMY, 96 Yale L.J. 787, 814+ (1987)
- C 2528 THE DEVIL AND DANIEL WEBSTER The Papers of Daniel Webster: Legal Papers. Vol. I: The New Hampshire Practice. Vol. II: The Boston Practice. Edited by Alfred S. Konefsky and Andrew J. King. (FNaa) Hanover: University Press, 94 Yale L.J. 445, 460 (1984)
- 2529 THE GAMING INDUSTRY: RIVER BOATS AND CRUISE SHIPS: CALM WATERS AND HIGH ROLLERS, SF89 ALI-ABA 93, 152 (2001)
- 2530 THE EFFECT OF CONFIRMATION ON THE FEDERAL COURTS' CONTINUING BANKRUPTCY JURISDICTION, 2002 WL 226382 (Bankr. L. Letter), *2+ (2002)
- 2531 85 BNA Daily Labor Report E-2, 2004, (2004)
- 2532 207 BNA Daily Labor Report C-3, 2003, (2003)
- 2533 144 BNA Daily Labor Report E-1, 2000, (2000)
- 2534 121 BNA Daily Labor Report E-1, 1999, (1999)
- 2535 249 BNA Daily Report for Executives K-10, 2002, LOCAL TAXES: FACTS. (2002)
- 2536 23 BNA Daily Report for Executives J-1, 2002, WELCOME TO THE BRAVE NEW WORLD OF FINANCIAL SERVICES: UNEXPECTED STATE TAX RAMIFICATIONS OF GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY (2002)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2537 64 BNA Daily Report for Executives K-14, 2000, SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: FACTS. (2000)
- 2538 249 BNA Daily Tax Report K-10, 2002, LOCAL TAXES: FACTS. (2002)
- 2539 23 BNA Daily Tax Report J-1, 2002, WELCOME TO THE BRAVE NEW WORLD OF FINANCIAL SERVICES: UNEXPECTED STATE TAX RAMIFICATIONS OF GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY (2002)
- 2540 64 BNA Daily Tax Report K-14, 2000, SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: FACTS. (2000)
- 2541 11/30/2001 BNA Patent, Trademark & Copyright Law Daily D5, (2001)
- 2542 63 BNA Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 87, TRADEMARKS/JURISDICTION: FEDERAL COURT LACKS JURISDICTION IN DISPUTE ABOUT TRADEMARK OWNERSHIP (2001)
- 2543 6/30/92 BNA Product Liability Daily, (1992)
- 2544 11/7/91 BNA Product Liability Daily, (1991)
- 2545 8/13/91 BNA Product Liability Daily, (1991)
- 2546 11/29/90 BNA Securities Law Daily, (1990)
- 2547 7/8/92 BNA Toxics Law Daily, (1992)
- 2548 11/15/91 BNA Toxics Law Daily, (1991)
- 2549 8/15/91 BNA Toxics Law Daily, (1991)
- 2550 8/8/91 BNA Toxics Law Daily, (1991)
- 2551 12/14/2001 BNA U.S. Law Week - Supreme Court Today D5, (2001)
- 2552 6/19/92 BNA U.S. Law Week - Supreme Court Today, (1992)
- 2553 11/15/91 BNA U.S. Law Week - Supreme Court Today, (1991)
- 2554 9/28/90 BNA U.S. Law Week - Supreme Court Today, (1990)
- C 2555 "PUN'S OIL SUES TOXICO": A COMEDY OF ERRORS IN (AT LEAST) FOUR ACTS, 11 Del. J. Corp. L. 345, 381+ (1986)
- 2556 BANK HOLDING COMPANY RESTRUCTURING ALTERNATIVES FOLLOWING THE ENACTMENT OF THE RIEGLE-NEAL INTERSTATE BANKING AND BRANCHING EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1994, 966 PLI/Corp 735, 758 (1996)
- 2557 BANKS AND INSURANCE ACTIVITIES: WHAT BANKING ORGANIZATIONS CAN DO NOW, 966 PLI/Corp 505, 557+ (1996)
- 2558 PRE-TRIAL MOTIONS AND OTHER PROCEDURAL MOVES: A DEFENSE PERSPECTIVE, 386 PLI/Lit 95, 115 (1990)
- 2559 REPRESENTING TENANTS, 320 PLI/Real 167, 249+ (1988)
- C 2560 THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT, ITS HISTORY AND CURRENT APPLICATION TO SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES, 72 Ed. Law Rep. 479, 501 (1992)
- C 2561 WHEN COURTS PLAY SCHOOL BOARD: JUDICIAL ACTIVISM IN EDUCATION, 51 Ed. Law Rep. 693, 709+ (1989)

Court Documents
Appellate Court Documents (U.S.A.)

Appellate Petitions, Motions and Filings

- 2562 Lundeen v. Canadian Pacific Railway Co., 2006 WL 3749525, *3749525+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 18, 2006) **Brief of Amici Curiae States of North Dakota, ...** (NO. 06-528)★★
- 2563 Van De Berg v. Com'r of Revenue, 2006 WL 3043817, *3043817+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 25, 2006) **Petition For Rehearing** (NO. 06-24) ""★★★
- 2564 Van De Berg v. Commissioner of Revenue, 2006 WL 1876563, *1876563+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 03, 2006) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-24) ""★★★★
- 2565 Collier v. Pruett, 2006 WL 2433421, *2433421+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 12, 2006) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-253)★★★
- 2566 E.I. Du Pont De Nemours and Co. v. Living Designs, Inc., 2006 WL 565446, *565446+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 06, 2006) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 05-1136)★★
- C 2567 Osborn v. Haley, 2006 WL 403906, *403906+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 17, 2006) **Brief for Respondent Barry Haley** (NO. 05-593)★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2568 Kircher v. Putnam Funds Trust, 2005 WL 3229093, *3229093+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 29, 2005) **Brief in Opposition** (NO. 05-409) ""★★
- 2569 Brown v. Montgomery County, 2005 WL 1304526, *1304526+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 26, 2005) **Brief of Respondent, Perkiomen Valley School ...** (NO. 04-1432)★
- 2570 Dotson v. Griesa, 2005 WL 682161, *682161+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 22, 2005) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 04-1276)★★
- 2571 People of the State of California v. Dynegey, Inc., 2005 WL 643377, *643377+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 16, 2005) **Joint Brief for Respondents in Opposition** (NO. 04-1028)★★
- C 2572 Whitman v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., 2005 WL 435914, *435914+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 22, 2005) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 04-1131)★★
- 2573 Burnett v. Potts, 2005 WL 166981, *166981+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 20, 2005) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 04-985) ""★★
- 2574 Tennessee Laborers Health & Welfare Fund v. Rodriguez, 2004 WL 1686277, *1686277+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 23, 2004) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 04-136)★★
- 2575 Cycenas v. Stoner, 2004 WL 1387152, *1387152+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 14, 2004) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 03-1673)★★
- 2576 Philip R. MCNEIL, Petitioner, v. THE STANLEY WORKS and Verisign, Inc., Respondents., 2004 WL 1243134, *1243134+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 27, 2004) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 03-1615)★★
- 2577 In re J. Patrick LYONS, Petitioner, v. Hon. Robert W. NEY, United States House of Representative; Hon. John B. Larson, United States House of Representative; Hon. Bart J. Gordon, United States House of Representative; and, Matthew S. Peterson, Attorney, United States House of Representatives, Committee on House Administration, Respondents., 2003 WL 23146569, *23146569+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 30, 2003) **Petition for an Extraordinary Writ Of Mandamus to ...** (NO. 03-975)★★
- 2578 E. Joseph FACE, Jr., in his official capacity as Commissioner of Financial Institutions, Bureau of Financial Institutions, Virginia State Corporation Commission, and Susan E. Hancock, in her official capacity as Deputy Commissioner, Consumer Finance, Bureau of Financial Institutions, Virginia State Corporation Commission, Petitioners, v. NATIONAL HOME EQUITY MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION, Respondent., 2003 WL 22428279, *22428279+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 15, 2003) **Reply Brief of Petitioners** (NO. 02-1810)★★
- 2579 Raymond J. CASCELLA, Petitioner, v. CANAVERAL PORT AUTHORITY and State Judge's J. Pleus, Cobb and JJ. Palmer Individually and Officially, Respondents., 2003 WL 22428948, *22428948+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 03, 2003) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 03-350)★★
- 2580 E. Joseph FACE, Jr., in his official capacity as Commissioner of Financial Institutions, Bureau of Financial Institutions, Virginia State Corporation Commission, and Susan E. Hancock, in her official capacity as Deputy Commissioner, Consumer Finance, Bureau of Financial Institutions, Virginia State Corporation Commission, Petitioners, v. NATIONAL HOME EQUITY MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION, Respondent., 2003 WL 22428277, *22428277+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 09, 2003) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 02-1810)★
- 2581 E. Joseph FACE, Jr., in his official capacity as Commissioner of Financial Institutions, Bureau of Financial Institutions, Virginia State Corporation Commission, and Susan E. Hancock, in her official capacity as Deputy Commissioner, Consumer Finance, Bureau of Financial Institutions, Virginia State Corporation Commission, Petitioners, v. NATIONAL HOME EQUITY MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION, Respondent., 2002 WL 32135840, *32135840+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 16, 2002) **Reply Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 01-1827)★★
- 2582 Susan JINKS, Petitioner, v. RICHLAND COUNTY, Respondent., 2002 WL 32101030, *32101030+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 18, 2002) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 02-258) ""★★

- 2583 MOLONEY COACHBUILDERS, INC., Petitioner, v. ALL OTHERS WHO ARE NOT NAMED PETITIONERS, Respondents., 2002 WL 32135062, *32135062+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 14, 2002) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 01-1373)★★
- 2584 Richard L. MATHIAS, et al., Petitioners, v. WORLDCOM TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al., Respondents., 2001 WL 34117494, *34117494+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 10, 2001) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Now Legal Defense and ...** (NO. 00-878)★★
- 2585 Mitchell R. SWARTZ, Petitioner, v. Q. Todd DICKINSON, Director of the USPTO, Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Respondent., 2001 WL 34117503, *34117503+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 22, 2001) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 00-1191)★★
- 2586 Franklin SANDERS, Petitioner, v. William E. FREEMAN, Jr. and Charles Burson, Respondents., 2000 WL 34000686, *34000686+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 11, 2000) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 00-570)★★
- 2587 PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION OF EASTERN NEW MEXICO, Petitioner, v. TAXATION AND REVENUE DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO, Respondent., 2000 WL 33999422, *33999422+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 28, 2000) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 00-156)★★
- 2588 Robert A. BROWN, et al., Petitioner, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Respondent., 2000 WL 34014748, *34014748+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 23, 2000) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 99-2066)★★
- 2589 Kurt Charles GARRISON, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. CITY OF WICHITA FALLS, TEXAS David Bynum, Police Officer, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Police Officer for the City of Wichita Falls Jack Schlieper, Chief of Police, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of Police for the City of Wichita Falls, Defendants - Appellees., 2000 WL 34014092, *34014092+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 06, 2000) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Fifth ...** (NO. 99-1492)★★★
- 2590 Hon. Helen CHENOWETH, Hon. Bob Schaffer, Hon. Don Young, and Hon. Richard W. Pombo, all in their official capacities, Petitioners, v. William J. CLINTON, President of the United States, et al., Respondents., 1999 WL 33639351, *33639351+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 30, 1999) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Hon. John T. Doolittle, ...** (NO. 99-944) ""★★
- 2591 John DOE, Petitioner, v. Thomas CONSTANTINE, Administrator, Drug Enforcement Agency and Peter F. Gruden, Special Agent, Respondents., 1999 WL 33640932, *33640932+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 18, 1999) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 99-692)★★
- 2592 UNITED FOOD AND COMMERCIAL WORKERS UNION, Local No. 324, AFL-CIO, CLC, Petitioner, v. K.V. MART COMPANY d/b/a Top Valu Markets and Valu Plus Food Warehouses, a corporation; and Market Venture, LLC, Respondents., 1999 WL 33640032, *33640032+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 13, 1999) **Respondents' Brief in Opposition** (NO. 99-96)★★
- 2593 UNITED FOOD AND COMMERCIAL WORKERS UNION, Local No. 324, AFL-CIO, CLC, Defendant-Petitioner, v. K.V. MART COMPANY d/b/a Top Valu Markets and Valu Plus Food Warehouses, a corporation; and Market Venture, LLC, Plaintiffs-Respondents., 1999 WL 33640025, *33640025 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 06, 1999) **Petition (with Appendix) for a Writ of Certiorari ...** (NO. 99-96)★★
- 2594 Robert KAHRE; John Nelson, Petitioners, v. IMF, THE WORLD BANK, et al., 1999 WL 33640356, *33640356+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 07, 1999) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 98-2031)★★
- 2595 Robert C. KIM, Petitioner, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Respondent., 1999 WL 33641144, *33641144+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 13, 1999) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 98-1651) ""★★
- 2596 STUDENT LOAN MARKETING ASSOCIATION, Petitioner, v. Richard W. RILEY, Secretary of the United States Department of Education, Respondent., 1997 WL 33557472, *33557472+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 09, 1997) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 96-1948)★★

- 2597 STATE OF ARKANSAS, Petitioner, v. FARM CREDIT SERVICES OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS, PCA, et al., Respondents., 1996 WL 33414058, *33414058+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 21, 1996) **Brief of the States of Ohio, California, Idaho, ...** (NO. 95-1918)★★
- 2598 Peter Di LAURO et al., Petitioner(s), v. Helen B. Ver STRATE Esq. et als., Respondents., 1996 WL 33422664, *33422664 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 06, 1996) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 96-64)★★
- 2599 Robert W. KEARNS, Petitioner, v. CHRYSLER MOTORS CORPORATION, American Motors Corporation, Respondents., 1995 WL 17035779, *17035779 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 13, 1995) **Reply Brief to Reed Smith Shaw & McClay's ...** (NO. 95-508)★★
- 2600 FIRST ADVANTAGE INSURANCE, INC. and First National Bank of Denham Springs, Petitioners, v. Douglas D. GREEN, Commissioner of Insurance, the Louisiana Association of Life Underwriters, the Professional Insurance Agents of Louisiana, the Independent Insurance Agents of Louisiana, Respondents., 1995 WL 17050038, *17050038+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 27, 1995) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 94-2130)★★
- 2601 Jon B. JACOB, Petitioner, v. UNITED STATES, Respondent., 1995 WL 17048845, *17048845 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 24, 1995) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 94-1382)★★
- 2602 Gordon FITZGERALD, Statutory Trustee Liquidator of Phoenix Systems International, Inc. Petitioner, v. Alan P. BAYHAM Jr., et al, Respondents., 1994 WL 16042521, *16042521+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 15, 1994) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 94-1225)★★
- 2603 PINEVILLE REAL ESTATE OPERATION CORPORATION, A North Carolina Corporation, and Carmen Viana, Trustee of the Retirement Plan of U.S.W. Local 6141 Employees of EC Manufacturing Division of Wittek Industries, Inc., Petitioners, v. Mark A. MICHAEL, Glenn Breitwieser, Eric Meierhoefer, Ronald J. Biggers, James E. Brandon, Linda M. Cornwell, James A. Dunn, Kenneth Elliott, Betty L. Griffin, Robert L. Jackson, Terry K. Jewell, Kenneth Jordan, Charles E. Lackey, Raymond E., 1994 WL 16042835, *16042835+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 30, 1994) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 94-968)★★
- 2604 Eugene H. DUFFY, et al., Petitioners, v. James W. WETZLER, et al., Respondents., 1994 WL 16043150, *16043150+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 26, 1994) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 94-766)★★
- 2605 Daniel R. THOMAS Sylvia Torres-Thomas, Petitioners, v. UNITED STATES, Respondent., 1994 WL 16042754, *16042754+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 19, 1994) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 94-700)★★
- 2606 Leon J. BROBST, Petitioner, v. COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Respondent., 1994 WL 16042623, *16042623+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 12, 1994) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 94-665)★★
- 2607 Alexander F. BEDDOE, Petitioner, v. Raymond SPILLMAN; Robert Mizell; Patricia L. Cunningham; Gail Arndt; and Robert D. Allphin, Sr., et al., Respondents., 1994 WL 16101638, *16101638+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 31, 1994) **Petition for Common Law Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 931901)★★
- 2608 James Richard O'CONNOR, Petitioner, v. COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY, a Corporation and London Nuclear Services, Inc., a Foreign Corporation, Respondents., 1994 WL 16099756, *16099756+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 23, 1994) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 931822) ""★★★
- 2609 Ramsey CLARK and Lawrence W. Schilling, Petitioners, v. Margaret THATCHER, former Prime Minister of Great Britain and the United Kingdom, Respondents., 1992 WL 12073960, *12073960+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 24, 1992) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 92-529)★★
- 2610 Eugene H. DUFFY, et al., Petitioners, v. James W. WETZLER, et al., Respondents., 1992 WL 12073953, *12073953+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 22, 1992) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 92-521)★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2611 Kathleen Saunders WILLIAMS, Individually, and Katherine Saunders Williams, Executrix of the Estate of Elizabeth George Saunders, Deceased, Petitioners, v. FEDERAL LAND BANK OF JACKSON, Federal Land Bank Association of Jackson, and Farm Credit System Assistance Board, Respondents., 1992 WL 12074571, *12074571+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May

- 01, 1992) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 91-1769) "" ★★★
- 2612 J. Gerard HOGAN, et al., Petitioners, v. Mark E. MUSOLF, et al., Respondents., 1991 WL 11178752, *11178752+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 31, 1991) **Petitioners' Reply Brief** (NO. 91-380) ★★
- 2613 AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS, Petitioner, v. S.G. and A.E., Respondents., 1991 WL 11009250, *11009250+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 12, 1991) **Reply Brief for the Petitioner** (NO. 91-594) ★★
- 2614 AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS, Petitioner, v. S.G. and A.E., Respondent., 1991 WL 11008937, *11008937+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 01, 1991) **Respondents' Brief in Opposition** (NO. 91-594) "" ★★★
- 2615 John W. GUMBY, Sr., et al., Petitioners, v. GENERAL PUBLIC UTILITIES CORPORATION, Metropolitan Edison Co., Jersey Central Power and Light Co., Pennsylvania Electric Co., Babcock & Wilcox Co., McDermott Inc., U.E. & C.-Catalytic, Inc., Burns & Roe Enterprises, Inc., and Dresser Industries Inc., Respondents., 1991 WL 11178917, *11178917+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 23, 1991) **Petition** (NO. 91-676) ★★
- 2616 In re Mason v. Clerk of the Supreme Court of Common Pl, 1988 WL 1094272, *1094272+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 12, 1988) **Petition** (NO. 88-310) ★★
- 2617 Young v. Langley, 1988 WL 1094333, *1094333 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 18, 1988) **Petition** (NO. 87-1907) "" ★★★
- 2618 Skoblow v. Ameri-Manage, Inc, 1988 WL 1094921, *1094921+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 29, 1988) **Petition** (NO. 87-1454) ★★★
- 2619 Pan-American Life Ins. Co. v. The Secretary of the Dep, 1988 WL 1094529, *1094529 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 06, 1988) **Petition** (NO. 87-1331) ★★
- 2620 Brooks v. Ebony Oil Corp., 1987 WL 954751, *954751+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 26, 1987) **On Petition for A Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 86-2065) ★★
- 2621 Howitt v. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1987 WL 955001, *955001+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 13, 1987) **Petition** (NO. 86-2004) ★★
- 2622 Malachowski v. Silverberg, 1986 WL 766524, *766524+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 05, 1986) **Petition** (NO. 88-1738) ★★
- 2623 Brooks v. Ebony Oil Corp., 1986 WL 767286, *767286+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 14, 1986) **On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 86-229) ★★
- 2624 O'Maley v. County of Baca, 1986 WL 766936, *766936 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 02, 1986) **Petition** (NO. 86-13) "" ★★★
- 2625 Grace v. Heartland Transp. Inc., 1986 WL 766880, *766880+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 25, 1986) **Petition** (NO. 85-2080) ★★
- 2626 Liberty Nat. Bank v. Buscaglia., 1968 WL 129243, *129243+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 10, 1968) **Jurisdictional Statement** (NO. 175) ★★
- 2627 Dombrowski v. Pfister, 1964 WL 95178, *95178+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 23, 1964) **Jurisdictional Statement** (NO. 52) ★★
- 2628 Annie PARKER, Ppa Annie Gibson, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Anthony Della ROCCO, Jr. Webster Bank, formerly known as First Federal Bank, formerly known as First Constitution Bank, New Haven Health Department, Defendants-Appellees, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Defendant., 2001 WL 34712903, *34712903 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (2nd Cir. Jun 26, 2001) **Petition for Rehearing Filed By the ...** (NO. 00-6340) ★★
- 2629 ATLANTIC PRODUCE COMPANY, INC., Petitioner, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al., Respondents., 1977 WL 203070, *203070+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (4th Cir. Apr 08, 1977) **Brief for the Respondents, United States of ...** (NO. 76-2344) "" ★★★
- 2630 PKG CONTRACTING, INC., Petitioner, v. CITY OF MESQUITE, Respondent., 2005 WL 1500164, *1500164+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. May 16, 2005) **PKG Contracting Inc.'s Brief in Support of its ...** (NO. 04-1139) ★★★

Appellate Briefs

- 2631 Watters v. Wachovia Bank, N.A., 2006 WL 3387939, *3387939+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 22, 2006) **Reply Brief for the Petitioner** (NO. 05-1342) ""★★
- 2632 Gonzales v. Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., 2006 WL 2725690, *2725690+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 20, 2006) **Brief for Intervenor-Respondent City and County ...** (NO. 05-1382)★★
- 2633 Osborn v. Haley, 2006 WL 2569963, *2569963+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 01, 2006) **Brief for Respondent Barry Haley** (NO. 05-593)★★
- 2634 Kircher v. Putnam Funds Trust, 2006 WL 820356, *820356+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 28, 2006) **Brief for Respondents** (NO. 05-409)★★
- 2635 Whitman v. U.S. Department of Transportation, 2005 WL 2094087, *2094087+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 26, 2005) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Allen Dotson in Support of ...** (NO. 04-1131)★★
- 2636 Central Virginia Community College v. Katz, 2005 WL 2043043, *2043043+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 22, 2005) **Brief in Support of Respondent for Amici Curiae ...** (NO. 04-885)★★★
- 2637 Central Virginia Community College v. Katz, 2005 WL 2055877, *2055877+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 22, 2005) **Brief for the Respondent** (NO. 04-885) ""★★★
- 2638 Ortega v. Star-Kist Foods, Inc., 2005 WL 139840, *139840+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 18, 2005) **Brief for Respondent** (NO. 04-79) ""★★★
- 2639 ExxonMobil Corporation v. Saudi Basic Industries Corpo, 2005 WL 23980, *23980+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 04, 2005) **Respondent's Brief** (NO. 03-1696) ""★★
- 2640 McCreary County, Kentucky v. American Civil Liberties, 2004 WL 2812087, *2812087+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 08, 2004) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Conservative Legal Defense ...** (NO. 03-1693) ""★★
- 2641 Jones v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 2003 WL 22299754, *22299754+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 02, 2003) **Respondent's Brief on the Merits** (NO. 02-1205) ""★★★
- 2642 Jones v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 2003 WL 22299769, *22299769+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 02, 2003) **Brief of the States of Alabama, Hawaii, ...** (NO. 02-1205)★★
- 2643 Beneficial Nat. Bank v. Anderson, 2003 WL 1824625, *1824625+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 04, 2003) **Brief of Arizona, Alaska, Connecticut, Georgia, ...** (NO. 02-306)★★
- 2644 Beneficial Nat. Bank v. Anderson, 2003 WL 1098993, *1098993+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 07, 2003) **Brief for the United States as Amicus Curiae ...** (NO. 02-306)★★
- 2645 Director of Revenue of Missouri v. CoBank, ACB, 2000 WL 1509966, *1509966+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 06, 2000) **BRIEF FOR THE RESPONDENT** (NO. 99-1792)★★
- 2646 State of Ark. v. Farm Credit Services of Central Arkansas, 1997 WL 138851, *138851+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 27, 1997) **BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS** (NO. 95-1918) ""★★★
- 2647 State of Ark. v. Farm Credit Services of Cent. Arkansas, PCA, 1997 WL 86259, *86259+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 28, 1997) **BRIEF FOR AMICI STATES OF OHIO, ALASKA, ...** (NO. 95-1918)★★
- 2648 Idaho v. Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho, 1996 WL 439249, *439249+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 05, 1996) **REPLY BRIEF** (NO. 94-1474) ""★★★
- 2649 Rocky Mountain Hosp. and Medical Service v. Phillips, 1995 WL 134918, *134918+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 27, 1995) **BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT** (NO. 94-555)★★
- 2650 Moore v. Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Co., 1993 WL 13547989, *13547989+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 09, 1993) **Respondent's Brief on the Merits** (NO. 173)★★
- 2651 American National Red Cross v. S.G., 1992 WL 532902, *532902+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 25, 1992) **REPLY BRIEF FOR THE PETITIONER** (NO. 91-594) ""★★★
- 2652 Eddie KELLER, et alia, Petitioners, v. STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA, et alia, Respondents., 1989 WL 1127371, *1127371+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 16, 1989) **Motion for Leave to File Brief Amicus Curiae of ...** (NO. 88-1905)★★
- 2653 OKLAHOMA TAX COMMISSION, Petitioner, v. Jan GRAHAM, et al, Respondent., 1988 WL 1025824, *1025824+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 16, 1988) **Brief Amicus Curiae, in Support of Respondent, of ...** (NO. 88-266)★★
- 2654 Barbara FINLEY, Petitioner, v. United States of America, Respondent., 1988 WL 1025747, *1025747+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 17, 1988) **Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 87-1973) ""★★★

