

71 S.Ct. 624  
Supreme Court of the United States

JOINT ANTI-FASCIST  
REFUGEE COMMITTEE

v.

**McGRATH**, Atty. Gen. of  
the United States, et al.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-  
SOVIET FRIENDSHIP, Inc., et al.

v.

**McGRATH**, Atty. Gen. of  
the United States, et al.

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS  
ORDER, Inc., et al.

v.

**McGRATH**, Atty. Gen. of  
the United States, et al.

Nos. 8, 7, 71.

|  
Argued Oct. 11, 1950.

|  
Decided April 30, 1951.

### Synopsis

Actions for declaratory and injunctive relief by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., and others, and by the International Workers Order, Inc., and another, against Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, and others, J. Howard McGrath was substituted as the Attorney General. In the first case, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia rendered judgment dismissing the complaint, and the plaintiff appealed. The United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, [85 U.S.App.D.C. 255](#), [177 F.2d 79](#), affirmed the judgment. In the second case, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia rendered judgment dismissing the complaint, and the plaintiffs appealed. The United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, affirmed the judgment. In the third case, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, [88 F.Supp. 873](#), rendered a judgment dismissing the complaint, and the plaintiffs appealed. The

United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, [86 U.S.App.D.C. 287](#), [182 F.2d 368](#), affirmed the judgment. In each case, the plaintiffs brought certiorari. The Supreme Court held that the dismissal of proceedings to review the determination, made without hearing by the Attorney General under Executive Order authorizing Attorney General to furnish Loyalty Review Board of United States Civil Service Commission with list of Communist organizations, that organizations which on face of record were engaged solely in charitable or insurance activities were Communist, was reversed.

Judgments of Court of Appeals reversed in each case, and each case remanded to the District Court with instructions.

Mr. Justice Reed, Mr. Chief Justice Vinson and Mr. Justice Minton, dissented.

West Headnotes (1)

### [1] **Federal Courts** Particular cases

The dismissal of proceedings to review the determination, made without hearing by the Attorney General under Executive Order authorizing Attorney General to furnish Loyalty Review Board of United States Civil Service Commission with list of Communist organizations, that organizations which on face of record were engaged solely in charitable or insurance activities were Communist, was reversed. [Executive Order No. 9835](#), pt. 3, § 3, 5 U.S.C.A. § 631 note.

[582 Cases that cite this headnote](#)

### Attorneys and Law Firms

**\*\*624** Mr. **\*124** Benedict Wolf, New York City, and O. John Rogge, Washington, D.C., for petitioner Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Mr. David Rein, Washington, D.C., for petitioners National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., and others.

Mr. Allen R. Rosenberg, Washington, D.C., for petitioners International Workers Order, Inc., and another.

Mr. Philip B. Perlman, Sol. Gen., Washington, D.C., for respondents.

### Opinion

Mr. Justice BURTON announced the judgment of the Court and delivered the following opinion, in which Mr. Justice DOUGLAS joins:

In each of these cases the same issue is raised by the dismissal of a complaint for its failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. That issue is whether, in the face of the facts alleged in the complaint and therefore admitted by the motion to dismiss, the Attorney \*125 General of the United States has authority to include the complaining organization in a list of organizations designated by him as Communist and furnished by him to the Loyalty Review Board of the United States Civil Service Commission. He claims to derive authority to do this from the following \*\*625 provisions in Part III, s 3, of [Executive Order No. 9835](#), issued by the President, March 21, 1947, 5 U.S.C.A. s 631 note:

#### 'Part III—Responsibilities of Civil Service Commission

'3. The Loyalty Review Board shall currently be furnished by the Department of Justice the name of each foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group or combination of persons which the Attorney General, after appropriate investigation and determination, designates as totalitarian, fascist, communist or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

'a. The Loyalty Review Board shall disseminate such information to all departments and agencies.' 3 CFR, 1947 Supp., pp. 129, 131, [12 Fed.Reg. 1935, 1938](#).

The respective complaints describe the complaining organizations as engaged in charitable or civic activities or in the business of fraternal insurance. Each implies an attitude of cooperation and helpfulness, rather than one of hostility or disloyalty, on the part of the organization toward the United States. Two of the complaints deny expressly that the organization is within any classification specified in Part III, s 3, of the order.

