



17 S.Ct. 326

Page 1

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
 (Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)



ROBERTSON v. BALDWIN  
 U.S. 1897

Supreme Court of the United States  
 ROBERTSON et al.  
 v.  
 BALDWIN.  
 No. 334.

January 25, 1897.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States  
 for the Northern District of California.

**\*\*326 \*275** This was an appeal from a judgment of the district court for the Northern district of California, rendered August 5, 1895, dismissing a writ of habeas corpus issued upon the petition of Robert Robertson, P. H. Olsen, John Bradley, and Morris Hanson.

The petition set forth, in substance, that the petitioners were unlawfully restrained of their liberty by Barry Baldwin, marshal **\*\*327** for the Northern district of California, in the county jail of Alameda county, by virtue of an order of commitment, made by a United State commissioner, committing them for trial upon a charge of disobedience of the lawful orders of the master of the American barkentine Arago; that such commitment **\*276** was made without reasonable or probable cause, in this: that at the time of the commission of the alleged offense, petitioners were held on board the Arago against their will and by force, having been theretofore placed on board said vessel by the marshal for the district of Oregon, under the provisions of Rev. St § 4596, subd. 1, and Id. §§ 4598, 4599, the master claiming the right to hold petitioners by virtue of these acts; that sections 4598 and 4599 are unconstitutional, and in violation of section 1 of article 3, and of the fifth amendment to the constitution; that section 4598 was also repealed by congress on June 7, 1872 (17 Stat.

262); and that the first subdivision of section 4596 is in violation of the thirteenth amendment, in that it compels involuntary servitude.

The record was somewhat meager, but it sufficiently appeared that the petitioners had shipped on board the Arago at San Francisco for a voyage to Knappton, in the state of Washington, thence to Valparaiso, and thence to such other foreign ports as the master might direct, and return to a port of discharge in the United States; that they had each signed shipping articles to perform the duties of seamen during the course of the voyage, but, becoming dissatisfied with their employment, they left the vessel at Astoria, in the state of Oregon, and were subsequently arrested, under the provisions of Rev. St. §§ 4596-4599, taken before a justice of the peace, and by him committed to jail until the Arago was ready for sea (some 16 days), when they were taken from the jail by the marshal, and placed on board the Arago against their will; that they refused to 'turn to,' in obedience to the orders of the master, were arrested at San Francisco, charged with refusing to work, in violation of Rev. St. § 4596, were subsequently examined before a commissioner of the circuit court, and by him held to answer such charge before the district court for the Northern district of California.

Shortly thereafter they sued out this writ of habeas corpus, which, upon a hearing before the district court, was dismissed, and an order made remanding the prisoners to the custody of the marshal.

**\*277** Whereupon petitioners appealed to this court.

West Headnotes

**Constitutional Law 92** **1067**

92 Constitutional Law

92VII Constitutional Rights in General

92VII(B) Particular Constitutional Rights

92k1067 k. Bill of Rights or Declaration  
 of Rights. Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 92k82(2), 92k82)

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

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
(Cite as: **165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326**)

The first 10 amendments to the constitution of the United States, commonly known as the "Bill of Rights," were not intended to lay down any novel principles of government, but simply embodied certain guaranties and immunities which we had inherited from our English ancestors, and which had, from time immemorial, been subject to certain well-recognized exceptions, arising from the necessities of the case. In incorporating these principles into the constitution, there was no intention of disregarding the exceptions, which have continued to be recognized as if formally expressed.

### **Constitutional Law 92 ↩1103**

#### 92 Constitutional Law

##### 92VII Constitutional Rights in General

##### 92VII(B) Particular Constitutional Rights

##### 92k1101 Involuntary Servitude

##### 92k1103 k. Labor and Employment.

#### Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 92k83(2))

### **Seamen 348 ↩4**

#### 348 Seamen

348k4 k. Statutory Provisions. Most Cited Cases  
Rev.St. §§ 4598, 4599, authorizing the apprehension, imprisonment, and return on board of deserting seamen in the merchant service, are not invalidated by the prohibition of "involuntary servitude" in the thirteenth amendment.

### **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 106k257)

The "judicial power," which the constitution, article 3, §§ 1, 2, U.S.C.A., confines to courts created by congress, extends only to "cases" in courts of record; and congress is at liberty to authorize judicial officers of the several states to exercise such powers as are ordinarily given to officers of

courts not of record.

### **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 106k257)

The power to arrest deserting seamen in the merchant service, and deliver them on board their vessel, is not a part of the "judicial power," as defined by the constitution, article 3, §§ 1, 2, U.S.C.A.; and congress, therefore, had power to confer it, by Rev.St. §§ 4598, 4599, on justices of the peace.

### **Seamen 348 ↩4**

#### 348 Seamen

348k4 k. Statutory Provisions. Most Cited Cases  
Rev.St. §§ 4598, 4599, authorizing the apprehension, imprisonment, and return on board of deserting seamen in the merchant service held valid.

J. H. Ralston, for appellants.

Sol. Gen. Conrad, for appellee.

Mr. Justice BROWN, after stating the facts in the foregoing language, delivered the opinion of the court.

Upon what ground the court below dismissed the writ and remanded the petitioners does not appear, but the record raises two questions of some importance: First, as to the constitutionality of Rev. St. §§ 4598, 4599, in so far as they confer jurisdiction upon justices of the peace to apprehend deserting seamen, and return them to their vessel; second, as to the conflict of the same sections, and also section 4596, with the thirteenth amendment to the constitution, abolishing slavery and involuntary servitude.

Section 4598, which was taken from section 7 of the act of July 20, 1790, reads as follows:

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
(Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)

'Sec. 4598. If any seaman who shall have signed a contract to perform a voyage shall, at any port or place desert, or shall absent himself from such vessel, without leave of the master, or officer commanding in the absence of the master, it shall be lawful for any justice of the peace within the United States, upon the complaint of the master, to issue his warrant to apprehend such deserter, and bring him before such justice; and if it then appears that he has signed a contract within the intent and meaning of this title, and that the voyage agreed for is not finished, or altered, or the contract otherwise dissolved, and that such seaman has deserted the vessel, or absented himself without leave, the justice shall commit him to the house of correction or common jail of the city, town or place, to remain there until the vessel shall be ready to proceed on her voyage, or till the master shall require his discharge, and then to be delivered to the master, he paying all the cost of such commitment, and deducting the same out of the wages due to such seaman.'

\*278 Section 4599, which was taken for section 53 of the shipping commissioners' act of June 7, 1872, authorizes the apprehension of deserting seamen, with or without the assistance of the local public officers or constables, and without a warrant, and their conveyance before any court of justice or magistrate of the state, to be dealt with according to law.

Section 4596, which is also taken from the same act, provides punishment by imprisonment for desertion, refusal to join the vessel, or absence without leave.

1. The first proposition, that congress has no authority under the constitution to vest judicial power in the courts or judicial officers of the several states, originated in an observation of Mr. Justice Story, in *Martin v. Hunter's Lessees*, 1 Wheat. 304, 330 to the effect that 'congress cannot vest any portion of the judicial power of the United States, except in courts ordained and established by itself.' This was repeated in *Houston v. Moore*, 5 Wheat. 1, 27; and the same general doctrine has received the approval of the courts of several of the states. *U. S. v. Lathrop*, 17 Johns. 4; *Ely v. Peck*, 7

*Conn.* 239; *U. S. v. Campbell* (Ohio Com. Pl.) 6 Hall, Law J. 113. These were all actions \*\*328 for penalties, however, wherein the courts held to the familiar doctrine that the courts of one sovereignty will not enforce the penal laws of another. *Huntington v. Attrill*, 146 U. S. 657, 672, 13 Sup. Ct. 224. In *Com. v. Feely*, 1 Va. Cas. 325, it was held by the general court of Virginia, in 1813, that the state courts could not take jurisdiction of an indictment for a crime committed against an act of congress.

In *Ex parte Knowles*, 5 Cal. 300, it was also held that congress had no power to confer jurisdiction upon the courts of a state to naturalize aliens, although, if such power be recognized by the legislature of a state, it may be exercised by the courts of such state of competent jurisdiction.

In *State v. Rutter*, 12 Niles, Reg. 115, 231, it was held, in 1817, by Judges Bland and Hanson, of Maryland, that congress had no power to authorize justices of the peace to issue warrants for the apprehension of offenders against the laws of \*279 the United States. A directly contrary view, however, was taken by Judge Cheves, of South Carolina, in *Ex parte Rhodes*, 12 Niles, Reg. 264.

The general principle announced by these cases is derived from the third article of the constitution, the first section of which declares that 'the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme court, and in such inferior courts as the congress may from time to time ordain and establish, ' the judges of which courts 'shall hold their offices during good behavior,' etc.; and, by the second section, '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; to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more states; between a state and citizens of another state; between citizens of different states; between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states, and between a state or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
 (Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)

subjects.'

The better opinion is that the second section was intended as a constitutional definition of the judicial power (*Chisholm v. Georgia*, 2 Dall. 419, 475), which the constitution intended to confine to courts created by congress; in other words, that such power extends only to the trial and determination of 'cases' in courts of record, and that congress is still at liberty to authorize the judicial officers of the several states to exercise such power as is ordinarily given to officers of courts not of record,—such, for instance, as the power to take affidavits, to arrest and commit for trial offenders against the laws of the United States, to naturalize aliens, and to perform such other duties as may be regarded as incidental to the judicial power rather than a part of the judicial power itself. This was the view taken by the supreme court of Alabama in *Ex parte Gist*, 26 Ala. 156, wherein the authority of justices of the peace and other such officers to arrest and commit for a violation of the criminal law of the United States \*280 was held to be no part of the judicial power within the third article of the constitution. And in the case of *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*, 16 Pet. 539, it was said that, as to the authority conferred on state magistrates to arrest fugitive slaves and deliver them to their owners, under the act of February 12, 1793, while a difference of opinion existed and might still exist upon this point in different states, whether state magistrates were bound to act under it, no doubt was entertained by this court that state magistrates might, if they chose, exercise the authority, unless prohibited by state legislation. See, also, *Moore v. Illinois*, 14 How. 13; *In re Kaine*, Id. 103.

We think the power of justices of the peace to arrest deserting seamen and deliver them on board their vessel is not within the definition of the 'judicial power' as defined by the constitution, and may be lawfully conferred upon state officers. That the authority is a most convenient one to intrust to such officers cannot be denied, as seamen frequently leave their vessels in small places, where there are no federal judicial officers, and where a justice of the peace may usually be found, with authority to issue warrants under the state laws.

2. The question whether sections 4598 and 4599 conflict with the thirteenth amendment, forbidding slavery and involuntary servitude, depends upon the construction to be given to the term 'involuntary servitude.' Does the epithet 'involuntary' attach to the word 'servitude' continuously, and make illegal any service which becomes involuntary at any time during its existence? or does it attach only at the inception of the servitude, and characterize it as unlawful because unlawfully entered into? If the former be the true construction, then no one, not even a soldier, sailor, or apprentice, can surrender his liberty, even for a day; and the soldier may desert his regiment upon the eve of battle, or the sailor abandon his ship at any intermediate port or landing, or even in a storm at sea, provided, only, he can find means of escaping to another vessel. If the latter, then an individual may, for a valuable consideration, contract for the surrender of his personal liberty for a definite time and for a recognized purpose, and subordinate his going and coming to the will of \*281 another during the continuance of the contract; not that all such contracts would be lawful, but that a servitude which was knowingly and willingly entered into could not be termed 'involuntary.' Thus, if one should agree, for a \*\*329 yearly wage, to serve another in a particular capacity during his life, and never to leave his estate without his consent, the contract might not be enforceable for the want of a legal remedy, or might be void upon grounds of public policy; but the servitude could not be properly termed 'involuntary.' Such agreement for a limited personal servitude at one time were very common in England, and by statute of June 17, 1823 (4 Geo. IV. c. 34, § 3), it was enacted that if any servant in husbandry, or any artificer, calico printer, handcraftsman, miner, collier, keelman, pitman, glassman, potter, laborer or other person, should contract to serve another for a definite time, and should desert such service during the term of the contract, he was made liable to a criminal punishment. The breach of a contract for personal service has not, however, been recognized in this country as involving a liability to criminal punishment, except in the cases of soldiers, sailors, and possibly some others; nor would public opinion tolerate a statute to that effect.

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
**(Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)**

But we are also of opinion that, even if the contract of a seaman could be considered within the letter of the thirteenth amendment, it is not, within its spirit, a case of involuntary servitude. The law is perfectly well settled that the first 10 amendments to the constitution, commonly known as the 'Bill of Rights,' were not intended to lay down any novel principles of government, but simply to embody certain guaranties and immunities which we had inherited from our English ancestors, and which had, from time immemorial, been subject to certain well-recognized exceptions, arising from the necessities of the case. In incorporating these principles into the fundamental law, there was no intention of disregarding the exceptions, which continued to be recognized as if they had been formally expressed. Thus, the freedom of speech and of the press (article 1) does not permit the publication of libels, blasphemous or indecent articles, or other publications injurious to public morals or private reputation; the right of the people \*282 to keep and bear arms (article 2) is not infringed by laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed weapons; the provision that no person shall be twice put in jeopardy (article 5) does not prevent a second trial, if upon the first trial the jury failed to agree, or if the verdict was set aside upon the defendant's motion (U. S. v. Ball, 163 U. S. 662, 627, 16 Sup. Ct. 1192); nor does the provision of the same article that no one shall be a witness against himself impair his obligation to testify, if a prosecution against him be barred by the lapse of time, a pardon, or by statutory enactment (Brown v. Walker, 161 U. S. 591, 16 Sup. Ct. 644, and cases cited). Nor does the provision that an accused person shall be confronted with the witnesses against him prevent the admission of dying declarations, or the depositions of witnesses who have died since the former trial.

The prohibition of slavery, in the thirteenth amendment, is well known to have been adopted with reference to a state of affairs which had existed in certain states of the Union since the foundation of the government, while the addition of the words 'involuntary servitude' were said, in the Slaughterhouse Cases, 16 Wall. 36, to have been intended to cover the system of Mexican peonage and the Chinese coolie trade, the practical operation

of which might have been a revival of the institution of slavery under a different and less offensive name. It is clear, however, that the amendment was not intended to introduce any novel doctrine with respect to certain descriptions of service which have always been treated as exceptional, such as military and naval enlistments, or to disturb the right of parents and guardians to the custody of their minor children or wards. The amendment, however, makes no distinction between a public and a private service. To say that persons engaged in a public service are not within the amendment is to admit that there are exceptions to its general language, and the further question is at once presented, where shall the line be drawn? We know of no better answer to make than to say that services which have from time immemorial been treated as exceptional shall not be regarded as within its purview.

From the earliest historical period the contract of the sailor \*283 has been treated as an exceptional one, and involving, to a certain extent, the surrender of his personal liberty during the life of the contract. Indeed, the business of navigation could scarcely be carried on without some guaranty, beyond the ordinary civil remedies upon contract, that the sailor will not desert the ship at a critical moment, or leave her at some place where seamen are impossible to be obtained, - as Molloy forcibly expresses it, 'to rot in her neglected brine.' Such desertion might involve a long delay of the vessel while the master is seeking another crew, an abandonment of the voyage, and, in some cases, the safety of the ship itself. Hence, the laws of nearly all maritime nations have made provision for securing the personal attendance of the crew on board, and for their criminal punishment for desertion, or absence without leave, during the life of the shipping articles.

Even by the maritime law of the ancient Rhodians, which is supposed to antedate the birth of Christ by about 900 years, according to Pardessus (Lois Mar. vol. 1, p. 250), if the master or the sailors absented themselves by night, and the vessel were lost or damaged, they were bound to respond in the amount of the loss.

In the compilation of maritime laws, known as the '

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
(Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)

Consulate of the Sea,' it was also provided that a sailor should not go ashore without permission, upon the penalty of being obliged to pay any damage occasioned by his absence, and, in default of his being able to respond, of being thrust in prison until he had paid all such damage. Chapters 121, 124; 2 Pard. Lois Mar. 146, 147, 148.

**\*\*330** A like provision is found in the Rules of Oleron, promulgated in the reign of Henry III., by which (article 5) the seamen were forbidden to leave the ship without the master's consent. 'If they do, and by that means she happens to be lost or damnified, they shall be answerable for the damage.' 1 Pet. Adm. Append. xi. A similar prohibition is found in article 17 of the Laws of Wisbuy. 1 Pet. Adm. Append. lxxiii.

The laws of the towns belonging to the Hanseatic League, first enacted and promulgated in 1597, were still more explicit and severe. No seaman might go ashore without the consent **\*284** of the master or other officer, and if he remained longer than the time allowed was condemned to pay a fine or suffer an imprisonment (articles 22 and 23); and, by article 40, if a seaman went ashore without leave, and the ship happened to receive any damage, 'he shall be kept in prison upon bread and water for one year,' and, if any seaman died or perished for the want of the assistance of the absent seaman, the latter was subject to corporal punishment; and, by article 43, 'if an officer or seaman quits a ship and conceals himself; if afterwards he is apprehended, he shall be delivered up to justice to be punished; he shall be stigmatized in the face with the first letter of the name of the town to which he belongs.' 1 Pet. Adm. Append. cvi.

By the Marine Ordinance of Louis XIV., which was in existence at the time the constitution was adopted (title 3, art. 3), 'if a seaman leaves a master without a discharge in writing before the voyage is begun, he may be taken up and imprisoned wherever he can be found, and compelled to restore what he has received, and serve out the time for which he had engaged himself for nothing; and if he leaves the ship after the voyage is begun, he may be punished corporally.' Article 5: 'After the ship is laded, the seamen shall not go ashore without leave from the

master, under pain of five livres for the first fault; and may be punished corporally if they commit a second.'

The present Commercial Code of France, however, makes no express provision upon the subject; but by the general mercantile law of Germany (article 532), 'the master can cause any seaman, who, after having been engaged, neglects to enter upon or continue to do his duties, to be forcibly compelled to perform the same.'

By the Dutch Code (article 402) 'the master, or his representative, can call in the public force against those who refuse to come on board, who absent themselves from the ship without leave, and refuse to perform to the end of the service for which they were engaged.'

Nearly all of the ancient commercial codes either make provision for payment of damages by seamen who absent **\*285** themselves from their ships without leave, or for their imprisonment, or forcible conveyance on board. Some of the modern commercial codes of Europe and South America make similar provisions. Argentine Code, art. 1154. Others, including the French and Spanish Codes, are silent upon the subject.

Turning, now, to the country from which we have inherited most immediately our maritime laws and customs, we find that Malynes, the earliest English writer upon the law merchant, who wrote in 1622, says in his *Lex Mercatoria* (volume 1, c. 23), that 'mariners in a strange port should not leave the ship without the master's license, or fastening her with four ropes, or else the loss falls upon them. \* \* \* In a strange country, the one-half of the company, at least, ought to remain on shipboard, and the rest who go on land should keep sobriety and abstain from suspected places, or else should be punished in body and purse; like as he who absents himself when the ship is ready to sail. Yea, if he give out himself worthier than he is in his calling, he shall lose his hire, -half to the admiral, and the other half to the master.' Molloy, one of the most satisfactory of early English writers upon the subject, states that, if seamen depart from a ship without leave or license of the master, and any disaster happens, they

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
(Cite as: **165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326**)

must answer, quoting article 5 of the Rules of Oleron in support of his proposition.

There appears to have been no legislation directly upon the subject until 1729, when the act of 2 Geo. II. c. 36, was enacted 'for the better regulation and government of seamen in the merchants' service.' This act not only provided for the forfeiture of wages in case of desertion, but for the apprehension of seamen deserting or absenting themselves, upon warrants to be issued by justices of the peace, and, in case of their refusal to proceed upon the voyage, for their committal to the house of correction at hard labor. Indeed, this seems to have furnished a model upon which the act of congress of July 20, 1790 (1 Stat. 131), for the government and regulation of seamen in the merchants' service, was constructed. The provisions of this act were substantially repeated by the \*286 act of 1791 (31 Geo. III. c. 39), and were subsequently added to and amended by the acts of 5 & 6 Wm. IV. c. 19, and 7 & 8 Vict. c. 112.

The modern law of England is full and explicit upon the duties and responsibilities of seamen. By Merchants' Shipping Act 1854 (17 & 18 Vict. c. 104) § 243, a seaman guilty of desertion might be summarily punished by imprisonment, by forfeiture of his clothes and effects, and all or any part of his wages. Similar punishment was meted out to him for neglecting or refusing to join his ship, or to proceed to sea, or for absence without leave at any time. By section 246, 'whenever, at the commencement or during the progress of any voyage, any seaman or apprentice neglects, or refuses to join, or deserts from or refuses to proceed to sea in any ship in which he is duly engaged to serve,' the master was authorized to call upon the \*\*331 police officers or constables to apprehend him without warrant and take him before a magistrate who, by article 247, was authorized to order him to be conveyed on board for the purpose of proceeding on the voyage.

The provision for imprisonment for desertion seems to have been repealed by the merchants' seamen (payment of wages and rating) act of 1880; but the tenth section of that act retained the provision authorizing the master to call upon the police

officers or constables to convey deserting seamen on board their vessels.

This act, however, appears to have been found too lenient, since, in 1894, the whole subject was reconsidered and covered in the new merchants' shipping act (57 & 58 Vict. c. 60), of 748 sections, section 221 of which provides, not only for the forfeiture of wages in case of desertion, but for imprisonment with or without hard labor, except in cases arising in the United Kingdom. The provision for the arrest of the deserting seaman, and his conveyance on board the ship, is, however, retained both within and without the kingdom. Sections 222, 223. This is believed to be the latest legislation on the subject in England.

The earliest American legislation which we have been able \*287 to find is an act of the colonial general court of Massachusetts, passed about 1668, wherein it was enacted that any mariner who departs and leaves a voyage upon which he has entered shall forfeit all his wages, and shall be further punished by imprisonment or otherwise, as the case may be circumstanced; and if he shall have received any considerable part of his wages, and shall run away, he shall be pursued as a disobedient runaway servant. Col. Laws Mass. (Ed. 1889) 251, 256.

The provision of Rev. St. § 4598, under which these proceedings were taken, was first enacted by congress in 1790. 1 Stat. 131, § 7. This act provided for the apprehension of deserters and their delivery on board the vessel, but apparently made no provision for imprisonment as a punishment for desertion; but by the shipping commissioners' act of 1872 (17 Stat. 243, § 51), now incorporated into the Revised Statutes as section 4596, the court is authorized to add to forfeiture of wages for desertion imprisonment for a period of not more than three months, and for absence without leave imprisonment for not more than one month. In this act and the amendments thereto very careful provisions are made for the protection of seamen against the frauds and cruelty of masters, the devices of boarding-house keepers, and, as far as possible, against the consequences of their own ignorance and improvidence. At the same time discipline is more stringently enforced by additional

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
(Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)

punishments for desertion, absence without leave, disobedience, insubordination, and barratry. Indeed, seamen are treated by congress, as well as by the parliament of Great Britain, as deficient in that full and intelligent responsibility for their acts which is accredited to ordinary adults, and as needing the protection of the law in the same sense in which minors and wards are entitled to the protection of their parents and guardians. 'Quemadmodum pater in filios, magister in discipulos, dominus in servos vel familiares.' The ancient characterization of seamen as 'wards of admiralty' is even more accurate now than it was formerly.

