5 S.Ct. 241 Supreme Court of the United States.

ARTHUR, late Collector, etc.,

v.

MORGAN.

December 22, 1884.

Synopsis

In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

West Headnotes (2)

[1] Customs Duties

Personal and household effects of persons arriving in United States

114 Customs Duties114II Goods Subject to Duty, Rate, and Amount

114k38 Free List

114k38(2) Personal and household effects of persons arriving in United States A carriage in use abroad for a year by its owner, who brings it to this country for his own use here, and not for another person, nor for sale, is "household effects," under Rev.St. § 2505, and free from duty.

53 Cases that cite this headnote

[2] Customs Duties

🧼 Protest

114 Customs Duties114XIV Recovery of Duties Paid114k103 Conditions Precedent114k105 Protest

A protest against paying 35 per cent. duty on a carriage brought into the United States by the owner, which states that the carriage is "personal effects," and had been used over a year (as shown by affidavit), and that, under Rev.St. § 2505 "personal effects in actual use" are free from duty, is a sufficient protest, on which the amount paid for duty can be recovered back on the ground that the carriage was free from duty as "household effects," under the same section.

71 Cases that cite this headnote

Attorneys and Law Firms

**241 *497 Sol. Gen. Phillips, for plaintiff in error.

Edward Hartley and *Walter H. Coleman*, for defendant in error.

Opinion

BLATCHFORD, J.

*496 Julia Morgan imported into the port of New York, from Europe, in May, 1876, a carriage on which, at the appraised value of \$667, the collector exacted a duty of 35 per cent., amounting to \$233.45, under the following provision of Schedule M of section 2504 of the Revised Statutes, p. 474, (2d Ed.:) 'Carriages and parts of carriages: thirty-five per centum ad valorem.' She protested in writing to the collector against paying the 35 per cent. duty, on the ground that the carriage was 'personal effects,' and had been used by her 'over a year,' and that she had shown that fact by affidavit; and that, under section 2505 of the Revised Statutes, 'personal effects in actual use' were free from duty. She appealed from the decision of the collector to the secretary of the treasury, and he affirmed it, and then she brought this suit. At the trial the above facts were shown, and the plaintiff proved that the affidavit referred to was to the effect that the carriage was old, and had been in use by her abroad for more than one year before its importation; that the affidavit was deposited with the defendant, and transmitted by him to the secretary, with the appeal; that she was a native citizen of the United States, and had lived abroad some three years, as a temporary resident, prior to the importation, and had returned to this country about two weeks before the importation; that the carriage had been purchased by her in France, and had been used by her as a family carriage abroad for more than one year before its importation; and that it was imported by her for her own use in this country, and was not intended for any other person or persons, or for

sale. The defendant offered no testimony, but moved the court to direct a verdict for the defendant on the following grounds: 'First, that no evidence was offered to support the claim made in the plaintiff's protest, that the carriage was a personal effect in actual use, within the meaning of that term as used in section 2505 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; second, that the said protest was insufficient to raise the point that the carriage was included within the meaning of the term 'household effects,' as that term is used in section 2505 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; third, that, even if the protest be considered sufficient to raise the last point, the carriage in question cannot properly be held to be included within the true sense and meaning of the term 'household effects,' as that term is used in section 2505 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.'

The court denied the motion on each ground, and the defendant excepted to each ruling. A verdict was rendered for the plaintiff, the court having directed it on the ground that on the testimony and within the meaning of section 2505, the carriage was 'a household effect,' and the exaction of duties ****242** was illegal. The defendant excepted to the direction, and, after a jugment against him, brought this writ of error.

It was provided by section 2505, Rev. St. 1874, that the importation of the following articles should be exempt from duty:

First. Page 484, (2d Ed.) 'Books, household effects, or libraries, or parts of libraries, in use, of persons or families from foreign countries, if used abroad by them not less than one year, and not intended for any other person or persons, nor for sale.'

Second. Page 487, (2d Ed.) 'Personal and household effects, not merchandise, of citizens of the United States dying abroad.'

Third. Page 489, (2d Ed.) 'Wearing apparel, in actual use, and other personal effects, (not merchandise,) professional books, implements, instruments, and tools of trade, occupation, or employment of persons arriving in the United States. But this exemption shall not be construed to include machinery or other articles imported for use in any mannfacturing establishment, or for sale.'

*498 By section 1 of the act of August 10, 1790, c. 39, (1 St. 181,) there were exempted from duty 'the clothes, books, household furniture, and the tools or implements of the trade or profession of persons who come to reside in the United States.' This exemption was continued by section 2 of the act of May 2, 1792, c. 27, (1 St. 260.) As to the above clause 1, Schedule I of the act of July 30, 1846, c. 74, (9 St. 49,) exempted from duty 'household effects, old and in use, of persons or families from foreign countries, if used abroad by them, and not intended for any other person or persons, or for sale.' The same exemption was continued in section 3 of the act of March 3, 1857, c. 98, (11 St. 194,) and in section 23 of the act of March 2, 1861, c. 68, (12 St. 195.) By section 22 of the act of July 14, 1870, c. 255, (16 St. 265, 268,) exemption was extended, in addition to 'household effects of persons and families returning or emigrating from foreign countries, which have been in actual use abroad by them, and not intended for any other person or persons, or for sale, not exceeding the value of five hundred dollars.' The above clause 1 first appeared in section 5 of the act of June 6, 1872, c. 315, (17 St. 234,) and is now in force as part of section 2503 of the Revised Statutes, by virtue of section 6 of the act of March 3, 1883, c. 121, (22 St. 518.) As to the above clause 2, section 9 of the act of August 30, 1842, c. 270, (5 St. 560,) exempted from duty 'books and personal and household effects, not merchandise, of citizens of the United States dving abroad.' Omitting the words 'books and,' this provision was repeated in Schedule I of the act of July 30, 1846, c. 74, (9 St. 49,) and in section 3 of the act of March 3, 1857, c. 98, (11 St. 194,) and in section 23 of the act of March 2, 1861, c. 68, (12 St. 195,) and is now in force as part of section 2503 of the Revised Statutes, by virtue of section 6 of the act of March 3, 1883, c. 121, (22 St. 520.) The history of clause 3 above is fully given in Astor v. Merritt, 111 U. S. 210; S. C. 4 SUP. CT. REP. 413.