- 2655 Barbara FINLEY, Petitioner, v. United States of America, Respondent., 1988 WL 1031714, *1031714+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 17, 1988) **Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 87-1973) "" ★★★
- 2656 Thomas K. GILHOOL, Petitioner, v. Russell A. MUTH, Jr., et al., Respondents., 1988 WL 1025571, *1025571+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1988) **Brief of Respondent** (NO. 87-1855) ★★
- 2657 BONITO BOATS, INC., Petitioner, v. THUNDER CRAFT BOATS, INC., Respondent., 1988 WL 1025950, *1025950 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 15, 1988) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Xenetics Biomedical, Inc.** (NO. 87-1346) ★★
- 2658 Kathryn Isabella MESA, Petitioner, v. PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. Shabbir A. EBRAHIM, Petitioner, v. PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA., 1988 WL 1026067, *1026067+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 02, 1988) **Brief for the Respondent** (NO. 87-1206) ""★★★
- 2659 Ray WILL, Petitioner, v. MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE, and DIRECTOR OF MICHIGAN STATE POLICE, Respondents., 1988 WL 1025884, *1025884+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 03, 1988) **Brief of Respondents** (NO. 87-1207) "" ★★★
- 2660 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Petitioner, v. UNION GAS COMPANY, Respondent., 1988 WL 1025621, *1025621+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 11, 1988) **Brief for the Chemical Manufacturers Association ...** (NO. 87-1241) ★★
- 2661 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Petitioner, v. UNION GAS COMPANY, Respondent., 1988 WL 1025629, *1025629+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 11, 1988) **Brief for Respondent** (NO. 87-1241) ★★
- 2662 GOODYEAR ATOMIC CORPORATION, Appellant, v. State ex rel. Esto Miller, Appellee., 1987 WL 881246, *881246+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 03, 1987) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 86-1172) ★★
- 2663 Rodney P. WESTFALL, et al., petitioners, v. William T. ERWIN, Sr., and Emely Erwin., 1987 WL 881087, *881087+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jun 04, 1987) **Brief for the Petitioners** (NO. 86-714) ★
- 2664 AMOCO PRODUCTION COMPANY, et al., Petitioners, v. PEOPLE OF THE VILLAGE OF GAMBELL, et al., Respondent. Donald P. Hodel Secretary of the Interior, et al., Petitioners, v. People of the Village of Gambell, et al., Respondents., 1986 WL 727426, *727426+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 30, 1986) **Brief of Amici Curiae in Support of Respondents ...** (NO. 85-1239, 85-1406) "" ★★★
- 2665 Frank G. BURKE, Acting Archivist of the United States, and Ronald Geisler, Executive Clerk of the White House, Petitioners, v. Michael D. BARNES, et al., 1985 WL 669407, *669407+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1985) **Brief for the Petitioners** (NO. 85-781) "" ★★★
- 2666 THE COUNTY OF ONEIDA, NEW YORK, and the County of Madison, New York, Petitioners, v. THE ONEIDA INDIAN NATION OF NEW YORK STATE, a1k1a the Oneida Nation of New York, a1k1a the Oneida Indians of New York; the Oneida Indian Nation of Wisconsin, a1k1a the Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Inc.; the Oneida of the Thames Band Council; and the State of New York, Respondents. The State of New York, Petitioner, v. The Oneida Indian Nation of New York State, et al., 1984 WL 566156, *566156+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 21, 1984) **Reply Brief of the County of Oneida, New York, ...** (NO. 83-1065, 83-1240) ★★
- 2667 Charles M. ATKINS, Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare, Petitioner, v. Gill PARKER, et al., Respondents., 1984 WL 565471, *565471+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 02, 1984) **Brief of Amicus Curiae State of Washington in ...** (NO. 83-1660) ★★
- 2668 Charles M. ATKINS, Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare, Petitioner, v. Gill PARKER, et al., Respondents., 1984 WL 566047, *566047+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 02, 1984) **Brief of Amicus Curiae State of Washington in ...** (NO. 83-1660) ★★
- 2669 MEMPHIS BANK & TRUST COMPANY, Appellant, v. Riley C. GARNER, Shelby County Trustee, Glenn E. Foster, Treasurer of The City of Memphis, Tennessee, William M. Leech, Jr., Attorney General For the State of Tennessee, Appellees., 1982 WL 608650, *608650+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 29, 1982) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 81-1613) ★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2670 MEMPHIS BANK & TRUST COMPANY, Appellant, v. Riley C. GARNER, Shelby County Trustee, Glenn E. Foster, Treasurer of the City of Memphis, Tennessee, William M. Leech, Jr., Attorney General for the State of Tennessee, Appellees., 1982 WL 608656, *608656+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 19, 1982) **Motion of the Farm Credit Banks for Leave to File ...** (NO. 81-1613)

- ★
- 2671 NORTHERN PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION CO., Appellant, v. MARATHON PIPELINE CO. and United States, Appellees. United States, Appellant, v. MARATHON PIPELINE CO. and NORTHERN PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION CO., Appellees., 1982 WL 607235, *607235+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 05, 1982) **Brief for Amicus Curiae Beneficial Corporation in ...** (NO. 81-150, 81-546) ""★★★
- 2672 NORTHERN PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION CO., Appellant, v. MARATHON PIPELINE CO. and United States, Appellees. United States, Appellant, v. Marathon Pipeline Co. and Northern Pipeline Construction Co., Appellees., 1982 WL 608639, *608639+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 05, 1982) **Brief for Amicus Curiae Beneficial Corporation in ...** (NO. 81-150, 81-546) ""★★★
- 2673 NORTHERN PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION CO., Appellant, v. MARATHON PIPELINE CO., et al. United States of America, Appellant, v. MARATHON PIPELINE CO., et al., 1982 WL 607231, *607231+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 11, 1982) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 81-150, 81-546) ★★
- 2674 NORTHERN PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION CO., Appellant, v. MARATHON PIPELINE CO., et al. United States of America, Appellant, v. Marathon Pipeline Co., et al., 1982 WL 608634, *608634+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 11, 1982) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 81-150, 81-546) ★★
- 2675 Kenneth CORY, Controller of the State of California and H. B. Alvord, County Treasurer of the County of Los Angeles, Petitioners, v. Mark WHITE, Attorney General of the State of Texas, et al., Respondents., 1981 WL 390012, *390012+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 10, 1981) **Petitioners' Reply Brief** (NO. 80-1556)★★
- 2676 CONTROLLER OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA and County Treasurer of the County of Los Angeles, Petitioners, v. ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF TEXAS, et al., Respondents., 1981 WL 390011, *390011+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 02, 1981) **Brief for Respondent Lummis** (NO. 80-1556)★★
- 2677 Mark J. MILLS, Michael Gill and William Malamud, Petitioners, v. Rubie ROGERS, Able Bolden, Betty Bybel, James Colleran, Donna Hunt, Willie Wadsworth, and Harold Warner, Respondents., 1981 WL 389834, *389834 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 01, 1981) **Brief of Respondents** (NO. 80-1417)★
- 2678 Susquehanna Power Co. v. State Tax Com'n of Maryland, 1981 WL 601426, *601426 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 17, 1981) **Appellant's Brief.** (NO. 369)★★
- 2679 Gonzales v. Young, 1978 WL 223232, *223232+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 13, 1978) **Reply Brief of Petitioners** (NO. 77-5324)★★★
- 2680 DUKE POWER COMPANY, Appellant, v. CAROLINA ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY GROUP, et al., Appellees. UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION, Appellant, v. CAROLINA ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY GROUP, et al., Appellees., 1978 WL 206735, *206735+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 14, 1978) **Reply Brief for Appellant Duke Power Company** (NO. 77-262, 77-375)★★
- 2681 Duke Power Company v. Carolina Environmental Study Group, 1978 WL 223100, *223100+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 14, 1978) **Reply Brief for Appellant Duke Power Company** (NO. 77-262, 77-375)★★
- 2682 DUKE POWER COMPANY, Appellant, v. CAROLINA ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY GROUP, et al., Appellees. UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION, Appellant, v. CAROLINA ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY GROUP, et al., Appellees., 1978 WL 206736, *206736+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 15, 1978) **Brief Amicus Curiae on Behalf of the Resources ...** (NO. 77-262, 77-375)★★★
- 2683 Duke Power Company v. Carolina Environmental Study Group, 1978 WL 223102, *223102+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 15, 1978) **Brief Amicus Curiae on Behalf of the Resources ...** (NO. 77-262, 77-375)★★★

- 2684 FIRST FEDERAL SAVINGS and LOAN ASSOCIATION OF BOSTON, et al., Appellants, v. STATE TAX COMMISSION, et al., Appellees., 1978 WL 206878, *206878+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 05, 1978) **Brief for the Appellants.** (NO. 77-334)★★
- 2685 First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Boston v. State Tax Commission, 1978 WL 223116, *223116+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 05, 1978) **Brief for the Appellants.** (NO. 77-334)★★
- 2686 Terrell Don HUTTO, Sub Nom, James Mabry, Commissioner, Arkansas Department of Correction, et al., Petitioners, v. Robert FINNEY, et al., Respondents., 1977 WL 189242, *189242+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 30, 1977) **Brief of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Amicus ...** (NO. 76-1660)★★
- 2687 Hutto v. Finney, 1977 WL 205280, *205280+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 30, 1977) **Brief of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Amicus ...** (NO. 76-1660)★★
- 2688 Earl L. BUTZ, et al., Petitioners, v. Arthur N. ECONOMOU, et al., Respondents., 1977 WL 189170, *189170+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 24, 1977) **Brief of the Respondents** (NO. 76-709)★★
- 2689 Butz v. Economou, 1977 WL 204933, *204933+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 24, 1977) **Brief for the Respondents** (NO. 76-709)★★
- 2690 William G. MILLIKEN, et al., Petitioners, v. Ronald G. BRADLEY, et al., Respondents., 1977 WL 189405, *189405+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 14, 1977) **Brief of Respondent Board of Education for the ...** (NO. 76-447)★★
- 2691 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al., Appellants, v. COUNTY OF FRESNO, Appellee. United States of America, et al., Appellants, v. County of Tuolumne, Appellee., 1976 WL 181595, *181595+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 15, 1976) **Brief for Appellee, County of Fresno** (NO. 75-1262)★★
- 2692 Rios v. Jones, 1976 WL 194500, *194500+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 23, 1976) **Jurisdictional Statement** (NO. 76-103)★★
- 2693 Monica ALDINGER, Petitioner, v. Merton HOWARD, individually and in his capacity as Treasurer of Spokane County, and Spokane County, a public corporation, Respondents., 1976 WL 181194, *181194+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 09, 1976) **Petitioner's Reply Brief** (NO. 74-6521)★★
- 2694 Aldinger v. Howard, 1976 WL 194062, *194062+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 09, 1976) **Petitioner's Reply Brief** (NO. 74-6521)★★
- 2695 Bitzer v. Matthews, 1976 WL 194120, *194120+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 12, 1976) **Brief of the Commonwealths of Pennsylvania and ...** (NO. 75-283)★★★
- 2696 Garland M. FITZPATRICK, et al., Plaintiffs, Donald Matthews, et al., Petitioners, v. Frederick BITZER, Chairman, et al., Respondents., 1976 WL 181732, *181732+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 28, 1976) **Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 75-251)★★
- 2697 Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer, 1976 WL 194102, *194102+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 28, 1976) **Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 75-251)★★
- 2698 Monica ALDINGER, Petitioner, v. Merton L. HOWARD, individually and in his capacity as Treasurer of Spokane County, and Spokane County, a public corporation, Respondents., 1975 WL 173563, *173563+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 24, 1975) **Brief for the Petitioner** (NO. 74-6521)★★★
- 2699 THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, et al., petitioners, v. PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ex rel. State Water Resources Control Board and State of Washington, et al., 1975 WL 173540, *173540+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 14, 1975) **Brief for the Petitioners** (NO. 74-1435)★★
- 2700 Robert E. HAMPTON, Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, et al., petitioners, v. Mow Sun WONG, et al., 1974 WL 175967, *175967+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 12, 1974) **Brief for the Petitioners** (NO. 73-1596)★★
- 2701 U.S. v. Connecticut General Ins. Corp., 1974 WL 186161, *186161 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 25, 1974) **Brief for Appellee Penn Central Company.** (NO. 74-165, 74-167, 74-168)★★
- 2702 Milliken v. Bradley, 1974 WL 185664, *185664+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 04, 1974) **Brief for Respondents Board of Education for the ...** (NO. 73-434, 73-435, 73-436)★★
- 2703 Edelman v. Jordan, 1973 WL 171916, *171916+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 07, 1973) **Petitioners' Reply Brief on the Merits** (NO. 72-1410)★★

- 2704 Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp., 1973 WL 172413, *172413+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 23, 1973) **Brief of Chamber of Commerce of the United States ...** (NO. 73-187)★★
- 2705 Edelman v. Jordan, 1973 WL 171915, *171915+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 06, 1973) **Brief for Respondents** (NO. 72-1410)★★
- 2706 Edelman v. Jordan, 1973 WL 171918, *171918 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 26, 1973) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the NAACP Legal Defense ...** (NO. 72-1410)★★
- 2707 Scheuer v. Rhodes, 1973 WL 171771, *171771+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 27, 1973) **Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 72-914)★★
- 2708 Oneida Indian Nation of New York State v. The County o, 1973 WL 172602, *172602 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 19, 1973) **Brief of Association on American Indian Affairs, ...** (NO. 72-851)★★
- 2709 Oneida Indian Nation of New York State v. The County o, 1973 WL 172597, *172597+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 16, 1973) **Brief for the Petitioners** (NO. 72-851)★★
- 2710 Zahn v. Intern. Paper Co., 1973 WL 173863, *173863+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jun 13, 1973) **Brief for Respondent** (NO. 72-888)""★★★
- 2711 Moor v. County of Alameda, 1972 WL 136497, *136497 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 24, 1972) **Brief for the Petitioners.1** (NO. 72-10)★★
- 2712 Grubbs v. General Elec. Credit Corp., 1972 WL 135767, *135767+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 19, 1972) **Brief for the Petitioner** (NO. 71-257)★★
- 2713 O'shea v. Littleton, 1972 WL 136519, *136519+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. 1972) **Brief of Respondents.** (NO. 72-953, 72-955)""★★
- 2714 Lindsey v. Normet, 1971 WL 133175, *133175+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 11, 1971) **Brief for Appellants** (NO. 70-5045)★★
- 2715 Lindsey v. Normet, 1971 WL 133283, *133283+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 11, 1971) **Brief for Appellants** (NO. 70-5045)★★
- 2716 D. H. Overmyer Co. v. Frick Co., 1971 WL 133595, *133595+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 27, 1971) **Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 69-5)★★
- 2717 Rogers v. Bellei, 1970 WL 121884, *121884+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 12, 1970) **Brief of Association of American Wives of ...** (NO. 24)★★
- 2718 Rogers v. Bellei, 1970 WL 122051, *122051+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 12, 1970) **Brief of Association of American Wives of ...** (NO. 24)★★
- 2719 Rogers v. Bellei, 1970 WL 136295, *136295 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 12, 1970) **Brief of Association of American Wives of ...** (NO. 24)★★
- 2720 Rosado v. Wyman, 1969 WL 120208, *120208 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 05, 1969) **Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 540)★★
- 2721 First Nat. Bank in Plant City v. Dickinson, 1969 WL 120087, *120087+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jun 26, 1969) **Brief for Amici Curiae Independent Bankers ...** (NO. 19, 34)★★
- 2722 U.S. v. Augenblick, 1968 WL 112627, *112627+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 26, 1968) **Brief for the Respondent, Richard G. Augenblick** (NO. 45)★★
- 2723 First Agr. Nat. Bank of Berkshire County v. State Tax Com'n, 1968 WL 112895, *112895+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 29, 1968) **Brief for the State Tax Commission.** (NO. 755)★★★
- 2724 First Agr. Nat. Bank of Berkshire County v. State Tax Com'n, 1968 WL 112897, *112897+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 29, 1968) **Brief Amicus Curiae on Behalf of the State of New ...** (NO. 755)""★★★★
- 2725 First Agr. Nat. Bank of Berkshire County v. State Tax Com'n, 1968 WL 112894, *112894 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 28, 1968) **Brief of Appellant.** (NO. 755)★
- 2726 Utah v. U.S., 1968 WL 112477, *112477+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 24, 1968) **Brief of the State of Utah in Response to The ...** (NO. 31, ORIGINAL)★★
- 2727 Utah v. U.S., 1968 WL 112479, *112479+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 25, 1968) **Brief of the State of Utah in Opposition to ...** (NO. 31, ORIGINAL)★★
- 2728 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellant, v. I. L. CLAYTON, Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina., 1966 WL 115501, *115501 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 14, 1966) **Jurisdictional Statement** (NO. 1115)★
- 2729 Fleming v. Wolke, 1965 WL 115301, *115301 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 04, 1965) **Petitioner's Reply To Respondent's Brief** (NO. 777)★★

- 2730 U.S. v. Mississippi, 1964 WL 81302, *81302+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 27, 1964) **Brief for the State of Mississippi** (NO. 73)★★
- 2731 Dombrowski v. Pfister, 1964 WL 81259, *81259+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 25, 1964) **Brief for Appellants and Appellants-Intervenors ...** (NO. 52)★★
- 2732 Schneider v. Rusk, 1963 WL 105871, *105871+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 13, 1963) **Jurisdictional Statement** (NO. 368)★★
- 2733 Wheeldin v. Wheeler, 1963 WL 105511, *105511+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 10, 1963) **Petitioners' Reply Brief** (NO. 493)★★
- 2734 Schneider v. Rusk, 1963 WL 105494, *105494+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 14, 1963) **Reply Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 251)★★
- 2735 Schneider v. Rusk, 1962 WL 115152, *115152+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 29, 1962) **Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 251)★★
- 2736 Mercantile Nat. Bank at Dallas v. Langdeau, 1962 WL 115426, *115426+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 29, 1962) **Supplemental Brief of Appellant Mercantile ...** (NO. 14)★★
- 2737 Schneider v. Rusk, 1962 WL 115153, *115153+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 28, 1962) **Brief of American Civil Liberties Union as Amicus ...** (NO. 251)★★
- 2738 Mercantile Nat. Bank at Dallas v. Langdeau, 1962 WL 115427, *115427+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 21, 1962) **Appellants Reply Brief on the Merits** (NO. 14)★★★
- 2739 Managed Funds, Inc. v. Brouk, 1961 WL 101639, *101639+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 24, 1961) **Brief of Petitioner.** (NO. 87) ""★★
- 2740 Howard v. Lyons, 1958 WL 91658, *91658+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 02, 1958) **Brief for the Petitioner** (NO. 57)★★
- 2741 Romero v. Intern. Terminal Operating Co., 1957 WL 87003, *87003+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 03, 1957) **Petitioner's Brief on the Merits** (NO. 320)★★
- 2742 Romero v. Intern. Terminal Operating Co., 1957 WL 87005, *87005+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1957) **Petitioner's Reply Brief** (NO. 322, 3) ""★★★
- 2743 Goodall-Sanford, Inc. v. United Textile Workers of America, AFL Local 1802, 1957 WL 87041, *87041+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 23, 1957) **Brief for the Petitioner** (NO. 262)★★
- 2744 Leslie Miller, Inc. v. Arkansas, 1956 WL 89135, *89135+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 02, 1956) **Brief for the United States as Amicus Curiae** (NO. 51)★★
- 2745 Leslie Miller, Inc. v. Arkansas, 1956 WL 89134, *89134+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 14, 1956) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 51)★★
- 2746 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ex rel. Audrey M. Toth, Petitioner, v. Harold E. TALBOTT, Secretary of the United States Air Force, Respondent., 1954 WL 45748, *45748+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 23, 1954) **Brief of the American Legion Amicus Curiae** (NO. 3) ""★★
- 2747 U.S. v. Talbott, 1954 WL 72822, *72822+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 21, 1954) **Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 3)★★
- 2748 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ex rel. Audrey M. Toth, Petitioner, v. Harold E. TALBOTT, Secretary of the United States Air Force, Respondent., 1954 WL 45749, *45749+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 20, 1954) **Brief for the American Legion, Amicus Curiae** (NO. 3) ""★★
- 2749 General Elec. Co. v. Washington, 1954 WL 72655, *72655+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 25, 1954) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 335)★★★
- 2750 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ex rel. Audrey M. Toth, Petitioner, v. Harold E. TALBOTT, Secretary of the United States Air Force, Respondent., 1954 WL 45746, *45746+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. 1954) **Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 3)★★
- 2751 Louise McGrew Moffett v. Commerce Trust Co., 1951 WL 81980, *81980 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 10, 1951) **Petitioner's Reply Brief.** (NO. 762, 75)★★
- 2752 Skelly Oil Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co., 1949 WL 50191, *50191+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 29, 1949) **Brief of Respondent** (NO. 221) ""★★★★
- 2753 New Jersey Realty Title Ins. Co. v. Div. of Tax Appeals in the Dept. of Taxation, 1949 WL 50460, *50460 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 28, 1949) **Brief for Appellee, the City of Newark.** (NO. 147)★★
- 2754 New Jersey Realty Title Ins. Co. v. Div. of Tax Appeals in the Dept. of Taxation, 1949 WL 50459, *50459+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 03, 1949) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 147)★★

- 2755 U.S. v. Burnison, 1949 WL 50469, *50469+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 1949) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 171, 188)★★
- 2756 Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Flowers, 1947 WL 43903, *43903 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 13, 1947) **Brief for Petitioners.** (NO. 432)★★
- 2757 Aircraft & Diesel Equipment Corp. v. Hirsch, 1947 WL 43983, *43983 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 13, 1947) **Reply Brief for Aircraft Diesel Equipment ...** (NO. 95)★★
- 2758 Gardner v. New Jersey, 1946 WL 50468, *50468+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 03, 1946) **Brief of Respondent, State of New Jersey.** (NO. 92)★★
- 2759 Seven up Co. v. Cheer up Sales Co. of St. Louis, 1946 WL 50484, *50484+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 16, 1946) **Petitioner's Reply Brief.** (NO. 127) ""★★
- 2760 R.F.C. v. County of Beaver, 1946 WL 50177, *50177+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 20, 1946) **Brief of the State of California as Amicus Curiae** (NO. 40)★★
- 2761 Mine Safety Appliances Co. v. Forrestal, 1945 WL 48504, *48504 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 09, 1945) **Reply Brief of Appellant** (NO. 71)★★
- 2762 Universal Oil Products Co. v. Root Refining Co., 1945 WL 48201, *48201+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 21, 1945) **Brief on Behalf of Petitioner, Universal Oil ...** (NO. 48, 64)★★★
- 2763 Mine Safety Appliances Co. v. Forrestal, 1945 WL 48502, *48502+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. May 12, 1945) **Statement as to Jurisdiction** (NO. 71)★★
- 2764 In re Summers, 1945 WL 48152, *48152 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 14, 1945) **Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 205) ""★★
- 2765 Nebraska v. Wyoming, 1945 WL 48354, *48354+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 23, 1945) **Answer Brief of Defendant, State of Wyoming** (NO. 6)★★
- 2766 Coffman v. Breeze Corp. Inc., 1944 WL 42286, *42286 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 22, 1944) **Brief for Appellant.** (NO. 71, 485)★★
- 2767 In re Summers, 1944 WL 42252, *42252+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 17, 1944) **Reply Brief of Petitioner, Replying to Return and ...** (NO. 205) ""★★
- 2768 Boyle v. U.S., 1944 WL 42554, *42554+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 15, 1944) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the Ohio Real Estate ...** (NO. 68, 69)★★
- 2769 Associated Press v. U.S., 1944 WL 42541, *42541+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 25, 1944) **Brief on Behalf of Chicago Times, Inc., Amicus ...** (NO. 57, 58, 59)★★
- 2770 Baumgartner v. U.S., 1944 WL 42713, *42713+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 20, 1944) **Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 493)★★
- 2771 Great Northern Life Ins. Co. v. Read, 1944 WL 42787, *42787 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 28, 1944) **Reply Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 235)★★
- 2772 Anderson Nat. Bank v. Reeves, 1944 WL 42455, *42455+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 23, 1944) **Brief of the Comptroller of the Currency of the ...** (NO. 154)★★
- 2773 Anderson Nat. Bank v. Reeves, 1944 WL 42454, *42454+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 18, 1944) **Brief in Behalf of Anderson National Bank** (NO. 154)★★★
- 2774 Great Northern Life Ins. Co. v. Read, 1944 WL 42786, *42786 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 08, 1944) **Brief of Respondent** (NO. 235)★★
- 2775 Anderson Nat. Bank v. Reeves, 1943 WL 54459, *54459+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 27, 1943) **Brief and Argument Filed by the State of ...** (NO. 154)★★
- 2776 Great Northern Life Ins. Co. v. Read, 1943 WL 54631, *54631+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 13, 1943) **Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 235)★★
- 2777 Anderson Nat. Bank v. Reeves, 1943 WL 54461, *54461 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 26, 1943) **Brief for Appellants** (NO. 154)★
- 2778 Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co. v. Charlet, 1943 WL 54777, *54777+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 29, 1943) **Original Brief on Behalf of Respondent.** (NO. 849)★★
- 2779 Mayo v. U.S., 1943 WL 54760, *54760+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 14, 1943) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 726)★★
- 2780 Penn Dairies, Inc. v. The Milk Control Com'n of the Com. of Pennsylvania, 1943 WL 54684, *54684+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 02, 1943) **Brief for the Appellants** (NO. 399)★★★
- 2781 Pacific Coast Dairy, Inc. v. Dept. of Agr. of the State of California, 1942 WL 54005, *54005+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1942) **Statement as to Jurisdiction.** (NO. 275)★★