In the face of this legislation upon the subject of desertion and absence without leave, which was in force in this country \*288 for more than 60 years before the thirteenth amendment was adopted, and similar legislation abroad from time immemorial, it cannot be open to doubt that the provision against involuntary servitude was never intended to apply to their contracts.

The judgment of the court below is, therefore, affirmed.

Mr. Justice GRAY was not present at the argument, and took no part in the decision of this case.

Mr. Justice HARLAN, dissenting.

The appellants shipped on the American barkentine Arago, having previously signed articles whereby they undertook to perform the duties of seamen during a voyage of that vessel from San Francisco (quoting from the record) 'to Knappton, state of Washington, and thence to Valparaiso, and thence to such other foreign ports as the master may direct, and return to a port of discharge in the United States.' The vessel was engaged in a purely private business.

As stated in the opinion of the court, the appellants left the vessel at Astoria, Or., without the consent of the master, having become dissatisfied with their employment. The grounds of such dissatisfaction are not stated.

Upon the application of the master, a justice of the peace at Astoria, Or., proceeding under sections

4596 to 4599 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, issued a warrant for the arrest of the appellants. They were seized, somewhat as runaway slaves were in the days of slavery, and committed to jail without bail, 'until the Arago was ready for sea.' After remaining in jail some 16 days, they were taken by the marshal and placed on board the Arago against their will. While on board they refused to 'turn to,' or to work, in obedience to the orders of the master. Upon the arrival of the barkentine at San Francisco, they were arrested for having refused to work on the vessel, and committed for trial upon that charge.

If the placing of the appellants on board the Arago at Astoria against their will was illegal, then their refusal to work while thus forcibly held on the vessel could not be a criminal offense, and their detention and subsequent arrest \*289 for refusing to work while the vessel was going from Astoria to San Francisco \*\*332 were without authority of law. The question, therefore, is whether the appellants, having left the vessel at Astoria, no matter for what cause, could lawfully be required, against their will, to return to it, and to render personal services for the master.

The government justifies the proceedings taken against the appellants at Astoria by sections 4596, 4598, and 4599 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

By section 4596 it is provided: 'Sec. 4596. Whenever any seaman who has been lawfully engaged, or any apprentice to the sea service, commits any of the following offenses, he shall be punishable as follows: First. For desertion, by imprisonment for not more than three months, and by forfeiture of all or any part of the clothes or effects he leaves on board, and of all or any part of the wages or emoluments which he has then earned Second. For neglecting and refusing, without reasonable cause, to join his vessel, or to proceed to sea in his vessel, or for absence without leave at any time within twenty-four hours of the vessel sailing from any port, either at the commencement or during the progress of any voyage; or for absence at any time without leave, and without sufficient reason, from his vessel, or from his duty, not



165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
**(Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)**

amounting to desertion, or not treated as such by the master; by imprisonment for not more than one month, and also, at the discretion of the court, by forfeiture of his wages, of not more than two days' pay, and, for every twenty-four hours of absence, either a sum not exceeding six days' pay, or any expenses which have been properly incurred in hiring a substitute. Third. For quitting the vessel without leave after her arrival at her port of delivery, and before she is placed in security, by forfeiture out of his wages of not more than one month's pay. Fourth. For wilful disobedience to any lawful command, by imprisonment for not more than two months, and also, at the discretion of the court, by forfeiture out of his wages of not more than four days' pay. Fifth. For continued wilful disobedience to lawful commands, or continued wilful neglect of duty, by imprisonment\***290** for not more than six months, and also, at the discretion of the court, by forfeiture, for every twenty-four hours' continuance of such disobedience or neglect, of either a sum not more than twelve days' pay, or sufficient to defray any expenses which have been properly incurred in hiring a substitute. Sixth. For assaulting any master or mate, by imprisonment for not more than two years. Seventh. For combining with any others of the crew to disobey lawful commands, or to neglect duty, or to impede navigation of the vessel, or the progress of the voyage, by imprisonment for not more than twelve months. \* \* \*

These provisions are brought forward from the act of June 7, 1872, c. 322, § 51 (17 Stat. 273).

Section 4598 provides: 'Sec. 4598. If any seaman who shall have signed a contract to perform a voyage shall, at any port or place, desert, or shall absent himself from such vessel, without leave of the master, or officer commanding in the absence of the master, it shall be lawful for any justice of the peace within the United States, upon the complaint of the master, to issue his warrant to apprehend such deserter, and bring him before such justice; and if it then appears that he has signed a contract within the intent and meaning of this title, and that the voyage agreed for is not finished, or altered, or the contract otherwise dissolved, and that such seaman has deserted the vessel, or absented himself without

leave, the justice shall commit him to the house of correction or common jail of the city, town or place, to remain there until the vessel shall be ready to proceed on her voyage, or till the master shall require his discharge, and then to be delivered to the master, he paying all the cost of such commitment, and deducting the same out of the wages due to such seaman.'

This section is the same as section 7, c. 29, of the act of July 20, 1890 (1 Stat. 134).

By section 4599-which is substantially the same as section 53 of the above act of June 7, 1872-it is provided: 'Sec. 4599. Whenever, either at the commencement of or during any voyage, any seaman or apprentice neglects or \***291** refuses to join, or deserts from or refuses to proceed to sea in, any vessel in which he is duly engaged to serve, or is found otherwise absenting himself therefrom without leave, the master or any mate, or the owner or consignee, or shipping commissioner, may, in any place in the United States, with or without the assistance of the local public officers or constables, who are hereby directed to give their assistance if required, and also at any place out of the United States, if and so far as the laws in force at such place will permit, apprehend him without first procuring a warrant; and may thereupon, in any case, and shall in case he so requires and it is practicable, convey him before any court of justice or magistrate of any state, city, town, or county, within the United States, authorized to take cognizance of offenses of like degree and kind, to be dealt with according to the provisions of law governing such cases; and may, for the purpose of conveying him before such court or magistrate, detain him in custody for a period not exceeding twenty-four hours, or may, if he does not so require, or if there is no such court at or near the place, at once convey him on board. If such apprehension appears to the court or magistrate before whom the case is brought to have been made on improper or on insufficient grounds, the master, mate, consignee, or shipping commissioner who makes the same, or causes the same to be made, shall be liable to a penalty of not more than one hundred dollars; but such penalty, if in flicted, shall be a bar to any action for false imprisonment.'

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
(Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)

The decision just made proceeds upon the **\*\*333** broad ground that one who voluntarily engages to serve upon a private vessel in the capacity of a seaman for a given term, but who, without the consent of the master, leaves the vessel when in port before the stipulated term is ended, and refuses to return to it, may be arrested and held in custody until the vessel is ready to proceed on its voyage, and then delivered against his will, and if need be by actual force, on the vessel to the master.

The thirteenth amendment of the constitution of the United States declares that 'neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party **\*292** shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.'

Slavery exists wherever the law recognizes a right of property in a human being, but slavery cannot exist in any form within the United States. The thirteenth amendment uprooted slavery as it once existed in this country, and destroyed all of its badges and incidents. It established freedom for all. 'By its own unaided force and effect it abolished slavery and established freedom.' The amendment, this court has also said, 'is not a mere prohibition of state laws establishing or upholding slavery or involuntary servitude, but an absolute declaration that slavery or involuntary servitude shall not exist in any part of the United States.' Civil Rights Cases, 109 U. S. 1, 20, 3 Sup. Ct. 18.

As to involuntary servitude, it may exist in the United States; but it can only exist lawfully as a punishment for crime of which the party shall have been duly convicted. Such is the plain reading of the constitution. A condition of enforced service, even for a limited period, in the private business of another, is a condition of involuntary servitude.

If it be said that government may make it a criminal offense, punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, for any one to violate his private contract voluntarily made, or to refuse without sufficient reason to perform it, a proposition which cannot, I think, be sustained at this day, in this land of freedom, it would by no means follow that government could, by force applied in advance of

due conviction of some crime, compel a freeman to render personal services in respect of the private business of another. The placing of a person, by force, on a vessel about to sail, is putting him in a condition of involuntary servitude, if the purpose is to compel him against his will to give his personal services in the private business in which that vessel is engaged. The personal liberty of individuals, it has been well said, 'consists in the power of locomotion, of changing situation, or moving one's person to whatsoever place one's own inclination may direct, without imprisonment or restraint, unless by due course of law.' 1 Bl. Comm. p. 134, c. 1.

**\*293** Can the decision of the court be sustained under the clause of the constitution granting power to congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several states? That power cannot be exerted except with due regard to other provisions of the constitution, particularly those embodying the fundamental guaranties of life, liberty, and property. While congress may enact regulations for the conduct of commerce with foreign nations and among the states, and may, perhaps, prescribe punishment for the violation of such regulations, it may not, in so doing, ignore other clauses of the constitution. For instance, a regulation of commerce cannot be sustained which, in disregard of the express injunctions of the constitution, imposes a cruel and unusual punishment for its violation, or compels a person to testify in a criminal case against himself, or authorizes him to be put twice in jeopardy of life or limb, or denies to the accused the privilege of being confronted with the witnesses against him, or of being informed of the nature and cause of the accusation against him. And it is equally clear that no regulation of commerce established by congress can stand if its necessary operation be either to establish slavery or to create a condition of involuntary servitude forbidden by the constitution.

It is said that the statute in question is sanctioned by long usage among the nations of the earth, as well as by the above act of July 20, 1790.

In considering the antiquity of regulations that restrain the personal freedom of seamen, the court

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
**(Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)**

refers to the laws of the ancient Rhodians, which are supposed to have antedated the Christian era. But those laws, whatever they may have been, were enacted at a time when no account was taken of a man as man, when human life and human liberty were regarded as of little value, and when the powers of government were employed to gratify the ambition and the pleasures of despotic rulers rather than promote the welfare of the people.

Attention has been called by the court to the laws enacted by the towns of the Hanseatic League 300 years ago, by one of which a seaman who went ashore without leave could, in certain contingencies, be kept in prison 'upon bread \*294 and water for one year,' and by another of which an officer or seaman who quit his ship and concealed himself could be apprehended and 'stigmatized in the face with the first letter of the name of the town to which he belongs.' Why the reference to these enactments of ancient times, enforced by or under governments possessing arbitrary power inconsistent with a state of freedom? Does any one suppose that a regulation of commerce authorizing seamen who quit their ship, without leave, to be imprisoned 'upon bread and water for one year,' or which required them to be 'stigmatized in the face' with the letter of the town or state to which they belonged, would now receive the sanction of any court in the United States?

**\*\*334** Reference has also been made to an act of the colonial general court of Massachusetts, passed in 1647, declaring that a seaman who left his vessel before its voyage was ended might be 'pursued as a runaway servant.' But the act referred to was passed when slavery was tolerated in Massachusetts, with the assent of the government of Great Britain. It antedated the famous declaration of rights, promulgated in 1780, in which Massachusetts declared, among other things, that 'all men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential, and unalienable rights, among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness.'

The effect of that declaration was well illustrated in

Parsons v. Track, 7 Gray, 473. That case involved the validity of a contract made in a foreign country in 1840 by an adult inhabitant thereof with a citizen of the United States, 'to serve him, his executors and assigns,' for the term of five years, 'during all of which term the said servant her said master, his executors or assigns, faithfully shall serve, and that honestly and obediently in all things, as a good and dutiful servant ought to do.' It was sought to enforce this contract in Massachusetts. After carefully examining the provisions of the contract, the court said: 'As to the nature, then, of the service to be performed, the place where and the person \*295 to whom it is to be rendered, and the compensation to be paid, the contract is uncertain and indefinite,-indefinite and uncertain, not from any infirmity in the language of the parties, but in its substance and intent. It is, in substance and effect, a contract for servitude, with no limitation but that of time; leaving the master to determine what the service should be, and the place where and the person to whom it should be rendered. Such a contract, it is scarcely necessary to say, is against the policy of our institutions and laws. If such a sale of service could be lawfully made for five years, it might, from the same reasons, for ten, and so for the term of one's life. The door would thus be opened for a species of servitude inconsistent with the first and fundamental article of our declaration of rights, which, proprio vigore, not only abolished every vestige of slavery then existing in the commonwealth, but rendered every form of it thereafter legally impossible. That article has always been regarded, not simply as the declaration of an abstract principle, but as having the active force and conclusive authority of law.' Observing that one who voluntarily subjected himself to the laws of the state must find in them the rule of restraint as well as the rule of action, the court proceeded: 'Under this contract the plaintiff had no claim for the labor of the servant for the term of five years, or for any term whatever. She was under no legal obligation to remain in his service. There was no time during which her service was due to the plaintiff, and during which she was kept from such service by the acts of the defendants.'

It may be here remarked that the shipping articles signed by the appellants left the term of their

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
(Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)

service uncertain, and placed no restriction whatever upon the route of the vessel after it left Valparaiso, except that it should ultimately return to some port in the United States.

Under the contract of service it was at the volition of the master to entail service upon these appellants for an indefinite period. So far as the record discloses, it was an accident that the vessel came back to San Francisco when it did. By the shipping articles, the appellants could not quit the vessel until it returned to a port of the \*296 United States, and such return depended absolutely upon the will of the master. He had only to land at foreign ports, and keep the vessel away from the United States, in order to prevent the appellants from leaving his service.

Nor, I submit, is any light thrown upon the present question by the history of legislation in Great Britain about seamen. The powers of the British parliament furnish no test for the powers that may be exercised by the congress of the United States. Referring to the difficulties confronting the convention of 1787, which framed the present constitution of the United States, and to the profound differences between the instrument framed by it and what is called the 'British Constitution,' Mr. Bryce, an English writer of high authority, says in his admirable work on the American Commonwealth: 'The British parliament had always been, was then, and remains now, a sovereign and constituent assembly. It can make and unmake any and every law, change the form of government or the succession to the crown, interfere with the course of justice, extinguish the most sacred private rights of the citizen. Between it and the people at large there is no legal distinction, because the whole plenitude of the people's rights and powers resides in it, just as if the whole nation were present within the chamber where it sits. In point of legal theory it is the nation, being the historical successor of the folk mote of our Teutonic forefathers. Both practically and legally, it is to-day the only and the sufficient depository of the authority of the nation, and is, therefore, within the sphere of law, irresponsible and omnipotent.' Volume 1, p. 35. No such powers have been given to or can be exercised by any legislative body

organized under the American system. Absolute, arbitrary power exists nowhere in this free land. The authority for the exercise of power by the congress of the United States must be found in the constitution. Whatever it does in excess of the powers granted to it, or in violation of the injunctions of the supreme law of the land, is a nullity, and may be so treated by every person. It would seem, therefore, evident that no aid in the present discussion can be derived from the \*\*335 legislation of Great Britain touching the rights, duties, and \*297 responsibilities of seamen employed on British vessels. If the parliament of Great Britain, her Britannic majesty assenting, should establish slavery or involuntary servitude in England, the courts there would not question its authority to do so, and would have no alternative except to sustain legislation of that character. A very short act of parliament would suffice to destroy all the guaranties of life, liberty, and property now enjoyed by Englishmen. 'What,' Mr. Bryce says, 'are called in England 'constitutional statutes,' such as Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, the Act of Settlement, the Acts of Union with Scotland and Ireland, are merely ordinary laws, which could be repealed by parliament at any moment in exactly the same way as it can repeal a highway act or lower the duty on tobacco.' Parliament, he further says, 'can abolish, when it pleases, any institution of the country, the crown, the house of lords, the Established Church, the house of commons, parliament itself.' Volume 1, p. 237. In this country, the will of the people, as expressed in the fundamental law, must be the will of courts and legislatures. No court is bound to enforce, nor is any one legally bound to obey, an act of congress inconsistent with the constitution. If the thirteenth amendment forbids such legislation in reference to seamen as is now under consideration, that is an end of the matter, and it is of no consequence whatever that government in other countries may, by the application of force, or by the infliction of fines and imprisonment, compel seamen to continue in the personal service of those whom they may have agreed to serve in private business.

Is the existing statute to be sustained because its essential provisions were embodied in the act of 1790? I think not, and for the reason, if there were

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
(Cite as: **165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326**)

no other, that the thirteenth amendment imposes restrictions upon the powers of congress that did not exist when that act was passed. The supreme law of the land now declares that involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, of which the party shall have been duly convicted, shall not exist any where within the United States.

The only exceptions to the general principles I have referred to, so far as they relate to private business, arise out of statutes respecting apprentices of tender years. But statutes relating to that class rest largely upon the idea that a minor is incapable of having an absolute will of his own before reaching majority. The infant apprentice, having no will in the matter, is to be cared for and protected in such way as, in the judgment of the state, will best subserve the interests both of himself and of the public. An apprentice serving his master pursuant to terms permitted by the law cannot, in any proper sense, be said to be in a condition of involuntary servitude. Upon arriving at his majority, the infant apprentice may repudiate the contract of apprenticeship, if it extends beyond that period. 1 Pars. Cont. 50. The word 'involuntary' refers, primarily, to persons entitled, in virtue of their age, to act upon their independent judgment when disposing of their time and labor. Will any one say that a person who has reached his majority, and who had voluntarily agreed, for a valuable consideration, to serve another as an apprentice for an indefinite period, or even for a given number of years, can be compelled, against his will, to remain in the service of the master?

It is said that the grounds upon which the legislation in question rests are the same as those existing in the cases of soldiers and sailors. Not so. The army and navy of the United States are engaged in the performance of public, not private, duties. Service in the army or navy of one's country according to the terms of enlistment never implies slavery or involuntary servitude, even where the soldier or sailor is required against his will to respect the terms upon which he voluntarily engaged to serve the public. Involuntary service rendered for the public, pursuant as well to the requirements of a statute as to a previous voluntary engagement, is not, in any legal sense, either slavery or involuntary

servitude.

The further suggestion is made that seamen have always been treated, by legislation in this country and in England, as if they needed the protection of the law, in the same sense that minors and wards need the protection of parents and guardians, and hence have been often described as 'wards of admiralty.' \*299 Some writers say that seamen are in need of the protection of the courts, 'because peculiarly exposed to the wiles of sharpers, and unable to take care of themselves.' 1 Pars. Shipp. & Adm. 32. Mr. Justice Story in *Harden v. Gordon*, 2 Mason, 541, 555, Fed. Cas. No. 6,047, said that 'every court should watch with jealousy any encroachment upon the rights of seamen, because they are unprotected and need counsel, because they are thoughtless and require indulgence, because they are credulous and complying, and are easily overreached.' Mr. Justice Thompson, in *The Cadmus v. Matthews*, 2 Paine, 229, 240, Fed. Cas. No. 2,282, said: 'In considering the obligation of seamen, arising out of their contract in shipping articles, according to the formula in common use, due weight ought to be given to the character and situation of this class of men. Generally ignorant and improvident, and probably very often signing the shipping articles without knowing what they contain, it is the duty of the court to watch over and protect their rights, and apply very liberal and equitable considerations to the enforcement of their contracts.'

In view of these principles, I am unable to understand how the necessity for the protection of seamen against those who take advantage of them can be made the basis of legislation compelling them, against their \*\*336 will, and by force, to render personal service for others engaged in private business. Their supposed helpless condition is thus made the excuse for imposing upon them burdens that could not be imposed upon other classes without depriving them of rights that inhere in personal freedom. The constitution furnishes no authority for any such distinction between classes of persons in this country. If, prior to the adoption of the thirteenth amendment, the arrest of a seaman, and his forcible return, under any circumstances, to the vessel on which he had engaged to serve, could

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
(Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)

have been authorized by an act of congress, such deprivation of the liberty of a freeman cannot be justified under the constitution as it now is. To give any other construction to the constitution is to say that it is not made for all, and that all men in this land are not free and equal before the law, but that one class may be so far subjected to involuntary servitude \*300 as to be compelled by force to render personal services in a purely private business, with which the public has no concern whatever.

The court holds that, within the meaning of the constitution, the word 'involuntary' does not attach to the word 'servitude' continuously, and make illegal a service which was voluntary at the outset, but became involuntary before the agreed term of service was ended; consequently, 'an individual may, for a valuable consideration, contract for the surrender of his personal liberty for a definite time and for a recognized purpose, and subordinate his going and coming to the will of another during the continuance of the contract,-not that all such contracts would be lawful, but that a servitude which was knowingly and willingly entered into could not be termed involuntary. Thus,' the court proceeds, 'if one should agree for a yearly wage, to serve another in a particular capacity during his life, and never to leave his estate without his consent, the contract might be void upon grounds of public policy, but the servitude could not be properly termed involuntary. Such agreements properly termed involuntary. Such agreements time were very common in England, and by statute of June 17, 1823 (4 Geo. IV. c. 34), it was enacted that if any servant in husbandry, or any artificer, calico printer, handicraftsman, miner, collier, keelman, pitman, glassman, potter, laborer or other person, should contract to serve another for a definite time, and should desert such service during the term of the contract, he was made liable to a criminal punishment. The breach of a contract for a personal service has not, however, been recognized in this country as involving a liability to criminal punishment, except in the cases of soldiers, sailors, and apprentices, and possibly some others; nor would public opinion tolerate a statute to that effect.'

It seems to me that these observations rest upon an erroneous view of the constitutional inhibition upon involuntary servitude.

Of the meaning and scope of the constitutional interdict upon slavery, no one can entertain doubt. A contract by which one person agrees to become the slave of another \*301 would not be respected in any court, nor could it become the foundation of any claim or right, even if it were entered into without constraint being used upon the person who assumed to surrender his liberty and to become the property of another. But involuntary servitude, no matter when it arises, if it be not the result of punishment for crime of which the party has been duly convicted, is as much forbidden by the constitution as is slavery. If that condition exists at the time the authority of the law is invoked to protect one against being forcibly compelled to render personal services for another, the court cannot refuse to act because the party seeking relief had voluntarily agreed to render such services during a given period. The voluntary contracts of individuals for personal services in private business cannot justify the existence, anywhere or at any time, in this country, of a condition of involuntary servitude not imposed as a punishment for crime, any more than contracts creating the relation of master and slave can justify the existence and recognition of a state of slavery anywhere, or with respect to any persons, within the jurisdiction of the United States. The condition of one who contracts to render personal services in connection with the private business of another becomes a condition of involuntary servitude from the moment he is compelled, against his will, to continue in such service. He may be liable in damages for the nonperformance of his agreement, but to require him, against his will, to continue in the personal service of his master, is to place him and keep him in a condition of involuntary servitude. It will not do to say that by 'immemorial usage' seamen could be held in a condition of involuntary servitude, without having been convicted of crime. The people of the United States, by an amendment of their fundamental law, have solemnly decreed that, 'except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted,' involuntary servitude shall not exist in any form in this country.

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
**(Cite as: 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326)**

The adding another exception by interpretation simply, and without amending the constitution, is, I submit, judicial legislation. It is a very serious matter when a judicial tribunal, by the construction of an act of congress, defeats the expressed will of the \*302 legislative branch of the government. It is a still more serious matter when the clear reading of a constitutional provision relating to the liberty of man is departed from in deference to what is called 'usage,' which has existed, for the most part, under monarchical and despotic governments.