In June, 1876, the attorney general advised the secretary of the treasury that the words 'personal effects,' in clause 3 above, did not include carriages previously in use, but only ***499** such things as are worn, like apparel, upon the person, or are used in connection therewith; and shortly afterwards he advised the same officer that the words 'household effects,' in clause 1 above, did not include carriages used abroad not less than one year and intended

5 S.Ct. 241, 28 L.Ed. 825

for personal use here. 15 Op. 113, 125. On this construction the department has acted. The last opinion proceeded on the ground that early and repeated decisions in England had held that books, wares, horses, etc., did not pass under bequests of 'household goods and effects,' and that the express mention of books in clause 1, and the omission of other articles so determined not to be included under the general term 'household effects,' indicated that 'carriages' were not within the exemption. The word 'effects' means 'property or **243 worldly substance.' When it is accompanied, in a will, by words of narrower import, the bequest, if not residuary, may be confined to species of property ejusdem generis with those previously described. But the analogies to be derived from wills are not strictly applicable to a case like the present, and no material aid can be derived from decisions in regard to wills. The construction of the words 'household effects' in a will often depends largely on the meaning of words in other provisions in the will, and upon the qualification by the word 'other,' as referring to specific articles before named, like the word 'other' in clause 3 above. In the present case the only direct qualification of 'effects' is 'household.'

Persons who dwell together as a family constitute a 'household.' In New York a statute exempted from execution a cow 'owned by any person being a householder.' In *Woodward* v. *Murray*, 18, Johns. 400, a judgment debtor, who owned a cow, had left his wife and children, they continuing to reside in the house he had occupied. While they were on the road, removing to the house of the wife's father, with the cow and their household furniture, the cow was seized on execution. The court held that the exemption continued so long as the wife and children remained together 'as a family,' and that they continued to be the debtor's 'household,' and he the 'householder.'

***500** The question for decision in this case is whether the carriage of the plaintiff fell under either of these heads: (1) Household effects in use of a person or a family from a foreign country, used abroad by the person or the family not less than one year, and not intended for any other person or persons, nor for sale; (2) personal effects, (not merchandise,) nor for sale, of a person arriving in the United States.

The carriage had been in use as a family carriage, abroad, by the plaintiff as owner for more than a year.

She came from abroad after a temporary residence there of three years, and imported the carriage two weeks later for use here, and not for any other person, nor for sale. Was it 'household effects' or 'personal effects' of the plaintiff? We think that it fell within clause 1 and was 'household effects.' In the provision respecting the 'household effects' of persons or families, there is an evident intention to include articles which pertain to a person as a householder, or to a family as a household, which have been used abroad not less than a year, and are not intended for others, nor for sale. A carriage is peculiarly a family or household article. It contributes in a large degree to the health, convenience, comfort, and welfare of the householder or of the family. The statute is not limited to articles of household furniture, or to things whose place is necessarily within the four walls of a house. Clause 2 above uses the words 'personal and household effects.' This serves to show that, by the use of the words 'household effects' alone in clause 1, in the same section of the statute, something is intended different from 'personal effects,' and that those words embrace articles which the words 'personal effects' do not cover. So, too, if the words 'other personal effects' in clause 3 should be extended to embrace articles properly covered by the words 'household effects' in clause 1, such household effects would come in free, although not used abroad for a year, and the door would be opened wide for the introduction without duty of large numbers of articles as 'household effects' which it is intended should pay duty. We do not find it necessary in this case to consider any further the construction of the words 'other personal effects' in clause 3, because *501 we place our decision on the ground that this carriage was 'household effects' of the plaintiff.

The protest claimed that the carriage was 'personal effects' in actual use, under section 2505, and, as such, free and not subject to the duty imposed on it, but did not claim it to be 'household effects.' The solicitor general concedes that the objection to the protest is a 'bare technicality,' and that its language could hardly mislead the officers. A proper protest, as well as an appeal, are prerequisites to the right to sue. Section 3011, Rev. St., as ****244** amended by the act of February 27, 1877, *c*. 69, (19 St. 247.) The protest must set forth 'distinctly and specifically' the grounds of objection to the decision of the collector as to the rate and amount of duties. Section 2931, Rev. St. This provision was taken from the act of June 30, 1864,

c. 171, § 14, (13 St. 214,) and is substantially the same as that in the act of February 26, 1845, *c.* 22, (5 St. 727.) A protest is not required to be made with technical precision, but is sufficient if it shows fairly that the objection afterwards made at the trial was in the mind of the party and was brought to the knowledge of the collector, so as to secure to the government the practical advantage which the statute was designed to secure. *Converse* v. *Burgess*, 18 How. 413; *Swanston* v. *Morton*, 1 Curt. C. C. 294; *Kriesler* v. *Morton*, Id. 413; *Burgess* v. *Converse*, 2 Curt. C. C. 216; *Steegman* v. *Maxwell*, 3 Blatchf. 365; *Frazee* v. *Moffitt*, 20 Blatchf.