\*126 For the reasons hereinafter stated, we conclude that, if the allegations of the complaints are taken as true (as they must be on the motions to dismiss), the Executive Order does not authorize the Attorney General to furnish the Loyalty Review Board with a list containing such a designation as he gave to each of these organizations without other justification. Under such circumstances his own admissions render his designations patently arbitrary because they are contrary to the alleged and uncontroverted facts constituting the entire record before us. The complaining organizations have not been afforded any opportunity to substantiate their allegations, but at this stage of the proceedings the Attorney General has chosen not to deny their allegations and has not otherwise placed them in issue.

Whatever may be his authority to designate these organizations as Communist upon undisclosed facts in his possession, he has not chosen to limit himself to that authorization. By his present procedure he has claimed authority so to designate them upon the very facts alleged by them in their own complaints. Self-serving or not, those allegations do not state facts from which alone a reasonable determination can be derived that the organizations are Communist. To defend such a designation of them, on the basis of the complaints alone, is an assertion of Presidential authority so to designate an organization at the option of the Attorney General without reliance upon either disclosed or undisclosed facts supplying a reasonable basis for the determination. It is that, and only that outer limit of the authority of the Attorney General that is now before us.

At least since 1939, increasing concern has been expressed, in and out of Congress, as to the possible presence in the employ of the Government of persons disloyal to it. This is reflected in the legislation, reports and executive orders culminating in \*127 [Executive Order No. 9835](#).<sup>1</sup> That order announced the President's Employees Loyalty \*\*626 Program in the Executive Branch of the Government. It states that both 'maximum protection must be afforded the United States against infiltration of disloyal persons into the ranks of its employees, and equal protection from unfounded accusations of disloyalty must be afforded the loyal employees of the Government: \* \* \*.' It provides for the Loyalty Review Board and sets up a standard for refusals of and removals from employment on grounds relating to loyalty. It outlines the use to be made in that connection of the list of organizations to be furnished by the Attorney General.<sup>2</sup> The \*128 organizations to be designated on that list are not limited to those having federal employees in their memberships. They may even

exclude such employees from membership. Accordingly, the impact of the Attorney General's list is by no means limited to persons who are subject to the Employees Loyalty Program.

The Attorney General included each of the complaining organizations in the list he furnished to the Loyalty Review Board November 24, 1947. That list was disseminated by the Board to all departments and agencies of the United States December 4, 1947. [13 Fed.Reg. 1473](#).<sup>3</sup> The complaints allege that such action resulted **\*129** in nationwide publicity and caused the injuries to the complaining organizations **\*\*627** which are detailed later. September 17, 1948, during the pendency of the instant cases but before action upon the appeals in any of them, 'the Attorney General furnished the Loyalty Review Board with a consolidated list containing the names of all of the organizations previously designated by him as within [Executive Order 9835](#), segregated according to the classifications enumerated in section 3, Part III, on the basis of dominant characteristics.'<sup>4</sup> He enumerated six classifications and classified the three complaining organizations as 'Communist.'<sup>5</sup>

**\*130** The instant cases originated in the District Court for the District of Columbia and come here after affirmance by the Court of Appeals. We granted certiorari because of the importance of the issues and their relation to the Employees Loyalty Program. [No. 8, 339 U.S. 910, 70 S.Ct. 573](#); [No. 7, 339 U.S. 956, 70 S.Ct. 978](#); [No. 71, 340 U.S. 805, 71 S.Ct. 39](#).

#### No. 8.—The Refugee Committee Case

The complainant is the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, an unincorporated association in the City and State of New York. It is the petitioner here. The defendants in the original action were the Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, and the members of the Loyalty Review Board. J. Howard McGrath has been substituted as the Attorney General and he and the members of that Board are the respondents here.

The following statement, based on the allegations of the complaint, summarizes the situation before us: The complainant is 'a charitable organization engaged in relief work' which carried on its relief activities from 1942 to 1946 under a license from the President's War Relief Control Board. Thereafter, it voluntarily submitted its program, budgets and audits for inspection by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the United States Government. Since its inception, it has, through voluntary contributions, raised and disbursed funds for the benefit of anti-Fascist refugees who

assisted the Government of Spain against its overthrow by force and violence. The organization's aims and purposes 'are to raise, administer and distribute funds for the relief and rehabilitation of Spanish Republicans in exile and other **\*131** anti-fascist refugees who fought in the war against Franco.'<sup>6</sup>