In considering this case it is our duty to \*\*337 look at the consequences of any decision that may be rendered. We cannot avoid this duty by saying that it will be time enough to consider supposed cases when they arise. When such supposed cases do arise, those who seek judicial support for extraordinary remedies that encroach upon the liberty of freemen will, of course, refer to the principles announced in previous adjudications, and demand their application to the particular case in hand.

It is, therefore, entirely appropriate to inquire as to the necessary results of the sanction given by this court to the statute here in question. If congress, under its power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several states, can authorize the arrest of a seaman who engaged to serve upon a private vessel, and compel him by force to return to the vessel, and remain during the term for which he engaged, a similar rule may be prescribed as to employes upon railroads and steamboats engaged in commerce among the states. Even if it were conceded-a concession to be made only for argument's sake-that it could be made a criminal offense, punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, for such employes to quit their employment before the expiration of the term for which they agreed to serve, it would not follow that they could be compelled, against their will and in advance of trial and conviction, to continue in such service. But the decision to-day logically leads to the conclusion that such a power exists in congress. Again, as the legislatures of the states have all legislative power not prohibited to them, while congress can only exercise certain enumerated powers for accomplishing specified objects, why

may not the states, under the principles this day announced, compel all employes of railroads engaged in domestic commerce, and all domestic servants, and all employes in private establishments, within \*303 their respective limits, to remain with their employers during the terms for which they were severally engaged, under the penalty of being arrested by some sheriff or constable, and forcibly returned to the service of their employers? The mere statement of these matters is sufficient to indicate the scope of the decision this day rendered.

The thirteenth amendment, although tolerating involuntary servitude only when imposed as a punishment for crime, of which the party shall have been duly convicted, has been construed, by the decision just rendered, as if it contained an additional clause expressly excepting from its operation seamen who engage to serve on private vessels. Under this view of the constitution, we may now look for advertisements, not for runaway servants as in the days of slavery, but for runaway seamen. In former days, overseers could stand with whip in hand over slaves, and force them to perform personal service for their masters. While, with the assent of all, that condition of things has ceased to exist, we can but be reminded of the past, when it is adjudged to be consistent with the law of the land for freemen, who happen to be seamen, to be held in custody, that they may be forced to go aboard private vessels, and render personal services against their will.

In my judgment, the holding of any person in custody, whether in jail or by an officer of the law, against his will, for the purpose of compelling him to render personal service to another in a private business, places the person so held in custody in a condition of involuntary servitude, forbidden by the constitution of the United States; consequently, that the statute as it now is, and under which the appellants were arrested at Astoria, and placed against their will on the barkentine Arago, is null and void, and their refusal to work on such vessel, after being forcibly returned to it, could not be made a public offense, authorizing their subsequent arrest at San Francisco.

I dissent from the opinion and judgment of the court.

17 S.Ct. 326

Page 16

165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715  
(Cite as: **165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326**)

U.S. 1897  
Robertson v. Baldwin  
165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715

END OF DOCUMENT

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





Date of Printing: OCT 15,2007

### KEYCITE

▶ **Robertson v. Baldwin, 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715 (U.S.Cal., Jan 25, 1897) (NO. 334)**

#### History Direct History

=> 1 **Robertson v. Baldwin, 165 U.S. 275, 17 S.Ct. 326, 41 L.Ed. 715 (U.S.Cal. Jan 25, 1897) (NO. 334)**

#### Negative Citing References (U.S.A.)

*Distinguished by*

▶ 2 **Parker v. District of Columbia, 478 F.3d 370, 375 U.S.App.D.C. 140 (D.C.Cir. Mar 09, 2007) (NO. 04-7041), rehearing en banc denied (May 08, 2007) ★★★**

#### Citing References

##### Positive Cases (U.S.A.)

★★★★ Examined

▶ 3 **U.S. v. Emerson, 270 F.3d 203, 223+ (5th Cir.(Tex.) Oct 16, 2001) (NO. 99-10331) ""**

★★★ Discussed

▶ 4 **U.S. v. Kozminski, 108 S.Ct. 2751, 2759+, 487 U.S. 931, 942+, 101 L.Ed.2d 788, 788+, 56 USLW 4910, 4910+, 46 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 38,067, 38067+ (U.S.Mich. Jun 29, 1988) (NO. 86-2000) ""**

▶ 5 **Dennis v. United States, 71 S.Ct. 857, 864+, 341 U.S. 494, 504+, 95 L.Ed. 1137, 1137+ (U.S.N.Y. Jun 04, 1951) (NO. 336)**

H 6 **Dickinson v. U.S., 159 F. 801, 805+, 86 C.C.A. 625, 625+ (C.C.A.1 (Mass.) Feb 12, 1908) (NO. 681) ""**

C 7 **Levin v. U.S., 128 F. 826, 829+, 63 C.C.A. 476, 476+ (C.C.A.8 (Mo.) Feb 26, 1904) (NO. 1969)**

▶ 8 **Brooks v. Central Bank of Birmingham, 1982 WL 365, \*6+, 29 Fair Empl.Prac.Cas. (BNA) 182, 182+, 29 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 32,956, 32956+ (N.D.Ala. Jun 14, 1982) (NO. 81-G-1303-S) ""**

▶ 9 **Seegars v. Ashcroft, 297 F.Supp.2d 201, 220+ (D.D.C. Jan 14, 2004) (NO. CIV.A.03-834(RBW)) ""**

▶ 10 **Bobilin v. Board of Ed., State of Hawaii, 403 F.Supp. 1095, 1109+, 22 Wage & Hour Cas. (BNA) 612, 612+, 78 Lab.Cas. P 33,349, 33349+ (D.Hawai'i Oct 31, 1975) (NO. CIV. 75-0205) ""**

C 11 **U.S. v. Miles, 238 F.Supp.2d 297, 301+ (D.Me. Dec 02, 2002) (NO. CRIM.02-27-P-C) ""**

H 12 **People v. Wilmshurst, 53 Cal.Rptr.3d 136, 143+, 146 Cal.App.4th 621, 631+, 07 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 239, 239+, 2007 Daily Journal D.A.R. 327, 327+ (Cal.App. 3 Dist. Jan 08, 2007) (NO. C050103) ""**

C 13 **Harris v. Superior Court of Sacramento County, 196 P. 895, 898+, 51 Cal.App. 15, 22+ (Cal.App. 3 Dist. Jan 05, 1921) (NO. CIV.2241, SAC.3221)**

H 14 **State v. Mendoza, 920 P.2d 357, 365+, 82 Hawai'i 143, 151+ (Hawai'i Jun 21, 1996) (NO. 17839)**

C 15 **State v. Huser, 184 P. 113, 116+, 76 Okla. 130, 130+, 1919 OK 218, 218+ (Okla. Jul 15, 1919) (NO. 10517)**

★★ Cited

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

- ▶ 16 Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Haslip, 111 S.Ct. 1032, 1052, 499 U.S. 1, 34, 113 L.Ed.2d 1, 1, 59 USLW 4157, 4157, 18 Media L. Rep. 1753, 1753 (U.S.Ala. Mar 04, 1991) (NO. 89-1279)
- ▶ 17 U.S. Bulk Carriers, Inc. v. Arguelles, 91 S.Ct. 409, 411, 400 U.S. 351, 355, 27 L.Ed.2d 456, 456, 76 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2161, 2161, 1971 A.M.C. 286, 286, 64 Lab.Cas. P 11,422, 11422 (U.S.Md. Jan 13, 1971) (NO. 29)
- ▶ 18 Stanley v. Georgia, 89 S.Ct. 1243, 1246, 394 U.S. 557, 562, 22 L.Ed.2d 542, 542 (U.S.Ga. Apr 07, 1969) (NO. 293)
- ▶ 19 Curtis Pub. Co. v. Butts, 87 S.Ct. 1975, 1986, 388 U.S. 130, 144, 18 L.Ed.2d 1094, 1094, 1 Media L. Rep. 1568, 1568 (U.S.Ga. Jun 12, 1967) (NO. 37, 150) ""
- ▶ 20 Isbrandtsen Co. v. Johnson, 72 S.Ct. 1011, 1014, 343 U.S. 779, 783, 96 L.Ed. 1294, 1294, 1952 A.M.C. 1283 (U.S.Pa. Jun 09, 1952) (NO. 493) ""
- ▶ 21 Kunz v. People of State of New York, 71 S.Ct. 312, 323, 340 U.S. 290, 311, 95 L.Ed. 280, 280 (U.S.N.Y. Jan 15, 1951) (NO. 50) (*in dissent*)
- ▶ 22 U.S. v. Rabinowitz, 70 S.Ct. 430, 437, 339 U.S. 56, 72, 94 L.Ed. 653, 653 (U.S.N.Y. Feb 20, 1950) (NO. 293) "" (*in dissent*)
- ▶ 23 Seas Shipping Co. v. Sieracki, 66 S.Ct. 872, 882, 328 U.S. 85, 104, 90 L.Ed. 1099, 1099, 1946 A.M.C. 698 (U.S.Pa. Apr 22, 1946) (NO. 365) (*in dissent*)
- ▶ 24 Calmar S. S. Corp. v. Taylor, 58 S.Ct. 651, 654, 303 U.S. 525, 529, 82 L.Ed. 993, 993, 1938 A.M.C. 341 (U.S.Pa. Mar 28, 1938) (NO. 594)
- ▶ 25 Associated Press v. National Labor Relations Board, 57 S.Ct. 650, 656, 301 U.S. 103, 133, 81 L.Ed. 953, 953, 1 Media L. Rep. 2689, 2689 (U.S.N.Y. Apr 12, 1937) (NO. 365)
- ▶ 26 Snyder v. Com. of Mass., 54 S.Ct. 330, 333, 291 U.S. 97, 107, 78 L.Ed. 674, 674, 90 A.L.R. 575, 575 (U.S.Mass. Jan 08, 1934) (NO. 241)
- ▶ 27 Williams v. U.S., 53 S.Ct. 751, 755, 289 U.S. 553, 567, 77 L.Ed. 1372, 1372 (U.S.Ct.Cl. May 29, 1933) (NO. 728)
- ▶ 28 Cortes v. Baltimore Insular Lines, 53 S.Ct. 173, 176, 287 U.S. 367, 377, 77 L.Ed. 368, 368, 1933 A.M.C. 9, 9 (U.S.N.Y. Dec 05, 1932) (NO. 12) ""
- H 29 Bainbridge v. Merchants' & Miners' Transp. Co., 53 S.Ct. 159, 160, 287 U.S. 278, 282, 77 L.Ed. 302, 302, 1933 A.M.C. 32, 32 (U.S.Pa. Dec 05, 1932) (NO. 90)
- ▶ 30 Gitlow v. People of State of New York, 45 S.Ct. 625, 630+, 268 U.S. 652, 666+, 69 L.Ed. 1138, 1138+ (U.S.N.Y. Jun 08, 1925) (NO. 19)
- ▶ 31 Ex parte Grossman, 45 S.Ct. 332, 335, 267 U.S. 87, 116, 69 L.Ed. 527, 527, 38 A.L.R. 131, 131 (U.S. Mar 02, 1925) (NO. 24)
- C 32 Frohwerk v. U.S., 39 S.Ct. 249, 250, 249 U.S. 204, 206, 63 L.Ed. 561, 561 (U.S.Mo. Mar 10, 1919) (NO. 685)
- ▶ 33 Gompers v. U.S., 34 S.Ct. 693, 695, 233 U.S. 604, 610, 58 L.Ed. 1115, 1115 (U.S.Dist.Col. May 11, 1914) (NO. 640, 574)
- ▶ 34 Bailey v. State of Alabama, 31 S.Ct. 145, 152, 219 U.S. 219, 243, 55 L.Ed. 191, 191 (U.S.Ala. Jan 03, 1911) (NO. 300)
- C 35 Dallemagne v. Moisan, 25 S.Ct. 422, 424+, 197 U.S. 169, 174+, 49 L.Ed. 709, 709+ (U.S.Cal. Mar 13, 1905) (NO. 104)
- ▶ 36 Clyatt v. U.S., 25 S.Ct. 429, 430, 197 U.S. 207, 216, 49 L.Ed. 726, 726 (U.S.Fla. Mar 13, 1905) (NO. 235)
- C 37 Patterson v. Eudora, 23 S.Ct. 821, 823, 190 U.S. 169, 174, 47 L.Ed. 1002, 1002 (U.S.Pa. Jun 01, 1903) (NO. 278)
- ▶ 38 Tucker v. Alexandroff, 22 S.Ct. 195, 198, 183 U.S. 424, 431, 46 L.Ed. 264, 264 (U.S.Pa. Jan 06, 1902) (NO. 303)
- ▶ 39 Cases v. U.S., 131 F.2d 916, 922 (C.C.A.1 (Puerto Rico) Nov 27, 1942) (NO. 3756)
- ▶ 40 In re Cole, 163 F. 180, 184+, 23 L.R.A.N.S. 255, 255+, 90 C.C.A. 50, 50+ (C.C.A.1 (Me.) Oct 24, 1907) (NO. 686) ""
- ▶ 41 Alma Soc. Inc. v. Mellon, 601 F.2d 1225, 1231 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Jun 22, 1979) (NO. 666, 78-7593) ""
- ▶ 42 U.S. v. Shackney, 333 F.2d 475, 487 (2nd Cir.(Conn.) Jun 05, 1964) (NO. 302, 28500)

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

- 43 United States v. Roth, 237 F.2d 796, 799+ (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Sep 18, 1956) (NO. 387, 24030)
- 44 Hume v. Moore-McCormack Lines, 121 F.2d 336, 337, 1941 A.M.C. 1079 (C.C.A.2 (N.Y.) Jun 23, 1941) (NO. 294)
- 45 The W.F. Babcock, 85 F. 978, 980, 29 C.C.A. 514, 514 (C.C.A.2 (N.Y.) Mar 02, 1898) ""
- 46 Paul v. U.S., 205 F.2d 38, 42, 1953 A.M.C. 1000 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Jun 08, 1953) (NO. 10895)
- 47 Harris v. Pennsylvania R. Co., 50 F.2d 866, 868, 1931 A.M.C. 1303 (C.C.A.4 (Va.) Jun 17, 1931) (NO. 3158)
- 48 Hickson v. U.S., 258 F. 867, 871, 169 C.C.A. 587, 587 (C.C.A.4 (S.C.) May 05, 1919) (NO. 1709)
- 49 Channer v. Hall, 112 F.3d 214, 218 (5th Cir.(La.) May 14, 1997) (NO. 95-30964)
- 50 N.L.R.B. v. Sea-Land Service, Inc., 837 F.2d 1387, 1397, 56 USLW 2511, 2511, 127 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2757, 2757, 1988 A.M.C. 2144, 2144, 108 Lab.Cas. P 10,359, 10359 (5th Cir. Feb 26, 1988) (NO. 86-4653) ""
- 51 Martinez v. Matson S. S. Co., 97 F.2d 19, 21, 1938 A.M.C. 949 (C.C.A.5 (Tex.) May 28, 1938) (NO. 8639)
- 52 The Margharita, 140 F. 820, 827, 72 C.C.A. 232, 232 (C.C.A.5 (Ga.) Oct 26, 1905) (NO. 1421) ""
- 53 Lafourche Packet Co. v. Henderson, 94 F. 871, 875, 36 C.C.A. 519, 519 (C.C.A.5 (La.) May 23, 1899) (NO. 810) ""
- 54 Creekmore v. U.S., 237 F. 743, 753, 150 C.C.A. 497, 497, L.R.A. 1917C,845, 1917C,845 (C.C.A.8 (Okla.) Oct 17, 1916) (NO. 4591)
- 55 Union Pac. R. Co. v. Ruef, 120 F. 102, 110 (C.C.D.Neb. Nov 08, 1902) (NO. 36)
- 56 Hopkins v. Oxley Stave Co., 83 F. 912, 930, 28 C.C.A. 99, 99 (C.C.A.8 (Kan.) Nov 08, 1897) (NO. 789) (*in dissent*)
- 57 U.S. v. Ballek, 170 F.3d 871, 874, 99 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 1805, 1805, 1999 Daily Journal D.A.R. 2325, 2325 (9th Cir.(Alaska) Mar 11, 1999) (NO. 97-30326)
- 58 Hudson Waterways Corp. v. Schneider, 365 F.2d 1012, 1014, 1966 A.M.C. 2411 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Aug 25, 1966) (NO. 20429)
- 59 The Baymead, 84 F.2d 346, 348, 1936 A.M.C. 1100 (C.C.A.9 (Cal.) Jun 08, 1936) (NO. 8191)
- 60 The John and Winthrop, 182 F. 380, 383, 106 C.C.A. 1, 1 (C.C.A.9 (Cal.) Oct 03, 1910) (NO. 1772) ""
- 61 The Iroquois, 118 F. 1003, 1005, 55 C.C.A. 497, 497 (C.C.A.9 (Cal.) Oct 06, 1902) (NO. 812) ""
- 62 Brandywine-Main Line Radio, Inc. v. F.C.C., 473 F.2d 16, 53+, 25 Rad. Reg. 2d (P & F) 205, 2010+, 25 Rad. Reg. 2d (P & F) 2010+, 153 U.S.App.D.C. 305, 342+, 1 Media L. Rep. 2067, 2067+ (D.C.Cir. Sep 25, 1972) (NO. 71-1181)
- 63 In re Gompers, 40 App.D.C. 293, 341+, 1913 WL 19983, \*13+ (App.D.C. May 05, 1913) (NO. 24477) (*in dissent*)
- 64 Penn Bridge Co. v. U.S., 29 App.D.C. 452, 455, 1907 WL 19819, \*2, 10 Am. Ann. Cas. 719, 719 (App.D.C. May 07, 1907) (NO. 1739)
- 65 Merrell v. All Seasons Resorts, Inc., 720 F.Supp. 815, 818, 52 Fair Empl. Prac. Cas. (BNA) 1412, 1412, 52 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 39,555, 39555 (C.D. Cal. Sep 01, 1989) (NO. CV 89-3218 DT)
- 66 Vitco v. Joncich, 130 F.Supp. 945, 950+, 1955 A.M.C. 1366+ (S.D. Cal. Apr 29, 1955) (NO. 16187) ""
- 67 U.S. v. Schneiderman, 102 F.Supp. 87, 95 (S.D. Cal. Dec 11, 1951) (NO. 21883, 21940)
- 68 Teresa T. v. Ragaglia, 154 F.Supp.2d 290, 305+ (D. Conn. Jul 16, 2001) (NO. CIV.3:00CV1190(AVC))
- 69 U.S. v. Copeland, 126 F.Supp. 734, 737+ (D. Conn. Nov 12, 1954) (NO. CRIM. 8923)
- 70 Ex parte Lloyd, 13 F.Supp. 1005, 1008 (E.D. Ky. Mar 19, 1936)
- 71 Gauthier v. Crosby Marine Service, Inc., 536 F.Supp. 269, 271, 1982 A.M.C. 2885, 2885 (E.D. La. Mar 16, 1982) (NO. CIV. 79-2366)
- 72 Sims v. Marine Catering Service, Inc., 217 F.Supp. 511, 517+, 1964 A.M.C. 377+ (E.D. La. May 14, 1963) (NO. 5458) ""
- 73 In re Cape Fear, Inc. for Exoneration From or Limitation of Liability, Civil and Maritime, 183 F.Supp.2d 228, 283+ (D. Mass. Dec 20, 2001) (NO. CIV.A. 99-11312-REK)

- 74 Complaint of Uncle Sam of '76, Inc., 928 F.Supp. 64, 66, 1996 A.M.C. 1942, 1942 (D.Mass. Apr 16, 1996) (NO. CIV.A. 94-12138-REK)
- 75 The Astra, 34 F.Supp. 152, 154, 1940 A.M.C. 1188 (D.Md. Jul 22, 1940) (NO. 2342)
- 76 IN RE CHARLES A. MURRAY, SEAMAN, FOR AN ORDER SETTING ASIDE THE FORFEITURE OF HIS WAGES, CLOTHING AND EFFECTS, FOR DESERTION., 1967 WL 157688, \*157688, 1967 A.M.C. 945, 947 (D.Mont. Mar 10, 1967) (NO. CIVIL 1456)
- 77 Herndon by Herndon v. Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Bd. of Educ., 899 F.Supp. 1443, 1447 (M.D.N.C. Jul 19, 1995) (NO. CIV. 1:94CV00196)
- 78 Sipe v. Amerada Hess Corp., 519 F.Supp. 781, 785 (D.N.J. Aug 05, 1981) (NO. CIV. A. 80-732, CIV. A. 80-733, CIV. A. 80-734) ""
- 79 Harisiades v. Shaughnessy, 90 F.Supp. 397, 428 (S.D.N.Y. Feb 09, 1950)
- 80 In re Iasigi, 79 F. 751, 755 (S.D.N.Y. Mar 10, 1897)
- 81 Petition of Den Norske Amerikalinje A/S, 276 F.Supp. 163, 172+, 1967 A.M.C. 1965, 1965+ (N.D. Ohio Oct 27, 1967) (NO. A65-19, C66-655, A65-6)
- 82 U.S. v. Toledo Newspaper Co., 220 F. 458, 507 (N.D. Ohio Jan 23, 1915)
- 83 Burke v. Mathiasen's Tanker Industries, Inc., 393 F.Supp. 790, 793 (E.D. Pa. Apr 29, 1975) (NO. CIV. 74-374)
- 84 U.S. v. Johns-Manville Corp., 225 F.Supp. 61, 63 (E.D. Pa. Dec 31, 1963) (NO. CRIM 21118)
- 85 U.S. v. Johns-Manville Corp., 231 F.Supp. 690, 702 (E.D. Pa. Dec 04, 1963) (NO. CR. 21118)
- 86 Ex parte Drayton, 153 F. 986, 993+ (D.S.C. May 23, 1907)
- 87 S.U. ex rel. Feldman v. Youth Care of Utah, Inc., 345 F.Supp.2d 1269, 1271 (D.Utah Nov 23, 2004) (NO. 2:04-CV-00933 PGC)
- 88 Jane L. v. Bangerter, 794 F.Supp. 1537, 1548 (D.Utah May 22, 1992) (NO. CIV. 91-C-345G) ""
- 89 Myers v. Garff, 655 F.Supp. 1021, 1024 (D.Utah Mar 04, 1987) (NO. CIV. C86-0693G) ""
- 90 U.S. v. Griffin, 14 F.2d 326, 326 (W.D. Va. Aug 07, 1926)
- 91 Guinness v. U. S., 1960 WL 8498, \*8498, 149 Ct.Cl. 1, 5 (Ct.Cl. Feb 03, 1960) (NO. 438-58) ""
- 92 U.S. v. Gladwin, 1964 WL 4997, \*4997, 34 C.M.R. 208, 213, 14 USCMA 428, 433 (CMA Mar 13, 1964) (NO. 17,194)
- 93 Barton v. City of Bessemer, 173 So. 626, 629+, 234 Ala. 20, 23+ (Ala. Mar 18, 1937) (NO. 6 DIV. 67)
- 94 Krasner v. State, 26 So.2d 519, 523+, 32 Ala.App. 420, 425+ (Ala.App. Jan 22, 1946) (NO. 6 DIV 232)
- 95 Miller v. Municipal Court of City of Los Angeles, 142 P.2d 297, 314, 22 Cal.2d 818, 847 (Cal. Sep 30, 1943) (NO. S.F. 16905)
- 96 In re Webb, 1975 WL 20075, \*9+, 80 Lab.Cas. P 54,059, 54059+ (Cal.App. Oct 27, 1975) (NO. 14528, 14539) ""
- 97 People v. Bastardo, 554 P.2d 297, 301, 191 Colo. 521, 525 (Colo. Sep 13, 1976) (NO. 26551)
- 98 Hoxie v. New York, N. H. & H. R. Co., 73 A. 754, 756+, 82 Conn. 352, 352+, 17 Am. Ann. Cas. 324, 324+ (Conn. Jul 20, 1909)
- 99 Walls v. U. S., 364 A.2d 154, 156 (D.C. Sep 09, 1976) (NO. 11238)
- 100 Williams v. U. S., 237 A.2d 539, 540 (D.C.App. Jan 19, 1968) (NO. 4419) ""
- 101 South Atlantic S. S. Co. of Del. v. Munkacsy, 187 A. 600, 607, 7 W.W.Harr. 580, 580, 37 Del. 580, 580, 1937 A.M.C. 111 (Del.Supr. Jul 07, 1936)
- 102 Carr v. State, 166 S.E. 827, 829+, 176 Ga. 55, 55+ (Ga. Nov 21, 1932) (NO. 9153)
- 103 Maryland Cas. Co. v. Grant, 150 S.E. 424, 425, 169 Ga. 325, 325, 1930 A.M.C. 897 (Ga. Oct 19, 1929) (NO. 7065)
- 104 Ex parte Edwards, 1900 WL 2513, \*8+, 13 Haw. 32, 41+ (Hawai'i Terr. Oct 09, 1900)
- 105 City of Chicago v. Kunowski, 139 N.E. 28, 29, 308 Ill. 206, 208 (Ill. Apr 18, 1923) (NO. 15089)
- 106 City of Chicago v. Coleman, 98 N.E. 521, 523, 254 Ill. 338, 342 (Ill. Apr 18, 1912) ""
- 107 People, to Use of La Salle County v. Witzeman, 191 Ill.App. 277, 282, 1915 WL 1750, \*2 (Ill.App. 2 Dist. Jan 06, 1915) (NO. 5,924, 5,925)
- 108 Bayh v. Sonnenburg, 573 N.E.2d 398, 410, 121 Lab.Cas. P 56,880, 56880, 1 NDLR P 367, 367 (Ind. Jun 12, 1991) (NO. 37S03-9106-CV-437)