- 2782 Pacific Coast Dairy, Inc. v. Dept. of Agr. of the State of California, 1942 WL 54006, *54006+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1942) **Brief for Appellees.** (NO. 275) ★★★
- 2783 Penn Dairies, Inc. v. The Milk Control Com'n of the Com. of Pennsylvania, 1942 WL 54102, *54102+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1942) **Statement as to Jurisdiction** (NO. 399) ""★★
- 2784 Maricopa County v. The Valley Nat. Bank of Phoenix, 1942 WL 54116, *54116+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1942) **Brief on Behalf of Respondent** (NO. 449)★★
- 2785 Sola Elec. Co. v. Jefferson Elec. Co., 1942 WL 53733, *53733+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 26, 1942) **Brief for the Petitioner.** (NO. 45)★★
- 2786 Peyton v. Ry. Exp. Agency Inc., 1942 WL 53870, *53870+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 30, 1942) **Brief on Behalf of Railway Express Agency, Inc., ...** (NO. 903)★★
- 2787 Standard Oil Co. of California v. Johnson, 1942 WL 54165, *54165+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 30, 1942) **Brief for Appellant.** (NO. 1125)★★
- 2788 E. E. Morgan Co. Inc. v. Arkansas, 1941 WL 52734, *52734+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1941) **Statement As To Jurisdiction.** (NO. 190)★★
- 2789 Query v. U.S., 1941 WL 52837, *52837+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1941) **Brief for the Respondents** (NO. 619)★★
- 2790 Alabama v. King & Boozer, 1941 WL 52828, *52828+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 21, 1941) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 602)★★★
- 2791 Federal Land Bank of St. Paul v. Bismarck Lumber Co., 1941 WL 53037, *53037+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 18, 1941) **Brief for the Respondents** (NO. 76) ""★★★
- 2792 Brooks v. Dewar, 1941 WL 52927, *52927+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 26, 1941) **Brief for Respondents** (NO. 718)★★
- 2793 Albers v. Farley, 1940 WL 46973, *46973+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 06, 1940) **Reply Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 271) ""★★★
- 2794 Perkins v. Lukens Steel Co., 1940 WL 46859, *46859+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 02, 1940) **Brief for Respondents** (NO. 593)★★
- 2795 James Stewart & Co. Inc. v. Sadrakula, 1940 WL 46412, *46412+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 10, 1940) **Appellant's Brief.** (NO. 251)★★
- 2796 U.S. v. The Baltimore and Annapolis R. Co., 1939 WL 48358, *48358 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 14, 1939) **Brief for O. E. Weller, et al. Constituting the ...** (NO. 78)★★
- 2797 U.S. v. The Baltimore and Annapolis R. Co., 1939 WL 48357, *48357+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 1939) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 78) ""★★★
- 2798 Woodring v. Wardell, 1939 WL 48507, *48507+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 05, 1939) **Brief for The Respondent.** (NO. 5) ""★★★★
- 2799 Inland Waterways Corp. v. Hardee, 1939 WL 48509, *48509+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 05, 1939) **Brief for the Respondent.** (NO. 6) ""★★★
- 2800 Pittman v. Home Owners' Loan Corp. of Washington, D. C., 1939 WL 48517, *48517+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 1939) **Brief for the Respondent** (NO. 10)★★★
- 2801 Pittman v. Home Owners' Loan Corp. of Washington, D. C., 1939 WL 48516, *48516+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 19, 1939) **Brief for Petitioner.** (NO. 10)★★
- 2802 Woodring v. Wardell, 1939 WL 48506, *48506+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 1939) **Brief for the Petitioners** (NO. 5) ""★★★
- 2803 U.S. v. The Baltimore and Annapolis R. Co., 1939 WL 48680, *48680+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. May 29, 1939) **Statement As to Jurisdiction** (NO. 78)★★
- 2804 U.S. v. Marxen, 1939 WL 48338, *48338 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 25, 1939) **Supplemental Brief of Trustee, Appellee** (NO. 544)★★
- 2805 Perkins v. Elg., 1939 WL 48628, *48628+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 01, 1939) **Brief for Marie Elizabeth Elg.** (NO. 454, 455)★★
- 2806 Keifer v. R.F.C., 1939 WL 48613, *48613+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 27, 1939) **Brief for the Respondent, Regional Agricultural ...** (NO. 364)★★
- 2807 Loomis v. First Federal Sav., 1939 WL 48599, *48599+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 04, 1939) **Brief on Behalf of the Federal Savings and Loan ...** (NO. 277)★★
- 2808 Loomis v. First Federal Sav., 1938 WL 39119, *39119+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 13, 1938) **Brief for the Respondent** (NO. 277)★★

- 2809 Loomis v. First Federal Sav., 1938 WL 39118, *39118+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 03, 1938) **Petitioners' Brief** (NO. 277) "" ★★★
- 2810 Keifer v. R.F.C., 1938 WL 39166, *39166 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1938) **Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 364)★★
- 2811 Allen v. Regents of the University System of Georgia, 1938 WL 39028, *39028+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 26, 1938) **Brief for Respondent.** (NO. 882)★★
- 2812 Helvering v. Freedman, 1937 WL 41060, *41060 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 1937) **Brief for the Respondent.** (NO. 597)★
- 2813 Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. v. Oklahoma, 1937 WL 40635, *40635+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 04, 1937) **Brief of Appellant in Opposition to Motion to ...** (NO. 560) ""★★
- 2814 Atkinson v. State Tax Com'n of Oregon, 1937 WL 40563, *40563+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1937) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 303)★★
- 2815 Deitrick v. Standard Sur. & Cas. Co., 1937 WL 40629, *40629+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1937) **Brief for Petitioners.** (NO. 455)★★
- 2816 Rainier Nat. Park Co. v. Martin, 1937 WL 41000, *41000+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1937) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 334)★★
- 2817 Chase Securities Corp. v. Husband, 1937 WL 41068, *41068+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1937) **Motion for Leave to File Brief in Opposition to ...** (NO. 621)★★
- 2818 Nat. City Bank of New York v. People of the Philipping Islands, 1937 WL 40881, *40881+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 21, 1937) **Reply Brief for Petitioner.** (NO. 35)★★
- 2819 Worcester County Trust Co. v. Riley, 1937 WL 40877, *40877+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 19, 1937) **Brief for Respondent Henry F. Long, Commissioner ...** (NO. 34)★★
- 2820 Worcester County Trust Co. v. Riley, 1937 WL 40875, *40875+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 15, 1937) **Brief for the Petitioner** (NO. 34)★★
- 2821 Silas Mason Co., Inc. v. Tax Com'n of the State of Washington, 1937 WL 40793, *40793+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 01, 1937) **Reply Brief on Behalf of Appellants** (NO. 7, 8)★★★
- 2822 Livermore v. Beal, 1937 WL 40984, *40984+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 10, 1937) **Petitioners' Consolidated Reply Brief.** (NO. 219, 220, 221, 222)★★
- 2823 Fox v. The Dravo Contracting Co., 1937 WL 40688, *40688+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 23, 1937) **Reply Brief of Appellant** (NO. 625)★★
- 2824 Fox v. The Dravo Contracting Co., 1937 WL 40687, *40687+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 22, 1937) **Brief for Appellee.** (NO. 625)★★
- 2825 Charles C. Steward Mach. Co. v. Davis, 1937 WL 40753, *40753+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 02, 1937) **Brief Amicus Curiae** (NO. 837)★★
- 2826 Anniston Mfg. Co. v. Davis, 1937 WL 40707, *40707+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 31, 1937) **Brief for Petitioner.** (NO. 667)★★
- 2827 Anniston Mfg. Co. v. Davis, 1937 WL 40706, *40706+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 27, 1937) **Brief Filed By Malcolm Donald As Amicus Curiae on ...** (NO. 667)★★
- 2828 Davis v. R.R., 1936 WL 40144, *40144+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1936) **Brief for Plaintiff-Appellant-Petitioner** (NO. 629)★★
- 2829 People of the State of New York v. Graves, 1936 WL 39975, *39975+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 28, 1936) **Brief for Relator-Appellant** (NO. 139)★★★
- 2830 People of the State of New York Upon v. Graves, 1936 WL 39974, *39974+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jun 26, 1936) **Statement as to Jurisdiction.** (NO. 139) ""★★★
- 2831 Underhill v. Lent, 1936 WL 39933, *39933+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jun 25, 1936) **Brief of Respondent** (NO. 61)★★
- 2832 Ashton v. Cameron County Water Imp. Dist. No. 1, 1936 WL 40169, *40169 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 28, 1936) **Brief of Amicus Curiae.** (NO. 859)★★
- 2833 Mitchell v. Maurer, 1934 WL 31848, *31848+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 06, 1934) **Brief for Petitioner.** (NO. 54) ""★★
- 2834 Helvering v. Leland Powers, 1934 WL 31808, *31808+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 17, 1934) **Brief for the Petitioner** (NO. 17)★★
- 2835 Trinityfarm Const. Co. v. Grosjean, 1933 WL 31651, *31651+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 27, 1933) **Brief of Defendant-Appellee.** (NO. 355)★★

- 2836 Tait v. Western Maryland Railway Co., 1933 WL 31671, *31671 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. May 10, 1933) **Brief on Behalf of Amicus Curiae.** (NO. 842)★
- 2837 Indian Territory Illuminating Oil Co. v. Bd. of Equalization of Tulsa County, 1933 WL 31817, *31817+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 09, 1933) **Brief of Respondent.** (NO. 356)★
- 2838 New Jersey v. Com. of Pennsylvania, 1932 WL 33516, *33516+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 09, 1932) **Plaintiff's Brief in Support of its Motion for ...** (NO. 7)★★
- 2839 Nashville v. Wallace, 1932 WL 33670, *33670 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 24, 1932) **Supplemental Brief on Jurisdiction on Behalf of ...** (NO. 176) ""★★
- 2840 Sterling v. Constantin, 1932 WL 33440, *33440+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 03, 1932) **Brief for Appellants.** (NO. 11)★★
- 2841 South Carolina Power Co. v. South Carolina Tax Com'n, 1932 WL 33288, *33288+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 11, 1932) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 542)★★
- 2842 Burnet v. A. T. Jergins Trust, 1932 WL 33480, *33480+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 08, 1932) **Brief for Respondent.** (NO. 541)★★
- 2843 Fox Film Corp. v. Doyal, 1932 WL 33528, *33528+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 09, 1932) **Brief for Appellee** (NO. 118)★★
- 2844 Mecom v. Fitzsimmons Drilling Co., Inc., 1931 WL 32585, *32585+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 14, 1931) **Brief and Argument of Petitioner.** (NO. 32)★★
- 2845 U.S. v. Macintosh, 1931 WL 32245, *32245+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 17, 1931) **Brief for Respondent.** (NO. 504)★★★
- 2846 Susquehanna Power Co. v. State Tax Com'n of Maryland, 1931 WL 32212, *32212 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 17, 1931) **Appellant's Brief.** (NO. 368)★
- 2847 U.S. v. Wilbur, 1931 WL 32278, *32278+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 25, 1931) **Motion of the Attorney General of the State of ...** (NO. 618) ""★★
- 2848 Arizona v. California, 1931 WL 32348, *32348+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 21, 1931) **Brief of Complainant in Opposition to Motions to ...** (NO. 10)★★
- 2849 In the Matter of Edward T. YOUNG, Petitioner., 1907 WL 18906, *18906+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1907) **Brief in Behalf of the Petitioner** (NO. (5)60ORIGINAL) ""★★★★
- 2850 In the Matter of Edward T. YOUNG, Petitioner., 1907 WL 18907, *18907+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1907) **Brief on Behalf of Respondent** (NO. 10ORIGINAL) ""★★
- 2851 The Western Union Telegraph Company v. The Western and Atlantic Railroad Company, 1875 WL 31951, *31951+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1875) **Brief of the Western Union Telegraph Company.** (NO. 61)★★★
- 2852 Mitchell SWARTZ, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, Charles O. Rossotti, Commissioner. Individually and as Officer. Margaret Milner Richardson, Past Commissioner, Individually and as Officer William Caine, District Director, Individually and as Officer, Laura Martin, Individually and as Officer, Thomas Loughrin, Individually and as Officer, Peter Bousnakis, Individually and as Officer, Peter Sorentino, Individually and as Officer, Robert Chaput., 1998 WL 34280474, *34280474 (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Oct 03, 1998) **Petition for Rehearing** (NO. 98-1058)★★
- 2853 Mitchell SWARTZ, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. ORANGE COUNTY (CA), Michael Capizzi, Individually and as District Attorney, Jan C. Sturla. Individually and as Deputy Da, Jackie Lesan, Linda Dow. Robert A. Burton, Charles Smith, Individually and as Supervisor, Jim Silva, Individually and as Supervisor, Todd Spitzer, Individually and as Supervisor, William G. Steiner, Individually and as Supervisor, Thomas Wilson, Individually and as Supervisor, Bradley Jacobs., 1998 WL 34279784, *34279784+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Sep 02, 1998) **Reply Brief** (NO. 98-1097)★★
- 2854 Mitchell SWARTZ, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. ORANGE COUNTY (CA), Michael Capizzi, Individually and as District Attorney, Jan C. Sturla, Individually and as Deputy Da, Jackie Lesan, Linda Dow, Robert A. Burton, Charles Smith, Individually and as Supervisor, Jim Silva, Individually and as Supervisor, Todd Spitzer, Individually and as Supervisor, William G. Steiner, Individually and as Supervisor, Thomas Wilson, Individually and as Supervisor, Bradley Jacobs., 1998 WL 34279782, *34279782+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Jul 17, 1998) **Appeal Brief** (NO. 98-1097)★★

- 2855 Mitchell SWARTZ, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, Margaret Milner Richardson, Commissioner, William Caine, District Director, Individually and Through the Irs, et alia Defendants, Appellees., 1998 WL 34280430, *34280430 (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Jun 08, 1998) **Reply Brief** (NO. 98-1058) ★★
- 2856 Charles RICHARDS, appellant, v. TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, Trustees of The University of Pennsylvania, Trustees of Boston University, United States Department of Education, appellees., 1998 WL 34299215, *34299215+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. 1998) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 98-2042) ""★★
- 2857 Dr. Jaime VIQUEIRA, et als., Plaintiffs - Appellants, v. FIRST BANK, et als., Defendants - Appellees., 1997 WL 33769460, *33769460+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Dec 31, 1997) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 97-2127, 97-1383) ★★
- 2858 Dr. Jaime VIQUEIRA, et als., Plaintiffs - Appellants, v. FIRST BANK, et als., Defendants - Appellees., 1997 WL 33769459, *33769459+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Nov 12, 1997) **Appellants Brief** (NO. 97-2127) ★★
- 2859 Allen DOTSON, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Thomas P. GRIESA, The Honorable, Kevin T. Duffy, The Honorable, United States District Court for The Southern District of New York Probation Office, Chris J. Stanton, Clifford P. Kirsch, Defendants-Appellees., 2002 WL 32397344, *32397344+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Oct 18, 2002) **Reply Brief of Amicus Curiae in support of ...** (NO. 01-6248) ★★
- 2860 Allen DOTSON, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. Thomas, P. GRIESA, The Honorable, Kevin T. Duffy, The Honorable, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York Probation Office, Chris J. Stanton, Clifford P. Kirsch, Defendants - Appellees., 2002 WL 34167148, *34167148+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Oct 15, 2002) **Reply Supplemental Brief of Appellant** (NO. 01-6248) ★★
- 2861 Christopher EARL Strunk, Pro Se Plaintiff - Appellant, v. THE NEW YORK STATE INSURANCE FUND, Terence L. Morris, Kenneth J. Ross, Underwriter A. Gilbert and Underwriter Semarak, Defendants -Appellees., 2002 WL 32488457, *32488457+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jun 06, 2002) **Brief of Plaintiff - Appellant** (NO. 02-7433) ★★
- 2862 Allen DOTSON, pro se, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Thomas P. GRIESA, The Honorable, Kevin T. Duffy, The Honorable, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York Probation Office, Chris J. Stanton, Clifford P. Kirsch, Defendants-Appellees., 2002 WL 32397347, *32397347+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Feb 08, 2002) **Brief of Appellant Appendix** (NO. 01-6248) ★★
- 2863 Alexander JULIAN, Inc., Petitioner-Appellee, v. MIMCO, INC., (d/b/a William Barry), Respondent-Appellant., 2001 WL 34368879, *34368879+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Aug 16, 2001) **Brief for Respondent-Appellant** (NO. 01-7621) ★★
- 2864 Joseph J. FARRICIELLI, Plaintiff, Appellee, QUINNIPIAC GROUP, INC., Defendant-Appellee, v. Sidney J. HOLBROOK, Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection, Defendant, Arthur J. ROCQUE, Jr., Defendant-Appellant., 2000 WL 33977896, *33977896+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jan 25, 2000) **Brief for Plaintiff-Appellee Joseph J. Farricielli** (NO. 98-9139) ★★
- 2865 STATE OF CONNECTICUT, on the Relation of Richard Blumenthal, in His Capacity as Attorney General of the State of Connecticut, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. John P. CAHILL, as New York State Commissioner of Environmental Conservation, and Donald W. Brewer, as Director of the Division of Law Enforcement at the New York State Department of Environmental Protection, Defendants-Appellees, FISHERS ISLAND LOBSTERMENS ASSOCIATION and Fishers Island Conservancy Inc., 1999 WL 33612198, *33612198+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Nov 16, 1999) **Reply Brief of Plaintiff-Appellant State of ...** (NO. 99-7793) ★★
- 2866 STATE OF CONNECTICUT, on the Relation of Richard Blumenthal, in His Capacity as Attorney General of the State of Connecticut, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. John P. CAHILL, as New York State Commissioner of Environmental Conservation, and Donald W. Brewer, as Director of the Division of Law Enforcement at the New York State Department of Environmental Protection, Defendants-Appellees, FISHERS ISLAND LOBSTERMENS ASSOCIATION and Fishers Island Conservancy Inc., Amici, 1999 WL 33608410, *33608410+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Nov 05, 1999) **Brief of Amici Curiae Fishers Island Lobstermen's ...** (NO. 99-7793) ""★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2867 STATE OF CONNECTICUT, on the Relation of Richard Blumenthal in His Capacity as Attorney General of the State of Connecticut, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. John P. CAHIL, as New York State Commissioner of Environmental Conservation, and Donald W. Brewer, as Director of the Division of Law Enforcement at the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation,

- Defendants-Appellees, FISHERS ISLAND LOBSTERMENS ASSOCIATION AND FISHERS ISLAND CONSERVANCY INC., 1999 WL 33612088, *33612088+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Nov 01, 1999) **Brief for New York State Defendants-Appellees** (NO. 99-7793)★★
- 2868 STATE OF CONNECTICUT, ON THE RELATION OF RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, in His Capacity as Attorney General of the State of Connecticut, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. John P. CAHILL, As New York State Commissioner of Environmental Conservation, and Donald W. Brewer, as Director of the Division of Law Enforcement at the New York State Department of Environmental Protection, Defendants-Appellees, FISHERS ISLAND LOBSTERMENS ASSOCIATION and FISHERS ISLAND CONSERVANCY INC., 1999 WL 33607426, *33607426+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Oct 01, 1999) **Brief of Plaintiff-Appellant State of Connecticut** (NO. 99-7793) ""★★★
- 2869 James E. FLAHERTY, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. June LANG, individually and in her official capacity as PO-25, Section 3324 Instructor, Suffolk County Community College, (SCCC) Ammerman Campus; Susan Finlay, individually, and in her official capacity as Social Sciences Instructor, SCCC Ammerman Campus; Dr. Gary Goodwin in his official capacity as Head, Department of History, Political Science & Geography, SCCC, Ammerman Campus; Dean Doris Stratmann, in her official, 1999 WL 33629933, *33629933+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. 1999) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 98-9418)★★
- 2870 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, and the City of New York, Plaintiffs-Appellees, and Willie Ellis, Plaintiff, v. LOCAL 28, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, Sheet Metal And Air Conditioning Contractors' Association of New York City, Inc., and Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association of Long Island, Inc., Defendants-Appellants., 1998 WL 34082141, *34082141+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Sep 25, 1998) **Brief of Defendants-Appellants Contractors' ...** (NO. 98-6159(L)98-6160) ""★★★
- 2871 Eugene LUDWIG, Comptroller of the Currency, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the United States of America, and Fleet National Bank, Appellants, v. John P. BURKE, Commissioner of Banking, State of Connecticut, Appellee., 1996 WL 33660741, *33660741+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Nov 07, 1996) **Brief of Consumer Bankers Association, Bankers ...** (NO. 96-6233)★★
- 2872 Wayne WASHINGTON, Plaintiff, v. Dr. Arnold ILLMAN and International Paralympics Committee, and John Doe #1-10 the Last 10 Names being Fictitious and Intended to be the Executors, Administrators and Governing Body of the International Paralympics Committee Defendants., 1996 WL 33664465, *33664465+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Oct 15, 1996) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 96-7874)★★
- 2873 MIZUNA, LTD., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. CROSSLAND FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK, AKA Crossland Savings, FSB, Defendant Royal Realty Co., a Partnership, Defendant-Appellee., 1996 WL 33471255, *33471255+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jun 17, 1996) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Federal Deposit Insurance ...** (NO. 95-7242)★★
- 2874 MIZUNA, LTD., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. CROSSLAND FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK, AKA Crossland Savings, FSB Defendant, Royal Realty Co., A Partnership, Defendant-Appellee., 1996 WL 33662025, *33662025+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jun 17, 1996) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Federal Deposit Insurance ...** (NO. 95-7242)★★
- 2875 BURGIO AND CAMPOFELICE, INC., Plaintiff-Appellee, v. NYS DEPT. OF LABOR; Thomas P. Hartnett, Industrial Commissioner of the State of New York; Charles C. Drobner, Director of Bureau of Public Work, New York State Department of Labor and Robert Abrams, Attorney General of the State of New York, Defendants-Appellants., 1996 WL 33661616, *33661616+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. May 06, 1996) **Brief for Defendants-Appellants** (NO. 96-7210)★★
- 2876 Vincent MOODIE, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK, Defendant-Appellee., 1994 WL 16181319, *16181319+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Dec 21, 1994) **Brief of Defendant-Appellee** (NO. 94-6259)★★