End of Document

267; S. C. 18 Fed. Rep. 584. This protest apprised the collector that the carriage was claimed to be free, under section 2505, as a carriage actually used abroad over a year. The 'household effects' clause was in the mind of the party, and the collector could not fail to so understand. The protest was sufficient. The judgment of the circuit court is affirmed.

All Citations

112 U.S. 495, 5 S.Ct. 241, 28 L.Ed. 825

© 2020 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Citing References (115)

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	 1. U.S. v. Bomar JJ 8 F.3d 226, 233+ , 5th Cir.(Tex.) Garageman was convicted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, 	Nov. 16, 1993	Case		-
	Melinda Harmon, J., of violating Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act by				
Discussed by	2. Pramette Juvenille Furniture Co. v. U.S. JJ 1948 WL 5146, *2+ , Cust.Ct.	May 28, 1948	Case		—
	Children's all-metal go-carts or strollers				
Cited by	3. Knowlton v. Moore 20 S.Ct. 747, 768+ , U.S.N.Y.	May 14, 1900	Case		—
	IN ERROR to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York to review a decision dismissing a suit to recover an amount paid to the internal revenue				
Cited by	4. U.S. v. Salambier 3 18 S.Ct. 771, 774 , U.S.N.Y.	May 23, 1898	Case		_
	On a Certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.				
Cited by	5. Herrman v. Robertson JJ 14 S.Ct. 686, 688 , U.S.N.Y.	Apr. 02, 1894	Case		_
	In error to the circuit court of the United States for the southern district of New York.				
Cited by	 6. Schell v. Fauche 11 S.Ct. 376, 378 , U.S.N.Y. 	Mar. 02, 1891	Case		_
	In error to the circuit court of the United States for the southern district of New York. This was a consolidation of six actions originally begun between September 1, 1857, and				
Cited by	7. Board of County Com'rs of Anderson County v. Beal 5 S.Ct. 433, 441, U.S.Kan.	Jan. 26, 1885	Case		_
	In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.				
Cited by	8. In re Hagop Bogigian Co. 104 F. 75, 77 , C.C.D.Mass.	May 23, 1900	Case		
	On July 24, 1897, the petitioner entered certain oriental goods in the port of Boston, which goods were examined and entered under the rates of the tariff act of 1894. The proper				
Cited by	9. U.S. v. W.R. Grace & Co. 166 F. 748, 749+ , C.C.A.2 (N.Y.)	Jan. 12, 1909	Case		_
	Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. The Circuit Court affirmed, without opinion, a decision by the Board of United States				

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 Hillhouse v. U.S. 152 F. 163, 164 , C.C.A.2 (N.Y.) Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. This cause comes here upon appeal from a decision of the Circuit Court, Southern 	Jan. 07, 1907	Case		
Cited by	 11. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. James 80 F.2d 802, 803 , C.C.A.4 (W.Va.) Action by Aileen James against the State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company. Judgment for plaintiff, and defendant appeals. Reversed. 	Jan. 06, 1936	Case		_
Cited by	 12. Shaw v. Prior JJ 68 F. 421, 423, C.C.D.Md. This was an application by Frank T. Shaw, the collector of customs at Baltimore, for a review of the decision of the board of general appraisers reversing the decision of the 	May 08, 1895	Case		_
Cited by	 13. Ocean Acc. & Guar. Co. v. Schmidt JJ 46 F.2d 269, 270 , C.C.A.6 (Ky.) Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky; Charles I. Dawson, Judge. Action by Mrs. Anna Schmidt against the Ocean Accident & 	Jan. 12, 1931	Case		
Cited by	 14. Neidhoefer v. Automobile Ins. Co. of Hartford, Conn. JJ 182 F.2d 269, 272 , 7th Cir.(III.) Charles A. Neidhoefer sued the Automobile Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut, on an insurance policy for losses of furs and jewelry belonging to his former wife. From a 	May 12, 1950	Case		
Cited by	15. American Service Mut. Ins. Co. v. Pugh JJ 271 F.2d 174, 176, 8th Cir.(Mo.) Action by tort judgment creditor of insured against insurer. The United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Albert A. Ridge, J., rendered judgment for	Oct. 28, 1959	Case		_
Cited by	 16. Johnson v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. JJ 252 F.2d 158, 161+ , 8th Cir.(Mo.) Action against automobile liability insurer by insured's daughter who was injured while passenger in insured's automobile. The United States District Court for the Western 	Feb. 18, 1958	Case		_
Cited by	 17. First Marine Ins. Co. v. Gibbs 173 F.3d 863, 863, 10th Cir.(Okla.) After examining the briefs and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist the determination of this appeal. See 	Mar. 31, 1999	Case		