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

- 109 Posey v. Com., 185 S.W.3d 170, 181 (Ky. Feb 23, 2006) (NO. 2004-SC-0060-DG)
- 110 Board of Sup'rs of Louisiana State University v. Lewark, 281 So.2d 706, 711+ (La. Aug 20, 1973) (NO. 53513)
- 111 Macomber v. De Bardeleben Coal Co., 8 So.2d 624, 627, 200 La. 633, 641, 1942 A.M.C. 816 (La. Apr 27, 1942) (NO. 36526)
- 112 Goulis v. Stone, 140 N.E. 294, 296+, 246 Mass. 1, 5+ (Mass. Jun 22, 1923) ""
- 113 Bacheller v. State, 240 A.2d 623, 629, 3 Md.App. 626, 635 (Md.App. Apr 15, 1968) (NO. 52)
- 114 Barnett v. Pemiscot County Court, 86 S.W. 575, 576, 111 Mo.App. 693, 693 (Mo.App. Apr 04, 1905)
- 115 State v. Williams, 61 S.E. 61, 62, 146 N.C. 618, 618, 17 L.R.A.N.S. 299, 299, 14 Am. Ann. Cas. 562, 562 (N.C. Apr 01, 1908)
- 116 Stephens v. Civil Service Commission of New Jersey, 127 A. 808, 811, 101 N.J.L. 192, 199, 16 Gummere 192, 192 (N.J. Err. & App. Jan 19, 1925) (NO. 83)
- 117 State v. Magee Pub Co., 224 P. 1028, 1033, 29 N.M. 455, 455, 38 A.L.R. 142, 142 (N.M. Feb 21, 1924) (NO. 2888-2891)
- 118 Kingsley Intern. Pictures Corp. v. Regents of University of N.Y., 175 N.Y.S.2d 39, 45, 151 N.E.2d 197, 201, 4 N.Y.2d 349, 357 (N.Y. May 15, 1958) ""
- 119 Julian v. American Business Consultants, Inc., 155 N.Y.S.2d 1, 19, 137 N.E.2d 1, 13, 2 N.Y.2d 1, 20 (N.Y. Jul 11, 1956) (*in dissent*)
- 120 Commercial Pictures Corporation v. Board of Regents of University of State of New York, 113 N.E.2d 502, 510, 305 N.Y. 336, 351 (N.Y. May 28, 1953)
- 121 Brinkman v. Oil Transfer Corporation, 88 N.E.2d 817, 819, 300 N.Y. 48, 53, 13 A.L.R.2d 623, 623, 1950 A.M.C. 341 (N.Y. Nov 23, 1949)
- 122 Wagner v. Panama R. Co., 87 N.E.2d 444, 446, 299 N.Y. 432, 437 (N.Y. Jul 19, 1949)
- 123 Ives v. South Buffalo Ry. Co., 94 N.E. 431, 446+, 201 N.Y. 271, 312+, 34 L.R.A.N.S. 162, 162+, Am. Ann. Cas. 1912B, 156, 1912B, 156+ (N.Y. Mar 24, 1911)
- 124 People v. Orange County Road Const. Co., 67 N.E. 129, 131, 13 Bedell 84, 84, 175 N.Y. 84, 91, 65 L.R.A. 33, 33 (N.Y. Apr 28, 1903)
- 125 Schreiber v. K-Sea Transp. Corp., 814 N.Y.S.2d 124, 130, 30 A.D.3d 101, 109, 2007 A.M.C. 353, 353, 2006 N.Y. Slip Op. 03033, 03033 (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Apr 25, 2006) (NO. 5410N, 104992/04, 10757104)
- 126 Moore v. Gallup, 45 N.Y.S.2d 63, 66+, 267 A.D. 64, 68+ (N.Y.A.D. 3 Dept. Nov 10, 1943)
- 127 People ex rel. Darling v. Warden of City Prison, 139 N.Y.S. 277, 283, 29 N.Y. Crim. R. 66, 66, 154 A.D. 413, 419 (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Jan 03, 1913)
- 128 TIDE WATER OIL CO., Plaintiff, vs. AMERICAN STEAMSHIP OWNERS MUTUAL PROTECTION & INDEMNITY ASSOCIATION, INC., Defendant., 1935 WL 58050, \*58050, 1935 A.M.C. 936, 945 (N.Y. Sup. Jun 19, 1935) (NO. NO NUMBER IN ORIGINA)
- 129 Tide Water Oil Co. v. American S.S. Owners Mut. Protection & Indem. Ass'n, 281 N.Y.S. 729, 739, 156 Misc. 367, 375 (N.Y. Sup. Jun 17, 1935) ""
- 130 Central School Dist. No. 2 of Town of Oyster Bay, Nassau County v. Cohen, 302 N.Y.S.2d 398, 405, 60 Misc.2d 337, 344 (N.Y. Dist. Ct. Apr 17, 1969)
- 131 People v. Lake Ronkonkoma Theater Corp., 299 N.Y.S.2d 545, 548, 59 Misc.2d 438, 441 (N.Y. Dist. Ct. Mar 06, 1969)
- 132 Baltimore & O.R. Co. v. Kepner, 30 N.E.2d 982, 985, 137 Ohio St. 409, 417, 19 O.O. 120, 120 (Ohio Dec 18, 1940) (NO. 28205)
- 133 State v. Kassay, 184 N.E. 521, 525, 126 Ohio St. 177, 187, 37 Ohio Law Rep. 337, 337 (Ohio Dec 21, 1932) (NO. 22990) ""
- 134 Sheward v. State, 159 N.E. 831, 832, 117 Ohio St. 568, 572, 6 Ohio Law Abs. 14, 14, 25 Ohio Law Rep. 636, 636 (Ohio Dec 28, 1927) (NO. 20473)
- 135 Barnett v. Baltimore & O. R. Co., 200 N.E.2d 473, 479, 119 Ohio App. 329, 339 (Ohio App. 6 Dist. Nov 25, 1963) (NO. 760)
- 136 Ex parte Owens, 258 P. 758, 804, 37 Okla. Crim. 118, 118 (Okla. Crim. App. Jul 05, 1927) (NO. A-6581)

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

- H 137 State v. Hirsch, 114 P.3d 1104, 1128, 338 Or. 622, 665 (Or. Jun 23, 2005) (NO. CC 99CR2684FE, SC S49370, A108859, CA A109091, 99CR1105FE, S49371)
- G 138 Bowles v. Barde Steel Co., 164 P.2d 692, 707, 177 Or. 421, 458, 162 A.L.R. 328, 328 (Or. Dec 04, 1945)
- T 139 State v. Ciancanelli, 45 P.3d 451, 460, 181 Or.App. 1, 19 (Or.App. Apr 24, 2002) (NO. A108122, 98CR2685FE) ""
- H 140 In re Mack, 126 A.2d 679, 685, 386 Pa. 251, 263 (Pa. Oct 05, 1956)
- T 141 Com. v. Nelson, 104 A.2d 133, 151, 377 Pa. 58, 96 (Pa. Jan 25, 1954) (*in dissent*)
- T 142 Ex parte Hollman, 60 S.E. 19, 23+, 79 S.C. 9, 9+, 21 L.R.A.N.S. 242, 242+, 14 Am. Ann. Cas. 1105, 1105+ (S.C. Jan 16, 1908)
- H 143 Masters v. State, 685 S.W.2d 654, 656 (Tex. Crim. App. Feb 20, 1985) (NO. 773-83)
- H 144 Masters v. State, 653 S.W.2d 944, 945 (Tex. App.-Austin Jun 22, 1983) (NO. 3-82-153-CR)
- H 145 American Bush v. City of South Salt Lake, 140 P.3d 1235, 1250+, 557 Utah Adv. Rep. 3, 3+, 2006 UT 40, 40+ (Utah Jul 28, 2006) (NO. 20020117) ""
- T 146 State v. Ringer, 674 P.2d 1240, 1248, 100 Wash.2d 686, 700 (Wash. Dec 29, 1983) (NO. 49022-8, 49107-1)
- G 147 Chicago, M. & St. P. Ry. Co. v. McGinley, 185 N.W. 218, 220, 175 Wis. 565, 565 (Wis. Nov 15, 1921)
- H 148 State v. Knies, 371 N.W.2d 430, 430, 125 Wis.2d 569, 569 (Wis. App. May 01, 1985) (Table, text in WESTLAW, NO. 84-1455-CR) ""
- H 149 Brunet Justiniano v. Hernandez Colon, 130 D.P.R. 248, 264, 1992 JTS 45, 45, 1992 P.R.-Eng. 755,646, 755646 (P.R. Apr 10, 1992) (NO. CE-88-432)
- C 150 Garcia v. La Asamblea Municipal de Cayey, 30 D.P.R. 491, 491 (P.R. May 12, 1922) (NO. 2561)
- C 151 Cappellini v. C.I.R., 1929 WL 975, \*975, 14 B.T.A. 1269, 1285 (B.T.A. Jan 15, 1929) (NO. 25926, 25927, 25928)

★ Mentioned

- T 152 Alexander v. U.S., 113 S.Ct. 2766, 2781, 509 U.S. 544, 569, 125 L.Ed.2d 441, 441, 61 USLW 4796, 4796, RICO Bus. Disp. Guide 8328, 8328, 21 Media L. Rep. 1609, 1609 (U.S. Minn. Jun 28, 1993) (NO. 91-1526) (*in dissent*)
- T 153 California v. Green, 90 S.Ct. 1930, 1947, 399 U.S. 149, 182, 26 L.Ed.2d 489, 489 (U.S. Cal. Jun 23, 1970) (NO. 387)
- T 154 Roth v. U.S., 77 S.Ct. 1304, 1307, 354 U.S. 476, 481, 1 L.Ed.2d 1498, 1498, 1 Media L. Rep. 1375, 1375 (U.S. N.Y. Jun 24, 1957) (NO. 582, 61)
- T 155 U.S. v. Classic, 61 S.Ct. 1031, 1038, 313 U.S. 299, 316, 85 L.Ed. 1368, 1368 (U.S. La. May 26, 1941) (NO. 618)
- T 156 U.S. v. Miller, 59 S.Ct. 816, 820, 307 U.S. 174, 182, 83 L.Ed. 1206, 1206, 39-1 USTC P 9513, 9513, 22 A.F.T.R. 331, 331 (U.S. Ark. May 15, 1939) (NO. 696)
- T 157 Wright v. U.S., 58 S.Ct. 395, 406, 302 U.S. 583, 607, 82 L.Ed. 439, 439 (U.S. Ct. Cl. Jan 17, 1938) (NO. 37) (*in dissent*)
- T 158 Salinger v. U.S., 47 S.Ct. 173, 175, 272 U.S. 542, 548, 71 L.Ed. 398, 398 (U.S. S.D. Nov 23, 1926) (NO. 238)
- H 159 Minneapolis & St. L.R. Co. v. Bombolis, 36 S.Ct. 595, 598, 241 U.S. 211, 221, 60 L.Ed. 961, 961, Am. Ann. Cas. 1916E,505, 1916E,505, L.R.A. 1917A,86, 1917A,86 (U.S. Minn. May 22, 1916) (NO. 478)
- H 160 Butler v. Perry, 36 S.Ct. 258, 259, 240 U.S. 328, 333, 60 L.Ed. 672, 672 (U.S. Fla. Feb 21, 1916) (NO. 182)
- T 161 Foretich v. Capital Cities/ABC, Inc., 37 F.3d 1541, 1551, 63 USLW 2292, 2292, 22 Media L. Rep. 2353, 2353 (4th Cir. (Va.) Oct 17, 1994) (NO. 94-1050)
- H 162 Wall v. Cox, 101 F. 403, 411, 41 C.C.A. 408, 408 (C.C.A.4 (N.C.) May 01, 1900) (NO. 355)
- T 163 Baker v. Raymond Intern., Inc., 656 F.2d 173, 184, 1982 A.M.C. 2752, 2752 (5th Cir. (La.) Sep 14, 1981) (NO. 80-3019)

- 164 Baker v. Ocean Systems, Inc., 454 F.2d 379, 383, 1972 A.M.C. 287, 287 (5th Cir.(La.) Jan 24, 1972) (NO. 71-1953)
- 165 Evans v. Dutton, 400 F.2d 826, 828 (5th Cir.(Ga.) Sep 16, 1968) (NO. 25348)
- 166 Moore v. Backus, 78 F.2d 571, 577, 101 A.L.R. 379, 379 (C.C.A.7 (Ill.) Jul 13, 1935) (NO. 5401)
- 167 Burton v. U.S., 142 F. 57, 59, 73 C.C.A. 243, 243 (C.C.A.8 (Minn.) Feb 19, 1906) (NO. 2181)
- 168 Sheldon v. Fannin, 221 F.Supp. 766, 773 (D.Ariz. Aug 29, 1963) (NO. CIV 749)
- 169 Baldauf v. Nitze, 261 F.Supp. 167, 173 (S.D.Cal. Nov 03, 1966) (NO. CIV. 3518)
- 170 Matter of Jama, 436 F.Supp. 963, 965 (M.D.Fla. Aug 15, 1977) (NO. 327 SEAMAN-J)
- 171 U.S. v. Adams, 11 F.Supp. 216, 219, 35-2 USTC P 9432, 9432, 16 A.F.T.R. 493, 493 (S.D.Fla. Jun 04, 1935) (NO. 4612-M-CRIMINAL)
- 172 Michigan Railroad Tax Cases (23 cases), 138 F. 223, 233 (C.C.W.D.Mich. May 19, 1905)
- 173 In re Woodbury, 98 F. 833, 837 (D.N.D. Jan 19, 1900)
- 174 U.S. v. Tot, 28 F.Supp. 900, 903 (D.N.J. Aug 14, 1939)
- 175 Quaker City Motor Parts Co. v. Inter-State Motor Freight System, 148 F.Supp. 226, 234, 39 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2326, 2326, 31 Lab.Cas. P 70,494, 70494 (E.D.Pa. Jan 21, 1957) (NO. CIV. 21825, CIV. 21826)
- 176 Moss v. Superior Court (Ortiz), 71 Cal.Rptr.2d 215, 224, 950 P.2d 59, 68, 17 Cal.4th 396, 411, 98 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 852, 852, 98 Daily Journal D.A.R. 1141, 1141 (Cal. Feb 02, 1998) (NO. S057081)
- 177 In re Wilkie, 208 P. 144, 146, 58 Cal.App. 22, 28 (Cal.App. 3 Dist. May 27, 1922) (NO. CIV. 2431)
- 178 State v. McClure, 105 A. 712, 712, 7 Boyce 265, 265, 30 Del. 265, 265 (Del.Gen.Sess. Jan 07, 1919)
- 179 Territory v. Crowley, 1939 WL 8134, \*26, 34 Haw. 774, 823 (Hawai'i Terr. Feb 04, 1939) (NO. 2371, 2372)
- 180 Com. v. Pouliot, 198 N.E. 256, 257, 292 Mass. 229, 231 (Mass. Oct 31, 1935)
- 181 Inhabitants of Hampden County v. Morris, 93 N.E. 579, 580, 207 Mass. 167, 169, Am. Ann. Cas. 1912A, 815, 1912A, 815 (Mass. Jan 02, 1911)
- 182 Citizens' Loan Ass'n v. Boston & M.R.R., 82 N.E. 696, 698, 196 Mass. 528, 531, 14 L.R.A.N.S. 1025, 1025, 124 Am.St.Rep. 584, 584, 13 Am. Ann. Cas. 365, 365 (Mass. Nov 27, 1907)
- 183 People v. Shirk, 174 N.W.2d 772, 776+, 383 Mich. 180, 188+ (Mich. Mar 09, 1970) (NO. 40)
- 184 Lenski v. O'Brien, 232 S.W. 235, 237, 207 Mo.App. 224, 224 (Mo.App. May 10, 1921) (NO. 17496)
- 185 State v. Robinson, 56 S.E. 918, 922, 143 N.C. 620, 620 (N.C. Apr 03, 1907)
- 186 Burton v. Sills, 248 A.2d 521, 529, 53 N.J. 86, 101, 28 A.L.R.3d 829, 829 (N.J. Dec 16, 1968) (NO. A-20)
- 187 Doremus v. Board of Ed. of Borough of Hawthorne, 75 A.2d 880, 889, 5 N.J. 435, 452 (N.J. Oct 16, 1950) (NO. A-2)
- 188 Freeholders of Passaic v. Slater, 90 A. 377, 377, 85 N.J.L. 621, 621, 56 Vroom 621, 621 (N.J.Err. & App. Mar 16, 1914) (NO. 74)
- 189 George Jonas Glass Co. v. Glass Bottle Blowers' Ass'n of United States & Canada, 79 A. 262, 267, 77 N.J. Eq. 219, 230, 7 Buchanan 219, 219, 41 L.R.A.N.S. 445, 445 (N.J.Err. & App. Feb 03, 1911) (*in dissent*)
- 190 Brown v. Kingsley Books, Inc., 151 N.Y.S.2d 639, 648, 134 N.E.2d 461, 468, 1 N.Y.2d 177, 189 (N.Y. Apr 27, 1956)
- 191 Thompson v. Wallin, 95 N.E.2d 806, 813, 301 N.Y. 476, 491 (N.Y. Nov 30, 1950)
- 192 James v. Gannett Co., Inc., 366 N.Y.S.2d 737, 740, 47 A.D.2d 437, 441 (N.Y.A.D. 4 Dept. Apr 23, 1975) (*in dissent*)
- 193 People v. Gitlow, 187 N.Y.S. 783, 794, 39 N.Y.Crim.R. 120, 120, 195 A.D. 773, 786 (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Apr 01, 1921)
- 194 U.S. v. Sirianni, 250 N.Y.S. 77, 81, 140 Misc. 124, 127 (N.Y.Sup. Apr 25, 1931)
- 195 Maloney v. State, 141 N.Y.S.2d 207, 214, 207 Misc. 894, 899 (N.Y.Ct.Cl. May 03, 1955)
- 196 State v. Kilbane., 1979 WL 209985, \*66 (Ohio App. 8 Dist. Feb 01, 1979) (NO. 38428, 38383, 38433) (*in dissent*)

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

- 197 Prep v. Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, 1962 WL 7052, \*6, 29 Pa. D. & C.2d 665, 674 (Pa.Com.Pl. 1962)
- 198 Eldredge v. Salt Lake County, 106 P. 939, 941, 37 Utah 188, 188 (Utah Jan 17, 1910)
- 199 Burns v. Alderson, 322 P.2d 359, 361, 51 Wash.2d 810, 814 (Wash. Feb 28, 1958) (NO. 34546)
- 200 State v. Superior Court of King County, 134 P. 916, 917, 75 Wash. 239, 241, 48 L.R.A.N.S. 429, 429 (Wash. Sep 04, 1913)
- 201 Pueblo v. Burgos, 75 D.P.R. 551, 560 (P.R. Dec 22, 1953) (NO. 15299 Y 15300 SOMET)

### Administrative Decisions (U.S.A.)

#### U.S. Attorney General Opinions

- 202 WHETHER THE SECOND AMENDMENT SECURES AN INDIVIDUAL RIGHT, 2004 WL 3519778 (O.L.C.), \*63+ (2004) ★★★
- 203 33 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 121, DESERTION FROM THE NAVY-STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS. (1922)★★
- 204 25 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 474, PANAMA CANAL LABORERS-INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE. (1905)★★

#### Other Administrative Materials (U.S.A.)

- 205 1990 Idaho Op. Atty. Gen. 15, Mr. Terry Thompson (1990)★★
- 206 XXXI Kan. Op. Atty. Gen. 07, The Honorable Laura McClure (1997)★★

#### Secondary Sources (U.S.A.)

- 207 Double jeopardy considerations in federal criminal cases--Supreme Court cases, 162 A.L.R. Fed. 415 (2000)
- 208 Federal constitutional right to bear arms, 37 A.L.R. Fed. 696 (1978)
- 209 Comment Note.--Constitutional aspects of libel or slander of public officials, 95 A.L.R.2d 1450 (1964)
- 210 Constitutional Rights of the Accused s 23:13, s 23:13. The use of hearsay--The prior statement of an unavailable witness (2007)
- 211 Federal Civil Rights Acts s 4:2, s 4:2. The Thirteenth Amendment--The definition of "involuntary servitude" (2007)
- 212 How to Avoid Reel Legal Problems: A Film-Making & Multi-Media Legal Guide s 4:17, s 4:17. Generally (2007)
- 213 Michigan Pleading and Practice s 60:12, s 60:12. Judicial or quasi-judicial power (2007)
- 214 Punitive Damages: State by State Guide Law & Prac APP IV, Appendix IV. The Pacific Mutual Insurance Company v. Haslip Decision (2007)
- 215 Smolla & Nimmer on Freedom of Speech s 1:12, s 1:12. Modern views of the historical debate--Judicial rejection of the view that the First Amendment is concerned only with prior restraints (2007)
- 216 Smolla & Nimmer on Freedom of Speech s 2:53, s 2:53. Absolutism as a free speech methodology--Supreme Court rejected absolutism (2007)
- 217 The Law of Seamen, 4th Edition s 8:1, s 8:1. In general (2007)
- 218 Treatise on Constitutional Law s 18.8, s 18.8. Classifications Based on Race or National Origin Following the Civil War (2007)
- 219 Treatise on Constitutional Law s 19.7, s 19.7. The Civil Rights Cases (2007)
- 220 7 Witkin, California Summary 10th Constitutional Law s 203, Other Exceptions.
- 221 30A Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 6357, s 6357. Construing Confrontation--The Tumultuous Nineties (2007)
- 222 Am. Jur. 2d Criminal Law s 1180, s 1180. Testimony at former trial or preliminary hearing (2007)
- 223 Am. Jur. 2d Involuntary Servitude and Peonage s 3, s 3. Generally (2007)
- 224 Am. Jur. 2d Involuntary Servitude and Peonage s 4, s 4. Servitude; involuntary entrance to servitude (2007)