It has disbursed \$1,011,448 in cash, and \$217,903 in kind, for the relief of anti- **\*\*628** Fascist refugees and their families. This relief has included money, food, shelter, educational facilities, medical treatment and supplies, and clothing to recipients in 11 countries including the United States. The acts of the Attorney General and the Loyalty Review Board, purporting to be taken by them under authority of the Executive Order, have seriously and irreparably impaired, and will continue to so impair, the reputation of the organization and the moral support and good will of the American people necessary for the continuance of its charitable activities. Upon information and belief, these acts have caused many contributors, especially present and prospective civil servants, to reduce or discontinue their contributions to the organization; members and participants in its activities have been 'vilified and subjected to public shame, disgrace, ridicule and obloquy \* \* \*' thereby inflicting upon it economic injury and discouraging participation in its activities; it has been hampered in securing meeting places; and many people have refused to take part in its fund-raising activities.

This complaint does not contain an express denial that the complaining organization is within the classifications **\*132** named in Part III, s 3, of [Executive Order No. 9835](#). It does, however, state that the actions of the Attorney General and the Loyalty Review Board which are complained of are unauthorized and without warrant in law and amount to a deprivation of the complainant's rights in violation of the Constitution; that [Executive Order No. 9835](#), on its face and as construed and applied, violates the First, Fifth, Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States and that s 9A of the Hatch Act, 53 Stat. 1148, 5 U.S.C. (1946 ed., Supp. III) s 118j, insofar as it purports to authorize the instant application of the order, is void.<sup>7</sup> It asks for declaratory and injunctive relief, alleging that the complaining organization is suffering irreparable loss and that no adequate remedy is available to it except through the equity powers of the District Court. That court granted a motion to dismiss the complaint for its failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted and denied the complainant's motion for a preliminary injunction.<sup>8</sup> The Court of Appeals

affirmed, one judge dissenting. [Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. Clark](#), 85 U.S.App.D.C. 255, 177 F.2d 79.

#### No. 7.—The National Council Case

In this case the court below relied upon its decision in the Refugee Committee case and reached the same result, per curiam (unreported). Except as indicated below in our summary of the facts alleged, this case, for our purposes, is like the first. The complainants, who are the \*133 petitioners here, are the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., a New York nonprofit membership corporation, organized in 1943; the Denver Council of American-Soviet Friendship, a Colorado unincorporated association and local affiliate of the National Council; and six individual officers and directors of one or the other of these organizations. The purpose of the National Council 'is to strengthen friendly relations between the United \*\*629 States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by disseminating to the American people educational material regarding the Soviet Union, by developing cultural relations between the peoples of the two nations, and by combatting anti-Soviet propaganda designed to disrupt friendly relations between the peoples of these nations and to divide the United Nations.' The complaint alleges that all of the complainants are seriously and irreparably injured in their capacity to conduct the National Council's educational, cultural and fund-raising program, and that the individual complainants have suffered personal losses such as the removal of one from an assistant rectorship of a church, the loss by another of a teaching position, and numerous cancellations of lecturing and professional engagements. The complaint expressly states that—'In all its activities the National Council has sought to further the best interests of the American people by lawful, peaceful and constitutional means. It has never in any way engaged in any conduct or activity which provides any basis for it to be designated as 'totalitarian, fascist, communist or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.'

#### \*134 No. 71.—The International Workers Case

The complaining organization, which is the petitioner here, is a fraternal benefit society, organized in 1930 as a corporation under the Insurance Law of the State of New York, [McK.Consol.Laws](#), c. 28, operating for the mutual

benefit of its members and their beneficiaries and not for profit. It is licensed and operates in the District of Columbia and several states; its purposes are comparable to those of fraternal benefit societies in general; it operates under a lodge system and has a representative form of government; at the time of the promulgation of the Department of Justice list it had 185,000 members, including employees of the Federal Government and of various states and municipalities; it provided life insurance protection for its membership exceeding \$120,000,000; its activities have been the subject of administrative and judicial proceedings in addition to those before the insurance departments of the states in which it functions, and, as a result of such proceedings, 'the purposes, and activities of the order have been held to be free from any illegal or improper taint \* \* \*'.<sup>9</sup> Among the allegations of damage, made upon information and belief, the complaint states that, \*135 solely as a result of the respondents' acts, there have been instituted against the order and its members a multiplicity of administrative proceedings, including those to rescind licenses, franchises, or tax exemptions, or to impede the naturalization of its members. Because of respondents' acts, many such members, especially present and prospective civil servants, have resigned or withdrawn from membership in the order, and many potential members have declined to join it.<sup>10</sup>

The second amended complaint was dismissed \*\*630 by the District Court, [88 F.Supp. 873](#). That judgment was affirmed by the Court of Appeals, one judge dissenting. [86 U.S.App.D.C. 287](#), [182 F.2d 368](#).