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 18. Battle & Co Chemists' Corporation v. U S 108 F. 216, 220 , C.C.E.D.Mo. Petition by importers to review the decision of the board of general appraisers affirming the classification for duty of certain imported merchandise. 	Apr. 17, 1901	Case		
Cited by	 19. Sandow v. U.S. 84 F. 146, 147, C.C.S.D.N.Y. This was an appeal by Eugene Sandow from a decision of the board of general appraisers as to the classification for duty of certain horses brought to this country by him. 	Dec. 09, 1897	Case		
Cited by	20. Legg v. Hedden 37 F. 861, 864 , C.C.S.D.N.Y. At Law.	Feb. 04, 1889	Case		_
Cited by	21. Smith v. Schell 27 F. 648, 651 , C.C.S.D.N.Y. There is no escape from the conclusion that this protest is insufficient. The statute provides that a person who feels himself aggrieved must, by his protest, point out clearly	Apr. 09, 1886	Case		_
Cited by	 22. Boyd v. Folsom 149 F.Supp. 925, 928, W.D.Pa. Proceeding brought for review of a decision of the Social Security Administration. The District Court, Gourley, Chief Judge, held that living under same roof was not essential to 	Apr. 05, 1957	Case		_
Cited by	 23. Knowlton and Buffum, Executors, v. Moore, United States Collector of Internal Revenue. 1900 WL 5700, *34+, C.C.E.D.Pa. The Act of Congress of June, 1898, which is usually spoken of as the War Revenue Act (30 Stat. 448), imposes various stamp duties and other taxes. Sections 29 and 30 of the 	May 14, 1900	Case		_
Cited by	24. D. Stone Industries, Inc. v. U.S. 1985 WL 24415, *3+, CIT This case is before the Court on plaintiff's motion for leave to amend the summons, defendant's opposition thereto and motion to dismiss and plaintiff's opposition to defendant's	Feb. 05, 1985	Case		_
Cited by	25. Pantoja v. U.S. 1979 WL 37218, *3 , Cust.Ct. [Motion to dismiss denied.]	Dec. 11, 1979	Case		_
Cited by	 26. Mattel, Inc. v. U. S. 377 F.Supp. 955, 959+ , Cust.Ct. Importer brought action claiming that its letters requesting correction of classification of wigs for dolls were valid protests. On plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings 	June 05, 1974	Case		_

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 27. Pistorino & Co., Inc. v. U.S. 1972 WL 23508, *5 , Cust.Ct. American goods returned Women's wearing apparel Jacket fronts made from American fabric cut in a pattern in the United States, and sent to Hong Kong to have beads sewn on, the 	Sep. 21, 1972	Case		_
Cited by	 28. Castelazo & Associates Atwood Imports, Inc. v. U. S. 314 F.Supp. 38, 43 , Cust.Ct. Protects against decision of Collector of Customs at Post of Los Angeles. The Customs Court, Rosenstein, J., held that evidence, with respect to woodworking machines, each 	June 02, 1970	Case		_
Cited by	 29. Castelazo & Associates v. U.S. 1967 WL 10009, *1 , Cust.Ct. Plastic article Sufficiency of protest Motion to dismiss [Motion to dismiss granted.] 	Sep. 07, 1967	Case		_
Cited by	30. Import Motors of Chicago, Inc. v. U.S. 1966 WL 9712, *1 , Cust.Ct. Optical Instruments Motion to Dismiss for Insufficiency.	Feb. 17, 1966	Case		_
Cited by	 31. How-Tex Peanut Co., Inc. v. U.S. 1965 WL 8879, *3 , Cust.Ct. Defendant has made identical motions to dismiss these two protests for alleged failure to apprise the collector of the reasons for protest, citing the enabling protest statute, 	Feb. 04, 1965	Case		_
Cited by	 32. Shell Oil Co. v. U.S. 1965 WL 8764, *3 , Cust.Ct. Clerical error Premature liquidation Moot question Merchandise, consisting of asphalt of petroleum and residual fuel oil, was exported from the Netherlands West Indies and 	Feb. 01, 1965	Case		_
Cited by	 33. Atlantic Linen Importing Co. v. U.S. 1964 WL 10190, *3 , Cust.Ct. Government's motion to dismiss for insufficient protest denied by Lawrence, J., and Ford, J.; Rao, J., dissenting. The following memorandum accompanied the order: This matter is 	Dec. 28, 1964	Case		_
Cited by	 34. Garod Radio Corp. v. U.S. 1961 WL 9885, *3 , Cust.Ct. Certain radios and accessories were imported by plaintiff from Germany and entered at the port of New York. The merchandise was appraised at a value higher than the entered value, 	May 11, 1961	Case		_
Cited by	 35. Von Kalinowski v. U.S. 1960 WL 8496, *3 , Ct.Cl. Plaintiff's motion for rehearing denied April 7, 1961 Customs duties; regulation of executive departmentIn an action brought under a special jurisdictional act to recover the 	Nov. 02, 1960	Case		_

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	36. National Carloading Corp. v. U.S. 1960 WL 9725, *1 , Cust.Ct. This is a motion for leave to amend the protest in the above-entitled action to insert the following claims: We claim that the cards are the usual containers for the needles and	June 01, 1960	Case		_
Cited by	37. Quaker Waxed Products Corp. v. U.S. JJ 1957 WL 9967, *4 , Cust.Ct. The merchandise the subject of this proceeding was classified by the collector of customs as "(Aluminum foil) as:—Foil under 0.006 inch thick: Aluminum, valued per pound—Under 27	Oct. 31, 1957	Case		
Cited by	 38. Preload Const. Corp. v. U.S. JJ 1957 WL 8834, *9 , Cust.Ct. So-called silico manganese bar reinforcement for prestressed concrete and sets of nuts and washers —Separately dutiable—Concrete reinforcement bars and nuts and washers Merchandise 	Feb. 13, 1957	Case		
Cited by	39. Lustre Fibers, Inc. v. U.S. 1953 WL 7105, *1 , Cust.Ct. The merchandise covered by this suit was classified by the collector of customs at Charleston, S. C., under the provisions of paragraph 1302 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified	Dec. 03, 1953	Case		
Cited by	40. Oxford University Press, N.Y., Inc. v. U.S. 1948 WL 5125, *5 , Cust.Ct. Electrotype shells—Incomplete electrotype plates— Parts of printing machinery	Mar. 05, 1948	Case		_
Cited by	 41. U S v. Barr 143 F.2d 132, 135 , Cust. & Pat.App. Appeal from the United States Customs Court, C.D. 801. Protest by John Barr against the United States because of conversion of pounds sterling to United States dollars at the 	May 22, 1944	Case		
Cited by	42. Associated Metals & Minerals Corp. v. U.S. 1942 WL 5363, *2 , Cust.Ct. Sufficiency of protest A letter addressed to the United States Customs Service, which was duly received and filed by the collector of customs at Chicago, in which these words	June 17, 1942	Case		_
Cited by	43. Raybestos Manhattan, Inc v. U S 1940 WL 4046, *4 , Cust. & Pat.App. Appeal from United States Customs Court, C. D. 175 [Affirmed.]	Mar. 04, 1940	Case		_
Cited by	44. U.S. v. Kidder 1930 WL 2551, *3 , Cust. & Pat.App. Appeal from United States Customs Court, T. D. 43485 [Reversed.]	Mar. 19, 1930	Case		_
Cited by	45. George C. Whitney Co. v. U.S. 1928 WL 28046, *3 , Cust.App. Appeal from United States Customs Court, Abstract 3773 [Modified and remanded.]	June 12, 1928	Case		_