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



- 225 Norton Bankruptcy Law and Practice 2d 28 USC s 1746, s 1746. Unsworn declarations under penalty of perjury (2007)
- C 226 Am. Jur. 2d Shipping s 340, s 340. Desertion and absence without leave (2007)
- C 227 Am. Jur. 2d Weapons and Firearms s 4, s 4. Constitutional right to bear arms--State constitutions (2007)
- C 228 Am. Jur. 2d Weapons and Firearms s 6, s 6. Constitutional right to bear arms--Federal constitution; generally--Relationship of right to bear arms to preservation of a militia (2007)
- C 229 CJS Constitutional Law s 635, s 635. Construction of rights (2007)
- 230 S.C. Jur. Blasphemy s 7, s 7. Generally (2007)
- 231 THE LITTLE WORD "DUE", 38 Akron L. Rev. 1, 51 (2005)
- C 232 THE USES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW IN CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATION, 98 Am. J. Int'l L. 82, 90 (2004)
- C 233 OCTOBER TERM, 1896-EMBRACING DUE PROCESS, 45 Am. J. Legal Hist. 71, 97 (2001)
- C 234 EXECUTIVE CONTROL OVER CRIMINAL LAW ENFORCEMENT: SOME LESSONS FROM HISTORY, 38 Am. U. L. Rev. 275, 312 (1989)
- C 235 THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS IN TEXAS: THE INTENT OF THE FRAMERS OF THE BILLS OF RIGHTS, 41 Baylor L. Rev. 629, 672+ (1989)
- 236 GRIFFIN v. OCEANIC CONTRACTORS: A RESPONSE, 35 Baylor L. Rev. 157, 167+ (1983)
- C 237 MUTINY, SHIPBOARD STRIKES, AND THE SUPREME COURT'S SUBVERSION OF NEW DEAL LABOR LAW, 25 Berkeley J. Emp. & Lab. L. 275, 349+ (2004)
- C 238 "WORKERS' CONTRACTS" UNDER THE UNITED STATES ARBITRATION ACT: AN ESSAY IN HISTORICAL CLARIFICATION, 17 Berkeley J. Emp. & Lab. L. 282, 303 (1996)
- C 239 A NEW LOOK AT GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION: RESPONDING TO A CULTURE OF VIOLENCE, 27 Beverly Hills B. Ass'n J. 160, 168 (1993)
- 240 SPEECH, COMMERCE, ELECTIONS AND CYBERSPACE, 44-FEB B. B.J. 12, 30 (2000)
- 241 OBSCENITY AND THE REASONABLE PERSON: WILL HE "KNOW IT WHEN HE SEES IT?", 30 B.C. L. Rev. 823, 860 (1989)
- C 242 WORKFARE AND INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE-WHAT YOU WANTED TO KNOW BUT WERE AFRAID TO ASK, 15 B.C. Third World L.J. 285, 321+ (1995)
- C 243 TIPPING THE BALANCE IN FAVOR OF JUSTICE: DUE PROCESS AND THE THIRTEENTH AND NINETEENTH AMENDMENTS IN CHILD REMOVAL FROM BATTERED MOTHERS, 2003 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 227, 263 (2003)
- C 244 THREATS, FREE SPEECH, AND THE JURISPRUDENCE OF THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAW, 2002 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 829, 1130+ (2002)
- C 245 THE SECOND AMENDMENT IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, 1998 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 1359, 1506+ (1998)
- C 246 CLASS STRUGGLE AT THE DOOR: THE ORIGINS OF THE PORTAL-TO-PORTAL ACT OF 1947, 39 Buff. L. Rev. 53, 180 (1991)
- C 247 JUSTICE HOLMES AND THE MODERNIZATION OF FREE SPEECH JURISPRUDENCE: THE HUMAN DIMENSION, 80 Cal. L. Rev. 391, 467+ (1992)
- C 248 CULTURAL HETEROGENEITY AND LAW: PORNOGRAPHY, BLASPHEMY, AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT, 76 Cal. L. Rev. 297, 335 (1988)
- C 249 IS THERE A NEUTRAL JUSTIFICATION FOR REFUSING TO IMPLEMENT THE SECOND AMENDMENT OR IS THE SUPREME COURT JUST "GUN SHY"?, 22 Cap. U. L. Rev. 641, 692+ (1993)
- C 250 THE SLAVERY OF EMANCIPATION, 17 Cardozo L. Rev. 2063, 2102+ (1996)
- 251 CHILDREN AS CHATTEL: INVOKING THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT TO REFORM CHILD WELFARE, 1 Cardozo Pub. L. Pol'y & Ethics J. 131, 187+ (2003)
- C 252 LOST AND FOUND: RESEARCHING THE SECOND AMENDMENT, 76 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 349, 385 (2000)
- C 253 GO AHEAD, STATE, MAKE THEM PAY: AN ANALYSIS OF WASHINGTON D.C.'S ASSAULT WEAPON MANUFACTURING STRICT LIABILITY ACT, 25 Colum. J.L. & Soc. Probs. 313, 370 (1992)

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

- C** 254 THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT AND SLAVERY IN THE GLOBAL ECONOMY, 102 Colum. L. Rev. 973, 1050+ (2002)
- C** 255 THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT VERSUS THE COMMERCE CLAUSE: LABOR AND THE SHAPING OF AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 1921-1957, 102 Colum. L. Rev. 1, 122 (2002)
- C** 256 PEONAGE AND CONTRACTUAL LIBERTY, 101 Colum. L. Rev. 351, 391+ (2001)
- C** 257 HABEAS CORPUS, EXECUTIVE DETENTION, AND THE REMOVAL OF ALIENS, 98 Colum. L. Rev. 961, 1067 (1998)
- C** 258 STATE SOVEREIGNTY AND SUBORDINACY: MAY CONGRESS COMMANDEER STATE OFFICERS TO IMPLEMENT FEDERAL LAW?, 95 Colum. L. Rev. 1001, 1089 (1995)
- C** 259 PRINCIPLE AND PREJUDICE: THE SUPREME COURT AND RACE IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA. PART 2: THE PEONAGE CASES, 82 Colum. L. Rev. 646, 718+ (1982)
- C** 260 COURT APPOINTMENT OF ATTORNEYS IN CIVIL CASES: THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF UNCOMPENSATED LEGAL ASSISTANCE, 81 Colum. L. Rev. 366, 390+ (1981)
- 261 GETTING TO KNOW HARLAN: A NEW APPROACH TO JUDICIAL BIOGRAPHY? THE REPUBLIC ACCORDING TO JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN. By Linda Przybyszewski. University of North Carolina Press. 1999. Pp. xii, 286. Hardcover, \$49.95; Paper, \$19., 18 Const. Comment. 647, 659 (2001)
- C** 262 FREE SPEECH AND CONSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION, 10 Const. Comment. 133, 166 (1993)
- C** 263 THE UNLUCKY THIRTEENTH: A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IN SEARCH OF A DOCTRINE, 80 Cornell L. Rev. 372, 412 (1995)
- C** 264 CHALLENGING THE CHALLENGE: THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT AS A PROHIBITION AGAINST THE RACIAL USE OF PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES, 76 Cornell L. Rev. 1, 128 (1990)
- C** 265 WHERE'S "THE NASTIEST PLACE ON EARTH?" FROM ROTH TO CYBERSPACE, OR, WHOSE COMMUNITY IS IT, ANYWAY? THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT ADDRESSES LOCAL COMMUNITY STANDARDS IN UNITED STATES v. THOMAS, 30 Creighton L. Rev. 1405, 1459 (1997)
- C** 266 THIS GUN FOR HIRE: CONCEALED WEAPONS LEGISLATION IN THE WORKPLACE AND BEYOND, 30 Creighton L. Rev. 285, 317 (1997)
- C** 267 BERING v. SHARE: ABORTION PROTESTORS LOSE GROUND IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, 18 Cumb. L. Rev. 205, 231 (1988)
- C** 268 THE NEED FOR REFORM OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES IN MASS TORT LITIGATION: JUZWIN v. AMTORG TRADING CORP., 39 DePaul L. Rev. 775, 823 (1990)
- 269 CITY OF LADUE v. GILLO: FREE SPEECH - A SIGN OF THE TIMES, 1995 Det. C.L. Rev. 797, 803+ (1995)
- C** 270 THE ROAD TO BRANDENBURG: A LOOK AT THE EVOLVING UNDERSTANDING OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT, 43 Drake L. Rev. 1, 49+ (1994)
- C** 271 THE SECOND AMENDMENT AND THE PERSONAL RIGHT TO ARMS, 43 Duke L.J. 1236, 1255 (1994)
- C** 272 PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT: DESHANEY AND THE SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHT TO OWN FIREARMS, 36 Duq. L. Rev. 827, 861+ (1998)
- C** 273 UNDER FIRE: THE NEW CONSENSUS ON THE SECOND AMENDMENT, 45 Emory L.J. 1139, 1259+ (1996)
- C** 274 PROBLEMS IN SEARCH OF PRINCIPLES: THE FIRST AMENDMENT IN THE SUPREME COURT FROM 1791-1930, 35 Emory L.J. 59, 137+ (1986)
- C** 275 FILLED MILK, FOOTNOTE FOUR & THE FIRST AMENDMENT: AN ANALYSIS OF THE PREFERRED POSITION OF SPEECH AFTER THE CAROLINE PRODUCTS DECISION, 13 Fordham Intell. Prop. Media & Ent. L.J. 1019, 1052+ (2003)
- C** 276 PRIVACY VERSUS THE FIRST AMENDMENT: A SKEPTICAL APPROACH, 11 Fordham Intell. Prop. Media & Ent. L.J. 97, 153+ (2000)

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

- 277 MISERY AND MYOPIA: UNDERSTANDING THE FAILURES OF U.S. EFFORTS TO STOP HUMAN TRAFFICKING, 74 *Fordham L. Rev.* 2977, 3040+ (2006)
- 278 THE SUPREME COURT AND FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION FROM 1791 TO 1917, 55 *Fordham L. Rev.* 263, 308+ (1986)
- 279 FEDERAL RULE OF EVIDENCE 801(d)(2)(E) AND THE CONFRONTATION CLAUSE: CLOSING THE WINDOW OF ADMISSIBILITY FOR COCONSPIRATOR HEARSAY, 53 *Fordham L. Rev.* 1291, 1332 (1985)
- 280 SEXUAL ABUSE OF WOMEN IN UNITED STATES PRISONS: A MODERN COROLLARY OF SLAVERY, 33 *Fordham Urb. L.J.* 571, 607 (2006)
- 281 SECOND-CLASS CITIZENSHIP AND THE SECOND AMENDMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 5 *Geo. Mason U. Civ. Rts. L.J.* 105, 178+ (1995)
- 282 WELFARE SERVITUDE, 1 *Geo. J. on Fighting Poverty* 340, 360+ (1994)
- 283 LOCHNER ERA REVISIONISM, REVISED: LOCHNER AND THE ORIGINS OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS CONSTITUTIONALISM, 92 *Geo. L.J.* 1, 60 (2003)
- 284 THE PAST AND FUTURE OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT TO ARMS, 31 *Ga. L. Rev.* 1, 76 (1996)
- 285 THE SECOND AMENDMENT IN THE SUPREME COURT: WHERE IT'S BEEN AND WHERE IT'S GOING, 29 *Hamline L. Rev.* 449, 459 (2006)
- 286 MEDIA OVERLOAD: RESTRUCTURING THE NEW YORK TIMES RULE IN ORDER TO AFFORD MORE PROTECTION TO PUBLIC FIGURES, 29 *Hamline L. Rev.* 21, 51+ (2006)
- 287 CHILD ABUSE AS SLAVERY: A THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT RESPONSE TO DESHANEY, 105 *Harv. L. Rev.* 1359, 1385+ (1992)
- 288 THE SHAPING OF THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT, 102 *Harv. L. Rev.* 1109, 1256 (1989)
- 289 THE SUPREME COURT AND THE MEIKLEJOHN INTERPRETATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT, 79 *Harv. L. Rev.* 1, 20+ (1965)
- 290 COURTS-MARTIAL AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS: THE ORIGINAL PRACTICE I, 72 *Harv. L. Rev.* 1, 49 (1958)
- 291 STRATHEARN S.S. CO. v. DILLON - UNPUBLISHED OPINION BY MR. JUSTICE BRANDEIS, 69 *Harv. L. Rev.* 1177, 1180 (1956)
- 292 THE SUPREME COURT, 1951 TERM, 66 *Harv. L. Rev.* 98, 172+ (1952)
- 293 FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION AND THE FUNCTION OF COURTS, 65 *Harv. L. Rev.* 1, 54 (1951)
- 294 ISSUES OF PROPERTY, ETHICS AND CONSENT IN THE TRANSPLANTATION OF FETAL REPRODUCTIVE TISSUE, 9 *High Tech. L.J.* 185, 209+ (1994)
- 295 TECHNOLOGICAL CONVERGENCE-"A MULTIPLICITY OF SOURCES", 36 *Hous. L. Rev.* 321, 350 (1999)
- 296 STATE ASSAULT RIFLE BANS AND THE MILITIA CLAUSES OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, 67 *Ind. L.J.* 187, 205+ (1991)
- 297 THE SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF CHILDREN, 89 *Iowa L. Rev.* 609, 669 (2004)
- 298 PLUGGING THE BULLET HOLES IN U.S. GUN LAW: AN AMMUNITION-BASED PROPOSAL FOR TIGHTENING GUN CONTROL, 32 *J. Marshall L. Rev.* 1, 34 (1998)
- 299 ROBERTSON V. BALDWIN AND THE EMANCIPATION OF CHILDREN, 14 *J. Contemp. Legal Issues* 437, 445+ (2004)
- 300 COURT-ORDERED SUPPORT AND THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT'S PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPOSITION OF INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE, 11 *J. Contemp. Legal Issues* 419, 426+ (2000)
- 301 THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT AND THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM, 83 *J. Crim. L. & Criminology* 614, 643+ (1992)
- 302 We Are the World? What United States Courts Can and Should Learn from the Law and Politics of Other Western Nations, 1 *Journal of International Law & International Relations* 279 (2005)

- 303 MILLER VERSUS TEXAS: POLICE VIOLENCE, RACE RELATIONS, CAPITAL PUNISHMENT, AND GUN-TOTING IN TEXAS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY-AND TODAY, 9 J.L. & Pol'y 737, 766+ (2001)
- 304 LOCHNER, LIQUOR AND LONGSHOREMEN: A PUZZLE IN PROGRESSIVE ERA FEDERALISM, 32 J. Mar. L. & Com. 1, 58 (2001)
- 305 PERSONAL INJURY AND WRONGFUL DEATH, 31 J. Mar. L. & Com. 293, 309+ (2000)
- 306 PRIOR RESTRAINTS ON THE MEDIA AND THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL: A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW STANDARD, 84 Ky. L.J. 259, 316 (1996)
- 307 OFFICERS' RIGHTS: TOWARD A UNIFIED FIELD THEORY OF AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT, 34 Law & Soc'y Rev. 873, 908 (2000)
- 308 STUDENTS OR SERFS? IS MANDATORY COMMUNITY SERVICE A VIOLATION OF THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT?, 30 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 809, 839+ (1997)
- 309 A SIGN OF THE TIMES: THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT EFFECTIVELY ABOLISHES THE NARROWLY TAILORED REQUIREMENT FOR TIME, PLACE AND MANNER RESTRICTIONS, 25 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 453, 497 (1992)
- 310 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THE STATE: RESPONSES TO AND RATIONALES FOR SPOUSAL BATTERING, MARITAL RAPE & STALKING, 78 Marq. L. Rev. 79, 120 (1994)
- 311 COMMUNITARIANS, NEOREPUBLICANS, AND GUNS: ASSESSING THE CASE FOR FIREARMS PROHIBITION, 56 Md. L. Rev. 438, 554+ (1997)
- 312 PROSTITUTION AND CIVIL RIGHTS, 1 Mich. J. Gender & L. 13, 31 (1993)
- 313 THE FIRST AMENDMENT COMES OF AGE: THE EMERGENCE OF FREE SPEECH IN TWENTIETH- CENTURY AMERICA, 95 Mich. L. Rev. 299, 392+ (1996)
- 314 "TAKE THIS JOB AND SHOVE IT": THE RISE OF FREE LABOR; The Invention of Free Labor: The Employment Relation in English and American Law and Culture, 1350-1870. By Robert J. Steinfeld. Chapel Hill: University of North Caro, 91 Mich. L. Rev. 1382, 1413 (1993)
- 315 HANDGUN PROHIBITION AND THE ORIGINAL MEANING OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT, 82 Mich. L. Rev. 204, 273 (1983)
- 316 THE MODALITIES OF THE NINTH AMENDMENT: WAYS OF THINKING ABOUT UNENUMERATED RIGHTS INSPIRED BY PHILIP BOBBITT'S CONSTITUTIONAL FATE, 75 Miss. L.J. 495, 544 (2006)
- 317 GUN "CONTROL" LAWS VIOLATE THE SECOND AMENDMENT AND MAY LEAD TO HIGHER CRIME RATES, 63 Mo. L. Rev. 155, 193 (1998)
- 318 THE THIRD AMENDMENT IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: MILITARY RECRUITING ON PRIVATE CAMPUSES, 40 New Eng. L. Rev. 113, 163+ (2005)
- 319 THE THOUGHT POLICE: DOLING OUT PUNISHMENT FOR THINKING ABOUT CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR IN JOHN DOE V. CITY OF LAFAYETTE, 40 New Eng. L. Rev. 263, 301 (2005)
- 320 DECISION OF THE DAY Appellate Division In re Schreiber, petitioner-respondent v. K-Sea Transportation Corp., respondents-appellants Decided April 25, 2006 Before Tom, J.P.; Andrias, Gonzalez, Catterson, JJ. Docket No. 54, 5/1/2006 N.Y. L.J. 18, col. 1, 18, col. 1 (2006)
- 321 PEOPLE v. WILLIAM RODRIGUEZ AND PROVIDE RODRIGUEZ, 6/6/91 N.Y. L.J. 29, col. 4, 29, col. 4 (1991)
- 322 "WARNING: EXPLICIT LANGUAGE CONTAINED" OBSCENITY AND MUSIC, 9 N.Y.L. Sch. J. Hum. Rts. 461, 494 (1992)
- 323 TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS: THE SOVEREIGN PREROGATIVE OF DISTRIBUTING POWER, 64-FEB N.Y. St. B.J. 6, 12 (1992)
- 324 HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS, INKBLOTS, AND LIFE AFTER DEATH: THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES, 78 N.C. L. Rev. 1071, 1151 (2000)
- 325 FINDING THE CONSTITUTION: AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF TRADITION'S ROLE IN CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATION, 77 N.C. L. Rev. 409, 521 (1999)
- 326 BRINGING FORWARD THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS: DO TEXT, HISTORY, OR PRECEDENT STAND IN THE WAY?, 75 N.C. L. Rev. 781, 899+ (1997)

- 327 PUBLIC ENDANGERMENT OR PERSONAL LIBERTY? NORTH CAROLINA ENACTS A LIBERALIZED CONCEALED HANDGUN STATUTE, 74 N.C. L. Rev. 2214, 2239+ (1996)
- 328 LOCHNER ERA JURISPRUDENCE AND THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL TRADITION, 70 N.C. L. Rev. 1, 111 (1991)
- 329 THE EMBARRASSING INTERPRETATION OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT, 29 N. Ky. L. Rev. 705, 734+ (2002)
- 330 THE EMBARRASSING INTERPRETATION OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT, 29 N. Ky. L. Rev. 705, 734+ (2002)
- 331 DEFAMATION IN THE WORK PLACE: "THE NEW WORKHORSE IN TERMINATION LITIGATION", 15 N. Ky. L. Rev. 93, 128 (1988)
- 332 FORCED LABOR: A THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT DEFENSE OF ABORTION, 84 Nw. U. L. Rev. 480, 523+ (1990)
- 333 THE DEBTOR AS MODERN DAY PEON: A PROBLEM OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS, 65 Notre Dame L. Rev. 165, 205+ (1990)
- 334 THE ROAD TO TWINING: REASSESSING THE DISINCORPORATION OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS, 61 Ohio St. L.J. 1457, 1528 (2000)
- 335 SECOND AMENDMENT JURISPRUDENCE: THE POSSIBLE DESTRUCTION OF THE RIGHTS OF "THE PEOPLE", 30 Okla. City U. L. Rev. 363, 396 (2005)
- 336 MERRICK v. BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION: STATUS AND OREGON'S FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION LAW, 72 Or. L. Rev. 729, 751 (1993)
- 337 "RIDING WITH THE COPS AND CHEERING FOR THE ROBBERS:" EMPLOYEE SPEECH, DOCTRINAL CUBBYHOLES, AND THE DUTY OF LOYALTY, 25 Pepp. L. Rev. 721, 784 (1998)
- 338 EVOLUTION, THE SUPREME COURT, AND THE DESTRUCTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL JURISPRUDENCE, 13 Regent U. L. Rev. 513, 570 (2001)
- 339 THE OSCEOLA AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF MARITIME PERSONAL INJURY LAW: SOME PROPOSITIONS ABOUT THE CASE AND ITS PROPOSITIONS, 34 Rutgers L.J. 663, 727 (2003)
- 340 UNITED STATES v. OWENS: THE DEMISE OF THE RELIABILITY STANDARD IN THE ADMISSION OF PRIOR IDENTIFICATION TESTIMONY, 41 Rutgers L. Rev. 915, 943 (1989)
- 341 THE SUPREME COURT'S THIRTY-FIVE OTHER GUN CASES: WHAT THE SUPREME COURT HAS SAID ABOUT THE SECOND AMENDMENT, 18 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 99, 187+ (1999)
- 342 FIRST AMENDMENT--PRIOR RESTRAINT--SEX, RICO, AND PRIOR RESTRAINT: THE FORFEITURE OF EXPRESSIVE MATERIAL PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT AS PUNISHMENT FOR RACKETEERING OFFENSES DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A PRIOR RESTRAINT--, 5 Seton Hall Const. L.J. 243, 268 (1994)
- 343 CONTROLLING GUNS: A CALL FOR CONSISTENCY IN JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CHALLENGES TO GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION, 25 Seton Hall L. Rev. 1467, 1495+ (1995)
- 344 CONSTITUTIONAL LAW-FIRST AMENDMENT-FIRST AMENDMENT DOES NOT PRECLUDE CLOSURE OF ADULT BOOKSTORE WHERE ILLEGAL ACTIVITY OCCURS ON PREMISES-ARCARA v. CLOUD BOOKS, INC., 106 S.Ct. 3172 (1986)., 17 Seton Hall L. Rev. 382, 401 (1987)
- 345 HISTORICIZING JUDICIAL SCRUTINY, 57 S.C. L. Rev. 1, 83 (2005)
- 346 HOLMES'S CONSTITUTIONAL JURISPRUDENCE, 18 S. Ill. U. L.J. 347, 356+ (1994)
- 347 A GENEROUSLY FLUCTUATING SCALE OF RIGHTS: RESIDENT ALIENS AND FIRST AMENDMENT FREE SPEECH PROTECTIONS, 46 SMU L. Rev. 225, 261+ (1992)
- 348 CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES TO COURT APPOINTMENT: INCREASING RECOGNITION OF AN UNFAIR BURDEN, 44 Sw. L.J. 1229, 1266 (1990)
- 349 THE CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRACY AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT POSED BY THE PRESENT STRUCTURE AND OPERATION OF THE MEDIA INDUSTRY UNDER THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACTS, 17 St. John's J. Legal Comment. 11, 44+ (2003)