If, upon the allegations in any of these complaints, it had appeared that the acts of the respondents, from which relief was sought, were authorized by the President under his [Executive Order No. 9835](#), the case would have bristled with constitutional issues. On that basis the complaint would have raised questions as to the justiciability and \*136 merit of claims based upon the First, Fifth, Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution. It is our obligation, however, not to reach those issues unless the allegations before us squarely present them. See [United States v. Lovett](#), [328 U.S. 303](#), [320](#), [66 S.Ct. 1073](#), [1081](#), [90 L.Ed. 1252](#). Cf. [United Public Workers of America \(C.I.O.\) v. Mitchell](#), [330 U.S. 75](#), [67 S.Ct. 556](#), [91 L.Ed. 754](#); [Myers v. United States](#), [272 U.S. 52](#), [47 S.Ct. 21](#), [71 L.Ed. 160](#).

The Executive Order contains no express or implied attempt to confer power on anyone to act arbitrarily or capriciously—even assuming a constitutional power to do so. The order includes in the purposes of the President's program not

only the protection of the United States against disloyal employees but the 'equal protection' of loyal employees against unfounded accusations of disloyalty. 3 CFR, 1947 Supp., p. 129, 12 Fed.Reg. 1935. The standards stated for refusal of and removal from employment require that 'on all the evidence, reasonable grounds (shall) exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal \* \* \*.' Id., at 132, 12 Fed.Reg. 1938. Obviously it would be contrary to the purpose of that order to place on a list to be disseminated under the Loyalty Program any designation of an organization that was patently arbitrary and contrary to the uncontroverted material facts. The order contains the express requirement that each designation of an organization by the Attorney General on such a list shall be made only after an 'appropriate \* \* \* determination' as prescribed in Part III, s 3. An 'appropriate' governmental 'determination' must be the result of a process of reasoning. It cannot be an arbitrary fiat contrary to the known facts. This is inherent in the meaning of 'determination.' It is implicit in a government of laws and not of men. Where an act of an official plainly falls outside of the scope of his authority, he does not make that act legal by doing it and then invoking the doctrine of administrative construction to cover it.

\*137 It remains, therefore, for us to decide whether, on the face of these complaints, the Attorney General is acting within his authority in furnishing the Loyalty Review Board with a designation of the complaining organizations either as 'Communist' or as within any other classification of Part III, s 3, of the order. In the National Council and International Workers cases, the complaining organization is alleged not only to be a civic or insurance organization, apparently above reproach from the point of view of loyalty to the United States, \*\*631 but it is also declared to be one that is not within any classification listed in Part III, s 3, of the order. In the Refugee Committee case, the negative allegations are omitted but the affirmative allegations are incompatible with the inclusion of the complaining organization within any of the designated classifications. The inclusion of any of the complaining organizations in the designated list solely on the facts alleged in the respective complaints, which must be the basis for our decision here, is therefore an arbitrary and unauthorized act. In the two cases where the complaint specifically alleges the factual absence of any basis for the designation, and the respondents' motion admits that allegation, the designation is necessarily contrary to the record. The situation is comparable to one which would be created if the Attorney General, under like circumstances, were to designate the American National Red Cross as a Communist organization. Accepting as common knowledge the charitable and loyal status of

that organization, there is no doubt that, in the absence of any contrary claim asserted against it, the Executive Order does not authorize its inclusion by the Attorney General as a 'Communist' organization or as coming within any of the other classifications named in Part III, s 3, of the order.

Since we find that the conduct ascribed to the Attorney General by the complaints is patently arbitrary, the deference \*138 ordinarily due administrative construction of an administrative order is not sufficient to bring his alleged conduct within the authority conferred by Executive Order No. 9835. The doctrine of administrative construction never has been carried so far as to permit administrative discretion to run riot. If applied to this case and compounded with the assumption that the President's Executive Order was drafted for him by his Attorney General, the conclusion would rest upon the premise that the Attorney General has attempted to delegate to himself the power to act arbitrarily. We cannot impute such an attempt to the Nation's highest law enforcement officer any more than we can to its President.