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	46. Rice & Co. v. U.S. 1920 WL 19895, *3 , Cust.App. Appeal from Board of United States General Appraisers, Abstract 43391. [Reversed.]	May 01, 1920	Case		_
Cited by	47. U.S. v. Snellenburg & Co. 1919 WL 21363, *2 , Cust.App. Appeal from Board of United States General Appraisers, G. A. 8190 (T. D. 37726). [Modified.]	Feb. 25, 1919	Case		_
Cited by	48. Michelin Tire Co. v. U.S. 1915 WL 20777, *3 , Cust.App. Appeal from Board of United States General Appraisers, G. A. 7603 (T. D. 34807). [Reversed.]	May 26, 1915	Case		_
Cited by	49. U.S. v. Stirn 1914 WL 21648, *2 , Cust.App. Appeal from Board of United States General Appraisers, Abstract 32977 (T. D. 33594). [Affirmed.]	Feb. 05, 1914	Case		_
Cited by	 50. Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. U.S. 1912 WL 19292, *2 , Cust.App. Appeal from Board of United States General Appraisers, G. A. 7157 (T. D. 31253). [Affirmed.] 	Jan. 11, 1912	Case		_
Cited by	 51. U.S. v. Shallus 1911 WL 20000, *3 , Cust.App. Transferred from United States Circuit Court, District of Maryland, Abstract 20361 (T. D. 29449). [Modified and affirmed.] 	Nov. 28, 1911	Case		_
Cited by	52. Carter v. U.S. 1910 WL 20684, *2 , Cust.App. Appeal from a decision of the Board of United States General Appraisers (T. D. 29389). [Reversed.]	Oct. 28, 1910	Case		_
Cited by	53. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Johnson JJ 729 P.2d 945, 947, Ariz.App. Div. 1 Spouse of insured killed in automobile accident sought to recover under insurance policy. Insurer filed action for declaratory judgment that spouse was excluded from liability	June 24, 1986	Case		
Cited by	54. Juzefski v. Western Cas. & Sur. Co. 342 P.2d 928, 933 , Cal.App. 2 Dist. Action against automobile liability insurer to recover balance owing on judgment against defendant's insured for damages sustained in automobile accident, involving automobile	Aug. 19, 1959	Case		
Cited by	55. Cincinnati Ins. Co. v. Argubright 31 502 N.E.2d 868, 873 , Ill.App. 3 Dist. Insurer brought declaratory judgment action seeking declaration that son was not covered under parents' homeowners' liability policy for purposes of personal injury action pending	Dec. 31, 1986	Case		

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	56. Goodsell v. State Auto. and Cas. Underwriters JJ 153 N.W.2d 458, 463 , Iowa	Oct. 17, 1967	Case		_
	Action by father and daughter to recover under collision and medical payments provisions of insurance policy. The Bremer District Court, B. C. Sullivan, J., found for plaintiffs				
Cited by	57. Simon v. Milwaukee Auto. Mut. Ins. Co. JJ 115 N.W.2d 40, 46 , Minn. Action for declaratory judgment to determine liability of insurer under automobile policy. The District	Apr. 27, 1962	Case		
	Court, Sibley County, Harold E. Flynn, J., denied motion of insurer for				
Cited by	58. Tomlyanovich v. Tomlyanovich JJ 58 N.W.2d 855, 858 , Minn.	May 01, 1953	Case		_
	Passenger in automobile brought action against owner and insurer, which had issued an automobile liability policy containing provision that policy should not cover any member of				
Cited by	59. Buckley v. Porter JJ 133 So. 215, 216 , Miss.	Mar. 30, 1931	Case		_
	Appeal from Circuit Court, Jasper County, Second District; W. L. Cranford, Judge. Action by D. N. Porter against Mrs. J. W. Buckley. From a judgment of the circuit court for the				
Cited by	60. Universal Underwriters Ins. Co. v. Johnson JJ 110 N.W.2d 224, 227 , N.D.	Aug. 09, 1961	Case		_
	Action by garage liability insurer for declaration of nonliability. The District Court, Mountrail County, Eugene A. Burdick, J., rendered judgment for defendants, and plaintiff				
Cited by	61. Territory v. Russell 86 P. 551, 551 , N.M.Terr. Appeal from District Court, San Juan County;	June 29, 1906	Case		_
	before Justice John R. McFie. James H. Russell was convicted of peddling without a license, and appeals. Affirmed.				
Cited by	62. In re Burnside's Will 59 N.Y.S.2d 829, 831 , N.Y.Sur.	Aug. 31, 1945	Case		_
	Proceeding in the matter of the construction of the last will and testament and codicil thereto of Georgia A. Burnside, also known as Georgia D. Burnside, deceased. Decree in				
Cited by	63. In re Mitchell's Will 38 N.Y.S.2d 673, 674 , N.Y.Sur.	Nov. 18, 1942	Case		_
	Proceeding in the matter of the probate of the last will and testament of Charlotte E. Mitchell, deceased, and the application for a determination as to the validity, construction				