- 350 THE INCONVENIENT MILITIA CLAUSE OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT: WHY THE SUPREME COURT DECLINES TO RESOLVE THE DEBATE OVER THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS, 16 St. John's J. Legal Comment. 41, 164+ (2002)
- 351 IS THE SECOND AMENDMENT AN INDIVIDUAL OR A COLLECTIVE RIGHT: UNITED STATES V. EMERSON'S REVOLUTIONARY INTERPRETATION OF THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS, 77 St. John's L. Rev. 345, 370 (2003)
- 352 CONSTITUTIONAL LAW-CONFRONTATION CLAUSE-ALLOWING A CHILD ABUSE VICTIM TO TESTIFY VIA ONE-WAY CLOSED-CIRCUIT TELEVISION DOES NOT VIOLATE A CRIMINAL DEFENDANT'S SIXTH AMENDMENT CONFRONTATION CLAUSE RIGHT IF THE TRIAL COURT, 22 St. Mary's L.J. 555, 577 (1990)
- 353 THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS: A RIGHT TO SELF-DEFENSE AGAINST CRIMINALS AND DESPOTS, 8 Stan. L. & Pol'y Rev. 25, 34 (1997)
- 354 THE CONTRACTUAL DISEMPOWERMENT OF EMPLOYEES, 46 Stan. L. Rev. 87, 146+ (1993)
- 355 ARRESTEES AS INFORMANTS: A THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT ANALYSIS, 29 Stan. L. Rev. 713, 746 (1977)
- 356 DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF EX-FELONS: A REASSESSMENT, 25 Stan. L. Rev. 845, 864 (1973)
- 357 FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION UNDER STATE CONSTITUTIONS, 20 Stan. L. Rev. 318, 335 (1968)
- 358 THE CONSTITUTION AND COURT-MARTIAL OF CIVILIANS ACCOMPANYING THE ARMED FORCES-A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS, 13 Stan. L. Rev. 461, 521+ (1961)
- 359 THE BABY AND THE BATHWATER TOO: A CRITIQUE OF AMERICAN LIBRARY ASS'N v. U.S., 2005 Syracuse Sci. & Tech. L. Rep. 1, 1 (2005)
- 360 FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION IN AMERICA: THE FEDERAL DILEMMA, 10 Tex. J. Women & L. 129, 208+ (2001)
- 361 ADRIFT IN THE HARBOR: AMBIGUOUS-AMPHIBIOUS CONTROVERSIES AND SEAMEN'S ACCESS TO WORKERS' COMPENSATION BENEFITS, 81 Tex. L. Rev. 1671, 1727+ (2003)
- 362 WHAT'S LEFT?, 69 Tex. L. Rev. 1985, 2041 (1991)
- 363 LABOR AND THE CONSTITUTION: FROM ABOLITION TO DEINDUSTRIALIZATION, 65 Tex. L. Rev. 1071, 1136 (1987)
- 364 A FEDERAL COURT HOLDS THE SECOND AMENDMENT IS AN INDIVIDUAL RIGHT: JEFFERSONIAN UTOPIA OR APOCALYPSE NOW?, 30 U. Mem. L. Rev. 55, 130+ (1999)
- 365 MANDATORY COMMUNITY SERVICE AS A HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION REQUIREMENT: INCULCATING VALUES OR UNCONSTITUTIONAL?, 11 T.M. Cooley L. Rev. 253, 276 (1994)
- 366 RECTIFYING LAND OWNERSHIP DISPARITIES THROUGH EXPROPRIATION: WHY RECENT LAND REFORM MEASURES IN NAMIBIA ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND UNNECESSARY, 15 Transnat'l L. & Contemp. Probs. 419, 455 (2005)
- 367 DISPENSING WITH THE SECOND AMENDMENT, 12 Trinity L. Rev. 75, 81+ (2004)
- 368 "YOUR" RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS: THE FIFTH CIRCUIT REEXAMINES THE GUARANTEES OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT WITH REGARD TO INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS: UNITED STATES V. EMERSON, 77 Tul. L. Rev. 283, 296 (2002)
- 369 THE ROLE OF FEDERAL COURTS IN ADMIRALTY: THE CHALLENGES FACING THE ADMIRALTY JUDGES OF THE LOWER FEDERAL COURTS, 75 Tul. L. Rev. 1355, 1385 (2001)
- 370 THE SECRET DISSENT IN YAMAHA MOTOR CORP., U.S.A. v. CALHOUN-NEVER BEFORE PUBLISHED!, 71 Tul. L. Rev. 203, 222 (1996)
- 371 THE PROPER ROLE OF SPECIAL SOLITUDE IN THE GENERAL MARITIME LAW, 70 Tul. L. Rev. 227, 311+ (1995)
- 372 AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORMITY IN INTERNATIONAL MARITIME LAW, 57 Tul. L. Rev. 1065, 1091+ (1983)

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

- 373 FALGOUT BROS. V. S/V PANGAEA: JUDICIAL PATERNALISM OR JUDICIAL ACTIVISM?, 22 Tul. Mar. L.J. 683, 692 (1998)
- 374 STORM ON THE CONSTITUTION: THE FIRST DEPORTATION LAW, 10 Tulsa J. Comp. & Int'l L. 63, 114 (2002)
- 375 BEYOND SURROGACY: GESTATIONAL PARENTING AGREEMENTS UNDER CALIFORNIA LAW, 1 UCLA Women's L.J. 89, 134+ (1991)
- 376 ZONING AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT: A MUNICIPALITY'S POWER TO CONTROL ADULT USE ESTABLISHMENTS, 55 UMKC L. Rev. 263, 283 (1987)
- 377 THE BETTER MEANS OF PRESERVING FREE EXPRESSION: THOUGHTS ON VIGILANCE, RESPONSIBILITY, STEWARDSHIP, JOURNALISM EDUCATION, AND THE DEMISE OF VALUE SYSTEMS, 23 U. Ark. Little Rock L. Rev. 81, 110+ (2000)
- 378 BLUNDERBUSS SCHOLARSHIP: PERVERTING THE ORIGINAL INTENT AND PLAIN MEANING OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT, 32 U. Balt. L. Rev. 127, 168 (2003)
- 379 THE PHAGES OF AMERICAN LAW, 36 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 455, 504 (2003)
- 380 INEQUALITY "FROM THE TOP": APPLYING AN ANCIENT PROHIBITION TO AN EMERGING PROBLEM OF DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE, 32 UCLA L. Rev. 100, 134 (1984)
- 381 THE CONSTITUTION IN THE SUPREME COURT: THE PROTECTION OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS, 1889-1910, 52 U. Chi. L. Rev. 324, 388+ (1985)
- 382 THE EMERGENCE OF MODERN FIRST AMENDMENT DOCTRINE, 50 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1205, 1355+ (1983)
- 383 THE VIABILITY OF RACIST SPEECH FROM HIGH SCHOOLS TO UNIVERSITIES: A WELCOME MATRICULATION?, 59 U. Cin. L. Rev. 871, 903 (1991)
- 384 TRUISMS THAT NEVER WILL BE TRUE: THE TENTH AMENDMENT AND THE SPENDING POWER, 57 U. Colo. L. Rev. 793, 833 (1986)
- 385 FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES TO ARMS, 15 U. Dayton L. Rev. 59, 89+ (1989)
- 386 ENCROACHMENTS OF THE CROWN ON THE LIBERTY OF THE SUBJECT: PRE-REVOLUTIONARY ORIGINS OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT, 15 U. Dayton L. Rev. 91, 124 (1989)
- 387 PRIVATE ARMS AS THE PALLADIUM OF LIBERTY: THE MEANING OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT, 77 U. Det. Mercy L. Rev. 1, 50+ (1999)
- 388 THE DIRTY WORDS YOU CANNOT SAY ON TELEVISION: DOES THE FIRST AMENDMENT PROHIBIT CONGRESS FROM BANNING ALL USE OF CERTAIN WORDS?, 2005 U. Ill. L. Rev. 989, 1019 (2005)
- 389 INDEPENDENT BUT INADEQUATE: STATE CONSTITUTIONS AND PROTECTION OF FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION, 33 U. Kan. L. Rev. 305, 340 (1985)
- 390 REJECTING "UNCONTROLLED AUTHORITY OVER THE BODY": THE DECENCIES OF CIVILIZED CONDUCT, THE PAST AND THE FUTURE OF UNENUMERATED RIGHTS, 9 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 423, 455+ (2007)
- 391 FUGITIVE SLAVES AND SHIP-JUMPING SAILORS: THE ENFORCEMENT AND SURVIVAL OF COERCED LABOR, 9 U. Pa. J. Lab. & Emp. L. 87, 116+ (2006)
- 392 TREATING GUNS LIKE CONSUMER PRODUCTS, 148 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1213, 1246 (2000)
- 393 RECONSTRUCTING THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE: THE CASE AGAINST DISCRETIONARY ACCOMMODATION OF RELIGION, 140 U. Pa. L. Rev. 555, 612 (1991)
- 394 WAR AND THE SOCIAL CONTRACT: NUCLEAR POLICY, DISTRIBUTION, AND THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS, 139 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1257, 1316 (1991)
- 395 THE LABOR VISION OF THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT, 138 U. Pa. L. Rev. 437, 504 (1989)
- 396 UNITED STATES V. KELNER: THREATS AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT, 125 U. Pa. L. Rev. 919, 946 (1977)
- 397 PRESERVING THE RIGHT TO CONFRONTATION--A NEW APPROACH TO HEARSAY EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL TRIALS, 113 U. Pa. L. Rev. 741, 768+ (1965)

- 398 FEDERAL MAGISTRATES FOR THE TRIAL OF PETTY OFFENSES: NEED AND CONSTITUTIONALITY, 107 U. Pa. L. Rev. 443, 471+ (1959)
- 399 FEDERAL COMMON LAW AND CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: A RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF ADMIRALTY, 61 U. Pitt. L. Rev. 367, 418+ (2000)
- 400 "DANCING IN THE COURTHOUSE": THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT OF ACCESS OPENS A NEW ROUND, 29 U. Rich. L. Rev. 237, 325 (1995)
- 401 RESTORING DEMOCRATIC SELF-GOVERNANCE THROUGH THE FEDERAL MARRIAGE AMENDMENT, 2 U. St. Thomas L.J. 95, 117+ (2004)
- 402 MANDATORY COMMUNITY SERVICE IN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS: CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS IN STEIRER v. BETHLEHEM AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT, 28 U.S.F. L. Rev. 517, 569+ (1994)
- 403 THE AVAILABILITY OF MAINTENANCE AND CURE TO SEAMEN WITH AIDS, 11 U.S.F. Mar. L.J. 333, 354 (1999)
- 404 HAVE ALL THE RECENT TWISTS AND TURNS IN THE JONES ACT LEFT DEEP SEA DIVERS HIGH AND DRY?, 11 U.S.F. Mar. L.J. 47, 75+ (1999)
- 405 FROM SUBSISTENCE TO STARVATION: A CALL FOR JUDICIAL REEXAMINATION OF GARDINER v. SEA LAND SERVICE, INC., 9 U.S.F. Mar. L.J. 71, 104 (1996)
- 406 THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT OF OUR ASPIRATIONS, 38 U. Tol. L. Rev. 855, 881+ (2007)
- 407 SPEECH OR OPINION? TWO OBJECTS OF FIRST AMENDMENT IMMUNITY, 2002 Utah L. Rev. 843, 925+ (2002)
- 408 CUSTOM AND USAGE AS ACTION UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW: AN ESSAY ON THE FORGOTTEN TERMS OF SECTION 1983, 89 Va. L. Rev. 925, 977+ (2003)
- 409 FREE SPEECH AND EXPERTISE: ADMINISTRATIVE CENSORSHIP AND THE BIRTH OF THE MODERN FIRST AMENDMENT, 86 Va. L. Rev. 1, 101 (2000)
- 410 COURTS, LEGISLATURES AND PATERNALISM, 74 Va. L. Rev. 519, 575 (1988)
- 411 A COMMENT ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES, 72 Va. L. Rev. 139, 158 (1986)
- 412 THE HISTORY AND MEANING OF THE NINTH AMENDMENT, 69 Va. L. Rev. 223, 268 (1983)
- 413 "NO CIVILIZED SYSTEM OF JUSTICE": THE FATE OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT, 102 W. Va. L. Rev. 499, 546 (2000)
- 414 UNITED STATES V. EMERSON: THE SECOND AMENDMENT AS AN INDIVIDUAL RIGHT - TIME TO SETTLE THE ISSUE?, 102 W. Va. L. Rev. 177, 220 (1999)
- 415 RATIONING FIREARMS PURCHASES AND THE RIGHT TO KEEP ARMS: REFLECTIONS ON THE BILLS OF RIGHTS OF VIRGINIA, WEST VIRGINIA, AND THE UNITED STATES, 96 W. Va. L. Rev. 1, 83+ (1993)
- 416 MCINTYRE v. OHIO ELECTIONS COMMISSION: A FREE SPEECH TRIUMPH OR AN APPROVAL OF ANONYMOUS LIBEL?, 17 Whittier L. Rev. 855, 893 (1996)
- 417 TURNER BROADCASTING V. FCC: MODERN COMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT AND THE EVOLVING FIRST AMENDMENT, 16 Whittier L. Rev. 685, 736 (1995)
- 418 REGULATING HANDGUN ADVERTISING DIRECTED AT WOMEN, 12 Whittier L. Rev. 113, 130+ (1991)
- 419 MEDIA VIOLENCE AND THE OBSCENITY EXCEPTION TO THE FIRST AMENDMENT, 3 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 107, 177+ (1994)
- 420 STATE JUDGES, STATE OFFICERS, AND FEDERAL COMMANDS AFTER SEMINOLE TRIBE AND PRINTZ, 1998 Wis. L. Rev. 1465, 1545+ (1998)
- 421 ARTICLE III CASES, STATE COURT DUTIES, AND THE MADISONIAN COMPROMISE, 1995 Wis. L. Rev. 39, 197+ (1995)
- 422 OUR INTERNATIONAL CONSTITUTION, 31 Yale J. Int'l L. 1, 125+ (2006)
- 423 BEYOND METAPHOR: BATTERED WOMEN, INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE AND THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT, 4 Yale J.L. & Feminism 207, 253+ (1992)

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



- C 424 THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT AND THE READING OF PRECISE CONSTITUTIONAL TEXTS, 113 Yale L.J. 1663, 1750 (2004)
- C 425 THE FIRST AMENDMENT IN ITS FORGOTTEN YEARS, 90 Yale L.J. 514, 539+ (1981)
- C 426 MORE ADO ABOUT DIRTY BOOKS, 75 Yale L.J. 1364, 1405 (1966)
- C 427 CONFRONTATION AND THE HEARSAY RULE, 75 Yale L.J. 1434, 1442 (1966)
- C 428 CORPORATE POLITICAL AFFAIRS PROGRAMS, 70 Yale L.J. 821, 862 (1961)
- C 429 JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF NEGROES: THE TRANSFORMATION OF A SOUTHERNER, 66 Yale L.J. 637, 710 (1957)
- C 430 "COOPERATIVE FEDERALISM" AGAIN: STATE AND MUNICIPAL LEGISLATION PENALIZING VIOLATION OF EXISTING AND FUTURE FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS: I, 57 Yale L.J. 1, 26 (1947)
- 431 060713 American Bankruptcy Institute 901, Individual Chapter 11s: A Better Choice Compared to Above-Median-Income Debtors in Chapter 13? (2006)

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

**Appellate Petitions, Motions and Filings**

- 432 District of Columbia v. Heller, 2007 WL 2571686, \*2571686+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 04, 2007) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-290)★★
- 433 Knight v. State of Washington, 2007 WL 2323445, \*2323445+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 08, 2007) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme ...** (NO. 07-184)★★
- 434 Fischer v. United States of America, 2006 WL 110459, \*110459+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 13, 2006) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 05-881) ""★★★
- 435 Brumfield v. Brumfield, 2005 WL 3607231, \*3607231+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 23, 2005) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 05-844) ""★★★
- 436 Padilla v. Hanft, 2005 WL 3531470, \*3531470+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 16, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Comparative Law Scholars ...** (NO. 05-533)★★
- 437 Renobato v. Merrill Lynch & Co., 2005 WL 3229120, \*3229120+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 07, 2005) **Petition Appeal] for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 05-692)★★
- 438 Nordyke v. King, 2004 WL 1453028, \*1453028+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 24, 2004) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 03-1707)★★
- 439 Victor DIAZ, Charles Rountree, Roy Edward Cline, Richard Webb Harris, Mitchell Pheffer, Phillipe Richard, Clayton Horschell, Shane Brent Richins, Arthur Boettger, Timothy Noble, Ordwayne P. Chauvin, and Guillermo Carrizales-Cortez, Petitioners, v. MCDERMOTT INTERNATIONAL, INC., McDermott Underwater Services, Inc., CCC Fabricaciones Y Construcciones, S.A. De C.V., and Corporacion De Industrias Construcciones, S.A. De C.V., Respondents., 2003 WL 23119180, \*23119180+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 26, 2003) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 03-939)★★
- 440 Sean SILVEIRA, Jack Safford, Patrick Overstreet, David K Mehl, Sgt. Steven Focht, Sgt. David Blalock, Marcus Davis, Vance Boyes, and Ken Dewald, Petitioners, v. Bill LOCKYER, Attorney General, and Gray Davis, Governor, State of California, Respondents., 2003 WL 22471719, \*22471719+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 22, 2003) **Brief in Opposition to Petition for Writ of ...** (NO. 03-051) ""★★
- 441 SILVEIRA, et al., Petitioners, v. LOCKYER, et al., Respondents., 2003 WL 22428487, \*22428487+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 07, 2003) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Rifle Association ...** (NO. 03-51)★★
- 442 Alec S. COSTERUS, Petitioner, v. Jane SWIFT, et al., Respondents., 2002 WL 32134491, \*32134491+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 27, 2002) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 02-427)★★
- 443 Jay Nolan RENOBATO, Petitioner, v. BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT, Respondent., 2001 WL 34117327, \*34117327+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 12, 2001) **Petition(Appel) for a Writ of Certiorari,** (NO. 01-830)★★

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

- 444 AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER FUEL SUPPLY, INC. and Indiana Michigan Power Co., Inc., River Transportation Division, Petitioners, v. James W. PERKINS and Judith Lynn Perkins, Respondents., 2001 WL 34115755, \*34115755 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. 2001) **Respondents' Brief in Opposition to Petition for ...** (NO. 01-325)★★
- 445 Thomas JOHNSTON, Petitioner, v. TWENTY GRAND OFFSHORE, INC., et al., Respondents., 1999 WL 33639307, \*33639307+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 05, 1999) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 98-1798)★★
- 446 Douglas Ray HICKMAN, in propria persona, Petitioner, v. COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, Sherman Block, Patrick G. Leonard, Claude Farris, Ed Barston, The City of Los Angeles, Robert M. Talcott, Herbert F. Boekmann, Rev. A. B. Tooley, Samuel L. Williams, Stephen D. Yslas, Frank E. Peirsol, The City of San Fernando, and Dominick J. Rivetti, Respondents., 1996 WL 33422748, \*33422748+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 05, 1996) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 96-109)★★
- 447 Rita FULLER, Babbette Thayer, Thomas Wilson, and the class of similarly situated persons who have worked aboard the F/T Michelle Irene, Petitioners, v. GOLDEN AGE FISHERIES, Simonson Enterprises V, Inc., Michelle Irene Joint Venture, Westcod II, Inc., BTI IV, Inc., et al., Respondents., 1994 WL 16099612, \*16099612+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 25, 1994) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 931676) ""★★★
- 448 Robert BLAINEY, Donald Larson, Mosa Mosed Said, Charles Reed, Carl Mayhew, Vincent Sylvis, Stanley Beckish, Albert Merchant, Martin Tighe, Said Mudhegi, Richard Waeme, Robert La Haie, Ali Yaha, and Thomas Puharic, Petitioners, v. AMERICAN STEAMSHIP COMPANY, Cleveland Tankers, Inc., Rouge Steel Company, Interlake Steamship Company, and Cleveland Cliffs Iron Company, Respondents., 1993 WL 13076410, \*13076410+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 22, 1993) **Respondents' Brief in Opposition** (NO. 93-0367) ""★★★
- 449 Leo J. SONNENBURG, Gerald Harnett and Dennis Sheffield, Petitioners, v. Evan BAYH, Governor of the State of Indiana and Jerry Thaden, Commissioner of the Indiana Department of Mental Health, Respondents., 1991 WL 11177502, \*11177502+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 16, 1991) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 91-975) ""★★★
- 450 Gail Elizabeth BOBAL, Petitioner, v. RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, Board of Trustees of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Dr. Gerald Moss, Dr. Punkaj K. Das, Dr. Donald S. Rodbell, Dr. J. Lawrence Katz, Dr. Hyo Sub Yoon, Dr. Stephen E. Wiberley, Dr. Edward J. Smith, Dr. Henry A. Scarton, Dr. Allen Zelman, Dr. Gary Judd, Dr. William C. Jennings, Dr. John B. Brunski, Respondents., 1991 WL 11176411, \*11176411+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 20, 1991) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 90-1333)★★
- 451 Kerr v. Com. of Pennsylvania, 1987 WL 954801, \*954801+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 03, 1987) **Petition** (NO. 87-207) ""★★
- 452 Voyd B. BURGER, Plaintiff-Appellant, Cross-Appellee, v. MILITARY SEALIFT COMMAND, as Owner of the U.S.N.S. Bellatrix; et al, Defendants, Military Sealift Command, as Owner of the U.S.N.S. Bellatrix; Bay Ship Management Inc.; Avondale Shipyard. Inc.; Richard P. Martucci, Captain; Edward L. Gibson; Arthur C. Clark; Joseph Conwell; Eric Bardes et al, Defendants-Appellees, American Maritime Officers Union, Defendant- Appellee-Cross-Appellant., 1999 WL 33918587, \*33918587+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (5th Cir. Jul 15, 1999) **Appellant-Cross Appellee Voyd B. Burger's ...** (NO. 98-30558)★★
- 453 Noel CORNELIO, et al., Petitioners, v. National Labor Relations BOARD, Respondent., 2007 WL 903921, \*903921+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (9th Cir. Feb 02, 2007) **Brief of Intervening Respondent Phoenix Processor ...** (NO. 06-74745)★★
- 454 John S. JENKINS and/or De Lois Stewart AKA De Lois S. Jenkins, v. CALIFORNIA FEDERAL LOAN ASSOCIATION AKA CAL FED; et al., 2002 WL 32750753, \*32750753 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (9th Cir. Nov 27, 2002) **Petition for Review** (NO. 02-15935)★
- 455 Chuck KLEIN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Sheriff, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2002 WL 32575671, \*32575671 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio May 28, 2002) **Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction of ...** (NO. 2002-585)★★