- 2877 George P. STOE, Appellant, v. William E. FLAHERTY; David Carpenter; James Carpenter; William Smelas; Robert Sunderman and Ronald Statile, Appellees., 2005 WL 4829263, *4829263+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Apr 08, 2005) **Brief in Opposition of William Smelas, Robert ...** (NO. 04-3947)★★
- 2878 WYATT V.I., INC., Plaintiff/Appellee, Hovensa, L.L.C., Intervenor/Appellee, v. GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, by and through the Virgin Islands Department of Labor, and Cecil Benjamin in His Official Capacity as Commissioner of the Virgin Islands Department of Labor, Defendants/Appellants, Virginie George, Malcolm Maccow, Edgar Berrios and Claude Gaines, Intervenor/Appellants., 2003 WL 24193024, *24193024+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Mar 14, 2003) **Brief of Appellee Wyatt VI, Inc.** (NO. 02-2695, 02-3762)★★
- 2879 David CHITTISTER, Appellant - Plaintiff v. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, David Black and Larry Segal, Appellees - Defendants, 2003 WL 24028569, *24028569 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Feb 25, 2003) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 02-4463)★★
- 2880 Melania Felix DE ASECIO, Manuel A. Gutierrez, Asela Ruiz, Eusebia Ruiz, Luiz A. Vigo, Luz Cordova, and Hector Pantajos, on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated individuals, Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. TYSON FOODS, INC., Defendant-Appellant., 2003 WL 24045913, *24045913+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jan 06, 2003) **Brief For Appellees** (NO. 02-3719)★★
- 2881 DIANESE, Inc. and Gaetano Dianese, Appellants, v. M&T BANK, Appellees., 2002 WL 32828592, *32828592+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Dec 20, 2002) **Informal Brief Filed Jointly for Appellants ...** (NO. 02-3119)★★
- 2882 GAETANO and Rosemarie Dianese, Appellants, v. COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Department of General Services, et al, Appellees., 2002 WL 32818517, *32818517+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Oct 07, 2002) **Brief of Appellee Laputka, Bayless, Ecker & Cohn, ...** (NO. 02-2781)★★
- 2883 DANES, INC., et al., Appellants, v. COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Department of General Services, et al., Appellees., 2002 WL 32818475, *32818475+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Oct 04, 2002) **Brief of Appellee, MID-States Surety Corporation** (NO. 02-2781)★★★
- 2884 DIANESE, INC. et al., Appellants, v. COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Department of General Services et al., Appellees., 2002 WL 32818464, *32818464+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Sep 27, 2002) **Brief for Appellee, Manufacturers & Traders Trust ...** (NO. 02-2781)★★★
- 2885 DIANESE, INC., et al., Appellants, v. COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Department Of General Services, et al., Appellees., 2002 WL 32819301, *32819301+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Aug 30, 2002) **Brief of Appellee Laputka, Bayless, Ecker & Cohn, ...** (NO. 02-1908)★★
- 2886 DIANESE, INC. et al., Appellants, v. COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Department of General Services et al., Appellees., 2002 WL 32819300, *32819300+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Aug 21, 2002) **Brief for Appellee, Manufacturers & Traders Trust ...** (NO. 02-1908)★★★
- 2887 DIANESE, INC. et al., Appellants, v. COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Department of General Services et al., Appellees., 2002 WL 32819302, *32819302+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Aug 21, 2002) **Brief for Appellee, Manufacturers & Traders Trust ...** (NO. 02-1908)★★★
- 2888 W. James OELSNER, West Indies Transport Company, and Wit Equipment Company, Defendants-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Respondent-Appellee., 2002 WL 32513525, *32513525+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jul 31, 2002) **Consolidated Brief for the Appellants** (NO. 00-3720, 00-3721)★★
- 2889 DIANESE, INC., et al, v. THE COMMONWEALTH OF PA, et al., 2002 WL 32819298, *32819298 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jul 17, 2002) **Informal Brief** (NO. 02-1908)★★
- 2890 DIANESE, INC., et al, v. THE COMMONWEALTH OF PA, et al., 2002 WL 32819306, *32819306 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jul 17, 2002) **Informal Brief** (NO. 02-1908)★★
- 2891 DIANESE, INC., et al, v. THE COMMONWEALTH OF PA, et al., 2002 WL 32819307, *32819307 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jul 17, 2002) **Informal Brief** (NO. 02-1908)★★
- 2892 DIANESE, INC. and Gaetano Dianese, Appellants v. M&T BANK CORPORATION, Manufacturers and Traders Trust Company d/b/a M&T Bank, and M&T Real Estate, Inc., Appellees., 2002 WL 32828591, *32828591+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. 2002) **Brief For Appellees**, (NO. 02-3119)★★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2893 MRM ENGINEERS, PC and M.R.Mikkilineni, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. AMWEST SURETY INSURANCE CO.; Maureen Hardy; Waterproducts Co.; Derry Township Municipal Authority; Joe Yarchak; Gibson-Thomas Engineering Co.; Edward F. Schmitt; Glenn Elliott; David Pohland; Robert McCabe, Jr.; Thomas Kutsie, Defendants/Appellees., 2000 WL 34027822, *34027822

- (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Nov 07, 2000) **M.R.Mikkilineni's Informal Brief** (NO. 00-2388)★★
- 2894 NEW JERSEY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, v. MERRITT LOGAN, INC., Merritt Logan, individually, Janey Montgomery Scott, and Hornor, Townsend and Kent, v. Kevin CALLAHAN and Corson Getson & Schatz., 1998 WL 34176261, *34176261 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Nov 15, 1998) **Informal Brief** (NO. 98-1810)★★
- 2895 Anthony MATTEO, Appellant, v. SUPERINTENDENT, SCI ALBION, Chester County District Attorney and Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Appellees., 1998 WL 34081708, *34081708+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jul 22, 1998) **Brief of Federal Defender Organization Amici ...** (NO. 96-2115)★★
- 2896 NEW JERSEY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, v. Merritt LOGAN, individually, Merritt Logan, Inc., Janey Montgomery Scott, and Hornor, Townsend and Kent, v. Kevin CALLAHAN and Corson, Getson & Schatz., 1998 WL 34169791, *34169791 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. May 29, 1998) **Informal Brief** (NO. 97-1903)★★
- 2897 Robert A. WALTON; Regina A. Walton, Appellants, v. DIVISION OF REVENUE FOR THE STATE OF DELAWARE; William Remington, Director of Revenue, Appellees., 1997 WL 33554764, *33554764+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. 1997) **Brief for Appellees** (NO. 97-7284)★★
- 2898 John HOFFMAN, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, William S. Cohen, Secretary of Defense, Sheila E. Widnall, Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, Richard Moss, Colonel Tactical Airlift Group Command of the Willow Grove Air Reserve Station, Robert Miller, Commander of the 913th Logistics Group Willow Grove Air Reserve Station, Defendants-Appellees., 1997 WL 33707849, *33707849 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. 1997) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 97-1215)★★
- 2899 Mac D. HUNTER, Honorable, Judge of the Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellant, v. SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY; Robert N. Wilentz, Honorable, Chief Justice; Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct; Sidney M. Schreiber, Honorable, Chairperson, Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct, Appellees., 1996 WL 33577573, *33577573+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Dec 12, 1996) **Brief of Appellant, Honorable Mac D. Hunter** (NO. 96-5628)★★
- 2900 MATTHEWS, Angela, Petitioner - Appellant, v. COMMISSIONER INTERNAL REVENUE, Respondent - Appellee., 1996 WL 33677786, *33677786 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Apr 19, 1996) **Appellants Opening Brief** (NO. 96-7146)★
- 2901 Margaret L. JOHNSTON and Paul E. Fontaine, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Appellants, v. HBO FILM MANAGEMENT, INC., a Delaware corporation; Entertainment Finance Services, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Home Box Office, Inc., a Delaware corporation; Kidder, Peabody & Co., Incorporated, a Delaware corporation; and Smith Barney Inc., a Delaware corporation, Appellees., 1996 WL 33657260, *33657260+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. 1996) **Reply Brief for Appellants** (NO. 96-3164)★★
- 2902 David Lee YOHN, Appellee, v. William J. LOVE, and The Attorney General of the State of Pennsylvania, and The District Attorney of Lehigh County: Appellant., 1995 WL 17198194, *17198194 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. 1995) **Brief for Appellee** (NO. 95-1412)★★
- 2903 CLEWELL, v. UPJOHN COMPANY; Richard N. Clewell, et. al., Appellants., 1994 WL 16180930, *16180930 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. 1994) **Informal Brief** (NO. 94-2082)★★
- 2904 ATKINSON & MULLEN, INC., d/b/a Apple Vacations, v. John DVORNIK, et al., Great American Vacations, Appellant., 1993 WL 13139501, *13139501+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. 1993) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 93-1870) ""★★
- 2905 Boris AVERBUKH, Et Al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION, Defendant-Appellee., 1992 WL 12140139, *12140139 (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Nov 25, 1992) **Brief of Defendant-Appellee National Railroad ...** (NO. 92-1752)★★
- 2906 Robert E. and LORRAINE J. Birth, Petitioners/Appellants, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et. al., Respondent/Appellee., 1991 WL 11248684, *11248684+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Dec 26, 1991) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 91-5696)★★

- 2907 Yaser Esam HAMDI, and Esam Fouad Hamdi, as next friend of Yaser Esam Hamdi, Petitioners-Appellees, v. Donald RUMSFELD, Secretary of Defense, and Commander W.R. Paulette, Norfolk Naval Brig, Respondents-Appellants., 2002 WL 33962809, *33962809+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Oct 25, 2002) **Brief Submitted on Behalf of the Center for ...** (NO. 02-7338)★★
- 2908 WEBSTER COUNTY LUMBER COMPANY, INC., et al, Defendant-Appellants, v. Larry WAYNE, et al, Plaintiff-Appellees., 2002 WL 32727447, *32727447+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Jul 16, 2002) **Brief of Appellees** (NO. 02-1429)★★
- 2909 Samuel ANTRICAN and Alana Antrican, minor children, by their next of friend Angela Antrican; Jeshod Hughes and Emani Tatum, minor children, by their next of friend Thea Gilbert; Arielle Mc Cree, minor child, by her next of friend Sherry McCree; and Austin Brooks, minor child, by his next of friend, Marty Greer; on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff-Appellees, v. CARMEN HOOKER BUELL, Director of the North Carolina Department of Health, 2001 WL 34383547, *34383547 (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Oct 29, 2001) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 01-1693)★★
- 2910 AMZURA ENTERPRISES, INCORPORATED, d/b/a AMZCO/SURGICAL DEVICES, U.S.A., Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Javid A. RATCHER, an individual; Affiliated Industries, Incorporated; Frank Francois, an individual, Defendant-Appellees, Stanley v. CAMPBELL; Mark Fowler; Rowe Incorporated; Anderson Funding Group, Defendants, GLOBAL FINANCIAL CORPORATION, Intervenor-Appellant., 1999 WL 33618761, *33618761+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Nov 22, 1999) **Appellee's Supplemental Brief** (NO. 97-2697(L)97-2698)★★
- 2911 Leonard TRAFICANTI, d/b/a LT's Gas/Snak, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant/Appellee., 1999 WL 33617092, *33617092+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Jul 23, 1999) **Brief for Appellee** (NO. 99-1478)★★
- 2912 Leonard TRAFICANTI, d/b/a LT's Gas/Snak, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant/Appellee., 1999 WL 33617116, *33617116+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Jul 23, 1999) **Brief for Appellee** (NO. 99-1478)★★
- 2913 Laura NELSON, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Irwin W. URAN, Defendant/Appellant., 1998 WL 34094342, *34094342+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Dec 10, 1998) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 98-2400) ""★★
- 2914 ALLIED COLLOIDS INC., Plaintiff - Appellee, v. JADAIR, INCORPORATED, Defendant - Appellant., 1997 WL 33513318, *33513318+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Jan 02, 1997) **Brief of Appellee Allied Colloids Inc.** (NO. 96-2078)★★
- 2915 NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Nicholas F. BRADY, in his official capacity as the Secretary of the Treasury, Stephen E. Higgins, in his official capacity as the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, U.S. Department of the Treasury, Defendants-Appellees., 1993 WL 13124392, *13124392+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Jan 1993) **Brief for Defendants-Appellees** (NO. 92-2261)★★
- 2916 Elizabeth LEVERETT, also known as Marjorie Huckabee, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. BISHOP FURNITURE COMPANY, Defendant-Appellee., 1978 WL 220524, *220524+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Oct 16, 1978) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 78-1549)★★
- 2917 GEORATOR CORPORATION, Appellant, v. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, Appellee., 1978 WL 221544, *221544+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Apr 26, 1978) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 78-1161)★★
- 2918 THE IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF NATUROPATHIC PHYSICIANS, INC., et al, Appellants, v. UNITED STATES FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, et al, Respondents., 1978 WL 220550, *220550+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Feb 15, 1978) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 77-1908, 77-2593, 77-2594)★★
- 2919 Peter N. BORSI, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. A. J. SPERO, Defendant-Appellee., 1977 WL 203406, *203406+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Aug 12, 1977) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 77-1674, 76-635-A)★
- 2920 THE IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF NATUROPATHIC PHYSICIANS, INC., et al, Appellants, v. UNITED STATES FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, et al, Respondents., 1977 WL 203776, *203776+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. May 03, 1977) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 77-1346)★★

- 2921 William C. MCCORKLE, Jr., et al., Plaintiffs - Appellants, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Robert E. Hampton, and James T. Lynn, Defendants - Appellees., 1976 WL 192799, *192799 (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. 1976) **Brief on Behalf of Appellants** (NO. 76-1479)★★
- 2922 Rutherford R. WILLIAMS, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. VIRGINIA EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION, Defendant-Appellee., 1975 WL 184078, *184078 (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Sep 26, 1975) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 75-1832)★★
- 2923 Ray SMITH, Individually and on Behalf of All Other Persons in the United States Similarly Situated, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS, INC., Defendant - Appellee., 2004 WL 3589483, *3589483+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Dec 21, 2004) **Brief of Appellant Ray Smith** (NO. 04-20827)★★
- 2924 Jeffrey BALAWAJDER, Appellant-Plaintiff, v. Benny G. RAIMER, Christina Crain, Lannette Linthicum, Owen Murray, Glenda Adams, Rochelle McKinney, A. Shabaaz, Lynn Allen, Guy Smith, Muhammed A. Rahi, Luke Scarmado, Sarah Vacante, Vernetta Porter, The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, Eugene Fontenot, David Geib, Jimmy Rosales, Norm McClure, Mattie Davis, Dorothy Whitley, Arlita Jefferson, Janie Cockrell, Allen Hightower, John, 2004 WL 3417714, *3417714+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Jun 04, 2004) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 04-20290) ""★★
- 2925 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Doyle Jones; Veronica Jones, Petitioners - Appellants, v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, Respondent - Appellee., 2003 WL 23313512, *23313512+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. May 08, 2003) **Reply Brief for Appellants** (NO. 02-60964) ""★★
- 2926 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS, Ex Rel Citizen Donald Wayne Eastman and Andrew Wayne Winston, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, Paul O'Neill as Principal, Henry Crawford, Revenue Agent for the Internal Revenue Service, Linda Short, Technical Support Manager for the Internal Revenue Service, Defendants/Appellees., 2002 WL 32488019, *32488019+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Dec 30, 2002) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 02-11237) ""★★★
- 2927 Yvette P. PATTON, et al, Appellants, v. Joseph Craig LEMOINE, et al, Appellees., 2002 WL 32180144, *32180144+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Mar 27, 2002) **Brief of Appellant - Yvette P. Patton** (NO. 02-30173)★★
- 2928 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Marylyn R. LEPRE, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. FRESENIUS MEDICAL CARE-NORTH AMERICA, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2000 WL 34030126, *34030126+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Apr 19, 2000) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 00-60061)★★
- 2929 Charles Etta WILLIAMS, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. DALLAS AREA RAPID TRANSIT, Defendant-Appellee., 2000 WL 33990703, *33990703 (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. 2000) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 00-10361)★★
- 2930 OTTO CANDIES, INC., Plaintiff - Appellee, v. HOUSTON SEA-PACKING, INC., Defendant - Appellant, Donald JONES, Movant - Appellant., 1999 WL 33728148, *33728148+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Nov 17, 1999) **Original Brief of Plaintiff-Appellee Otto ...** (NO. 99-30517)★
- 2931 OTTO CANDIES, INC., Plaintiff-Appellee, v. HOUSTON SEA-PACKING COMPANY INC., Defendant-Appellant., 1999 WL 33728146, *33728146+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Sep 21, 1999) **Brief for Appellant, Donald E. Jones** (NO. 99-30517) ""★★★★
- 2932 MARATHON OIL COMPANY, Marathon International Oil Company, and Marathon Petroleum Norge AIS, Plaintiffs-Appellants-Cross Appellees, v. RUHRGAS, A G, Defendant-Appellee-Cross Appellant., 1998 WL 34082202, *34082202+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Mar 09, 1998) **Appellants' Response to Amicus Filings** (NO. 96-20361)★★
- 2933 Vera L. SCHOPPE, Appellant, v. TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, and James A. Collins, IN His Official Capacity AS Director of Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Appellees., 1997 WL 33627741, *33627741+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Feb 12, 1997) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 96-21026)★★
- 2934 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Darrel TOMBLIN, Defendant-Appellant., 1996 WL 33475998, *33475998+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Aug 29, 1996) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 96-50371)★★

- 2935 Darrell A. TOMBLIN Pro Se, Defendant-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Respondent-Appellant., 1996 WL 33475997, *33475997+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Jun 15, 1996) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 96-50371)★★
- 2936 Merlyn J. POLLOCK, Appellant, v. FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION AS RECEIVER FOR FIRST CITY, Texas -- Dallas, Appellee., 1993 WL 13102779, *13102779+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Jul 14, 1993) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 92-9010)★★
- 2937 Everette G. LEWIS and Addie B. Lewis, Plaintiff-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES; South Terry Water Association; Earl B. Vick; Johnny Terry; James Green, Defendants-Appellees., 1993 WL 13099711, *13099711+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Jul 06, 1993) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 93-7258)★★
- 2938 Rebecca VALENCIA-PONCE, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. William BARR, Former United States Attorney; Henry Oncken, Former United States Attorney for the southern District of Texas; Jeffery A. Babcock, Assistant United States Attorney for the Couthern District of Texas; Carlos Martinez, Fromer Assistant United States Attorney; John Does 1 through 100; Jane Does 1 through 100; Et.al., Defendants/Appellees., 1993 WL 13131262, *13131262+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Jun 03, 1993) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 93-7163)★★
- 2939 John DOE, Father of John Doe, and Mother of John Doe, Plaintiff-Appellants, v. Robert I. KERWOOD, D.O.; Lee Memorial Hospital; American Red Cross d/b/a Central Texas Region Blood Services; Ronald E. Henderson, Jr., M.D.; David M. McTaggart, M.D.; Abbott Manufacturing, Inc., d/b/a Abbott Diagnostics Manufacturing; and Abbott Laboratories, Defendant-Appellees., 1991 WL 11246941, *11246941+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Oct 18, 1991) **Brief of Appellee American Red Cross** (NO. 91-8397) ""★★★★
- 2940 John DOE, Father of John Doe, and Mother of John Doe, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. ROBERT I. Kerwood, D.O., et al, Defendants-Appellees., 1991 WL 11245421, *11245421+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. 1991) **Brief of Appellants, John Doe, Father of John ...** (NO. 91-8397) ""★★★★
- 2941 WESTSIDE MOTHERS, ET AL., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. James K HAVEMAN Jr., ET AL Defendants-Appellees., 2001 WL 34624940, *34624940+ (Appellate Brief) (6th Cir. Apr 12, 2001) **Brief of Amici Curiae Law Professors Supporting ...** (NO. 01-1494)★★
- 2942 Philip BARTLING, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants and Cross-Appellees, v. FRUEHAUF CORPORATION, Kelsey-Hayes Company, Kelsey-Hayes Sep Plan Defendants-Appellees and Cross-Appellants, Citibank, N.A., Irving Trust Company, Defendants., 1993 WL 13579905, *13579905+ (Appellate Brief) (6th Cir. 1993) **Reply Brief of Plaintiffs-Appellants and ...** (NO. 93-3281, 93-3324) ""★★★
- 2943 AIRBORNE BEEPERS & VIDEO INC., An Illinois Corporation, Plaintiff, v. SOUTHWESTERN BELL MOBILE SYSTEMS, LLC, d/b/a Cingular Wireless., Defendants., 2006 WL 3857801, *3857801+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. Dec 13, 2006) **Brief of Appellant Airborne Beepers** (NO. 06-2949, 06-2181)★★
- 2944 In re OCWEN FEDERAL BANK FSB MORTGAGE SERVICING LITIGATION., 2006 WL 2788080, *2788080+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. Sep 13, 2006) **Appellants' Opening Brief** (NO. 06-3132)★★
- 2945 In re: ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendant-Appellant. Billy E. ADKINS, Administrator of the Estate of Helena R. Adkins, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendant-Appellant., 2001 WL 34105258, *34105258+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. 2001) **Brief and Appendix of Defendant-Appellant ...** (NO. 01-3081, 01-3418)★
- 2946 In re: ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendant-Appellant. Billy E. ADKINS, Administrator of the Estate of Helena R. Adkins, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendant-Appellant., 2001 WL 34105320, *34105320+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. 2001) **Brief and Appendix of Defendant-Appellant ...** (NO. 01-3081, 01-3418)★
- 2947 Charlotte KLINGLER, Charles Wehner, and Sheila Brashear on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, State of Missouri, Defendant-Appellee., 2000 WL 34004457, *34004457+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. 2000) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 00-1597)★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2948 Leon Gene CLUGSTON, Petitioner-Appellant, v. Eric SMITH, individual capacity; and, Kevin D. Williams, individual capacity; and, Rachel King, individual capacity; and, Richard Romero, individual capacity; and, Ray A. Hollenbeck, individual capacity; and, Crystal Dawn Langham, individual capacity, Respondent-Appellees., 2006 WL 3623335, *3623335+ (Appellate Brief) (9th

- Cir. Oct 30, 2006) **Petitioner-Appellant's Opening Brief in Support ...** (NO. 06-35755) ★★★
- 2949 Darius MOSTOWFI, Teng Lew Lim, Teng Howe Lim, and Fung Chee Lim, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. 12 TELECOM INTERNATIONAL, INC., Paul R. Arena, Bernard R. Kossar, Anthony F. Zalenski, Alex Opreescu, Ron Roswell, Sr., Stresser & Associates, P.C., Jim Leimbach, Carol Kossar, Stephanie Kossar, Valerie Kossar, Alexander Arena, Francesca DePalma, Chantal Hall, Alexandra Hall, Shannon Hall, Lara Leonard, Dane Leonard, Millennium Partners, LP, Clare Family Trust, Angela, 2006 WL 3294822, *3294822+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Sep 25, 2006) **Appellants' Consolidated Reply Brief** (NO. 06-15597)★★
- 2950 Evangelina MENDEZ and Angel Mendez, Plaintiffs, Arturo Jorge Gonzalez, Appellant. v. COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO; San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department; City of Hesperia; James Martinez, Sergeant; Rod Medley, Deputy; Marion Browne, Deputy; Cesar Reves, Deputy, Defendants., 2005 WL 4155700, *4155700+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Nov 03, 2005) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 05-56118)★★
- 2951 Robert KAHRE, Plaintiff- Appellant, v. Thomas BIGGAR;Lionel sawyer & Collins; Nevada State Bank; R. Gardner Jolley; James C. Mahan; Seven Circles Gaming Corporation; Swiss Casinos Holding AG; Swiss Casinos of Merica, Inc.; the Resort at Summerlin, Inc.; the Resort at Summerlin Limited Partnership; Todd M. Touton, Defendants- Appellees., 2005 WL 3128078, *3128078+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jun 30, 2005) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 05-15401)★★
- 2952 D. KARL HUMBARGER, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. US EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, et al Defendants-Appellees., 2005 WL 3128127, *3128127 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jun 24, 2005) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 05-15552)★★
- 2953 Lea Purwin D'AGOSTINO, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Rockard J. DELGADILLO, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2004 WL 1621423, *1621423 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. May 14, 2004) **Plaintiff-Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 04-55291)★★
- 2954 Michael L. SWIFT, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., Defendants, Steve Christian, et al., Defendants and Appellees., 2003 WL 22669838, *22669838+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Mar 24, 2003) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 02-57136)★★
- 2955 Rosolino Frank PASSALACQUA, Petitioner-Appellant, v. David MELIGAN, et al., Respondents-Appellees., 2002 WL 32117969, *32117969+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Sep 20, 2002) **Respondents' Answering Brief** (NO. 02-16467)★★
- 2956 Thomas ANDERSON, Plaintiff / Appellant, v. James ANDERSON, et. al., Defendant / Appellee., 2002 WL 32107804, *32107804+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Mar 28, 2002) **Reply Brief for Appellant** (NO. 01-15537)★★
- 2957 Thomas ANDERSON, Plaintiff / Appellant, v. James ANDERSON, et. al., Defendant / Appellee., 2002 WL 32107805, *32107805+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. 2002) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 01-15537) "" ★★★
- 2958 CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., and Margaret M. Lynch, Plaintiffs/Appellees. v. CALIFORNIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD, and Lawrence F. Newman, Defendants/Appellants., 2001 WL 34102628, *34102628 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Nov 14, 2001) **Appellees' Answering Brief** (NO. 01-16096)★★
- 2959 STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY, Proposed Intervenor / Appellant, v. Thomas ANDERSON, Plaintiff / Appellee., 2001 WL 34098183, *34098183+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Nov 08, 2001) **Brief for Appellee (Corrected)** (NO. 01-15815) "" ★★★
- 2960 STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY, Proposed Intervenor / Appellant, v. Thomas ANDERSON, Plaintiff / Appellee., 2001 WL 34098184, *34098184+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Oct 18, 2001) **Brief for Appellee** (NO. 01-15815) "" ★★★