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	64. In re Winburn's Will JJ 247 N.Y.S. 584, 592 , N.Y.Sur.	Jan. 19, 1931	Case		_
	Proceeding for the judicial settlement of the accounts of City Bank Farmers' Trust Company and another, executors of the last will and testament of Jesse Winburn, deceased, and for				
Cited by	65. Motorist Mutual Ins. Co. v. Zetts J 1979 WL 207193, *2 , Ohio App. 7 Dist.	Jan. 10, 1979	Case		
	On August 18, 1974, Barbara Zetts, appellant, was involved in a collision with an uninsured motorist. At the time of the collision, she was operating a Volvo automobile owned by a				
Cited by	66. Robinson v. Robinson JJ 30 Ohio Dec. 666, 671 , Ohio Com.Pl.	Jan. 27, 1913	Case		
	This case involves the construction to be given to the last will and testament of M. Louise Bowler. Plaintiff alleges his appointment and qualification as executor of the last will				
Cited by	67. Henderson v. Eaves)) 516 P.2d 270, 274 , Okla.	Nov. 13, 1973	Case		
	After obtaining a judgment against a prison parolee for damages for the shooting and wrongful death of her minor son, a mother brought garnishment proceedings to satisfy the				
Cited by	68. Indemnity Ins. Co. of North America v. Sanders JJ 36 P.2d 271, 273 , Okla.	Oct. 02, 1934	Case		_
	Appeal from District Court, Tulsa County; Edwin R. McNeill, Judge. Proceeding by garnishment by Adah C. Sanders against the Indemnity Insurance Company of North America, in aid of				
Cited by	69. Schehen v. North-West Ins. Co. 3 484 P.2d 836, 837 , Or.	Apr. 28, 1971	Case		_
	Action on automobile liability policy. The Circuit Court, Lane County, Roland K. Rodman, J., rendered judgment for plaintiffs, and the defendant appealed. The Supreme Court,				
Cited by	70. Allen v. Multnomah County JJ 173 P.2d 475, 477 , Or.	Oct. 15, 1946	Case		—
	Appeal from Circuit Court, Multnomah County; James R. Bain, Judge. Suit by A. C. Allen against Multnomah County, Oregon, a municipal corporation and body politic, and Martin T				
Cited by	71. Mutual of Enumciaw Ins. Co. v. Rohde JJ 13 P.3d 1006, 1008 , Or.App.	Nov. 01, 2000	Case		
	INSURANCE - Liability. Named insured's adult son who lived in separate house on farm was not member of insured's "household."				

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	72. Goggans v. Simmons 319 S.W.2d 442, 446 , Tex.Civ.AppFort Worth Proceeding to construe holographic will. The District Court, Dallas County, F. B. Davenport, J., decreed that testator did not die intestate as to any property and decreed that	Dec. 19, 1958	Case		_
Cited by	73. Travelers Indem. Co. v. American Indem. Co. 315 S.W.2d 677, 681 , Tex.Civ.AppFort Worth Action by plaintiff insurer against defendant insurer to recover pro rata share of settlement it had made with an injured third person and for attorney's fees. From adverse	June 13, 1958	Case		_
Cited by	74. Arellano v. Maryland Cas. Co. 312 S.W.2d 701, 703 , Tex.Civ.AppEl Paso Action on automobile policy affording extended medical payments coverage to named insured's relatives 'while residents of the same household as the named insured'. The El Paso	Apr. 09, 1958	Case		_
Cited by	75. Barrett v. Commercial Standard Ins. Co. JJ 145 S.W.2d 315, 318, Tex.Civ.AppFort Worth Appeal from County Court at Law No. 1, Tarrant County; David McGee, Judge. Action by James R. Barrett against the Commercial Standard Insurance Company to recover on a policy of	Nov. 15, 1940	Case		_
Cited by	76. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Phillips 76. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Phillips 77. Automobile liability insurer sought declaratory judgment that its policy did not afford coverage for injuries received by insured's son who while riding motorcycle was struck by	Mar. 26, 1970	Case		_
Cited by	 77. Herbst v. Hansen JJ 176 N.W.2d 380, 383 , Wis. Action to recover under uninsured motorist clause of automobile liability policy. The Circuit Court, Milwaukee County, Elmer W. Roller, J., denied insurer's motion for summary 	Apr. 28, 1970	Case		_
Cited by	 78. Doern v. Crawford JJ 140 N.W.2d 193, 195 , Wis. Passenger in automobile brought action against insurer and others. The Circuit Court, Waukesha County, Clair Voss, J., entered three orders and an interlocutory judgment adverse 	Mar. 01, 1966	Case		_
Cited by	 79. National Farmers Union Property & Cas. Co. v. Maca JJ 132 N.W.2d 517, 520 , Wis. Action for declaratory judgment by insurer against insured father and his son injured in accident on insurred's farm. The Circuit Court, La Crosse County, Leonard F. Roraff, J., 	Feb. 01, 1965	Case		_