- 456 Chuck KLEIN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Jr., Sheriff, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2002 WL 32575684, \*32575684+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio May 28, 2002) **Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction** (NO. 2002-0585)★★
- 457 Chuck KLEIN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Sheriff, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2002 WL 32575690, \*32575690 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio May 28, 2002) **Memorandum of Amici Curiae Ohio Association of ...** (NO. 2002-585)★★

#### Appellate Briefs

- 458 Boumediene v. Bush, 2007 WL 2441590, \*2441590+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 24, 2007) **Brief for the Boumediene Petitioners** (NO. 06-1195) ""★★
- 459 Hammon v. State of Indiana, 2006 WL 303912, \*303912+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 02, 2006) **Brief for the States of Illinois, Alabama, ...** (NO. 05-5224, 05-5705)★★
- 460 Crawford v. Washington, 2003 WL 22228005, \*22228005+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 22, 2003) **Brief for the United States as Amicus Curiae** (NO. 02-9410)★★
- 461 United States of America, Petitioner, v. Alfonso LOPEZ, Jr., Respondent., 1994 WL 16007617, \*16007617+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jun 02, 1994) **Amicus Brief on Behalf of: Academics for the ...** (NO. 93-1260)★★
- 462 BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES OF VERMONT, INC. and Browning-Ferris Industries, Inc., Petitioners, v. KELCO DISPOSAL, INC. and Joseph Kelley, Respondents., 1989 WL 1127698, \*1127698+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 19, 1989) **Brief of Amici Curiae Johnson & Higgins and the ...** (NO. 88-556)★★
- 463 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, petitioner, v. Ike KOZMINSKI, et al., 1987 WL 880475, \*880475+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 14, 1987) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 86-2000) ""★
- 464 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Appellant, v. Anthony J. GALIOTO, Appellee., 1986 WL 728211, \*728211+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 13, 1986) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the Coalition for the ...** (NO. 84-1904)★★
- 465 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Appellant, v. Anthony J. GALIOTO, Appellee., 1985 WL 669550, \*669550+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 07, 1985) **Brief Amicus Curiae in Support of Motion to ...** (NO. 84-1904)★★
- 466 Danny L. GRIFFIN, Petitioner, v. OCEANIC CONTRACTORS, INC., Respondent., 1982 WL 608412, \*608412 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 01, 1982) **Brief for Respondent** (NO. 81-614)★
- 467 Freeman v. U.S., 1974 WL 186136, \*186136+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 15, 1974) **Brief of the Citizens Committee for the Right to ...** (NO. 74-11)★★
- 468 Old Dominion Branch No. 496 v. Austin, 1973 WL 172287, \*172287+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 1973) **Brief of the National Right to Work Legal Defense ...** (NO. 72-1180)★★
- 469 Pittsburgh Press Co. v. The Pittsburgh Comm'n on Human, 1973 WL 171999, \*171999 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 20, 1973) **Brief for the Pittsburgh Commission on Human ...** (NO. 72-419)★★
- 470 Davis v. Alaska, 1972 WL 135765, \*135765+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. 1972) **Respondent's Brief** (NO. 72-5794)★★
- 471 Hill v. California, 1969 WL 120196, \*120196+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 08, 1969) **Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 51)★★
- 472 Ted Steven CHIMEL, Petitioner, v. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Respondent., 1969 WL 100891, \*100891+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 03, 1969) **Respondent's Brief** (NO. 770) ""★★
- 473 Ted Steven CHIMEL, Petitioner, v. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Respondent., 1969 WL 136850, \*136850+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 03, 1969) **Respondent's Brief** (NO. 770) ""★★
- 474 Boyle v. Landry, 1969 WL 120246, \*120246+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 23, 1969) **Brief for Appellants.** (NO. 4)★★
- 475 Zwickler v. Koota, 1967 WL 113590, \*113590 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 25, 1967) **Brief of National District Attorneys Association, ...** (NO. 29)★★
- 476 Harper v. Virginia State Bd. of Elections, 1965 WL 115351, \*115351+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 11, 1965) **Brief for Appellees** (NO. 48) ""★★

- 477 Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. U.S., 1964 WL 81380, \*81380+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 21, 1964) **Jurisdictional Statement and Brief** (NO. 515) ""★★
- 478 Roth v. U.S., 1957 WL 87777, \*87777+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 17, 1957) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 582) ""★★
- 479 Roth v. U.S., 1957 WL 87529, \*87529+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 23, 1957) **Brief of American Civil Liberties Union as Amicus ...** (NO. 582)★★
- 480 General Elec. Co. v. Local 205, United Elec. Radio, 1957 WL 87202, \*87202+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 13, 1957) **Brief for the Respondent** (NO. 276)★★
- 481 Thompson v. Coastal Oil Co., 1956 WL 88961, \*88961+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 04, 1956) **Reply Brief of Petitioner on Rehearing** (NO. 1) ""★★★
- 482 Thompson v. Coastal Oil Co., 1955 WL 72495, \*72495+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 1955) **Brief for the Petitioner** (NO. 1) ""★★★
- 483 Ullmann v. U.S., 1955 WL 72443, \*72443+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 1955) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 58)★★
- 484 Com. of Pennsylvania v. Nelson, 1955 WL 72658, \*72658 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 31, 1955) **Brief of the American Legion Amicus Curiae** (NO. 10) ""★★
- 485 United Const. Workers v. Laburnum Const. Corp., 1953 WL 78536, \*78536+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1953) **Brief of Respondent** (NO. 188)★★
- 486 Lauritzen v. Larsen, 1953 WL 78552, \*78552+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 24, 1953) **Motion for Leave to File a Brief as Amicus Curiae ...** (NO. 226)★★
- 487 Isbrandtsen Co. Inc. v. Johnson, 1952 WL 82123, \*82123 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 21, 1952) **Brief for Respondent.** (NO. 493)★★
- 488 Joseph Burstyn, Inc. v. Wilson, 1952 WL 82542, \*82542+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 18, 1952) **Brief for Appellees** (NO. 522) ""★★
- 489 Brunner v. U.S., 1952 WL 82331, \*82331+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 1952) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 442)★★
- 490 Doremus v. Bd. of Educ. of the Borough of Hawthorne, 1952 WL 81994, \*81994+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 30, 1952) **Brief of State Council of the Junior Order of ...** (NO. 9) ""★★
- 491 John v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Bd., 1950 WL 78640, \*78640+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 30, 1950) **Brief of Appellee Milwaukee Gas Light Company** (NO. 302)★★
- 492 Dennis v. U.S., 1950 WL 78653, \*78653+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 28, 1950) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 336)★★
- 493 Dennis v. U.S., 1950 WL 78740, \*78740+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 20, 1950) **Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 336)★★
- 494 Niemotko v. Maryland, 1950 WL 78466, \*78466+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 09, 1950) **Joint Brief for Appellee** (NO. 17, 18) ""★★
- 495 U.S. v. Shoreline Co-op. Apartments, Inc., 1949 WL 50230, \*50230+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 05, 1949) **Brief for Appellees Robert R. Lumsden, Arthur J. ...** (NO. 334)★★
- 496 U.S. v. Shoreline Co-op. Apartments, Inc., 1949 WL 50228, \*50228+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1949) **Brief for the Petitioner** (NO. 334)★★
- 497 Doubleday & Co. Inc. v. The People of the State of New York, 1948 WL 47136, \*47136+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 22, 1948) **Brief of American Civil Liberties Union as an ...** (NO. 11)★★
- 498 Doubleday & Co. Inc. v. The People of the State of New York, 1948 WL 47135, \*47135+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 19, 1948) **Appellee's Brief** (NO. 11)★★
- 499 Doubleday & Co. Inc. v. People of the State of New York, 1948 WL 47133, \*47133+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 04, 1948) **Brief in Opposition to Appellee's Motion to ...** (NO. 11)★★
- 500 Winters v. People of the State of New York, 1947 WL 43990, \*43990+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 08, 1947) **Appellee's Brief on Reargument** (NO. 3)★★
- 501 U.S. v. Petrillo, 1947 WL 44079, \*44079+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 24, 1947) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 954)★★
- 502 Testa v. Katt, 1947 WL 43902, \*43902+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 06, 1947) **Brief for Respondent.** (NO. 431)★★

- 503 Testa v. Katt, 1947 WL 43901, \*43901+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 16, 1947) **Brief for the Petitioners** (NO. 431)★★
- 504 Hirabayashi v. U.S., 1943 WL 71885, \*71885+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. May 08, 1943) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 870)★★
- 505 Matton Steamboat Co. v. Miller, 1943 WL 54764, \*54764+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 17, 1943) **Brief on Behalf of Appellants** (NO. 783) ""★★
- 506 Waterman S.S. Corp. v. Jones, 1943 WL 71792, \*71792+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 25, 1943) **Brief on Behalf of Respondent on Writ of ...** (NO. 582)★★
- 507 Scheneotady Union Pub. Co. v. Sweeney, 1942 WL 53662, \*53662+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 28, 1942) **Brief for the Respondent.** (NO. 745)★★
- 508 Southern S.S. Co. v. N.L.R.B., 1942 WL 53582, \*53582+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 1942) **Brief for the National Labor Relations Board** (NO. 320) ""★★
- 509 Southern S.S. Co. v. N.L.R.B., 1941 WL 52785, \*52785+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1941) **Brief for the National Maritime Union of America, ...** (NO. 320)★★
- 510 Southern S.S. Co. v. N.L.R.B., 1941 WL 52786, \*52786+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1941) **Brief of American Merchant Marine Institute, ...** (NO. 320)★★
- 511 Thornhill v. Alabama, 1940 WL 47039, \*47039+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 05, 1940) **Brief for Respondent** (NO. 514)★★
- 512 U.S. v. Miller, 1939 WL 48353, \*48353+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 1939) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 696)★★
- 513 U.S. v. Miller, 1939 WL 48352, \*48352 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 03, 1939) **Statement As To Jurisdiction** (NO. 696)★
- 514 Joseph S. Finch & Co. v. McKittrick, 1938 WL 39465, \*39465+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1938) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 252, 253, 254, 255, 256)★★
- 515 Beeck v. Sabine Towing Co., Inc., 1937 WL 40653, \*40653 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 03, 1937) **Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 460)★★
- 516 Associated Press v. Nat. Labor Relations Bd., 1937 WL 40512, \*40512+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 22, 1937) **Brief on Behalf of Petitioner the Associated Press** (NO. 365)★★
- 517 Associated Press v. Nat. Labor Relations Bd., 1936 WL 64995, \*64995+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct Term 1936) **Brief for the National Labor Relations Board** (NO. 365)★★
- 518 Warner v. Goltra., 1934 WL 60231, \*60231 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 17, 1934) **Petitioner's Brief on the Merits.** (NO. 4) ""★★
- 519 U.S. v. Gibson, 1934 WL 60210, \*60210+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 1934) **Brief for the United States** (NO. 659)★★
- 520 J. M. NEAR, Appellant, v. STATE OF MINNESOTA Ex Rel. Floyd B. Olson, County Attorney of Hennepin County, Minnesota, Appellee., 1931 WL 30640, \*30640+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 19, 1931) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 91)★★★
- 521 Near v. Minnesota, 1931 WL 67634, \*67634+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 19, 1931) **Brief of Appellee.** (NO. 91)★★★
- 522 J. M. NEAR, Appellant, v. STATE OF MINNESOTA ex rel. Floyd B. Olson, County Attorney of Hennepin County, Minnesota, Appellee., 1930 WL 28681, \*28681+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 12, 1930) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 91)★★
- 523 Near v. Minnesota, 1930 WL 30038, \*30038+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 12, 1930) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 91)★★
- 524 Alec S. COSTERUS, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. Barry NEAL, Timothy Landers, Peter Holman, John Kennedy, Paul McGrath, Leonard J. Wetherbee, Town of Concord, Brian J. Scott, Jonathan F. Philbrook Town of Marion, Argeo Paul Cellucci, Thomas Reilly Martha Coakley, Erin Duggan, Jane Perlov, John J. O'Brien, East Boston District Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Defendants - Appellees., 2001 WL 36011968, \*36011968+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Sep 24, 2001) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 01-1493)★★

- 525 Patricia A. WILLS, individually and as personal representative of the Estate of Ricky Lee Wills deceased, on behalf of Ricky Lee Wills, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. AMERADA HESS CORP., Spentonbush/Red, Red Star Companies, Inc., Sheridan Transportation Corp., and Hygrade Operators, Inc., Defendant(s)-Respondents., 2004 WL 3464120, \*3464120+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Oct 12, 2004) **Plaintiff-Appellant'S Memorandum of Law in ...** (NO. 02-7913) ""★★
- 526 David D. BACH, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. George E. PATAKI, in his official capacity as Governor of New York; Eliot Spitzer, in his official capacity as Attorney General of New York; James W. McMahon, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the New York State Police; and J. Richard Bockelmann, in his official capacity as Ulster County Sheriff, Defendants-Appellees., 2004 WL 3588175, \*3588175+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. May 21, 2004) **Reply Brief of Plaintiff-Appellant David D. Bach** (NO. 03-9123)★★
- 527 David D. BACH, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. George E. PATAKI, in his official capacity as Governor of New York; Eliot Spitzer, in his official capacity as Attorney General of New York; James W. McMahon, in his official capacity as Superintendent, New York State Police and Richard Bockelmann, in his capacity as Ulster County Sheriff, Defendants-Appellees., 2004 WL 3588177, \*3588177+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. May 07, 2004) **Brief for Defendants-Appellees** (NO. 03-9123) ""★★★
- 528 Sheriff Samuel FRANK, Orange County, Vermont, Plaintiff-Appellee/Cross-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant-Appellant/Cross-Appellee., 1995 WL 17203738, \*17203738+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Apr 21, 1995) **Brief of Handgun Control, Inc., Center to Prevent ...** (NO. 95-6019, 95-6023)★★
- 529 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee, v. Steven L. BELL, Appellant., 2002 WL 32922243, \*32922243+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Sep 30, 2002) **Brief for Appellee United States of America** (NO. 02-2340) ""★★
- 530 William W. EVANS, Appellant/Cross-Appellee, v. UNITED ARAB SHIPPING COMPANY, (S.A.G.) and M/V AL Wattyah, her engines, boilers, etc., in rem, Appellee/Cross-Appellant; William W. Evans, Appellant, United ARAB Shipping Company, (S.A.G.) and M/V AL Wattyah, Appellee/Cross-Appellant., 1992 WL 12133687, \*12133687+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Aug 03, 1992) **Brief of Appellant/Cross-Appellee William W. Evans** (NO. 92-5300, 92-5301)★★
- 531 Jose PADILLA, Petitioner-Appellee, v. C. T. HANFT, U.S.N. Commander, Consolidated Naval Brig, Respondent-Appellant., 2005 WL 1656799, \*1656799+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Jun 13, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Comparative Law Scholars ...** (NO. 05-6396)★★
- 532 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee, v. Michael CHERRY, Appellant., 1991 WL 11249773, \*11249773 (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Feb 11, 1991) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 90-5544) ""★★
- 533 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee, v. Michael CHERRY, Appellant., 1991 WL 11249775, \*11249775 (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Feb 11, 1991) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 90-5544) ""★★
- 534 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee, v. Keith Thelbert JONES, Appellant., 1975 WL 183944, \*183944+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Aug 20, 1975) **Brief and Appendix for Appellee** (NO. 75-1550)★★
- 535 RICHMOND SHIPPING COMPANY LTD; East Coast Marine Co Ltd., Plaintiffs - Appellees, THE WEST OF ENGLAND SHIP OWNERS MUTUAL INSURANCE ASSOCIATION (LUXEMBOURG); Riise Shipping Inc; Suderman and Young Towing Co; Houston Ship Repair Inc; Triton Marine Fuels, Ltd; CMP Coatings Inc; Hamburg Shipping Services GMBH; Marimar Marine Industries Inc; Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's London; Universal Cooperatives Inc., Intervenor Plaintiffs - Appellees, BRITANNIA MARINE SERVICES, 2000 WL 34214518, \*34214518+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. 2000) **Brief of Appellants, the Former Crew of the M/V ...** (NO. 99-20972)★★
- 536 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Timothy Joe EMERSON, Defendant-Appellee., 1999 WL 33631489, \*33631489+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Dec 20, 1999) **Brief of Amici Curiae Ethan Allen Institute ...** (NO. 99-10331)★★

- 537 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Timothy Joe EMERSON, Defendant-Appellee., 1999 WL 33607237, \*33607237+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Sep 07, 1999) **Brief FOF Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, ...** (NO. 99-10331)★★
- 538 ROWAN COMPANIES INCORPORATED, Plaintiff - Counter Defendant - Appellee, v. Berwin B MCCURDY, Jr, Defendant - Counter Claimant - Appellant., 1997 WL 33618560, \*33618560+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Oct 31, 1997) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 97-20759) ""★★
- 539 PETER SCALAMANDRE & SONS, INC., et al., Plaintiffs, Merco Joint VENTURE, Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant/Appellee, v. Hugh B. KAUFMAN, et al., Defendants, Hugh B. KAUFMAN and Tristar Television, Inc., Defendants/Counter-Plaintiffs/Appellants., 1996 WL 33474640, \*33474640+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Sep 05, 1996) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Accuracy in Media, Inc.** (NO. 96-50253)★★
- 540 Allan G. MANACAP, Rodolfo M. Spida, Andres P. Beloy, Fernando E. Dimacuha, Mauro Laguerta, Ben M. Jalocon, and Eugenio B. Dillo, Plaintiffs, v. BORA CORPORATION, INC. and Jardin Ship Management Ltd., Defendants., 1995 WL 17110916, \*17110916+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Jan 13, 1995) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 94-20638)★★
- 541 Sheriff J.R. KOOG, Val Verde County, Texas, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant-Appellee; Sheriff Bill McGEE and Forrest County, Mississippi, Plaintiffs-Appellants/Cross-Appellees, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant-Appellee/Cross-Appellant., 1994 WL 16059108, \*16059108+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Dec 16, 1994) **Brief of Handgun Control, Inc., Center to Prevent ...** (NO. 94-50562, 94-60518())★★
- 542 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Thomas Clinton MARTIN, Defendant-Appellant., 1993 WL 13124789, \*13124789+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. May 10, 1993) **Defendant-Appellant's Pro Se Supplemental Brief** (NO. 92-2761)★★
- 543 Woodrow C. MCQUEEN and Helen Mcqueen, Plaintiffs/Appellees, v. MCDERMOTT OFFSHORE SERVICES COMPANY, INC. Mcdermott International, Inc. and the Babcock & Wilcox Company, Defendants/Appellants., 1992 WL 12145009, \*12145009+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. May 20, 1992) **Original Brief on Behalf of Plaintiffs-Appellees, ...** (NO. 91-3756)★★
- 544 Carlos W. ORTIS and Tammy O. Ortis, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. DELMAR OFFSHORE, INC., and/or Delmar Systems, Inc., Penrod Drilling Company and the M/V Kodiak II, her Gear, Tackle, Engines, Equipment and Appurtenances, Defendants-Appellees., 1991 WL 11251347, \*11251347+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Apr 11, 1991) **Original Brief of Plaintiff-Appellants Carlos W. ...** (NO. 90-4945)★★
- 545 Carlos W. ORTIS and Tammy O. Ortis, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. DELMAR OFFSHORE, INC. and/or Delmar Systems, Inc., Penrod Drilling Company and the M/V Kodiak II, her Gear, Tackle, Engines, Equipment and Appurtenances, Defendants-Appellees., 1991 WL 11251349, \*11251349+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Apr 11, 1991) **Original Brief of Plaintiff-Appellants Carlos W. ...** (NO. 90-4945)★★
- 546 Gerard N. HAAS, Jr., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. STATE OF WISCONSIN, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2003 WL 22734119, \*22734119+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. Jun 06, 2003) **Plaintiff-Appellant's Brief** (NO. 03-1450)★★
- 547 Andre Tony WALLS, Appellant, v. Deanna HILLER, Michael Isaacson, and Federal Bureau of Prisons, Appellees., 2001 WL 34155520, \*34155520+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. 2001) **Brief of Appellees** (NO. 01-2997)★★
- 548 Noel CORNELIO, et al., Petitioners, v. NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, Respondent., 2007 WL 1308630, \*1308630+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Mar 08, 2007) **Petitioners' Reply Brief** (NO. 06-74745)★★
- 549 CALIFORNIA FIRST AMENDMENT COALITION and Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Chapter, Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Jeanne WOODFORD, Warden of San Quentin Prison, and C.A. Terhune, Director of the California Department of Corrections, Defendants-Appellants., 2001 WL 34095805, \*34095805 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. May 07, 2001) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 00-16752)★★