- 2961 Jane Largent ALFREY, Personal Representative of the Estate of Thomas Martin Alfrey, Appellant, v. Joseph H. CRABTREE, Warden FCI Sheridan, et al., Respondents, Jane Largent ALFREY, Personal Representative of the Estate of Thomas Martin Alfrey, Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Respondent., 2001 WL 34091690, *34091690+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Apr 17, 2001) **Reply Brief of Appellant Jane Alfrey, Personal ...** (NO. 00-35838)★★
- 2962 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Ronnie Joseph BRICKEY, Defendant/Appellant., 2001 WL 34090767, *34090767+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Mar 03, 2001) **Opening Brief of Defendant-Appellant** (NO. 00-10561) ""★★
- 2963 Steven KESSLER, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2000 WL 34217181, *34217181+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Sep 14, 2000) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 00-55604) ""★★
- 2964 Humberto ALVAREZ-MACHAIN, Plaintiff-Appellee1Cross-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al., Defendants., 2000 WL 33997812, *33997812+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jul 25, 2000) **Response Brief of Cross-Appellees Jack Lawn, ...** (NO. 99-56880, 99-56762)★★
- 2965 Ronnie HAWKINS, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Joan COMPARET-CASSANI, et al., Defendants, Leroy Baca and County of Los Angeles, Defendants-Appellants-Real Parties in Interest., 1999 WL 33625934, *33625934 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jul 20, 1999) **Plaintiff-Appellee's Answering Brief** (NO. 99-55187, 99-55394)★★
- 2966 Robert A. and Elena H. BROWN; et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendants - Appellees., 1999 WL 33727190, *33727190 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jul 16, 1999) **Appellants/Petitioners' Informal Reply Brief** (NO. 99-15308) ""★★
- 2967 Richard F. BRODERICK, and Margaret E. Broderick, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Frank GOODROE, et al, Defendants-Appellees., 1999 WL 33636988, *33636988+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jun 21, 1999) **Appellants' Opening Brief** (NO. 99-55540)★★
- 2968 Jose Alfredo BEDOLLA-CHAVEZ, Petitioner, v. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, Respondent., 1999 WL 33729968, *33729968 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Mar 15, 1999) **Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 98-71428)★★
- 2969 UNITED STATES FIDELITY & GUARANTY CO., Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Robert KAHRE, Defendant/Appellant., 1999 WL 33627464, *33627464+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 18, 1999) **Appellant Robert Kahre's Opening Brief** (NO. 99-15018)★★
- 2970 Roddy WONG, D.C., Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Karen ALLISON, Defendant, Jeff ANDREWS; Dave Rovetti; George Lyford; Jo Briggs; and Cindy Wade, Defendants-Appellants., 1998 WL 34107586, *34107586+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Dec 01, 1998) **Opening Brief of the Defendants/Appellants** (NO. 98-16532)★★
- 2971 Mishler v. Clift, 1998 WL 34300920, *34300920+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jun 15, 1998) **Opening Brief of the Defendants/Appellants** (NO. 98-15796)★★
- 2972 Anna Maria La SPINA, Appellant/Petitioner, v. Joseph C. WUCHERER, J. Alexander, Appellee/Respondent., 1997 WL 33621627, *33621627 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 24, 1997) **Appellant's or Petitioner's Informal Brief** (NO. 96-56735)★★
- 2973 John EARL: Tomlinson, sui juris, Appellant/Demandant, v. ALLEN NAILOR AGENT, IRS & Jose Melendez Treasury Agent, Appellees/Defendants., 1996 WL 33488176, *33488176+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Apr 18, 1996) **Appellants opening brief** (NO. 96-55022)★★
- 2974 HARRY'S COCKTAIL LOUNGE, INC., et al., Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. Brook MCMAHON, individually and in his official capacity, etc., et al., Defendants/Appellees., 1995 WL 17066884, *17066884+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Nov 07, 1995) **Appellants' Opening Brief** (NO. 95-55478)★★
- 2975 David C. STEPHENSON, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. STATE OF WASHINGTON, Kitsap County, Warren Sharpe, Danny Clem, Leonerd Costello, Leonard Kruse, Ginger Grulur, Jay Nuxall, Defendants-Appellees., 1995 WL 17065570, *17065570+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. May 04, 1995) **Brief of Defendants-Appellees** (NO. 95-35138)★★
- 2976 Randolph S. RAINS, Appellant, v. CRITERION SYSTEMS, INC., a California Corporation, Kaiser Permanente Hospital, Inc., a California Corporation, Anthony Freitas, Paul Fice, and Does 1 through 50, inclusive, Appellees., 1995 WL 17017709, *17017709 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Mar 09, 1995) **Supplemental Brief of Respondents** (NO. 93-17168)★★

- 2977 STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, v. Hazel O'LEARY, Secretary of Energy, Defendant., 1995 WL 17143776, *17143776+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 06, 1995) **Plaintiff State of Nevada's Reply Brief** (NO. 94-70148) "" ★★★
- 2978 Alexander F. BEDDOE, Appellant, v. UNITED STATES AND CALIFORNIA, Appellees. Alexander F. Beddoe, Defendant - Appellant, v. United States and California, Defendant - Appellees., 1994 WL 16172628, *16172628+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Nov 14, 1994) **Appellant/Petitioner's Opening Brief** (NO. 94-16734) ★★★
- 2979 Andrew RAHAS Jr., Plaintiff/Appellant, v. UNITED STATES AND IT'S AGENT BRIAN P. MCMAHON, Defendants/Appellee., 1994 WL 16180860, *16180860 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Apr 14, 1994) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 94-15347) ★★
- 2980 THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION, as Receiver for Merabank, a federal savings bank, Appellants, v. Shirley BROCKMAN, as natural mother and special conservator of Michael Brockman, an incapacitated person, Appellee., 1994 WL 16137578, *16137578+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Mar 03, 1994) **Brief for Appellee** (NO. 93-15505) ★★
- 2981 Frederick M. FOX, Appellant, v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, Appellee., 1993 WL 13097794, *13097794+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Dec 15, 1993) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 93-70824) ★★
- 2982 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NATUROPATHIC PHYSICIANS, a non-profit Oregon corporation, Appellee, v. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NATUROPATHIC PHYSICIANS, a non-profit Nevada corporation, Appellant., 1993 WL 13105539, *13105539+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Aug 16, 1993) **Brief of Appellee American Association of ...** (NO. 93-35038) ★★
- 2983 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. ALASKA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 1993 WL 13011165, *13011165+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Mar 01, 1993) **Brief for the Appellees** (NO. 92-36614) ★★
- 2984 ARIZONANS FOR OFFICIAL ENGLISH Robert D. PARK, Movants/Intervenors - Appellants, v. Maria-Kelly F. YNIGUEZ, Plaintiff - Appellee, The Hon. Rose MOFFORD, Defendant - Appellee. The Hon. Rose MOFFORD, Defendant - Appellant, v. Maria-Kelly F. YNIGUEZ, Plaintiff - Appellee. ARIZONANS FOR OFFICIAL ENGLISH Robert D. PARK, Movants/Intervenors - Appellants., 1990 WL 10022831, *10022831+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jul 30, 1990) **Brief for Appellants/Movants/Intervenors** (NO. 90-15546, 90-15581) ★★★
- 2985 Rio Grande Silvery MINNOW, (Hybognathus amarus); Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (Empidonax Trailii Extimus); Defenders of Wildlife; Forest Guardians; National Audubon Society; New Mexico Audubon Council, Sierra Club; and Southwest Environmental Center, Plaintiffs - Appellees, v. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, an agency of the United States; Carl A. Strock, Lt. Gen., Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, an agency of the United, 2006 WL 2151365, *2151365+ (Appellate Brief) (10th Cir. Jun 19, 2006) **Opening Brief of Appellant Middle Rio Grande ...** (NO. 05-2399, 06-2020, 06-2021) "" ★★★
- 2986 ANDREWS, et al, Plaintiff/Petitioner - Appellant, v. ANDREWS, et al, Defendant/Respondent - Appellee., 2005 WL 2367698, *2367698 (Appellate Brief) (10th Cir. Jun 17, 2005) **Appellant/Petitioner's Opening Brief** (NO. 05-6102, 05-6098) ★
- 2987 Moshe TAL; Bricktown 2000, Inc.; and Tal Technologies, Inc., Plaintiffs - Appellants, v. Dan Randolph HOGAN; TMK/Hogan Joint Venture, also known as Commercial Real Estate Services; Hogan Property Management LLC; Bricktown-TMK/Hogan Parking LLC, also known as Bricktown-SMC/Hogan LLC; Bricktown-TMK/Hogan Entertainment LLC, also known as Bricktown Entertainment LLC; Mark D. Elgin; Stonegate Management Company LLC; Elgin Development Company LLC; TDC, 2004 WL 1431808, *1431808+ (Appellate Brief) (10th Cir. May 13, 2004) **Appellee Tiana Douglas' Response Brief** (NO. 03-6293) "" ★★
- 2988 ALL COMMUNITY WALK IN CLINIC, Petitioner-Appellant, v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, Respondent-Appellee; Mohammed A. Gazi, and Estate of Raees I. Gazi, Deceased, Mohammed A. Gazi, Personal Representative, Petitioners-Appellants, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent-Appellee., 2006 WL 4127948, *4127948+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Sep 22, 2006) **Brief for the Appellee** (NO. 05-16314-II, 05-16315-II) ★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 2989 ALL COMMUNITY WALK IN CLINIC, Petitioner-Appellant, v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, Respondent-Appellee; Mohammed A. Gazi, and Estate of Raees I. Gazi, Deceased, Mohammed A. Gazi, Personal Representative, Petitioners-Appellants, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent-Appellee., 2006 WL 4127951, *4127951+ (Appellate Brief) (11th

- Cir. Sep 22, 2006) **Brief for the Appellee** (NO. 05-16314-II, 05-16315-II)★★
- 2990 Patricia A. SHEELER, Appellant, v. O'CARRS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, Appellee., 2006 WL 2630042, *2630042 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Jul 17, 2006) (NO. 06-13137-GG)★★
- 2991 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Billy Joe McCLAIN, Defendant-Appellant., 2006 WL 3074810, *3074810+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Mar 24, 2006) **Reply Brief of Appellant** (NO. 05-16015-HH)★★
- 2992 Patricia A. SHEELER, Appellant, v. O'CARRS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, Appellee., 2006 WL 2630041, *2630041 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. 2006) **Appeal from the United States District Court ...** (NO. 06-163137-GG)★★
- 2993 Ernest B. FORD, Petitioner-Appellant, v. Warden R. WILEY, et al., Respondent-Appellee., 2005 WL 4780895, *4780895+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Jul 07, 2005) **Brief for Appellant Ernest B. Ford** (NO. 05-10986-H)★★
- 2994 Michael-JARRETT; Casdorff, Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee., 2004 WL 3569747, *3569747+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Dec 18, 2004) **Appellant's Appeal Brief** (NO. 04-15786-G)★★
- 2995 Linda B. ALBASINI, Appellant, v. WAL-MART STORES, INC., et al, Appellees., 2004 WL 1772610, *1772610+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Feb 26, 2004) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 04-10183GG)★★
- 2996 Monica HENDERSON, Appellant, v. Jack TILLMAN, et al., Appellee., 2002 WL 32160379, *32160379+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. 2002) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 02-13231-FF)★★
- 2997 Lijyasu KANDEKORE, Esq., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA, Defendants/Appellees., 2001 WL 34142280, *34142280+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Apr 26, 2001) **Brief for the Plaintiff-Appellant** (NO. 01-11300-CC)★★
- 2998 USX CORPORATION and HEATHERWOOD GOLF CLUB, INC., Plaintiffs-Appellants/Counterclaim Defendants, v. TIECO, INC., ATOZ Management Inc., and Fletcher Yeilding, Defendants-Appellees/Counterclaim Plaintiffs., 2000 WL 34004494, *34004494+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Jun 21, 2000) **Reply Brief of Appellants USX Corporation and ...** (NO. 00-11309-HH)★★
- 2999 Henry L. MANNS, Petitioner/Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Respondent/Appellee., 2000 WL 34018910, *34018910+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. May 12, 2000) **Reply Brief** (NO. 99-14078-EE) ""★★
- 3000 INGLESBY, Falligant, Horne, Courington & Nash, P.C., Appellant, v. Anne R. MOORE, Chapter 7 Trustee, Appellee., 1999 WL 33619234, *33619234 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Apr 19, 1999) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 98-08831)★★
- 3001 James MACON, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. SECRETARY OF STATE, ORLANDO, Defendant(s)-Appellee(s)., 1998 WL 34097188, *34097188+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Jul 14, 1998) **Initial Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. 98-2265)★★
- 3002 UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA, Appellant, v. William H. PRYOR, Attorney General State of Alabama Appellee., 1998 WL 34082275, *34082275+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Mar 23, 1998) **Brief of Appellee Attorney General Bill Pryor** (NO. 97-6680) ""★★
- 3003 IN THE MATTER OF: CLYDE THOMAS CARTER, Debtor Frances Carter, Appellant, v. HARRY LEE CARTER ESTATE MANAGEMENT TRUST, Appellee., 1998 WL 34184747, *34184747 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Jan 05, 1998) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 97-6570) ""★★
- 3004 Frank FICA, Appellant, v. Chester A. LAMB DIN, Major Pipta, Sergeant Nappi, Officer Richards, Dr. Rodriguez, Appellees., 1997 WL 33626654, *33626654 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Aug 12, 1997) **Brief of Appellees** (NO. 96-4896-1)★★
- 3005 Cruz SIGALA, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. AT&T CORP., et al., Defendants-Appellees. Consolidated with Ligia Pacheco De Perez, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. AT&T Corp., et al., Defendants-Appellees., 1997 WL 33559274, *33559274+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Jun 03, 1997) **Defendants-Appellees" Answer Brief** (NO. 96-8792)★★

- 3006 Berman J. WATTS, Plaintiff- Appellant, v. Togo D. WEST, Et Al., Defendant - Appellee., 1997 WL 33626916, *33626916+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Jan 29, 1997) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 96-9082)★★
- 3007 Fredene J. DAVIS, Appellant, v. Larue CAMP, Sarah McMichael, Humer Keadle, Arihur Gurdun, City of Monticello, Georgia, Appellees., 1996 WL 33477367, *33477367 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Dec 17, 1996) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 96-9056)★★
- 3008 Fredene J. DAVIS, Appellant, v. Larue CAMP, Sarah Mcmichael, Homer Keadle Arthur Gordon City of Monticello. Georgia Appellees., 1996 WL 33501005, *33501005 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Dec 17, 1996) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 96-9056)★★
- 3009 James S. LAKE, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY, Delta Employees Credit Union, et al., 1996 WL 33472654, *33472654+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Apr 22, 1996) **Appellant's Response Brief** (NO. 95-8932)★★★
- 3010 James S. LAKE, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY, Delta Employees Credit Union, et al., Appellee., 1996 WL 33500397, *33500397+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Mar 27, 1996) **Appellant's Response Brief** (NO. 95-08932)★★★
- 3011 Regis D. DAHL, Petitioner; Levelle A. DAHL, Petitioner-Appellant, v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, Respondent-Appellee., 1995 WL 17058730, *17058730+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Dec 13, 1995) **Brief for the Appellee** (NO. 95-2916)★★
- 3012 Regis D. DAHL, Petitioner; and Lavelle A. Dahl, Petitioner-Appellant, v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, Respondent-Appellee., 1995 WL 17115789, *17115789+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Dec 13, 1995) **Brief for the Appellee** (NO. 95-2916)★★
- 3013 James S. LAKE, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY; Internal Revenue Service (IRS); Director of the Internal Revenue Service; Special Procedures Functions Officer of the Internal Revenue Service; And Their Principal, Et Al.; Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms; General Accounting Office; D.W. Rucker, Chief Collections Branch; And Delta Employees Credit Union, Appellees., 1995 WL 17058207, *17058207 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Dec 07, 1995) **Appellant's Appeal Brief** (NO. 95-8932)★★
- 3014 CORPORACION DE EXPORTACIONES MEXICANA USA, INC., Appellant, v. THE STATE OF FLORIDA, Et. Al., Appellees., 1995 WL 17134826, *17134826+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. May 01, 1995) **Reply Brief of Appellant** (NO. 94-5152)★★
- 3015 CORPORACION DE EXPORTACIONES MEXICANA USA, INC., Plaintiff/Appellant, v. THE STATE OF FLORIDA et al., Defendants/Appellees., 1995 WL 17134827, *17134827+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Apr 03, 1995) **Brief of Appellees** (NO. 94-5152)★★
- 3016 James S. LAKE, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY; Internal Revenue Service (IRS); Director of the Internal Revenue Service; Special Procedures Functions Officer of the Internal Revenue Service; And Their Principal, Et Al.; Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms; General Accounting Office; D.W. Rucker, Chief Collections Branch; And Delta Employees Credit Union, Appellees., 1995 WL 17110434, *17110434+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Jan 02, 1995) **Appellant's Appeal Brief** (NO. 95-8932)★★
- 3017 Ron J. BROWN, Appellant Pro Se, v. UNITED STATES, Appellee., 1994 WL 16054815, *16054815+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Oct 03, 1994) **Appellant's Appeal Brief** (NO. 94-8757)★★
- 3018 Reinhold DIDIE, Appellee, v. Ashley E. HOWES, Jr., Appellant., 1992 WL 12149164, *12149164 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Feb 21, 1992) **Reply by Appellant** (NO. 91-5797)★★
- 3019 James F. DAVIS; Myron J. Allquist; Lee Armstrong; Carlos Davila; Trudy Dishrud; Duane Eldridge; Carlton G. Evans; Kenneth Ferris; Thomas Fttzgerald; Sharon Gaston; Larry Gibbs; Michael I. Ooar; William L Green, Sr.; Frederick W. Greenfiel D. Stephen R. Guercio; Dwight A. Haynes; Albert Hefner; Dennis Henderson; Gary R. Hendricks; James Hudson; Troy Hutchinson; William Johnson; Ken Jones; Christopher Kuhn; Joe Lewis; Thomas Malone; Robert S. Martinez; Michael D., 2003 WL 24056479, *24056479+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Mar 20, 2003) **Corrected Brief for Defendants-Appellees** (NO. 03-1112)★★
- 3020 In Re Mitchell R. SWARTZ., 2000 WL 34417373, *34417373 (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Jul 06, 2000) **Reply Brief** (NO. 00-1107)★★

- 3021 STONE CONTAINER CORPORATION, Stone Container International and Stone Container Savannah River Pulp & Paper, Plaintiffs-Cross Appellants, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellant., 1999 WL 33617673, *33617673+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Oct 26, 1999) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New Holland North America, ...** (NO. 99-1333, -1334) ""★★
- 3022 STONE CONTAINER CORPORATION, Stone Container International and Stone Savannah River Pulp & Paper, Plaintiffs Cross-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellant., 1999 WL 33614024, *33614024+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Oct 07, 1999) **Brief of Stone Container Corporation, Stone ...** (NO. 99-1333, 99-1334)★★
- 3023 KINGSTON CONSTRUCTORS, INC., Appellant-Petitioner, v. WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY, Respondent., 1996 WL 33424846, *33424846+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal. Oct 15, 1996) **Answer Brief on the Merits** (NO. S053577) ""★★
- 3024 Floyd A. WRIGHT, Plaintiff/ appellant, v. Sylvia Ruth WEEDEN, Defendant/Respondent., 2005 WL 1248100, *1248100+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 3 Dist. Apr 14, 2005) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. C047609)★★
- 3025 Floyd A. WRIGHT, Plaintiff/appellant, v. Sylvia Ruth WEEDEN et al., Defendant/Respondent., 2005 WL 1124565, *1124565+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 3 Dist. Mar 31, 2005) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. C047609)★★
- 3026 Elzbieta ZIELINSKA, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES et al, Defendants and Respondents., 2003 WL 21977723, *21977723 (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 3 Dist. Feb 20, 2003) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. C042392)★
- 3027 Brian K. COPELAND, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff-Petitioner, v. MBNA AMERICA, N.A., Defendant-Respondent., 1995 WL 17064530, *17064530+ (Appellate Brief) (Colo. Jan 23, 1995) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Citibank (South Dakota), ...** (NO. 94SC409)★★
- 3028 Randy Leverne GARRISS, A sovereign Citizen of Colorado and a Sovereign Holder of Inherent Political Power, Plaintiff, Appellant, v. PROWERS COUNTY DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GARTH NIESCHBURG Unknown Parties John Doe and Jane Doe, 1 (one) through 20 (twenty) Does, Appellee., 2002 WL 34150787, *34150787+ (Appellate Brief) (Colo.App. Sep 23, 2002) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 02CA747) ""★★
- 3029 Randy Leverne GARRISS, A sovereign Citizen of Colorado and a Sovereign Holder of Inherent Political Power, Plaintiff, Appellant, v. PROWERS COUNTY DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GARTH NIESCHBURG UNKNOWN PARTIES JOHN DOE AND JANE DOE, 1 (one) through 20 (twenty) Does, Appellee., 2002 WL 34150789, *34150789+ (Appellate Brief) (Colo.App. Jan 10, 2002) **Appellant's Revised Reply Brief Double spaced, ...** (NO. 02CA747) ""★★
- 3030 R.R.R. LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, Appellant, v. RECREATIONAL SERVICES INCORPORATED et al., Appellees., 1996 WL 33482480, *33482480 (Appellate Brief) (Ga. Dec 31, 1996) **Brief of State Bar of Georgia, Amicus Curiae** (NO. S96A1828)★★
- 3031 CHICAGO SOUTHSHORE and South Bend Railroad, Movant-Appellee, v. NORTHERN INDIANA COMMUTER TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT, Respondent-Appellant., 1996 WL 33653498, *33653498 (Appellate Brief) (Ill.App. 1 Dist. Oct 30, 1996) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Office of the Attorney ...** (NO. 1-96-0358, 1-96-2757)★★
- 3032 Eugene W. ALPERN, Respondent, Respondent-Appellant, v. Phyllis ALPERN, Petitioner-Appellee., 1994 WL 16175135, *16175135+ (Appellate Brief) (Ill.App. 1 Dist. Jun 20, 1994) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 1-92-2905, DATEDWITH1-92-2975, 1-93-0240, 1-93-0601)★★
- 3033 INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF STATE REVENUE, Appellant, v. FARM CREDIT SERVICES OF MID-AMERICA, ACA, Appellee., 1999 WL 34759843, *34759843 (Appellate Brief) (Ind. Nov 22, 1999) **Brief of Appellee farm Credit Services of ...** (NO. 49S10-9908-TA-453)★
- 3034 In the Matter of the Estate of Esther R. BRODERICK, Deceased., 2007 WL 1257668, *1257668 (Appellate Brief) (Kan.App. Mar 21, 2007) **Reply Brief of Appellant** (NO. 06-97088-A)★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 3035 Maria A. KITRAS, as Trustee of Bear Realty Trust, and as Co-Trustee of Gorda Realty Trust, and James J. Decoulos, as Co-Trustee of Gorda Realty Trust, Plaintiffs - Appellants, v. Jerry A. WIENER, as he is the Zoning Administrator of the Town of Aquinnah; Jerry A. Wiener, Richard Skidmore and Sarah Saltonstall, as they are members of the Board of Health of the Town of

- Aquinnah; the Town of Aquinnah; and the Martha's Vineyard Commission, Defendants -, 2007 WL 696801, *696801 (Appellate Brief) (Mass.App.Ct. Jan 23, 2007) **Reply Brief of the Plaintiffs - Appellants** (NO. 06-P-1463)★★
- 3036 Dr. Isaac J. TARASULO, Appellant, v. Bela TARASULO, Appellee., 2000 WL 34522988, *34522988+ (Appellate Brief) (Md.App. Jun 19, 2000) **Reply Brief of Appellant** (NO. 1221)★★
- 3037 SAVE OUR CREEKS, Plaintiff-Respondent, v. CITY OF BROOKLYN PARK, Defendant-Appellant., 2004 WL 3404188, *3404188 (Appellate Brief) (Minn. Oct 28, 2004) **Appellant City of Brooklyn Park's Brief and ...** (NO. A031794) ""★★
- 3038 Grover HODGES, Appellant, v. State of Mississippi, Appellee., 2003 WL 23917404, *23917404+ (Appellate Brief) (Miss. Dec 12, 2003) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 02-KA-01577) ""★★
- 3039 Myra and Kevin SMITH, Appellants, v. W. Wilson DEFORE, Jr and H. Richard Johnson, Appellees., 2001 WL 34642885, *34642885 (Appellate Brief) (Miss. Jul 02, 2001) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 00-CA-00808)★★
- 3040 Cardinal D. WOOLSEY, Appellant, v. BRIGHTON TRANSPORTATION/INTERSTATE TRANSPORT, Respondent., 2001 WL 34865202, *34865202+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. W.D. Oct 16, 2001) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. WD59951)★★
- 3041 Jerry L. HOLDEN, Plaintiff, Respondent, v. Bartley A. BOONE, Defendant. v. John Williams Plumbing, Inc. and Builders Mutual Insurance Company, Inc., Unnamed Defendants. Appellants., 2002 WL 32443399, *32443399 (Appellate Brief) (N.C.App. Feb 11, 2002) **Plaintiff-Respondent's Brief** (NO. COA01-1347)★★
- 3042 Curt WETZEL, Petitioner-Appellee, v. Orville P. SCHLENVOGT, Respondent-Appellant, Cenex Oil, Petitioner-Appellee, v. Orville Paul Schlenvogt, Respondent-Appellant., 2005 WL 4156028, *4156028+ (Appellate Brief) (N.D. May 2005) **Brief Of Respondent/Appellant O.Paul Schlenvogt** (NO. 20050121) ""★★
- 3043 Joseph O'LOUGHLIN, Carol O'Loughlin, Ada Dorothy Hayes, M.D., Donald McAdams, Boardwalk On the Bay Condominium Association, Inc. and Thirty-O-Seven Bayshore Condominium Association, Inc., Appellants, v. NATIONAL COMMUNITY BANK, Charles Stanfa, Andrew Simpson, George Maul, Boardwalk on the Bay Association, Inc., a New Jersey Corporation, Respondents., 2000 WL 35356874, *35356874+ (Appellate Brief) (N.J.Super.A.D. Jun 08, 2000) **Brief and Appendix for Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. A-960-99T1)★★
- 3044 Daniel HERNANDEZ and Nevin Cohen, Lauren Abrams and Donna Freeman-Tweed, Michael Elsasser and Douglas Robinson, Mary Jo Kennedy and Jo-Ann Shain, and Daniel Reyes and Curtis Woolbright, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Victor R. ROBLES, in His Official Capacity as City Clerk of the City of New York, Defendant-Respondent., 2006 WL 1930150, *1930150+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. May 04, 2006) **Brief for the Amicus Curiae New York State ...**★★
- 3045 FARM CREDIT SERVICES OF MID-AMERICA, an Agricultural Credit Association, Appellant/Cross-Appellee, v. Roger W. TRACY, Tax Commissioner of Ohio, Appellee/Cross-Appellant., 2000 WL 34335428, *34335428 (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Aug 16, 2000) **Reply Brief and Answer Brief of ...** (NO. 2000-0505)★
- 3046 FARM CREDIT SERVICES OF MID-AMERICA, A.C.A., Appellant/Cross-Appellee, v. Roger W. TRACY, Tax Commissioner of Ohio, Appellee/Cross-Appellant., 2000 WL 34335206, *34335206+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Jun 28, 2000) **Answer Brief and Initial Merit Brief of ...** (NO. 2000-0505)★★★
- 3047 FRANKLIN COUNTY, Treasurer, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Ajamu M. KAFELE, Defendant-Appellant., 2005 WL 3700398, *3700398 (Appellate Brief) (Ohio App. 10 Dist. May 06, 2005) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 05AP-252)★★