In thus emphasizing an outer limit to what can be considered an authorized designation of an organization under the order, the instant cases serve a valuable purpose. They demonstrate that the order does not authorize, much less direct, the exercise of any such absolute power as would permit the inclusion in the Attorney General's list of a designation that is patently arbitrary or contrary to fact.<sup>11</sup>

\*139 When the acts of the Attorney General and of the members of the Loyalty Review Board are stripped of the Presidential authorization claimed for them by the respondents, they stand, on the face of these complaints, as unauthorized publications of \*\*632 admittedly unfounded designations of the complaining organizations as 'Communist.' Their effect is to cripple the functioning and damage the reputation of those organizations in their respective communities and in the nation. The complaints, on that basis, sufficiently charge that such acts violate each complaining organization's common-law right to be free from defamation. 'A communication is defamatory if it tends so to harm the reputation of another as to lower him in the estimation of the community or to deter third persons from associating or dealing with him.' Restatement, Torts, s 559.<sup>12</sup>

These complaints do not raise the question of the personal liability of public officials for money damages caused by their ultra vires acts. See \*140 Spalding v. Vilas, 161 U.S. 483, 16 S.Ct. 631, 40 L.Ed. 780. They ask only for declaratory and injunctive relief striking the names of the designated

organizations from the Attorney General's published list and, as far as practicable, correcting the public records.

The respondents are not immune from such a proceeding. Only recently, this Court recognized that 'the action of an officer of the sovereign (be it holding, taking or otherwise legally affecting the plaintiff's property) can be regarded as so 'illegal' as to permit a suit for specific relief against the officer as an individual \* \* \* if it is not within the officer's statutory powers or, if within those powers \* \* \* if the powers, or their exercise in the particular case, are constitutionally void.' *Larson v. Domestic and Foreign Commerce Corp.*, 337 U.S. 682, 701—702, 69 S.Ct. 1457, 1467, 93 L.Ed. 1628. The same is true here, where the acts complained of are beyond the officer's authority under the Executive Order.<sup>13</sup>

Finally, the standing of the petitioners to bring these suits is clear.<sup>14</sup> The touchstone to justiciability is injury \*141 to a legally protected right<sup>15</sup> and the right of a bona fide charitable organization to carry on its work, free from defamatory statements of the kind discussed, is such a right.

**\*\*633** It is unrealistic to contend that because the respondents gave no orders directly to the petitioners to change their course of conduct, relief cannot be granted against what the respondents actually did. We long have granted relief to parties whose legal rights have been violated by unlawful public action, although such action made no direct demands upon them. *Columbia Broadcasting System v. United States*, 316 U.S. 407, 62 S.Ct. 1194, 86 L.Ed. 1563; *Pierce v. Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary*, 268 U.S. 510, 45 S.Ct. 571, 69 L.Ed. 1070; *Buchanan v. Warley*, 245 U.S. 60, 38 S.Ct. 16, 62 L.Ed. 149; *Truax v. Raich*, 239 U.S. 33, 36 S.Ct. 7, 60 L.Ed. 131.<sup>16</sup> The complaints here amply allege past and impending serious damages caused by the actions of which the petitioners complain.

Nothing we have said purports to adjudicate the truth of petitioners' allegations that they are not in fact communistic. We have assumed that the designations made by the Attorney General are arbitrary because we are compelled to make that assumption by his motions to dismiss the complaints. Whether the complaining organizations are in fact communistic or whether the Attorney General possesses information from which he could reasonably \*142 find them to be so must await determination by the District Court upon remand.

For these reasons, we find it necessary to reverse the judgments of the Court of Appeals in the respective cases and to remand each case to the District Court with instructions' to deny the respondents' motion that the complaint be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Reversed and remanded.

Mr. Justice CLARK took no part in the consideration or decision of any of these cases.

Mr. Justice BLACK, concurring.