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	80. Lontkowski v. Ignarski)) 95 N.W.2d 230, 232 , Wis.	Mar. 03, 1959	Case		_
	Wrongful death action arising out of a collision between automobile in which decedent was riding and an automobile owned by driver's brother. Plaintiff sued nonhost driver, and				
Cited by	81. CUSTOMS LAWS-COWS-HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS. JJ 23 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 310, 312	Oct. 22, 1900	Administrative Decision		_
	I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of October 10, 1900, in which you call my attention to section 2 of the act of March 3, 1876 (18 Stat., 469), which				
Cited by	 82. ATTORNEY-GENERAL-BICYCLES "AS PERSONAL EFFECTS'-STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION. 20 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 719, 720+ 	Feb. 12, 1894	Administrative Decision		_
	Your communication of January 29, relating to bicycles brought into the United States by travelers for purposes of travel, has received careful attention. The question in dispute				
Mentioned by	83. Pence v. U.S. 62 S.Ct. 1080, 1084 , U.S.Wis.	May 11, 1942	Case		
	Mr. Justice MURPHY, Mr. Justice BLACK, and Mr. Justice DOUGLAS, dissenting. On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Action on a				
Mentioned by	84. U.S. v. M. Rice & Co. 42 S.Ct. 212, 213 , U.S.Cust.App.	Feb. 27, 1922	Case		
	Certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals. Proceedings by M. Rice & Co. and another against the United States to recover customs duties illegally exacted. The Court				
Mentioned by	85. Heinze v. Miller 12 S.Ct. 604, 606 , U.S.N.Y.	Mar. 14, 1892	Case		_
	In error to the circuit court of the United States for the southern district of New York. Reversed.				
Mentioned by	86. Robertson v. Edelhoff 10 S.Ct. 186, 190 , U.S.N.Y.	Jan. 06, 1890	Case		
	In error to the circuit court of the United States for the southern district of New York.				
Mentioned by	87. Lothrop v. U.S. 164 F. 99, 101 , C.C.D.Mass.	July 27, 1908	Case		_
	On Application for Review of a Decision by the Board of United States General Appraisers.				
Mentioned by	88. Curiel v. Beard 44 F. 551, 552 , C.C.D.Mass.	Dec. 26, 1890	Case		_
	At Law.				

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Mentioned by	 89. In re Collector of Customs 55 F. 276, 277, C.C.A.2 (N.Y.) Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Sherman, Cecil & Co. protested against an assessment by the collector of the port of New 	Apr. 18, 1893	Case		_
Mentioned by	90. U.S. v. Cassiagnol 420 F.2d 868, 876 , 4th Cir.(Va.) Four defendants were convicted before the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Oren R. Lewis, J., of unseemly and disorderly conduct, and three	Jan. 08, 1970	Case		_
Mentioned by	 91. Aler v. Travelers Indem. Co. 92 F.Supp. 620, 624 , D.Md. James F. Aler sued the Travelers Indemnity Company for a declaratory judgment that defendant is liable to plaintiff on an automobile liability insurance policy for any damages 	Sep. 21, 1950	Case		_
Mentioned by	92. National Exch. Bank v. White 30 F. 412, 415 , C.C.W.D.Mich. At Law. Assumpsit.	1887	Case		_
Mentioned by	93. Fauche v. Schell 33 F. 336, 342 , C.C.S.D.N.Y. At Law. Action to recover back customs duties.	Oct. 24, 1887	Case		_
Mentioned by	94. VWP of America, Inc. v. U.S. 2006 WL 2779988, *5 , CIT As one of a series of similar matters, this action was initiated by VWP of America, Inc. ("VWPA") to contest the denial of protests on the valuation of textile imports from	Sep. 26, 2006	Case		
Mentioned by	 95. Douglas Homs Co. v. U.S. 300 F.Supp. 1389, 1390 , Cust.Ct. Proceeding with respect to protest against decision of collector of customs. The United States Customs Court, Ford, J., held that where original timely protest challenged the 	July 17, 1969	Case		
Mentioned by	96. W.J. Byrnes & Co., Inc. v. U.S. 1966 WL 9478, *3 , Cust.Ct. Manufactures of india rubber or gutta-percha Parts of facemasks Not parts of surgical instruments	Jan. 31, 1966	Case		
Mentioned by	97. Kaiser Reismann Corp. v. U.S. 1962 WL 10804, *2 , Cust.Ct. This case originally came before the court on a stipulation of fact and submission. The stipulation was subsequently ordered withdrawn by the court and the matter placed on the	Sep. 25, 1962	Case		
Mentioned by	 98. Connor v. U.S. 1961 WL 9765, *3 , Cust.Ct. This is a motion to dismiss the above-entitled action on the ground that the protest purporting to initiate it is not legally sufficient and for the further reason that it was not 	Apr. 20, 1961	Case		