- 3048 Robert L. PATTERSON and Doris F. Patterson, H/W, Appellants at 38 E.D. Appeal Docket 1987, Carl W. Williams, Jr. and Frances Williams, H/W Appellants at 43 E.D. Appeal Docket 1987, v. JOHNS-MANVILLE CORP.; Johns-Manville Sales Corp.; Raybestos Manhattan, Inc.; Owens-Corning Fiberglas, Corp.; Forty-Eight Insulations, Inc.; Nicolet Industries, Inc.; Pittsburgh-Corning Corp.; GAF Corp.; Celotex Corp.; Armstrong World Industries, Inc.; Unarco Industries., 1987 WL 882484, *882484 (Appellate Brief) (Pa. Apr 15, 1987) **Brief of Appellants Patterson and Williams** (NO. 1987, 1987)★★
- 3049 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Appellee, v. Tracey HAGGAS, Appellant., 2003 WL 23304589, *23304589+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Super. Feb 18, 2003) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 01646MDA02)★★
- 3050 Robert J. TAYLOR, Appellee, v. TAYLOR MILK COMPANY, INC. and Tri-Point Ice Cream Company, Appellants., 2003 WL 23340452, *23340452+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Super. 2003) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 01224WDA03)★★
- 3051 A. Dana HODGDON, Plaintiff, v. ANDERSON ELECTRONICS, INC., a Pennsylvania Corporation, and William G. Anderson, Defendants., 1999 WL 33888982, *33888982+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Super. 1999) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 00370WDA99)★★
- 3052 Daniel ALEXANDER: Boudreau & Robert James: Fox, v. FEDERAL TRUST BANK., 2003 WL 23194982, *23194982+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Nov 12, 2003) **Brief for the Appellant** (NO. 03-1037) ""★★★
- 3053 Amanda FLORANCE, and Richard John Florance, Junior, Petitioners-Appellants, v. State of Texas, A federal corporation, Defendant-Appellee., 2006 WL 452056, *452056+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas Jan 09, 2006) **Florances' Brief** (NO. 05-05-01435-CV)★★
- 3054 Kurt GARRISON, v. CITY OF LEON VALLEY., 2004 WL 2863359, *2863359+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-San Antonio Nov 15, 2004) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 04-04-00714-CV)★★
- 3055 GLUMINA BANK, d.d., Appellant, v. D.C. DIAMOND CORPORATION, a Virginia Corporation, and Karlo Milic, Appellees., 1999 WL 33999390, *33999390+ (Appellate Brief) (Va. Nov 08, 1999) **Appellee Brief** (NO. 991042)★★
- 3056 JADAIR INCORPORATED, Plaintiff-Appellant-Petitioner, v. UNITED STATES FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendant-Respondent, MESIROW INSURANCE SERVICES, INC., West Bend Air, Inc., Stanley Aircraft & Engine Service, Inc., and Employers Reinsurance Corporation, Defendants, BLUEPRINT ENGINES, INC., Defendant-Petitioner., 1996 WL 33468252, *33468252+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis. Jun 17, 1996) **Respondent's Brief in the Review of the Decision ...** (NO. 95-1946)★★
- 3057 H&H ASSAD LLC, Petitioner-Respondent, v. CITY OF MILWAUKEE and Ronald D. Leonhardt, Respondents-Appellants., 2003 WL 23575119, *23575119+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis.App. I Dist. May 12, 2003) **Reply Brief of Respondents-Appellants** (NO. 03-0199)★★
- 3058 Jones v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 2003 WL 21839688, *21839688+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 04, 2003) **Brief for the United States as Amicus Curiae ...** (NO. 02-1205) ""★★★
- 3059 Mathias v. Worldcom Technologies, Inc., 2001 WL 1077905, *1077905+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 10, 2001) **BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE NOW Legal Defense and ...** (NO. 00-878)★★
- 3060 Director of Revenue v. CoBank ACB, 2000 WL 1210374, *1210374+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 23, 2000) **BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE MULTISTATE TAX COMMISSION ...** (NO. 99-1792)★★
- 3061 Alden v. Maine, 1999 WL 66196, *66196+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 12, 1999) **BRIEF OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE ...** (NO. 98-436) ""★★
- 3062 Alden v. State, 1999 WL 83928, *83928+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 12, 1999) **BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY ...** (NO. 98-436)★★
- 3063 California Public Employees' Retirement System v. Felzen, 1998 WL 784341, *784341+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 10, 1998) **BRIEF OF PROFESSORS LAWRENCE A. HAMERMESH AND ...** (NO. 97-1732) ""★★
- 3064 U.S. v. U.S. Shoe Corp., 1998 WL 42605, *42605+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 15, 1998) **BRIEF FOR NEW HOLLAND NORTH AMERICA, INC., ET AL. ...** (NO. 97-372) ""★★
- 3065 State v. Coeur d'Alene Tribe, 1996 WL 376980, *376980+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 01, 1996) **BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL ...** (NO. 94-1474) ""★★★

- 3066 Smiley v. Citibank (South Dakota), N.A., 1996 WL 144122, *144122+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 29, 1996) **BRIEF OF THE NEW YORK CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION ...** (NO. 95-860)★★
- 3067 Barnett Bank of Marion County, N.A. v. Gallagher, 1995 WL 702806, *702806+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 09, 1995) **BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER AND SEEKING ...** (NO. 94-1837)★★
- 3068 Alden v. State of Maine, 1999 WL 66190, *66190+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 11, 1999) **BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT** (NO. 98-436) ""★★
- 3069 Williams v. Taylor, 1999 WL 459574, *459574+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jun 28, 1999) **BRIEF FOR PETITIONER** (NO. 98-8384)★★
- 3070 Idaho v. Coeur D'Alene Tribe of Idaho, 1996 WL 290997, *290997+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. May 30, 1996) **BRIEF FOR THE PETITIONER** (NO. 94-1474) ""★★
- 3071 American Nat. Red Cross v. S.G., 1992 WL 532904, *532904+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 10, 1992) **BRIEF FOR THE PETITIONER** (NO. 91-594) ""★★★★
- 3072 State of Cal. v. Deep Sea Research, Inc., 1997 WL 685307, *685307+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 03, 1997) **REPLY BRIEF ON THE MERITS** (NO. 96-1400) ""★★
- 3073 Vermont Agency of Natural Resources v. U.S. ex rel. Stevens, 1999 WL 966531, *966531+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 22, 1999) **BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT** (NO. 98-1828) ""★★★★
- 3074 Rivet v. Regions Bank of Louisiana, 1997 WL 769468, *769468+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 15, 1997) **RESPONDENTS' BRIEF ON THE MERITS** (NO. 96-1971) ""★★
- 3075 Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Epstein, 1995 WL 551027, *551027+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 15, 1995) **BRIEF FOR THE RESPONDENTS** (NO. 94-1809)★★
- 3076 Seminole Tribe of Florida v. State of Florida, 1995 WL 271443, *271443+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. May 03, 1995) **BRIEF OF RESPONDENTS** (NO. 94-12)★★
- 3077 Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America, 1994 WL 137026, *137026+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 05, 1994) **BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS** (NO. 93-263)★★
- 3078 American Nat. Red Cross v. S.G., 1992 WL 532903, *532903+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 11, 1992) **BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS** (NO. 91-594) ""★★★★
- 3079 Jinks v. Richland County, 2002 WL 31769150, *31769150+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 05, 2002) **BRIEF ON THE MERITS FOR PETITIONER** (NO. 02-258) ""★★★★

Trial Court Documents (U.S.A.)

Trial Pleadings

- 3080 Leon Gene CLUGSTON, Plaintiff, v. Eric SMITH, individual capacity (personal capacity); and Kevin D. Williams, individually (personal capacity); and, Rachel King, individually (personal capacity); and, Richard Romero, individually (personal capacity); and, Ray A. Hollenbeck, individually (personal capacity); and, Crystal Dawn Langham, individually (personal capacity); and, John Does 1-20, Defendants., 2006 WL 2178180, *2178180 (Trial Pleading) (D.Alaska Jun 09, 2006) **Complaint, Injunction, and Writ of Quo Warranto ...** (NO. 06CV00140)★★
- 3081 John E. SEARCY III, Plaintiff, v. Charles E. CLAWSON Jr., individually and in his official capacity as Judge of the Chancery Court of Van Buren County, Arkansas, Third Division, Twentieth Judicial District, Defendant., 2001 WL 34813783, *34813783 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Ark. Apr 17, 2001) **Brief in Support of Verified Complaint for Civil ...** (NO. 1-01CV00037)★★
- 3082 Richard N. URIAS, Plaintiff, (In law), v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant., 1997 WL 33830530, *33830530 (Trial Pleading) (S.D.Cal. May 01, 1997) **Complaint to Vacate Judgment for Fraud, (Case No. ...** (NO. 97CV0814K, CGA)★★
- 3083 J. Patrick, Lyons, Plaintiff, v. Bart GORDON, United States House of Representatives, Tennessee 6th Congressional District, Robert W. Ney, United States House of Representative, Chairman, committee on House Administration, Juanita Millendar-McDonald, United States House of Representatives, Ranking Minority Member, Committee on House Administration, Mathew S. Petersen, Attorney, United States House of Representatives, Committee on House Administration., 2005 WL 3555354, *3555354 (Trial Pleading) (D.D.C. May 03, 2005) **Complaint** (NO. 105CV00870)★★

- 3084 George JURICH, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, Defendant., 2003 WL 24249823, *24249823+ (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Mich. Apr 04, 2003) **Complaint for Writ of Mandamus** (NO. 03-10078)★★
- 3085 Chambala J.E. HOLLIS, Plaintiff, v. LOFFREDO FRESH PRODUCE, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 1444623, *1444623 (Trial Pleading) (W.D.Mo. Apr 24, 2006) **Amended Complaint and More Definite Statement in ...** (NO. 05-1211-CV-W-ODS)★★
- 3086 HKH, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, Plaintiff, v. THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS, a federally chartered corporation, the southern Nevada Chapter of the American National Red Cross, a local unit of the American National Red Cross, Defendants., 2006 WL 2921866, *2921866 (Trial Pleading) (D.Nev. Jun 30, 2006) **First Amended Complaint for: 1. Breach of ...** (NO. 206-CV-00461-LDG-LRL)★★
- 3087 HKH, LLC. a Delaware Limited Liability Company, Plaintiff, v. THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS, a federally chartered corporation, the Southern Nevada Chapter of the American National Red Cross, a local unit of the American National Red Cross, Defendants., 2006 WL 1499255, *1499255 (Trial Pleading) (D.Nev. Apr 18, 2006) **Complaint for 1. Breach of Contract 2. Breach of ...** (NO. 206-CV-00461-LDG-LRL)★★
- 3088 Alexander C. KAZEROONI, M.S., M.S., Plaintiff, v. DEPARTMENT OF BIOMEDICAL INFORMATICS VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, (the); Academic Program Committee, Department of Biomedical Informatics (the); Vanderbilt University (the) d/b/a Vanderbilt University Medical Center; Vanderbilt University, Inc.; Randolph Miller, M.D., Nancy Lorenzi, Ph.D., Judy Ozbolt, R.N., Ph.D., Kevin Johnson, M.D. Andrew Gregory, M.D. John Doe(s)/Jane Doe(s), Defendants., 2006 WL 1174649, *1174649 (Trial Pleading) (M.D.Tenn. Mar 03, 2006) **Complaint** (NO. 3060183)★★

Trial Motions, Memoranda and Affidavits

- 3089 Arlena LAWRENCE and, Robert Hollins, on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. LAKEVIEW COMMUNITY HOSPITAL; and Community Health Systems, Inc., et. al., Defendants., 2004 WL 3985563, *3985563 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Ala. Dec 01, 2004) **Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendants' Opposition to ...** (NO. 204-CV-923)★
- 3090 Bill ROGERS, Plaintiff, v. CIVIL AIR PATROL, et al., Defendants., 2001 WL 35675798, *35675798+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Ala. Jan 08, 2001) **Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss** (NO. CV-00-A-1529-N)★★★
- 3091 Hubbard A. MOORE, Plaintiff, v. SPRING COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, et al., Defendants. Hubbard A. Moore, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. Williams Communications, L.L.C., Defendant., 2003 WL 24857539, *24857539 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ala. Mar 19, 2003) **Plaintiff's Objection to Magistrate Judge's Order ...** (NO. 02-PWG-1338-S02-PWG-)★★
- 3092 Annie DAVIS, individually and as the representative of a statewide class, Plaintiff, v. NORTHPORT HEALTH SERVICES, INC.; Northport Health Services, Inc. d/b/a Moundville Nursing Facility, Defendants., 2003 WL 23934830, *23934830+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Ala. Sep 15, 2003) **Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition to Motion ...** (NO. 03-0465-CB-L)★★
- 3093 Oscar STILLEY, Plaintiff, v. Mike BEEBE, in His Official Capacity as Attorney General of the State of Arkansas, Defendant., 2004 WL 3552773, *3552773+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Ark. Nov 15, 2004) **Response to Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 2004-CV-780)★
- 3094 Dean FITZWATER and Betty Fitzwater, Charles T. Taggart and Tommy R. Taggart and Taggart and Taggart, Inc., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendant., 2003 WL 24169183, *24169183+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Ark. Mar 27, 2003) **Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition to ...** (NO. 203CV00020GH)★★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 3095 John E. SEARCY III, Plaintiff, v. Charles E. CLAWSON Jr., individually and in his official capacity as Judge of the Chancery Court of Van Buren County, Arkansas, Third Division, Twentieth Judicial District, Defendant., 2002 WL 32898329, *32898329 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Ark. Aug 26, 2002) **Brief in Support of Verified Complaint**

- for Civil ...** (NO. 4-02-CV-00532)★★
- 3096 Kathleen M. VELEK, et al, Plaintiffs, v. State of Arkansas, et al, Defendants., 2001 WL 34815434, *34815434 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Ark. Feb 22, 2001) **Brief in Support of Plaintiffs' Response to ...** (NO. 400CV00929SMR)★★
- 3097 Myron BASS, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF JACKSONVILLE, Defendant., 2000 WL 34542460, *34542460 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Ark. Mar 17, 2000) **Response to the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 200CV002)★★
- 3098 John RICHMOND, Plaintiff, v. Karrol FOWLKES, et. al., Defendant., 1999 WL 33960955, *33960955 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Ark. May 21, 1999) **Plaintiff's Brief in Support of Response to ...** (NO. LR-C-98-406)★
- 3099 Yolanda MORALEZ, surviving spouse and legal representative of the Estate of Jose L. Moralez, and legal representative of her minor children Kaelyn Moralez, Dustin Moralez, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF FRESNO; Chief Jerry Dyer; Captain Al Maroney; Lt. Art Alvarado; Lt. Burt Farrah; Sgt. Richard Mendoza, Does 1 through 20, inclusive, Defendants., 2006 WL 1183528, *1183528+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Cal. Mar 24, 2006) **Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support ...** (NO. 106CV00224AWI/SMS)★★
- 3100 Alan Dale JENAN, Otis Oren Gillis, Owner and Fiduciary Owners / Trustees for King's Pride Produce, Marjen Co., and Royal Flavor Packing Co., Pure Trusts, Plaintiffs, v. Bernard Alan TEVELDE, Rebecca Dee TeVelde, Defendants., 2005 WL 4115393, *4115393 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Cal. Apr 08, 2005) **Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support ...** (NO. CIV-F-04-6632RECSMS)★★
- 3101 Emil ALPERIN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. VATICAN BANK, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 3311105, *3311105+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Sep 20, 2006) **Opposition to Defendant IOR's Motion to Dismiss ...** (NO. 399CV04941)★★
- 3102 Randall P. BAKER, Karen J. Baker, Kelly O. Banks, Sarah H. Banks, Allen E. Snyder, Teresa M. Snyder, Plaintiffs, v. BDO SEIDMAN, L.L.P.; Michael Kerekes; and Does 1-20; Defendants., 2005 WL 2612779, *2612779 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Aug 31, 2005) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Points and Authorities ...** (NO. 05-02500EMC)★★
- 3103 PACIFIC BELL INTERNET SERVICES, Plaintiff, v. RECORDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC., Mediasentry, Inc. d/b/a Mediaforce, and IO Group, Inc., d/b/a Titan Media, Titanmedia.com, Titanmen.com, Defendants., 2003 WL 24245670, *24245670+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Sep 26, 2003) **Pbis' Motion for Summary Judgment Re Claim Two ...** (NO. C03-3560SI)★★
- 3104 Jay KORDICH, an individual, Plaintiff, v. SALTON, INC., a Delaware Corporation, Defendants., 2005 WL 3734782, *3734782 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Cal. May 13, 2005) **Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to ...** (NO. 05CV0202LAB, RBB)★★
- 3105 Karel SPIKES Plaintiffs, v. EKATERINAS KOUTZMBIS and Pashalis Koutzmbis dba Zorba's; Sanford Scherer; Charlotte Scherer and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, Defendants., 2002 WL 32701456, *32701456 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Cal. Nov 05, 2002) **Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support ...** (NO. 00CV2306B)★★
- 3106 Michael L. SWIFT, Plaintiff, v. Steve CHRISTIAN and Maritza Rodriguez, Defendants., 2002 WL 32691548, *32691548+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Cal. Oct 25, 2002) **Memorandum of Points and Authorities in ...** (NO. 02CV-0309-K(PQR))★★
- 3107 David L. OWEN, individually and as Trustee for Remington Investments, Inc. Profit-Sharing Plan and Trust aka Profit Sharing Trust Remington Investments, Plaintiff, v. Steven Vladislav ZUBKIS; Elena Kozik; Bruno Kozik Rima Zubkis; Robert Marsik; Z3 Capital Corporation; Rose Blossom Corporation; F Corporation; Charles B. Harris; Michael P. Johnstone aka Mike Johnstone Miles S. Paschini; Carmine Bua; International Brands, Inc; aka Stella Bella, 2000 WL 34445557, *34445557 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Cal. May 26, 2000) **Reply to Plaintiff's Objection to IBI's ...** (NO. 00CV00695J, CGA)★★

- 3108 Domanique DIXON, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE, and John E. Potter, Postmaster General of the United States Postal Service, Defendants., 2006 WL 1407034, *1407034 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Colo. Apr 25, 2006) **Defendants' Reply in Support of Their Partial ...** (NO. 05-CV-1191-BNB-PAC)★★
- 3109 Ethan BOOK, Jr., Plaintiff, v. Richard TOBIN and Martin L. Nigro, Defendants., 2004 WL 3043452, *3043452 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Conn. Aug 27, 2004) **Defendants' Objection to Motion to ""Void" ...** (NO. 304CV442(JBA))★★
- 3110 William L. REICHLER, Plaintiff, v. Robert G. HALL Jr., Robin Lyn Wilson, Defendants., 2004 WL 3042157, *3042157 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Conn. Jul 30, 2004) **Objection to Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 304CV0555CFD)★★
- 3111 James O. BOLDEN, Plaintiff, v. Gordon R. ENGLAND, Secretary of Navy, Defendants, et al., 2005 WL 2453292, *2453292 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Aug 20, 2005) **Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss or for Summary ...** (NO. 04-1905(EGS))★★
- 3112 Oscar L. THOMAS, - Plaintiff, v. THE NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, et al, - Defendants., 2004 WL 2056887, *2056887+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. May 09, 2004) **Plaintiff's Response to Defendant Dav's Motion to ...** (NO. 04CV00193, JDB)★★
- 3113 Oscar L. THOMAS, Plaintiff, v. THE NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, et al, Defendants., 2004 WL 2056866, *2056866 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Apr 27, 2004) **Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Motion to ...** (NO. 04CV00193, JDB)★★
- 3114 Dolores S. SHERLEY and Robert E. Sherley, Plaintiff's, v. NATIONAL OCEANIC ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, Donald Evans, in his Capacity as Director of United States Department of Commerce, William Hogarth, in his Capacity as Director of National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, Subpart National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Gulf Coast Counsel et. al., Defendant., 2005 WL 3122214, *3122214+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Fla. Oct 12, 2005) **Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant's ...** (NO. 8904CV645-T-17MSS)★★
- 3115 Andrew P. MOORE, II, Plaintiff, v. Harvey E. SCHLESINGER, John E. Steele, Timothy J. Corrigan, Reginald Luster, Charles Truncale, Ralph J. Lee, Maxie Broome, Jr., Earl Johnson, Jr., William J. Henderson & Egan, Lev & Siwica, Defendants., 2001 WL 34658376, *34658376 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Fla. May 16, 2001) **Plaintiff's Memorandum and Opposition to ...** (NO. 301-CV-108-ORL-31KRS)★★
- 3116 VACATION HOMES OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA, INC., a Florida corporation, Plaintiff, v. THE JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, an agency of the United States, Defendant., 2003 WL 24235034, *24235034 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Fla. May 16, 2003) **Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant's ...** (NO. 503CV31RH)★★
- 3117 Cynthia VITALE, Patrick McCreesh, and Edward Ortiz, Plaintiffs, v. UNITED GOVERNMENT SECURITY OFFICERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 131, Defendant., 2004 WL 2868054, *2868054 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Jun 04, 2004) **Reply to Defendant's Memorandum in Opposition to ...** (NO. 04-CV-21058MARTINEZ/)★★
- 3118 Cynthia VITALE, et al., Plaintiffs, v. UNITED GOVERNMENT SECURITY OFFICERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 131,U Defendant., 2004 WL 2868041, *2868041 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. May 28, 2004) **Defendant's Memorandum In Opposition to Motion to ...** (NO. 04-21058-CIV-MARTINE)★★
- 3119 Gerald BAGWELL, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. FLORIDA BROADBAND, LLC, a Florida Limited Liability Company, and Dean C. Lovett, individually, Defendants., 2004 WL 2875385, *2875385 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. May 25, 2004) **Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defendant's, Florida ...** (NO. 04-60655-CIV-GRAHAM)★
- 3120 David GARCIA, et. al, Plaintiffs, v. John O. AGWUNOBI, M.D., M.B.A., in his official capacity as Secretary of the State of Florida Department of Health, and Morris Gallo, Individually, Defendants., 2003 WL 24064741, *24064741 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Jul 30, 2003) **Plaintiffs' Supplemental Memorandum** (NO. 03-21700-)★★