- 550 Roger W. KNIGHT, Appellant, v. Norm MALENG, King County Prosecuting Attorney, and Calvin G. Rapada, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Appellees., 2000 WL 33986829, \*33986829+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Oct 02, 2000) **Reply Brief** (NO. 00-35625)★★
- 551 Roger W. KNIGHT, Appellant, v. Norm MALENG, King County Prosecuting Attorney, and Calving Rapada, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Appellee., 2000 WL 33986828, \*33986828+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Aug 28, 2000) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 00-35625) ""★★★
- 552 TCW SPECIAL CREDITS, Plaintiff, v. M/V CHLOEZ, Defendant; Appellant, v. Slobodan Pranjic, Intervening Plaintiff; Appellee., 1999 WL 33627544, \*33627544+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Sep 27, 1999) **Appellee's Answering Brief** (NO. 99-15136, 99-15350, 99-15612, 99-15663)★★
- 553 TCW SPECIAL CREDITS, Plaintiff, v. M / V CHLOE Z, Defendant; Appellant, v. Slobodan PRANJIC, Intervening Plaintiff, Appellee., 1999 WL 33727180, \*33727180+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Sep 27, 1999) **Appellee's Answering Brief** (NO. 99-15136, 99-15350, 99-15612, 99-15663)★★
- 554 TCW SPECIAL CREDITS, a California general partnership, as Agent and Nominee, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. FISHING VESSEL CHLOE Z, Official No. 653391, Her Engines, Nets, Furniture, etc., in rem; and Chloe Z Fishing Co., Inc. a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands corporation, in personam, Defendants, Juan Barandriaran, et al., Plaintiffs-in-Intervention/Respondents., 1997 WL 33555989, \*33555989+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. May 22, 1997) **Brief for the United States as Amicus Curiae** (NO. 97-15726) ""★★
- 555 James LANE, Denise Lien, Carl Offenheiser and the class of similarly situated persons who worked aboard the F/T Ocean Rover, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. BIRTING FISHERIES, INC., and F/T Ocean Rover, Official Number 552100, her engines, tackle, equipment, appurtenances, freights, and cargo in Rem, Defendants/Appellees., 1995 WL 17066001, \*17066001+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Dec 13, 1995) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 95-35847) ""★★
- 556 SAN DIEGO COUNTY GUN RIGHTS COMMITTEE, Mark Bruce Skane, Henri Jon Donald Buettner, John Wallner, San Diego Militia, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Janet RENO, Attorney General of the United States of America; Frank Newman, acting Secretary of the Treasury; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Defendants-Appellees., 1995 WL 17017135, \*17017135+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Oct 09, 1995) **Appellants' Opening Brief** (NO. 95-55811)★★
- 557 Sheriff Richard MACK, Graham County, Arizona, Plaintiff-Appellee/Cross-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant-Appellant/Cross-Appellee., 1995 WL 17014411, \*17014411+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 10, 1995) **Brief of Handgun Control, Inc., Center to Prevent ...** (NO. 94-16940, 94-17002)★★
- 558 Douglas Ray HICKMAN, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, Sherman Block, Patrick G. Leonard, Claude Farris, Ned Barston, the City of Los Angeles, Robert M. Talcott, Herbert F. Boekmann, Reva B. Tooley, Samuel L. Williams, Stephen D. Yslas, Frank E. Peirsol, the City of San Fernando, and Dominick J. Rivetti, Defendants and Appellees., 1994 WL 16133623, \*16133623+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Sep 22, 1994) **Brief of Appellees City of San Fernando and ...** (NO. 94-55836)★★
- 559 Steve BASTIBLE, et alia, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. WEYERHAEUSER CO., Defendant/Appellee; Jimmie Wyatt, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. Weyerhaeuser Co., Defendant/Appellee; Ryan Lewis, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. Weyerhaeuser Co., Defendant/Appellee., 2005 WL 2481841, \*2481841 (Appellate Brief) (10th Cir. Jun 22, 2005) **Appellants' Consolidated Brief** (NO. 05-7037, 05-7038, 05-7039)★
- 560 Keith and Stephanie HENDRICKS, Appellants, v. MASSON SHIPPING, et al., Appellees., 1998 WL 34152497, \*34152497+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Oct 30, 1998) **Brief of Appellees Unishipping, S.A. and ...** (NO. 98-8659)★★
- 561 C. F. TAYLOR, v. ENERGY SAVING AUDITORS, INC.; James (Jim) Cole; Richard Pou; J.L.C. Enterprises, Inc.; Jacques Louis Cote; Vision Impact Corp.; Dan Young; Rus Spitz; Society of Energy Professionals International; Wayne L. Stallsmith; Hy-Save Inc.; Rus Smith; Builders Square; Dave Attebery; Frank G. Felicella; K-Mart Corporation; Ronald J. Floto; Lear Associates, Inc.; Joe Glasheen; Gordon Meyers, jointly and severally., 1997 WL 33627279, \*33627279+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Aug 27, 1997) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 97-4701)★★



- 562 IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF BOUCHARD TRANSPORTATION CO., INC.,  
etc., Limitation Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, etc.,  
Claimants-Appellees., 1997 WL 33625261, \*33625261+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Jun 17, 1997)  
**Brief of Appellants: Bouchard Transportation Co., ...** (NO. 96-3494)★★
- 563 James O'BOYLE, Appellant, v. FRANK ORTH & ASSOCIATES, Appellee., 1993 WL 13126587,  
\*13126587+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Oct 04, 1993) **Appellant's Initial Brief** (NO. 93-4323)★
- 564 James O'BOYLE, Appellant, v. FRANK ORTH & ASSOCIATES, Appellee., 1993 WL 13126590,  
\*13126590+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Oct 04, 1993) **Appellant's Initial Brief** (NO. 93-4323)★
- 565 Joyce EVANS, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Defendant-Appellee., 2007 WL 1508336, \*1508336 (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Mar 28, 2007)  
**Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation ...** (NO. 07-5045)★★
- 566 Shelly PARKER, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al.,  
Defendants-Appellees., 2006 WL 2187169, \*2187169+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Jul 21, 2006)  
**Brief for the District of Columbia** (NO. 04-7041) ""★★★
- 567 Shelly PARKER, Dick Anthony Heller, Tom G. Palmer, Gillian St. Lawrence, Tracey Ambeau, and  
George Lyon, Appellants, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA and Anthony Williams, Appellees., 2006  
WL 2041482, \*2041482+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Jun 16, 2006) **Brief of the States of Texas,  
Alabama, Arkansas, ...** (NO. 04-7041) ""★★★
- 568 Sandra SEEGARS, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants-Cross-Appellees, v. John D. ASHCROFT, Attorney  
General of the United States, Defendant-Appellee-Cross-Appellant, Anthony A. WILLIAMS,  
Mayor of the District of Columbia, Defendant-Appellee., 2004 WL 1656665, \*1656665+  
(Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Jul 12, 2004) **Brief For The District Of Columbia** (NO.  
04-5016-5081)★★
- 569 Sandra SEEGARS, Gardine Hailes, Absalom F. Jordan, Jr., Carmela B. Brown, and Robert N.  
Hemphill, Appellants and Cross-Appellees, v. John D. ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the  
United States, Appellee and Cross-Appellant, Anthony A. Williams, Mayor, District of Columbia,  
Appellee., 2004 WL 2578140, \*2578140+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. May 19, 2004) **Brief for  
Appellants/Cross-Appellees** (NO. 04-5016, 04-5081)★★
- 570 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee, v. Jerome MAPLE, Appellant., 2003 WL 25586115,  
\*25586115+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Jan 10, 2003) **Brief for Appellee** (NO. 01-3109) ""★★
- 571 State of arizona, Appellee, v. David L. TAYLOR, Appellant., 1991 WL 11651655, \*11651655+  
(Appellate Brief) (Ariz. May 03, 1991) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. CR-91-0012-PR)★★
- 572 Lawrence M. ROBERTSON, Jr., M.D.; Sharon Deatherage; Jeffrey Hecht; and David Jewell, d/b/a/  
Scotties Guns & Militaria, Plaintiffs-Appellees, State of Colorado ex rel. Gale A. Norton,  
Plaintiff/Intervenor-Appellee, v. THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER; Ari Zavaras, Chief of  
Police of the City and County of Denver; and Manuel Martinez, Manager of Safety and Ex-Officio  
Sheriff of the City and County of Denver, Defendants-Appellants., 1993 WL 13038209, \*13038209  
(Appellate Brief) (Colo. Sep 21, 1993) (sic)(Answer)(sic) **Appellees' Reply Brief** (NO. 93SA91)  
""★★
- 573 Lavenski O. DRUMGOOLE, Devenn Smith, Appellants, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Appellee., 2004 WL 5285395, \*5285395+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C. Dec 30, 2004) **Appeal from the  
Superior Court of the District of ...** (NO. 03-CF-864, 03-CF-1012) ""★★
- 574 Lavenski O. DRUMGOOLE, Devenn Smith, Appellants, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Appellee., 2004 WL 5394168, \*5394168 (Appellate Brief) (D.C. Dec 30, 2004) **Brief for Appellee**  
(NO. 03-CF-864, 03-CF-1012)★★
- 575 Thadduse LEE Hartridge, Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee; James  
Thomas Cullison, Appellant, v. United States of America, Appellee; Mark A. Ford, Appellant, v.  
United States of America, Appellee., 2003 WL 25481582, \*25481582+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.  
Mar 20, 2003) **Joint Supplemental Brief for Appellants** (NO. 97-CF-1867, 97-CF-2028,  
98-CF-153) ""★★

- 576 Lavenski O. DRUMGOOLE, Devenn Smith, Appellants, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee., 2003 WL 25568097, \*25568097 (Appellate Brief) (D.C. 2003) **Brief for Appellee** (NO. 03-CF-864, 03-CF-1012) ""★★
- 577 GREAT BEGINNINGS CHILD CARE, INC., an Idaho nonprofit corporation; Lois Flaherty, an individual; Chris Birdwell, an individual; Wendy Wall, an individual; and Chris Lee, an individual, Petitioners/Appellants/Cross-Respondents, v. Jerry HARRIS, Director of the Department of Health and Welfare; State of Idaho Department of Health and Welfare; State of Idaho Board of Health and Welfare, Respondents, Idaho Office for Children, an Office of, 1994 WL 16179536, \*16179536+ (Appellate Brief) (Idaho Dec 21, 1994) **Respondent/Cross-Appellant's Brief** (NO. 21497)★★
- 578 Suzanne McKINLEY, Petitioner-Appellant, v. IOWA DISTRICT COURT FOR POLK COUNTY, Respondent-Appellee., 1995 WL 17798396, \*17798396+ (Appellate Brief) (Iowa Sep 01, 1995) **State's Brief Pursuant to Special Request and ...** (NO. 94-0357)★★
- 579 Bryan NIEWALD, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Myron SSAFE, Chief of Police, Defendant-Appellee., 1995 WL 17146933, \*17146933+ (Appellate Brief) (Kan.App. Feb 23, 1995) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 95-73337-A) ""★★
- 580 STATE OF MINNESOTA, Respondent, v. Kristen Rae MANYPENNY, Appellant., 2002 WL 32704411, \*32704411 (Appellate Brief) (Minn.App. Dec 04, 2002) **Appellant's Pro Se Supplemental Brief** (NO. CX-02-855)★★
- 581 State of New Mexico, ex rel. Jim BACA, Mayor of Albuquerque, Petitioner, v. Nicholas BAKAS, Secretary of the New Mexico Department of Public Safety, Respondent, Ken McWethy, Heather Bartels, and Paul Lisle, Intervenor., 2002 WL 32993919, \*32993919+ (Appellate Brief) (N.M. Jan 08, 2002) **Brief of Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence, ...** (NO. 27149) ""★★★
- 582 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, Respondent, v. Carlos DIAZ, Defendant-Appellant., 2001 WL 34151580, \*34151580+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Aug 02, 2001) **Brief for Respondent** (NO. 2001-0136)★★
- 583 Chuck KLEIN, et al. Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Jr., Sheriff, et al. Defendant-Appellants., 2003 WL 23514699, \*23514699+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Jan 02, 2003) **Reply Brief of the County, Township and Municipal ...** (NO. 2002-0585)★★
- 584 Chuck KLEIN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Sheriff, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2002 WL 32506590, \*32506590+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Dec 31, 2002) **Reply Brief of Defendant-Appellant City of ...** (NO. 2002-585) ""★★★
- 585 Chuck KLEIN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Sheriff, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2002 WL 32506419, \*32506419+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Oct 28, 2002) **Merit Brief of Defendant-Appellant City of ...** (NO. 2002-0585) ""★★
- 586 Chuck KLEIN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Jr., Sheriff, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2002 WL 32506589, \*32506589+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Oct 28, 2002) **Merit Brief of the County, Township and Municipal ...** (NO. 2002-0585)★★
- 587 Chuck KLEIN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Sheriff, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2002 WL 32506422, \*32506422+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Oct 25, 2002) **Amici Curiae Brief in Support of the ...** (NO. 2002-0585)★★
- 588 Chuck KLEIN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Sheriff, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2002 WL 32153967, \*32153967+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Oct 23, 2002) **Merit Brief of Defendant-Appellant City of ...** (NO. 02-585, COURTOFAPPEALSC-0200, C-020013, C-020015, C-020021) ""★★
- 589 Charles H. MOSBY, Jr. and Steven Golotto, Appellants, v. Vincent MCATEER, in his capacity as Chief of the Rhode Island Bureau of Criminal Identification, and Patrick Lynch, in his capacity as Rhode Island Attorney General, Appellees., 2003 WL 24135730, \*24135730+ (Appellate Brief) (R.I. May 15, 2003) **Brief of Amicuriae Brady Center to Preyent Gun ...** (NO. 01-0161)★★
- 590 Charles H. Mosby, Jr. and Steven Golotto, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Vincent MCATEER, in his capacity as Chief of the Rhode Island Bureau of Criminal Identification and Sheldon Whitehouse, in his capacity as Rhode Island Attorney General, Defendants-Appellees., 2003 WL 24135729, \*24135729+ (Appellate Brief) (R.I. Apr 30, 2003) **Brief of the Attorney General** (NO. 01-161) ""★★

- 591 State of WISCONSIN Plaintiff-Respondent, v. Munir HAMDAN, Defendant-Appellant., 2002 WL 32373751, \*32373751+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis. Aug 26, 2002) **Supplemental Reply Brief of Defendant-Appellant ...** (NO. 01-0056-CR)★★
- 592 State of WISCONSIN, Plaintiff-Respondent, v. Munir A. HAMDAN, Defendant-Appellant., 2002 WL 32373750, \*32373750+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis. Aug 14, 2002) **Supplemental Brief of Plaintiff-Respondent** (NO. 01-0056-CR)★★
- 593 Printz v. U.S., 1996 WL 585868, \*585868+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 10, 1996) **BRIEF OF HANDGUN CONTROL, INC., CENTER TO PREVENT ...** (NO. 95-1478, 95-1503)★★
- 594 Printz v. U.S., 1996 WL 469119, \*469119+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 16, 1996) **BRIEF OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS AND ...** (NO. 95-1478, 95-1503)★★
- 595 Miles v. Apex Marine Corp., 1990 WL 508055, \*508055+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Apr 27, 1990) **BRIEF ON THE MERITS ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER** (NO. 89-1158)★★

#### Trial Court Documents (U.S.A.)

##### Trial Pleadings

- 596 Don HAMRICK, U.S. Merchant Seaman, Plaintiff, Pro Se, v. David Michael GEORGE Dragan Samardzic, Fleet Manager U.S. Ship Management, Inc. Patrick O'Leary, Chief Mate M/V SeaLand Voyager John Williamson,Boatswain M/V SeaLand Voyager, Defendants., 2004 WL 2236381, \*2236381 (Trial Pleading) (W.D.N.C. Jul 19, 2004) **Seaman's Complaint of Wrongful/Malicious ...** (NO. 304CV344K)★★
- 597 Larry BANZET, Plaintiff, v. Mickey PERRY, dba Claremore Police Dept. Defendant, (individual and official capacity), Mark Robertson, dba as Robertson Tire Co. Defendant, (individual and official capacity)., 2007 WL 2206970, \*2206970 (Trial Pleading) (N.D.Okla. May 07, 2007) **Federal Civil Rights Complaint Freedom of Speech** (NO. 07CV-270CVEFHM)★★

##### Trial Motions, Memoranda and Affidavits

- 598 Sandra SEEGARS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. John D. ASHCROFT, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 24057328, \*24057328+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Sep 2003) **Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum to Amici Curiae ...** (NO. 1-03CV00834, RGW)★★
- 599 Shelly PARKER, et al., Plaintiffs, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 24057345, \*24057345 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Aug 28, 2003) **Memorandum of Amicus Curiae the Heartland ...** (NO. 03-CV-0213-EGS)★
- 600 Sandra SEEGARS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. John D. ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the United States, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 22217691, \*22217691 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Jun 09, 2003) **Motion to Dismiss of Defendant Attorney General ...** (NO. 103CV00834, RBW)★★
- 601 Sandra SEEGARS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. John D. ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the United States, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 23650500, \*23650500 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Jun 09, 2003) **Motion to Dismiss of Defendant Attorney General ...** (NO. 103CV00834(RBW))★★
- 602 Sandra SEEGARS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. John D. ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the United States, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 24057322, \*24057322 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Jun 09, 2003) **Motion to Dismiss of Defendant Attorney General ...** (NO. 103CV00834, RBW)★★
- 603 Sandra SEEGARS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. John D. ASHCROFT, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 23650503, \*23650503 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. 2003) **Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant Williams' ...** (NO. 1-03CV00834(RGW))★★
- 604 Sandra SEEGARS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. John D. ASHCROFT, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 24057323, \*24057323 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. 2003) **Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant Williams' ...** (NO. 1-03CV00834(RGW))★★

- 605 In re: WILLIAMS MARINE CONSTRUCTION AND SERVICES, INC. etc., 2003 WL 23774191, \*23774191 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Fla. Apr 23, 2003) **Emergency Motion to Require Williams Marine to ...** (NO. 303-CV-293-J-16-HTS)★
- 606 Barbara MATUSZEVOSKA, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Joseph Francisco Avila Argueta, Deceased, Plaintiff, v. PRINCESS CRUISE LINES, LTD. (CORP.), Defendant., 2006 WL 3668051, \*3668051 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Oct 19, 2006) **Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant's ...** (NO. 60-21975-CIV-ALTONAG)★★
- 607 Mohan Rao KODA, Plaintiff, v. CARNIVAL CORPORATION d/b/a Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc., Defendant., 2006 WL 2841333, \*2841333 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Aug 24, 2006) **Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant's ...** (NO. 06-21088-CIV-HOEVELE)★★
- 608 Stewart GREENBERG Plaintiff, pro se, v. James ZINGALE, Chairman, Executive Director Florida Department of Revenue, in his official capacity and, Florida Department of Revenue and, Fifteenth Judicial Circuit Court of Florida, The Honorable Edward Fine, Chief Judge Defendants., 2004 WL 3343014, \*3343014 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Aug 16, 2004) **Plaintiff's Objection to Magistrate's Report and ...** (NO. 04-80443-CIV-RYSKAMP)★★
- 609 Ana COLAK, Plaintiff, v. RADISSON SEVEN SEAS, et al, Defendants., 2004 WL 2463819, \*2463819 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Aug 13, 2004) **Motion and Memorandum to Reconsider Order ...** (NO. 001CV7765LENARD)★
- 610 NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC., et al., Plaintiffs, v. C. Ray NAGIN, Mayor of New Orleans, and Warren Riley, Superintendent of Police, New Orleans, Defendants., 2006 WL 1034827, \*1034827 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.La. Feb 27, 2006) **Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants' Rule ...** (NO. 05-4234)★★
- 611 Donald HORTON, Plaintiff, v. ANDRIE, INC., Defendant., 2005 WL 2577983, \*2577983 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Mich. Sep 01, 2005) **Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's Motion in ...** (NO. 104-CV-0480)★★
- 612 Michael WILLIAMSON, the Estate of Don C. Craft, Kirk O'Donnell, John Lettow, Timothy McGinnis, Fred Newton, William Watson, Chris Hancock, Dale Schoeneman and International Deep Sea Survey, Inc., Plaintiffs, v. RECOVERY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, Columbus Exploration, LLC, Columbus-America Discovery Group, Inc., Columbus Exploration Limited Partnership, Omni Engineering, Inc., Omni Engineering of Ohio, Inc., Economic Zone Resource Associates, Economic Zone Resource, 2006 WL 3618881, \*3618881 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.N.Y. Oct 23, 2006) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Opposition to ...** (NO. 065724, LTS)★★
- 613 Chad M. MILLS, Plaintiff, v. DUROCHER DOCK & DREDGE, INC., Defendant., 2006 WL 499756, \*499756 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ohio Jan 16, 2006) **Motion in Limine Re: Evidence Preclusion** (NO. 05-CV-540)★★
- 614 John WESTFALL, Plaintiff, v. Maersk LINE, Limited, Defendant., 2006 WL 499673, \*499673 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ohio Jan 11, 2006) **Plaintiff's Trial Brief** (NO. 104-CV-1088)★★
- 615 Chad M. MILLS, Plaintiff, v. DUROCHER DOCK & DREDGE, INC., Defendant., 2005 WL 3337118, \*3337118 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ohio Nov 08, 2005) **Plaintiff's Brief in Opposition to Defendants ...** (NO. 05-CV-540)★★
- 616 Raymond MYERS, Plaintiff, v. OGLEBAY NORTON MARINE SERVICES COMPANY, LLC, Defendant., 2005 WL 3336691, \*3336691 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ohio Nov 07, 2005) **Plaintiffs Motion in Limine Re: Evidence ...** (NO. 103-CV-2537)★★
- 617 THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC. et alia, Plaintiffs, v. C. Brad HENRY, Governor of the State of Oklahoma; W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, Defendants., 2005 WL 2414642, \*2414642+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Okla. Jul 13, 2005) **Response Brief of Amici, Jimmie Wyatt et alia** (NO. 04-CV-820-TCK-PJC)★★
- 618 WHIRLPOOL CORP., Plaintiff, v. Hon Brad HENRY et al., Defendants., 2004 WL 3341934, \*3341934 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Okla. Nov 03, 2004) **Memrandum of Law by Intervenors, Jimmie Wyatt et ...** (NO. CV-04-820(H))★★

- 619 Larry G. MERRILL, Plaintiff, v. ICICLE SEAFOODS, INC., Defendant., 2005 WL 2889443, \*2889443 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Wash. Sep 14, 2005) **Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to ...** (NO. C04-1721L)★★
- 620 Roberto BATISTA, Plaintiff, v. SUPREME ALASKA SEAFOOD, INC., Defendant., 2005 WL 2889459, \*2889459 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Wash. Sep 13, 2005) **Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Motion In ...** (NO. C-04-1851-L)★★
- 621 Alpha Doris D. LASSITER, et al Plaintiffs, v. THE CITY OF BREMERTON, et al., Defendants., 2003 WL 23959382, \*23959382+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Wash. Jun 02, 2003) **3. Second Resposnse in Opposition to Motion to ...** (NO. CO3-5166RJB)★★
- 622 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA and Adrian M. Fenty, Mayor of the District of Columbia, Petitioners, v. Dick Anthony HELLER, Respondent., 2007 WL 2608849, \*2608849+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (U.S.Tax Ct. Sep 04, 2007) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-290) ""★★
- 623 Chuck KLEIN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Sheriff, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2002 WL 32153912, \*32153912 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Ohio May 24, 2002) **Memorandum of Amici Curiae Ohio Association of ...** (NO. 02-585, C-020012, C-020013, C-020015, C-020021) ""★★
- 624 Chuck KLEIN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Simon L. LEIS, Sheriff, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2002 WL 32153913, \*32153913 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Ohio May 24, 2002) **Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction of ...** (NO. 02-585, C-020012, C-020013, C-020015, C-020021) ""★★

#### Jury Instructions

- 625 Steven TAVARES, Plaintiff, v. NELSON FISHING, INC., Defendant., 2006 WL 3890991, \*3890991 (Jury Instruction) (Mass.Super. Sep 29, 2006) **Plaintiff's Request for Jury Instructions** (NO. 03-01103)★★

#### Positive & Neutral Cases (Canada)

##### Considered in

- 626 Head v Ontario Provincial Police Commissioner, 16 D.L.R. (4th) 768, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 566, 8 O.A.C. 368, 59 N.R. 81, 1985 CarswellOnt 937, 1985 CarswellOnt 1370, 50 O.R. (2d) 118 (S.C.C. May 09, 1985)
- 627 Klein v Law Society of Upper Canada, 16 D.L.R. (4th) 489, 8 O.A.C. 161, 1985 CarswellOnt 1566, 50 O.R. (2d) 118, 13 C.R.R. 120, [1985] O.J. No. 2321 (Ont. Div. Ct. Feb 04, 1985)

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