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Mentioned by	 99. J.R. Press Corp. v. U.S. 1960 WL 10585, *1 , Cust.Ct. The protests listed in schedule "A," annexed hereto and made a part hereof, are before us for determination of two motions, one a motion to dismiss on the grounds that the 	Nov. 23, 1960	Case		
Mentioned by	 100. E. Gross & Co., Inc. v. U.S. 1959 WL 8588, *2 , Cust.Ct. Certain imported cotton cord tire fabric and cotton belting were classified as entered, respectively, within the provisions of paragraph 904(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, for 	May 25, 1959	Case		
Mentioned by	 101. Hutchinson v. U.S. 1943 WL 5206, *1 , Cust.Ct. Refusal of collector to post notice of liquidation at headquarters port A number of entries of merchandise were made at San Ysidro, Calif., a subport in the customs district of 	Jan. 09, 1943	Case		
Mentioned by	102. Raybestos Manhattan, Inc. v. U.S. 1939 WL 4437, *5 , Cust.Ct. Sufficiency of protest The collector of customs classified the merchandise in issue as a coal-tar distillate under paragraph 27 (a) (2), Tariff Act of 1930. The protest was	June 08, 1939	Case		
Mentioned by	 103. U. Fujita & Co. v. U.S. 1938 WL 4016, *3 , Cust. & Pat.App. Appeal from United States Customs Court, Abstract 35198 [Affirmed.] 	Feb. 07, 1938	Case		_
Mentioned by	104. U.S. v. Macksoud Importing Co. 1937 WL 3275, *4+ , Cust. & Pat.App. Appeal from United States Customs Court, T. D. 48442 [Affirmed.]	May 29, 1937	Case		_
Mentioned by	 105. Mueller v. U.S. 1927 WL 29467, *1 , Cust.App. Appeal from United States Customs Court, T. D. 41636 [Affirmed.] 	Apr. 04, 1927	Case		_
Mentioned by	 106. U.S. v. Sheldon & Co. 1914 WL 21588, *2 , Cust.App. Appeal from Board of United States General Appraisers, Abstract 35500 (T. D. 34425). [Reversed.] 	Nov. 18, 1914	Case		_
Mentioned by	 107. Lynch v. Boyer 105 N.E. 786, 787 , Ind.App. 2 Div. Appeal from Superior Court, Marion County; Charles J. Arbison, Judge. Action by Edith Boyer against Joseph Lynch and another. From a judgment for plaintiff, defendant Lynch 	June 24, 1914	Case		_
Mentioned by	108. Leteff v. Maryland Cas. Co. 91 So.2d 123, 138 , La.App. 1 Cir. Suit for injuries to a guest passenger in a station wagon owned by the father of defendant driver thereof. From judgments of the Nineteenth Judicial District Court, Parish of East	Nov. 26, 1956	Case		_

Treatment	Title	Date	Туре	Depth	Headnote(s)
Mentioned by	109. Rydstrom v. Queen Ins. Co. of America 112 A. 586, 587 , Md.	Jan. 11, 1921	Case		_
	Appeal from Baltimore City Court; James M. Ambler, Judge. Suit by Herbert W. Rydstrom against the Queen Insurance Company of America, a body corporate. From judgment for				
Mentioned by	110. In re Bloomingdale's Estate 142 N.Y.S.2d 781, 785 , N.Y.Sur.	May 25, 1955	Case		_
	Proceeding involving construction of will. The Surrogate's Court, Collins, S., held that tesator, who was man of considerable means, and who maintained summer, winter, and				
_	111. Federal Procedure, Lawyers Edition s 37:123, § 37:123. What must be included in protest—Adequacy of contents of protest	2019	Other Secondary Source	-	_
	The Supreme Court has said that protests are mercantile and not legal instruments, and they are sufficient if it is shown that the position taken at trial was fairly in the mind of				
_	112. Williston on Contracts s 30:14, § 30:14. The variable meaning of words; interpretation or construction of particular words and phrases —"Family" and related terms	2019	Other Secondary Source	_	_
	In a number of cases, the courts have been required to interpret the word "family." Unless the context manifests a different intention, the word "family" is usually construed in				
_	113. THE NEW TEXTUALISTS' NEW TEXT 38 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 2027 , 2062	2005	Law Review	—	
	Most disputes over the meanings of statutes are about the fit between events in the world and the words in the statute: The defendant did x. The statute says it is a crime to do				
_	114. FOURTH AMENDMENT TEXTUALISM 118 Mich. L. Rev. 233 , 283	2019	Law Review	—	
	The Fourth Amendment's prohibition of "unreasonable searches" is one of the most storied constitutional commands. Yet after decades of Supreme Court jurisprudence, a coherent				
_	115. Customs Law and Administration - Commentary s 5:88, § 5:88. Form and sufficiency—Form and sufficiency in general	2019	Other Secondary Source	-	_
	There has been a great deal of litigation concerning the sufficiency of protests, both before and since the enactment of the Customs Courts Act of 1980. While the statute now				

Table of Authorities (7)

Treatment	Referenced Title	Туре	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	- 1. Astor v. Merritt	Case			242
	4 S.Ct. 413, U.S.N.Y., 1884				
	In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.				
Mentioned	2. Burgess v. Converse	Case			244
	4 F.Cas. 726, C.C.D.Mass., 1855				
	At law. Action by Benjamin Burgess, Nathan B. Gibbs, and Benjamin F. Burgess against James C. Converse, administrator of Philip Greely, deceased, late collector of the port of				
Cited	3. Converse v. Burgess	Case			244
	1855 WL 8212, U.S.Mass., 1855				
	THIS case was brought up, by writ of error, from the circuit court of the United States for the district of Massachusetts. The facts of the case are stated in the opinion of the				
Mentioned	4. Frazee v. Moffitt	Case			244
	18 F. 584, C.C.N.D.N.Y., 1882				
	At Law.				
Mentioned	5. Steegman v. Maxwell	Case			244
	22 F.Cas. 1198, C.C.S.D.N.Y., 1855				
	This was an action [by Henry Steegman and others] against [Hugh Maxwell] the collector of the port of New York, to recover back an excess of duties. The jury found a verdict for				
Cited	6. Swanston v. Morton	Case			244+
	23 F.Cas. 516, C.C.D.Mass., 1852				
	This was an action of assumpsit [by James Swanston and others against Marcus Morton] to recover from the defendant, who was formerly collector of the customs for the port of				
Cited	7. Underwood v. Isham	Case			242
	22 N.E.2d 468, Ohio App. 9 Dist., 1939				
	Action by one Underwood and others, the Civil Service Commissioners, against one Isham, Judge, and others, under the Declaratory Judgment Act to have declared whether the				

Negative Treatment

There are no Negative Treatment results for this citation.

History

There are no History results for this citation.

Filings

There are no Filings for this citation.