- 3121 Katy JOHNSON, Plaintiff, v. Tucker MAX, Defendant., 2003 WL 24242317, *24242317+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Jun 30, 2003) **Defendant's Brief Regarding Subject Matter ...** (NO. 03-CIV-80515-HURLEY)★★
- 3122 SKY KNIGHT AIR SERVICES, INC., a Florida Corporation, and Brian Kilcullen, President, Plaintiffs, v. Guy LEWIS, Terrance Thompson, Laurie Rucoba, Howard Weintraub, Michael Consavage, John Devaney, Michael Palmer, EG&G Technical Services, Inc. (formerly EG&G Dynatrend, Inc.), EG&G, Inc., George Melton, Jerry Hawkins, John Dent, Roy Butler, Sr., Roy Butler, Jr., Patrick Holmes, Unnamed Defendant(s), Defendants., 2002 WL 32686810, *32686810 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Sep 13, 2002) **Defendants Roy Butler, Sr., Roy Butler, Jr., and ...** (NO. 02-60964-CIV-ZLOCH)★★
- 3123 Rep. Corrine BROWN, Rep. Alcee Hastings, Re. Carrie Meek, and Sallie Stephens, Plaintiffs, v. State of Florida, Jeb Bush Governor of the State of Florida; Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General of the State of Florida; Katherine Harris, Secretary of State of the State of Florida; Tom Feeney, Speaker of the House of Representatives; John McKay, President of the Florida Senate; Mitchell Ceasar, Chairman of Broward County Democratic Executive Committee; and George, 2002 WL 32961049, *32961049 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. May 01, 2002) **Motion to Remand of Defendant Robert A. ...** (NO. 02-60459-CIV-JORDAN)★★
- 3124 Rep. CORRINE BROWN, Rep. Alcee Re. Carrie Meek, and Sallie Stephens, Plaintiffs, v. State of Florida, Jeb Bush Governor of the State of Florida; Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General of the State of Florida; Katherine Harris, Secretary of State of the State of Florida; Tom Feeney, Speaker of the House of Representatives; John McKay, President of the Florida Senate; Mitchell Ceasar, Chairman of Broward County Democratic Executive Committee; and George Lemieux., 2002 WL 32961042, *32961042 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Apr 24, 2002) **Motion to Remand of Defendant Robert A. ...** (NO. 02-60459-CIV-JORDAN)★★
- 3125 Rep. CORRINE BROWN, Rep. Alcee Hastings, Re. Carrie Meek, and Sallie Stephens, Plaintiffs, v. State of Florida, Jeb Bush Governor of the State of Florida; Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General of the State of Florida; Katherine Harris, Secretary of State of the State of Florida; Tom Feeney, Speaker of the House of Representatives; John Mckay, President of the Florida Senate; Mitchell Ceasar, Chairman of Broward County Democratic Executive Committee; and George, 2002 WL 32961040, *32961040 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Apr 22, 2002) **Motion to Remand of Defendant Robert A. ...** (NO. 02-60459-CIV-JORDAN)★★
- 3126 Ricardo RAMIREZ, Plaintiff, v. Janet RENO, et al., Defendants., 2001 WL 34678736, *34678736 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Aug 02, 2001) **Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition to ...** (NO. 01-2190CIV-GOLD/BAND)★★
- 3127 Mayra DELGADO, M.D., Plaintiff, v. Kathleen Hawk SAWYER, in her official capacity as Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons of the United States Department of Justice, Defendant., 2001 WL 34681425, *34681425 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Apr 19, 2001) **Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant's ...** (NO. 01-1460-CIV-MORE)★★
- 3128 VISIONWORKS ENTERTAINMENT, LLC, Plaintiffs, v. Ricky MARTIN, Ricky Martin Enterprises, Inc., Nereida Morales, Gladys Martinez and Ferdinand Fernandez, Defendants., 2001 WL 34724636, *34724636 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Feb 14, 2001) **Visionworks Entertainment, LLC's Motion to Strike ...** (NO. 01CV282)★
- 3129 Thomas Eddie FARRAR, Plaintiff, v. BUTTS COUNTY, Sheriff Gene Pope, Deputy Russell Rieske, Deputy Gary Long, Deputy Larry Mooney, Georgia Correctional Healthcare, and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, Defendants., 2004 WL 3026354, *3026354 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Ga. 2004) **Brief in Support of Defendants Georgia ...** (NO. 504-CV-0098-2)★★
- 3130 ADVENTURE OUTDOORS, INC.; Jay Wallace, a Georgia Resident; and Cecilia Wallace, a Georgia Resident; Plaintiffs, v. Michael BLOOMBERG, a New York Resident and Mayor of the City of New York; Tanya Marie Nooner, a Georgia Resident, of the Nooner Investigative Group, a/k/a Nooner Initiatives, Inc.; Melissa Merced, a Georgia Resident, of the Nooner Investigative Group, a/k/a Nooner Initiatives, Inc.; Joseph Tounsel, a Georgia Resident, of the Nooner Investigative Group., 2007 WL 596617, *596617+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ga. Jan 11, 2007) **Defendants' Memorandum of Law in Opposition to ...** (NO. 06CV2897, JOF)★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 3131 Jordanna Elizabeth LEICHENAUER, Abigail Leigh Leichenauer, Faith Christine Leichenauer, Jennifer Jean Leichenauer, and William Harland Bailey et. al., Plaintiffs, v. TAZEWELL COUNTY, Illinois, Stuart Umholtz, Anna Peters, Joel Brown, Cheryl Penman, Lori Larimore, Kevin Krueger, Sharon Stewart, Kim Fengel, Deb Nelson, Bridgeway Inc., Carol Snyder, Linda

- Bridgemon, and Patti Askins et. al., Defendants., 2005 WL 3280124, *3280124 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (C.D.Ill. Nov 07, 2005) **Plaintiffs Collective Reply to Defendant's ...** (NO. 105-CV-01047-MMM-JAG)★★
- 3132 Angel GARCIA as Independent Administrator of the Estate of Miguel Angel Garcia, Deceased, Plaintiff, v. NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION, d/b/a Amtrak; Northeast Illinois Commuter Railroad Corporation, d/b/a Metra, and The City of Chicago, a Municipal Corporation., 2006 WL 1773058, *1773058 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. May 24, 2006) **Motion to Remand Back to State Court** (NO. 05C4413)★★
- 3133 Derek THOMPSON, Plaintiff, v. WAUKESHA STATE BANK as successor trustee of the Derek Thompson Trust, Defendant & Eric Thompson Cynthia Thompson Jacqueline Maxwell, as Nominal Defendants., 2006 WL 4089567, *4089567 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. 2006) **Plaintiff's LR. 56.1(a)(2) Memorandum of Law in ...** (NO. 06C7033)★★
- 3134 AIRBORNE BEEPERS & VIDEO, INC., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs, v. SOUTHWESTERN BELL MOBILE SYSTEMS, LLC, d/b/a Cingular Wireless, (a successor to Southwestern Bell Mobile Systems, Inc., d/b/a Cellular One - Chicago), Defendant., 2005 WL 2871090, *2871090 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. Sep 02, 2005) **Defendant Cingular's Motion to Strike the Third ...** (NO. 02C9134)★★
- 3135 KATHLEEN GRANNEY both individually and as a representative of all other persons similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. FOREMOST INS. CO. Foremost Signature Ins. Co. Foremost Corp. of America, Defendants., 2005 WL 3830137, *3830137 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. Aug 08, 2005) **Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Motion to Remand** (NO. 05C2997)★★
- 3136 KATHLEEN GRANNEY both individually and as a representative of all other persons similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. FOREMOST INS. CO. Foremost Signature Ins. Co. Foremost Corp. of America, Defendants., 2005 WL 3830132, *3830132 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. Jun 20, 2005) **Plaintiff's Motion to Remand** (NO. 05C2997)★★
- 3137 Badejoko OLOJO, Plaintiff, v. Kennedy-King COLLEGE Kina Montgomery, Defendants., 2005 WL 3881934, *3881934+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. 2005) **Defendant Kennedy-King College's Reply in Support ...** (NO. 05C-6234)★★
- 3138 Susanna R. COOK, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. FIRST CELLULAR OF SOUTHERN ILLINOIS, Defendant., 2005 WL 4125302, *4125302 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Ill. May 12, 2005) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiff's ...** (NO. 05-4061-JPG)★★
- 3139 Huey HENDRIX, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, Defendant., 2006 WL 1866874, *1866874 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ind. May 16, 2006) **Defendant Eli Lilly and Company's Omnibus ...** (NO. 406-CV-0025AS)★★
- 3140 Mary SLADE, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, Defendant., 2006 WL 1866878, *1866878 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ind. May 16, 2006) **Defendant ELI Lilly and Company's Omnibus ...** (NO. 406-CV-26)★★
- 3141 Lynette HANSON, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, Defendant., 2006 WL 1866881, *1866881 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ind. May 16, 2006) **Defendant Eli Lilly and Company's Omnibus ...** (NO. 406-CV-0027AS)★★
- 3142 Nancy EMANUEL, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, Defendant., 2006 WL 1866884, *1866884 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ind. May 16, 2006) **Defendant Eli Lilly and Company's Omnibus ...** (NO. 406-CV-0028AS)★★
- 3143 Raleigh HARRIS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, Defendant., 2006 WL 1866887, *1866887 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ind. May 16, 2006) **Defendant Eli Lilly and Company's Omnibus ...** (NO. 406-CV-0029AS)★★
- 3144 Leland BOND, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, Defendant., 2006 WL 1866891, *1866891 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ind. May 16, 2006) **Defendant Eli Lilly and Company's Omnibus ...** (NO. 406-CV-0030AS)★★

- 3145 Faye HOOD, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, Defendant., 2006 WL 1866894, *1866894 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ind. May 16, 2006) **Defendant Eli Lilly and Company's Omnibus ...** (NO. 406-CV-0031AS)★★
- 3146 Melissa BIDY, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, Defendant., 2006 WL 1866897, *1866897 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ind. May 16, 2006) **Defendant Eli Lilly and Company's Omnibus ...** (NO. 406-CV-0032AS)★★
- 3147 INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL GROUP, INC., an Indiana corporation, Plaintiff, v. J. Leslie SMITH, Medibroker International, LLC, and Medibroker Ltd., Defendants., 2007 WL 607250, *607250 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Ind. Jan 04, 2007) **Plaintiff's Combined Reply in Support of Motion ...** (NO. 106-CV-0280DFH-VSS)★★
- 3148 Jane WALTERS, Plaintiff, v. PDI MANAGEMENT SERVICES, Defendant; PDI Management Services, Counter-Claimant, v. Jane Walters, Counter-Defendant., 2003 WL 24249254, *24249254 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Ind. Dec 19, 2003) **Surreply in Opposition to PDI Management ...** (NO. IP02-1100-C-T/K)★★
- 3149 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. John HANSL, Defendant., 2003 WL 24236402, *24236402 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Iowa Nov 21, 2003) **Reply to Government's Brief in Opposition to ...** (NO. 403-CV-90406)★★
- 3150 MEDCORP, INC., Plaintiff, v. KENTUCKY BOARD OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES Serve: Brian Bishop Executive Director 2545 Lawrenceburg Road Frankfort, KY 40601 And Commonwealth of Kentucky Serve: Hon. Gregory Stumbo Attorney general Capitol, Suite 118 Frankfort, KY 40601 And Kentucky Certificate of Need Office Serve: Shawn Crouch Executive Director 275 East Main Street, 3CB Frankfort, KY 40621, Defendants., 2005 WL 2292400, *2292400 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Ky. Jul 15, 2005) **Plaintiff's Memorandum of Points and Authorities ...** (NO. 05-CV-51KKC)★
- 3151 Olena L. De LUCA, Plaintiff, v. HOMESERVICES OF KENTUCKY, INC., a Kentucky corporation, doing business as Paul Semonin Realtors an assumed named corporation, and Homeservices of America, Inc., a Delaware corporation Ronald J. Peltier, Chief Executive Officer Home Services of America George E. Gans, III, President/CEO Pual Semonin Realtors Bradley J. Devries, Chief Executive Officer Home Services of Kentucky Howard Stacey, Managing Broker Paul Semonin, 2004 WL 2883300, *2883300 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Ky. Nov 17, 2004) **Plaintiff's Amended Opposing Memorandum in ...** (NO. 303-CV-659-S)★★
- 3152 Olena L. De LUCA, Plaintiff, v. HOMESERVICES OF KENTUCKY, INC., a Kentucky corporation, doing business as Paul Semonin Realtors an assumed named corporation, and Homeservices of America, Inc., a Delaware corporation Ronald J. PELTIER, Chief Executive Officer Home Services of America George E. GANS, III, President/CEO Paul Semonin Realtors Bradley J. Devries, Chief Executive Officer Home Services of Kentucky Howard Stacey, Managing Broker Paul Semonin, 2004 WL 2883296, *2883296 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Ky. Nov 15, 2004) **Plaintiff's Opposing Memorandum in Response to ...** (NO. 303-CV-659-S)★★
- 3153 Michael THOMPSON and Peggy Thompson, v. CROSS OFFSHORE CORPORATION, James Danos, Inc. and Galliano Tugs, Inc., 2002 WL 32697327, *32697327 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.La. May 23, 2002) **Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss for ...** (NO. 01-1914)★★
- 3154 Lorenzo E. PRICE JR., Pauline Price, Geraldine Jones, Golden Jones, Marlo A. Oubre, Tiffany Harris, Marva Feefee, Brenda Harris personally and on behalf of her minor child Devaney Harris, Izora Moore, Joe Powell, Felton Henry, Cherise Forest, Joe R. Bourgeois, Demetrius Franklin, Dorothy Williams, Patricia Snell personally and on behalf of the minor Latoya M. Snell, De'Velta P. Wilson personally and on behalf of her minor children, Tamika Cherell Wilson and, Darion J., 2006 WL 1862031, *1862031+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.La. May 17, 2006) **Union Pacific Railroad Company's Opposition to ...** (NO. 306-CV-00220-JJB-CN)★★★
- 3155 Michael J. MARCHAND and Lizanne Marchand, Plaintiffs, v. Amsouth BANK, Lloyd Cockerham and Bill Myhand, Defendants., 2005 WL 3832659, *3832659 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.La. Jan 03, 2005) **Memorandum in Support of Motion for Remand** (NO. 04-CV-861-C-M1)★★

- 3156 Donald W. ABSHIRE, Et Al, v. THE STATE OF LOUISIANA, Et Al. Arthur A. Lewis, v. The State of Louisiana, Et Al., 2001 WL 34648486, *34648486 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.La. Oct 17, 2001) **Memorandum in Opposition to Remand** (NO. 01-781-C-M3) ★★
- 3157 Anieta MATTHEWS, v. Edmond STEWART, Individually and in His Official Capacity, et al., 2001 WL 34682953, *34682953 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.La. May 01, 2001) **Memorandum in Support of Motion to Remand** (NO. 01-94-A-M3) ★★
- 3158 Chance REED, v. TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE., 2006 WL 1098738, *1098738 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.La. Mar 27, 2006) **Plaintiff's Reply Memorandum in Response to ...** (NO. 206CV0037-LC) ★★
- 3159 Henry ARCENEUX, v. Pamela NORMAN, et al., 2004 WL 2775247, *2775247 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.La. Jun 04, 2004) **Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to ...** (NO. SECTION603CV2331(LEA)) ★★
- 3160 Billy Frank ANDREWS, v. Steve PRATOR, Sheriff Caddo Parish, Louisiana., 2001 WL 34650248, *34650248+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.La. Nov 28, 2001) **Memorandum in Opposition to Motion of Steve ...** (NO. CV01-1847S) ★★
- 3161 Velma Maliffe HERBERT and Lillie Mae Duhon, Plaintiffs, v. DOYLE LAND SERVICES, INC., Doyle & Associates, Inc., Qwest Communications Corporation of Delaware, and Qwest Transmission, Inc. (formerly Qwest Communications Inc. of Delaware), Defendants., 2000 WL 34511205, *34511205 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.La. Oct 17, 2000) **Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Remand** (NO. CV01-0047LC) ★
- 3162 Velma Maliffe HEBERT and Lillie Mae Duhon, v. DOYLE LAND SERVICES, INC., et al., 2000 WL 34511244, *34511244 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.La. Sep 29, 2000) **Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Remand** (NO. 00-1851) ★
- 3163 C. S. PANSE, et al., plaintiffs, v. L. NORMAN, et al., defendants., 2005 WL 2463908, *2463908 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Mass. Feb 14, 2005) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support of their ...** (NO. 04-CV-11658RWZ) ★★
- 3164 Stephen GOLASH and Susan Golash, Plaintiffs, v. HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORP. II, Patricia A. Davis, Richard J. Volpe, and Shechtman, Halperin Savage, LLP, Defendants., 2004 WL 3711256, *3711256 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Mass. Dec 31, 2004) **Memorandum in Opposition by Defendants Patricia ...** (NO. 04-12414-MAP) ★
- 3165 Maria A. KITRAS, as she is the Trustee of Bear Realty Trust, Maria A. Kitras and James J. Decoulos, as they are the Co-Trustees of Bear II Realty Trust, Maria A. Kitras and James J. Decoulos, as they are the Co-Trustees of Gorda Realty Trust, Plaintiffs, v. TOWN OF AQUINNAH, Vineyard Conservation Society, Inc., David and Betsy Wice, Susan and Russell Smith, Caroline Kennedy, George B. Brush, as he is the Trustee of Toad Rock Realty Trust, South Shore Beach., 2004 WL 3643439, *3643439 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Mass. Jan 02, 2004) **Plaintiffs' Opposition to the Town of Aquinnah ...** (NO. 03-11590-MLW) ★★
- 3166 Julius MCKENZIE, Plaintiff, v. Celine DJANGMAH, et al., Defendants., 2005 WL 3570500, *3570500 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Md. Feb 28, 2005) **Memorandum of Law of Defendants Preferred ...** (NO. 05-272-PJM) ★★
- 3167 Charles A. STANZIALE, Jr., in his capacity as Litigation Trustee and as Assignee of Claims, Plaintiff, v. ERNST & YOUNG LLP, Defendant., 2003 WL 23843758, *23843758 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Md. May 08, 2003) **Defendant Ernst & Young LLP's Memorandum in ...** (NO. MJG03-CV-981) ★★
- 3168 RED OAK GROUP, LLC, Plaintiff, v. W.I.T.T., INC. & Daniel E. Erz (an individual), Defendants., 2006 WL 352629, *352629+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mich. Jan 17, 2006) **Plaintiff's Reply Brief in Support of its Motion ...** (NO. 05-74242) ★★
- 3169 David A. ALLEMON Jr., Plaintiff, v. Emile BAIR - Individually and as Constable Parvin Lee Jr, Joan Killion Emile Bair Alison Kalcec Allan T. Motzny., Defendants., 2005 WL 2142574, *2142574+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mich. Jul 12, 2005) **Plaintiff's Brief in Repsonse to Defendant Parvin ...** (NO. 04-72925) ★★

- 3170 DETROIT ASSOCIATION OF PRINCIPALS and Assistant Principals, Osas, Afsa, Afl-Cio, Plaintiff, v. Kenneth BURNLEY, as Ceo of the Detroit Public Schools, Defendant., 2005 WL 1476361, *1476361 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mich. Jun 01, 2005) **Defendant's Response to Order Show cause Why Case ...** (NO. 205-CV-71959-GCS-SDP)★★
- 3171 Shirley D. MARTIN and Gordon R. Martin, Plaintiffs, v. NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION, a foreign Corporation, Amtrak Railroad, a foreign Corporation, and John Doe, jointly and severally, Defendants., 2004 WL 2628423, *2628423 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mich. Sep 29, 2004) **Defendants' Response to Order Directing ...** (NO. 04-72393)★★
- 3172 Bradley W. OLSON and Barbara E. Olson., Plaintiffs, v. Jennifer S. KENNEY, Assistant Attorney General for the State of Minnesota and Mike Hatch, Attorney General for the State of Minnesota Defendants., 2004 WL 3038491, *3038491 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Minn. May 18, 2004) **Brief Memorandum of Law** (NO. 04-1098RLE/RLE)★
- 3173 Debbie HENDERSON, et. al., Plaintiffs, v. FIRST HORIZON HOME LOAN, CORPORATION, et. al., Defendants., 2004 WL 3333323, *3333323 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mo. Dec 08, 2004) **Defendant Mortgage Lenders Network USA, Inc.'s ...** (NO. 404CV1572RWS)★★
- 3174 THE OFFICIAL PLAN COMMITTEE OF OMNIPLEX COMMUNICATIONS GROUP, LLC, Plaintiff, v. LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Defendant., 2004 WL 2878722, *2878722 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mo. Jun 03, 2004) **Lucent's Opposition to Motion to Abstain and ...** (NO. 404-CV-00477, ERW)★★
- 3175 Monica LEWIS as Mother Of and Plaintiff Ad Litem For Baby Boy Doe, deceased, and Monica Lewis, individually, Plaintiff, v. HAMID AGHA HOSSEINE, M.D., et al., Defendants., 2004 WL 3644722, *3644722 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mo. Jun 01, 2004) **Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to ...** (NO. 404CV522JCH)★★
- 3176 A.P. THORPE, III; A.P. Thorpe, IV; Annie Gray Thorpe Dixon; Tridra Investments, LLC; and Thorpe Liquidating Company, Inc. f/k/a Thorpe & Company, Inc. of Rocky Mount, Plaintiffs, v. KPMG LLP; Presidio Advisors, LLC; and Sidley Austin Brown & Wood, LLP f/k/a Brown & Wood, LLP, Defendants., 2003 WL 24226985, *24226985 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.C. Mar 12, 2003) **KPMG's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to ...** (NO. 503-CV-68BO(3))★★
- 3177 NORTH CAROLINA ASSOCIATION, Long Term Care Facilities, et al, Plaintiffs, v. Carmen Hooker BUELL, in her official capacity as Secretary of the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, et al, Defendants., 2001 WL 34890379, *34890379 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.C. May 25, 2001) **Memorandum in Support of official Defendants' ...** (NO. 501-CV-292-BO(2))★★
- 3178 Timothy Everett GREENE and Amy V. Greene, Plaintiffs, v. GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION and Mack Brown, Incorporated, Defendants., 2003 WL 24236830, *24236830 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.N.C. Mar 14, 2003) **Motion for Remand and Brief in Support Thereof** (NO. 503-CV-28-V)★★
- 3179 BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC., Plaintiff, v. INTERMEDIA COMMUNICATION, INC., and the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Defendants., 1999 WL 33986003, *33986003 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.N.C. Mar 18, 1999) **The North Carolina Utilities Commission's Reply ...** (NO. 399-CV-05-MU)★
- 3180 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. Irwin A. SCHIFF, Defendant., 2004 WL 3695151, *3695151 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Sep 29, 2004) **Defenant's Reply to the Government's Opposition ...** (NO. CV-S-01-0895-PMPLRL)★★
- 3181 ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY, Plaintiff, v. Stanley HOWSER; Cheryl Borowy Does I through X, inclusive, Defendants., 2003 WL 24269900, *24269900 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Aug 26, 2003) **Opposition to Defendants Howser & Borowy's Motion ...** (NO. CV-S03-0525-RLH-PAL)★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 3182 UNITED STATES, Plaintiff, v. Irwin SCHIFF, Cynthia Neun Ans Lawrence N. Cohen, a/k/a Larry Cohen, individually and All doing business as Freedom Books, www.livetaxfree.com, www.paynoincometax.com www.ischiff.com, Defendant., 2003 WL 24268315, *24268315 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. May 20, 2003) **Defendants Reply to the**

- Government's Response ...** (NO. CV-S-03-0281-LDG-RJJ)★★
- 3183 Robert KAHRE, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, as corporator and alter ego of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; Internal Revenue Service; an entity of unknown origin Jerry L. Johnson; P. Thomas Menaugh; Sharilee Code; Nancy Mikesell; Linda Drake; John Doe Individuals 1-50; Richard Roe Business or Government entities 51-100, Defendants., 2002 WL 32981339, *32981339+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Nov 16, 2002) **Plaintiff' Opposition to Defendants' Motion to ...** (NO. CV-S-02-0375-LRH-LRL)★★
- 3184 Robert KAHRE, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, as corporator and alter ego of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; Internal Revenue Service; an entity of unknown origin Jerry L. Johnson; P. Thomas Menaugh; Sharilee Code; Nancy Mikesell; Linda Drake; John Doe Individuals 1-50; Richard Roe Business or Government entities 51-100, Defendants., 2002 WL 32981891, *32981891+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Nov 16, 2002) **Plaintiff' Opposition to Defendants' Motion to ...** (NO. CV-S-02-0375-LRH-LRL)★★
- 3185 CARLMONT CAPITAL SPECIAL PURPOSE CORPORATION I, a Nevada corporation; Medical Capital Corporation, a Nevada corporation, Plaintiffs, v. STARR HOME HEALTH CARE, INC., a Michigan corporation, dba Starr Home Health Care; Priscilla Ann Norris-Jackson, et al., Defendants., 2002 WL 32976140, *32976140 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Sep 24, 2002) **Motion to Strike Answer of Defendant Starr Home ...** (NO. CV-S-02-0582-LRH-RJJ)★★
- 3186 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. Irwin A. SCHIFF, Defendant., 2002 WL 32978941, *32978941 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Jun 12, 2002) **Irwin Schiff's Reply to the Government's ""Reply ...** (NO. CV-S-01-0895-PMP-LRL)★★
- 3187 James W. ANDERSON, Plaintiff, v. Robert KAHRE, Christian Common Law Foundation; Also all other persons unknown claiming any right, title, estate, lien or interest in the real property described in the Complaint adverse to Plaintiffs ownership, or any cloud upon Plaintiffs title thereto, named as John Does 1 through 50, inclusive, Defendants, Robert Kahre, ex rel, The People of the State of Nevada, Counter-Claimant, v. James W. Anderson., 2000 WL 34599241, *34599241 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Oct 26, 2000) **Third-Party Plaintiff's Counter-Motion for ...** (NO. CV-S-00-1063-PMP(RJJ)★★
- 3188 Kevin A. HOLBERT, Donna Mcdaniel, Anita Washington, Raymond P. White and Crystal Wrightniton, by Mary Wrightniton, her guardian ad litem, Plaintiffs, v. ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc., and Janssen, L.P. a/k/a and d/b/a Janssen Pharmaceutica Products, L.P., Defendants., 2006 WL 1753298, *1753298 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. May 19, 2006) **Defendant Eli Lilly and Company's Memorandum of ...** (NO. 306-CV-01742-GEB-JJH)★★
- 3189 Samuel A. ABADY, Plaintiff, v. TOWNSHIP OF MANALAPAN, Defendant., 2006 WL 1753243, *1753243+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. May 18, 2006) **Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Support of the ...** (NO. 06-1419AET)★★
- 3190 Samuel A. ABADY, Plaintiff, v. TOWNSHIP OF MANALAPAN, Defendant., 2006 WL 1753242, *1753242+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. May 17, 2006) **Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Support of the ...** (NO. 06-1419, AET)★★
- 3191 Samuel A. ABADY, Plaintiff, v. TOWNSHIP OF MANALAPAN, Defendant., 2006 WL 1753241, *1753241+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. May 12, 2006) **Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Support of the ...** (NO. 06-1419AET)★★

- 3192 GENESIS INTERNATIONAL HOLDINGS, International Infrastructure Consortium & Boban Jovanovic, Plaintiffs, v. NORTHROP GRUMMAN CORPORATION, Mr. Donald Wilhelm, Ms. Peggy Hewinson, US Algeria Business Council, Sonatrach Corporation, Halliburton Corporation, Boeing Corporation, Anadarko Corporation, Lockheed Martin Corporation, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 654137, *654137+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Feb 27, 2006) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant Boeing ...** (NO. 05-4487, DMC)★★
- 3193 GENESIS INTERNATIONAL HOLDINGS, International Infrastructure Consortium & Boban Jovanovic, Plaintiffs, v. NORTHROP GRUMMAN CORPORATION, Mr. Donald Wilhelm, MS. Peggy Hewinson, Us Algeria Business Council, Sonatrach Corporation, Halliburton Corporation, Boeing Corporation, Anadarko Corporation, Lockheed Martin Corporation, ET AL., Defendants., 2005 WL 3720210, *3720210+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Dec 27, 2005) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant Boeing ...** (NO. 05-4487, DMC)★★
- 3194 Barbara SCHWAB, et al., Individually; and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. PHILIP MORRIS USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2005 WL 2547423, *2547423+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.Y. Aug 19, 2005) **Plaintiffs' Brief in Opposition to Defendants' ...** (NO. CV-0401945, JBW)★★
- 3195 Christian GENITRINI and Amerigen Gloversville Corp., Plaintiffs, v. MAKO HOLDINGS INTERNATIONAL, LLC, Richard Makoujy, and Jacqueline Palumbo, Defendants., 2005 WL 2169431, *2169431 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.N.Y. Apr 25, 2005) **Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Motion for ...** (NO. 04-CV-1432, DNH/GHL)★★
- 3196 INDEMNITY INSURANCE COMPANY OF NORTH AMERICA, as subrogee of Trane, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S&W TRANSPORT SERVICES OF SUMMERVILLE INC., S&W Transport Services, Inc., Expeditors International of Washington, Inc., Defendants., 2006 WL 3089734, *3089734 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.N.Y. Sep 14, 2006) **Memorandum of Law in Support of S&W Transport's ...** (NO. 06CIV2607, AKH)★★
- 3197 Ronald FOSTER aka Ronald D. Foster, Plaintiff, v. FORD MOTOR CREDIT, Defendant, William Clay Ford, Defendant., 2004 WL 3150034, *3150034 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D. Ohio Dec 10, 2004) **Plaintiff Opposition to Defendants Motion to ...** (NO. 104CV2024)★
- 3198 OSAGE NATION, a federally recognized Indian tribe; Osage Nation Tax Commission, Plaintiffs, v. State of Oklahoma, ex rel. Oklahoma Tax Commission, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 824432, *824432+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Okla. Feb 23, 2006) **Motion to Dismiss of Defendants Henry, Kemp, ...** (NO. CIV-06-067TCK-FHM)★★
- 3199 B. WILLIS, C.P.A., INC. an Oklahoma corobratibon, Plaintiff, v. PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF OKALHOMA, an Oklahoma Corporation, Union Pacific Railiroaid Company, a foreign corporation. and Burlington Northern and Santa FE Railway Company, a foreign corporation, Defendants., 2004 WL 3341650, *3341650 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Okla. Sep 13, 2004) **Defendant Union Pacific Railroa's F.R.C.P. ...** (NO. 04-CV-640P(C))★★
- 3200 Dr. K. F. MOORE, and Colleen Moore, a married couple, Plaintiffs, v. William W. BUSBY, an individual, and John G. Lanning, an individual, Defendants., 2002 WL 32837787, *32837787 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Okla. Dec 11, 2002) **Plaintiffs' Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, ...** (NO. 02-CV-300-B(M))★★
- 3201 John C. BERKERY, Sr., 12 W. Willow Grove Ave., Ste. 198, Philadelphia, 19118, Plaintiff, v. BENEFICIAL BANK & ROCHELLE REITHMEIER, (both individually and in her capacity as a bank officer), 530 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106., 2006 WL 431490, *431490+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Pa. Jan 27, 2006) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant ...** (NO. 05-CV-6170-MAM)★★
- 3202 GENTLE LASER SOLUTIONS, INC. d/b/a Sona Laser Center and Sona Med Spa, Plaintiff, v. PROGRESSIVE PAYROLL SOLUTIONS, INC.; Scott D. Skarbowski and Maryann Skarbowski (h/W) d/b/a Advantage Payroll Solutions; David Skarbowski, and Mad Sk8, LLC. Defendants., 2005 WL 2687123, *2687123 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Pa. Aug 26, 2005) **Memorandum in Support of Defendants' Motion to ...** (NO. 05-CV-2831)★★

- 3203 Philip THIBODEAU, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. COMCAST CORPORATION, et al., Defendants., 2004 WL 3660633, *3660633+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Pa. Jul 15, 2004) **Defendants' Memorandum of Law in Opposition to ...** (NO. 04-CV-1777)★★
- 3204 ROOFERS LOCAL 30 COMBINED WELFARE FUND, et. al., Plaintiffs, v. ANTHILL CONSTRUCTION, INC., Defendant., 2003 WL 23904113, *23904113+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Pa. Sep 05, 2003) **Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike, or in the ...** (NO. 03-3853, HJH)★★
- 3205 Alexander N. ASANOV, et al., Plaintiffs, v. M. Hayes HUNT, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 403465, *403465 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Pa. Jan 25, 2006) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion of ...** (NO. 105-CV-470)★★
- 3206 Alexander N. ASANOV, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Dewitt T. HICKS, Jr., et al., Defendants., 2005 WL 3136511, *3136511 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Pa. Nov 01, 2005) **Memorandum Of Law In Support Of The Motion Of ...** (NO. 105-CV-2098)★★
- 3207 Alexander N. ASANOV, et al., Plaintiffs, v. M. Hayes HUNT, et al., Defendants., 2005 WL 2613800, *2613800 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Pa. Aug 18, 2005) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion of ...** (NO. 105-CV-470)★★
- 3208 Alexander N. ASANOV and Bioelectrospec, Inc., Plaintiffs, v. M. Hayes HUNT and Marina Y. Hunt, Defendants., 2005 WL 917127, *917127 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Pa. Mar 30, 2005) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion of ...** (NO. 105-CV-470)★
- 3209 Andrew KENNEDY, Plaintiff, v. Former Warden Jake MENDEZ, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 23788946, *23788946 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Pa. Dec 02, 2003) **Brief in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss ...** (NO. 3CV-03-1366)★★
- 3210 DIANESE, INC., et al, Plaintiffs, v. THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Department of General Services, et al, Defendants., 2003 WL 23789153, *23789153+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Pa. Apr 03, 2003) **Brief in Support of Motion to Dismiss Filed ...** (NO. 3CV-03-0145)★★
- 3211 DIANESE, INC., Gaetano Dianese, and Rosemarie Dianese, Plaintiffs, v. COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 23789146, *23789146+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Pa. Apr 02, 2003) **Brief in Support of Defendant Conyngham Builders, ...** (NO. 303CV-00145-TIV)★★
- 3212 DIANESE, INC., et al., Plaintiffs, v. THE COMMONWEALTH OF PA DEPT. OF GENERAL SERVICES, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 23789115, *23789115+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Pa. Mar 24, 2003) **Brief in Support of Pnc Bank, National ...** (NO. 3CV-03-0145)★★
- 3213 DIANESE, INC. et al., Plaintiffs, v. THE COMMONWEALTH OF PA/DEPT. OF GENERAL SERVICES et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 23789085, *23789085+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Pa. Mar 18, 2003) **Brief in Support of Motion for Dismissal Pursuant ...** (NO. 3CV-03-0145)★★
- 3214 State of South Carolina, and Henry D. McMaster, in his official capacity as Attorney General for the State of South Carolina, Plaintiff, v. DEY, L.P., f/k/a Dey Laboratories, Defendant., 2006 WL 4087340, *4087340+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.S.C. Dec 04, 2006) **Plaintiff's Reply Brief in Support of Motion to ...** (NO. 306-CV-02914)★★
- 3215 State of South Carolina, and Henry D. McMaster, in his official capacity as Attorney General for the State of South Carolina, Plaintiff, v. DEY, L.P., f/k/a Dey Laboratories, Defendant., 2006 WL 4087343, *4087343+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.S.C. Dec 04, 2006) **Plaintiff's Reply Brief in Support of Motion to ...** (NO. 306-CV-02925)★★
- 3216 Charles R. MAJOR, Plaintiff, v. GREENVILLE COUNTY SHERIFFS DEPARTMENT, Dr. Stephen Burkholtz; Dr. Benjamin Crumpler; Cathy Phillips, Anderson Clerk of Court; Stephen M. Pruitt, Esquire; Defendants., 2005 WL 2919186, *2919186 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.S.C. Sep 23, 2005) **Objections** (NO. 605-1993-RBH-WMC)★★
- 3217 ABRO INDUSTRIES, INC., Plaintiff, v. HY-POXY SYSTEMS, INC., Defendant., 2004 WL 2081260, *2081260 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.S.C. May 26, 2004) **Abro Industries, Inc.'s Memorandum in Support of ...** (NO. 904-CV-1404-23)★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 3218 Ranina T. OWENS, Personal Representative of the Estate of Edwin L. Turner, Deceased, Plaintiff, v. THE COUNTY OF SUMTER, William T. Noonan, Sumter County Administrator; Sumter County Detention Center; Simon Major, Individually and in his official capacity as Director of the Sumter County Detention Center; Captain Maggie Lane, Individually and in her official capacity;

- Captain Tami M. Griffin, Individually and in her official capacity; Captain Joseph Nelson,, 2004 WL 2626483, *2626483 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.S.C. Mar 03, 2004) **Response to Court's Request to Show Cause Why ...** (NO. 3-03-2755-17)★★
- 3219 Debra S. MORRIS and Franklin J. Morris, Individually and on behalf of All others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. NATIONAL CITY MORTGAGE CO., Defendant., 2003 WL 23877191, *23877191+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.S.C. Dec 22, 2003) **Defendant's Memorandum in Opposition to ...** (NO. 803-3497-26)★★
- 3220 Tsephanyah Y. HAWKINS, Yahchanan Y. Hawkins, Courtroom Data Solutions, Inc., Plaintiffs, v. THE HONORABLE JOHN W. WEEKS, et al., Defendants., 2005 WL 3720320, *3720320 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Tex. Nov 29, 2005) **Brief in Support of Plaintiff Courtroom Data ...** (NO. 105-CV-184-C)★★
- 3221 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. Cenk SHIPPING, in personam, and the M/V Cabot Strait, its appurtenances, engines, tackle, etc., in rem, Defendants., 2007 WL 978928, *978928 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Tex. Feb 19, 2007) **Memorandum in Support of the United States' ...** (NO. H05-2144)★★
- 3222 Jay Nolan RENOBATO, Plaintiff, v. COMPASS BANK CORPORATION, Defendant., 2007 WL 979483, *979483 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Tex. Feb 05, 2007) **Plaintiff's Reply in Opposition to Defendant's ...** (NO. H-07-0046)★★
- 3223 J. Mathew WHITAKER and Three Cities Fund III, L.P., Plaintiffs, v. WILLIAMS FIELD SERVICES-GULF COAST COMPANY, L.P., Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Corporation, WFS-Liquids Company, Williams Field Services Group, Inc., Williams Gas Processing-Gulf Coast Company, L.P., WFS-Offshore Gathering Company, L.P., Hi-Bol Pipeline Company and Black Marlin Pipeline Company Defendants., 2006 WL 1437810, *1437810 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Tex. Apr 06, 2006) **Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Motion to ...** (NO. 406-CV-00573)★
- 3224 MOUNTAIN CABLE COMPANY, d/b/a Adelpia Cable Communications, et al., Plaintiffs, v. PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD OF THE STATE OF VERMONT, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 24840409, *24840409 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Vt. Oct 14, 2003) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Opposition to ...** (NO. 100-CV-298)★★
- 3225 MOUNTAIN CABLE COMPANY, d/b/a Adelpia Cable Communications, Main at Water Street, Coudersport, Pa 16915 and Better TV, Inc. of Bennington, d/b/a Adelpia Cable Communications, Main at Water Street, Coudersport, PA 16915, Plaintiffs, v. PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD OF THE STATE OF VERMONT, 112 State Street, Montpelier, Vt 05620 Serve On: William H. Sorrell Office of the Attorney General 109 State Street Montpelier, Vt 05620, Defendant., 2001 WL 35674177, *35674177 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Vt. Feb 16, 2001) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Opposition to ...** (NO. 100-CV-298)★★
- 3226 HANFORD ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FOUNDATION, a Washington non-profit corporation, on behalf of the State of Washington, Plaintiff, v. ADVANCEMED CORPORATION, a foreign corporation; HPM Corporation, a Washington corporation, Defendants., 2004 WL 3108081, *3108081 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Wash. May 14, 2004) **Defendants' Memorandum and Points of Authorities ...** (NO. CV-04-5046-FVS)★★
- 3227 Paul GRONDAL and All Mill Bay Resort Members, Similarly Situated, Plaintiffs, v. CHIEF EVANS INC., a Washington corporation; Chief Evans Inc. a Colville Tribal corporation; William Evans and Jane Doe Evans, husband and wife and the marital community composed thereof; Jamie Jones and Jane Doe Jones, husband and wife and the marital community composed thereof; Kenneth Evans and Leslie Evans, husband and wife and the marital community composed thereof; John Jones and, 2003 WL 23981285, *23981285+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Wash. Apr 16, 2003) **Defendants' Memorandum Re: Subject Matter ...** (NO. 03CS92-WFN)★★
- 3228 In re Talidesigns Group., 2005 WL 2889260, *2889260 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Wash. Sep 13, 2005) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. APPEAL205-CV-01120-J)★★

- 3229 VILLAGER FRANCHISE SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware Corporation, Plaintiff, v. SH HOTELS, LLC., a Wisconsin Corporation; Edward Vaver, an individual; TIM Podolsky, an individual, and Dairyland Investments, Inc., a Wisconsin Corporation., Defendants., 2004 WL 2753099, *2753099 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Wis. 2004) **Villager Franchise Systems Inc.'s Memorandum in ...** (NO. 04-C-0517)★★
- 3230 CAUDTLL ENTERPRISES, LLC, Plaintiff, v. WEST VIRGINIA FEDERAL CREDIT UNION, Defendant., 2004 WL 3026668, *3026668 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.W.Va. Aug 31, 2004) **Memorandum in Support of Defendant's Motion to ...** (NO. 304-0827)★★
- 3231 Warren D. NICODEMUS, Trustee of the Warren D. Nicodemus Living Trust dated August 5, 1999, Plaintiff, v. UNION PACIFIC CORPORATION and Union Pacific Railroad Company, Defendants; John N. Morris, Norma B. Morris and John H. Bell Iron Mountain Ranch Company, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. Union Pacific Corporation and Union Pacific Railroad Company, Defendants., 2001 WL 35674964, *35674964+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Wyo. Dec 20, 2001) **Defendants' Memorandum in Support of Their Motion ...** (NO. 01CV009J01CV099J)★★★
- 3232 Warren D. NICODEMUS, Trustee of the Warren D. Nicodemus Living Trust dated August 5, 1999, Plaintiff, v. UNION PACIFIC CORPORATION and Union Pacific Railroad Company, Defendants; John N. Morris, Norma B. Morris and John H. Bell Iron Mountain Ranch Company, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. Union Pacific Corporation and Union Pacific Railroad Company, Defendants., 2001 WL 35674977, *35674977+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Wyo. Dec 20, 2001) **Defendants' Memorandum in Support of Their Motion ...** (NO. 01CV009J01CV099J)★★★
- 3233 Iris Arocho SERRANO, Plaintiff, v. Yolanda ZAYAS, Secretary of the Family Department; Juan Sotomayor Lopez, Director of the Integral Service Center for the Family Department at San Sebastian, Defendants., 2006 WL 4087628, *4087628 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Puerto Rico Nov 29, 2006) **Opposition to Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 06-1783(ADC))★
- 3234 In re ADELPHIA COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION, et al., Debtors., 2005 WL 5314937, *5314937 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Bankr.S.D.N.Y. Jul 26, 2005) **Objection of the Ad Hoc Committee of Arahova ...** (NO. 02-41729)★★
- 3235 Josephat HENRY, Julian Michaeu, William Wickham, Boniface Harriett, Simon Joseph, Pascal Prescott, Lawrence Charlery, Johannes Abraham, Peter Nestor, James Henry, Aybert Leon, St. George Baptiste, Daniel Germe, Foster James, Maurice Leon, Martin Fevrier, Julian Defoe, James Grant, Joseph Laforce, Paulinus Gentius, Rupert Dore, George John, James Williams, Joseph St. Brice, Samuel Blackman, Petitioners/Plaintiff(s), v. HESS OIL VIRGIN ISLANDS, 1995 WL 17147874, *17147874+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Jud.Pan.Mult.Lit. Feb 22, 1995) **Third Party Defendant Borinquen Insulation Co., ...** (NO. 1987/345-351, 353-355, 1988/0004-0006, 0008, 1988/0013, 0014, 1988/0017, 1988/0019, 1988/) ""★★★★
- 3236 In Re ASBESTOS PRODUCTS LLABILITY LITIGATION (M.D.L. NO. 875). Josephat Henry, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Hess Oil Virgin Islands Corp., Defendant/ Third Party Plaintiff, v. Borinquen Insulation Co., Inc., Third-Party Defendant., 1995 WL 17147903, *17147903 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Jud.Pan.Mult.Lit. Feb 02, 1995) **Motion to Remand Based on Lack of Subject Matter ...** (NO. 875, 1987/345-51, 353-55, 1988/004-0006, 0008, 0017, 0019, 1988/0086-0088, 1988/0097-0098)★★
- 3237 CITY OF FORT SMITH, Arkansas, Plaintiff, v. SOUTH SEBASTIAN COUNTY WATER USERS ASSOCIATION, a Public Facilities Board, Defendant., 2003 WL 24860414, *24860414 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Ark.Cir. Jul 30, 2003) **Defendant's Response to Plaintiff's Motion to ...** (NO. 203-CV-2116)★★
- 3238 PALMER LAKE PLAZA, LLC, Plaintiff, v. J. ROUX DESIGN AND ASSOCIATES, INC., and Janis Kennedy, Defendant(s)., 2005 WL 4131983, *4131983 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Minn.Dist.Ct. Mar 30, 2005) **Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Support of ...** (NO. COURTCT04-18603)★★

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

- 3239 TRANSIT CASUALTY COMPANY IN RECEIVERSHIP, Plaintiff, v. CERTAIN UNDERWRITERS AT LLOYD'S OF LONDON WHO ARE MEMBERS OF SYNDICATE NO. 553, as Subscribers to Contracts of Reinsurance with Transit Casualty Company, etc., Defendants., 1998 WL 34377133, *34377133 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Mo.Cir. May 07,

- 1998) **Response to the Special Deputy Receiver's ...** (NO. CV595-2CC)★★
- 3240 NINE PENN CENTER ASSOCIATES and Six Penn Center Associates, v. BOARD OF REVISION OF TAXES OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA and The City of Philadelphia and The School District of Philadelphia., 1994 WL 16187621, *16187621 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Pa.Com.Pl. Aug 19, 1994) **Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Appellants' ...** (NO. 0088, 0089, 0090, 0091, 0092)★★
- 3241 PHILADELPHIA AIRPORT BUSINESS CENTER LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, v. BOARD OF REVISION OF TAXES OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA and The City of Philadelphia and The School District of Philadelphia., 1993 WL 13147958, *13147958 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Pa.Com.Pl. Aug 26, 1993) **Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Appellant's ...** (NO. 3263, 802)★★
- 3242 Bonnie J. LARSON, Plaintiff, v. TRAVELERS LLOYDS OF TEXAS INSURANCE COMPANY, and Geico General Insurance Company, Defendants., 2002 WL 32854386, *32854386+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Tex.Dist. May 25, 2002) **Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Demand for ...** (NO. CAUSE48-192962-02)★★★
- 3243 Guardianship Estate of Danny KEFFELER, by Wanda Pierce, Guardian, and Other Persons Similarly Situated, and Danny Keffeler, an individual, Plaintiffs, v. State of Washington Department of Social and Health Services and Department of Licensing; Defendant, Lyle Quasim, Director of the Department of Social and Health Services, and Michael R. Hobbs, Program Manager for Social Security Income Department and Social and Health Services Department, 1997 WL 34622025, *34622025 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Wash.Super. Dec 15, 1997) **Brief in Opposition to CR 12(B)(6) Motion** (NO. 96-2-00157-2)★
- 3244 M&I BANK OF SOUTHERN WISCONSIN, Plaintiff, v. John J. POEHLING and Dixie Poehling, Defendants/Third-Party Plaintiffs, v. Lawyers Title Insurance Corp., Fine Line Construction, Inc., Third-Party Defendants., 2003 WL 24210495, *24210495 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Wis.Cir. Feb 13, 2003) **John and Dixie Poehlings' Memorandum Supporting ...** (NO. 01CV0169)★★

Trial Filings

- 3245 In re NATTEL, LLC, Debtor., 2006 WL 3381399, *3381399 (Trial Filing) (Bankr.D.Conn. Oct 30, 2006) **U. S. Trustee's Motion for an Order Converting ...** (NO. 06-50421, AHWS)★★
- 3246 In re LAND PRESERVE, LLC, Debtor., 2006 WL 1832930, *1832930 (Trial Filing) (Bankr.D.Conn. Jun 19, 2006) **U. S. Trustee's Motion for an Order Converting ...** (NO. 06-20525, RLK)★★
- 3247 In re LAND PRESERVE, LLC, Debtor., 2006 WL 3381396, *3381396 (Trial Filing) (Bankr.D.Conn. Jun 19, 2006) **U. S. Trustee's Motion for an Order Converting ...** (NO. 06-21016, RLK)★★
- 3248 In re: DUNLAP, INC., Debtor. United States Trustee, Movant, v. Dunlap, Inc., Respondent., 2006 WL 1833078, *1833078 (Trial Filing) (Bankr.W.D.Pa. May 19, 2006) **Motion of the United States Trustee to Dismiss** (NO. 06-22238MBM)★★
- 3249 In re LELAND MEDICAL CENTERS, INC. Po Box 251548 Piano, TX 75025 Tax id: xxxxx2975, Debtor., 2006 WL 2840180, *2840180 (Trial Filing) (Bankr.E.D.Tex. Feb 08, 2006) **Motion to Dismiss - Pro Se Corporate Debtor** (NO. 05-47913)★★
- 3250 In re: AKP, LTD., Debtor., 2006 WL 1833010, *1833010 (Trial Filing) (Bankr.N.D.Tex. Jun 14, 2006) **Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 06-31894-HDH)★★

Secondary Sources (Canada)

- 3251 Marbury v. Madison and Canadian Constitutionalism: Rhetoric and Practice, 37 R.J.T. 375, 403 (2003)

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.



Date of Printing: MAY 11,2007

KEYCITE

🚩 **Osborn v. Bank of U.S., 22 U.S. 738, 1824 WL 2682, 6 L.Ed. 204, 9 Wheat. 738 (U.S.Ohio, Mar 19, 1824)**

© Copyright 2007 West, Carswell, Sweet & Maxwell Asia and Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, ABN 64 058 914 668, or their Licensors. All rights reserved.

<p>Trial U.S. Supreme Court</p>	<p>Westlaw has no direct history for this case</p> <div data-bbox="259 420 381 724" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>U.S. Supreme Court KeyCited Case Osborn v. Bank of U.S. 22 U.S. 738 U.S. Ohio Mar 19, 1824</p> </div>	<p>Trial U.S. Supreme Court</p>
<p>(c) 2007 Thomson/West</p>		