Without notice or hearing and under color of the President's *Executive Order No. 9835*, the Attorney General found petitioners guilty of harboring treasonable opinions and designs, officially branded them as Communists, and promulgated his findings and conclusions for particular use as evidence against government employees suspected of disloyalty. In the present climate of public opinion it appears certain that the Attorney General's much publicized findings, regardless of their truth or falsity, are the practical equivalents of confiscation and death sentences for any blacklisted organization not possessing extraordinary financial, political or religious prestige and influence. The Government not only defends the power of the Attorney General to pronounce such deadly edicts but also argues that individuals or groups so condemned have no standing to seek redress in the courts, even though a fair judicial hearing might conclusively demonstrate their loyalty. My basic reasons for rejecting these and other contentions of the Government are in summary the following:

**\*143** (1) I agree with Mr. Justice BURTON that petitioners have standing to sue for the reason among others that they have a right to conduct their admittedly legitimate political, charitable and business operations free from unjustified governmental defamation. Otherwise, executive officers could act lawlessly with impunity. And, assuming that the President may constitutionally authorize the promulgation of the Attorney General's list, I further agree with Mr. Justice BURTON that this Court **\*\*634** should not attribute to the President a purpose to vest in a cabinet officer the power to destroy political, social, religious or business organizations by 'arbitrary fiat,' and thus the methods employed by the Attorney General exceed his authority under *Executive Order No. 9835*.

(2) Assuming, though I deny, that the Constitution permits the executive officially to determine, list and publicize individuals and groups as traitors and public enemies, I agree with Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER that the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment would bar such condemnation without notice and a fair hearing. My views previously expressed under similar circumstances are relevant here. E.g., dissenting opinion in *Ludecke v. Watkins*, 335 U.S. 160, 173, 68 S.Ct. 1429, 1435, 92 L.Ed. 881; and see *In re Oliver*, 333 U.S. 257, 68 S.Ct. 499, 92 L.Ed. 682.

(3) More fundamentally, however, in my judgment the executive has no constitutional authority, with or without a hearing, officially to prepare and publish the lists challenged by petitioners. In the first place, the system adopted effectively punishes many organizations and their members merely because of their political beliefs and utterances, and to this extent smacks of a most evil type of censorship. This cannot be reconciled with the First Amendment as I interpret it. See my dissent in *American Communications Ass'n, C.I.O. v. Douds*, 339 U.S. 382, 445, 70 S.Ct. 674, 707, 94 L.Ed. 925. Moreover, officially prepared and proclaimed governmental \*144 blacklists possess almost every quality of bills of attainder, the use of which was from the beginning forbidden to both national and state governments. U.S.Const. Art. I, ss 9, 10. It is true that the classic bill of attainder was a condemnation by the legislature following investigation by that body, see *United States v. Lovett*, 328 U.S. 303, 66 S.Ct. 1073, 90 L.Ed. 1252, while in the present case the Attorney General performed the official tasks. But I cannot believe that the authors of the Constitution, who outlawed the bill of attainder, inadvertently endowed the executive with power to engage in the same tyrannical practices that had made the bill such an odious institution.<sup>1</sup>

There is argument that executive power to issue these pseudo-bills of attainder can be implied from the undoubted power of the Government to hire and discharge employees and to protect itself against treasonable individuals or organizations.<sup>2</sup> Our basic law, however, wisely \*145 withheld authority for resort to executive investigations, condemnations and blacklists as a substitute for imposition of legal types of penalties by courts following trial and conviction in accordance with procedural safeguards of the Bill of Rights.<sup>3</sup>

\*\*635 In this day when prejudice, hate and fear are constantly invoked to justify irresponsible smears and persecution of persons even faintly suspected of entertaining

unpopular views, it may be futile to suggest that the cause of internal security would be fostered, not hurt, by faithful adherence to our constitutional guarantees of individual liberty. Nevertheless, since prejudice manifests itself in much the same way in every age and country and since what has happened before can happen again, it surely should not be amiss to call attention to what has occurred when dominant governmental groups have been left free to give uncontrolled rein to their prejudices against unorthodox minorities. As specific illustration, I am adding as an appendix Macaulay's account of a parliamentary proscription which took place when popular prejudice was high; this is only one out of many similar \*146 instances that readily can be found.<sup>4</sup> Memories of such events were fresh in the minds of the founders when they forbade the use of the bill of attainder.

#### Appendix to Opinion of Mr. Justice BLACK.

James II, the last Stuart king of England, was driven from his throne in 1688 by William of Orange. After a brief sojourn at Saint Germain in France, James landed in Ireland where he was supported by those Irish Catholics who had suffered greatly at the hands of the English Protestant colonists. One of his first official acts was to call an Irish Parliament which enacted the bill of attainder described by the historian Macaulay as follows:

‘\* \* \* (the Commons) respected no prerogative, however ancient, however legitimate, however salutary, if they apprehended that (James II) might use it to protect the race which they abhorred. They were not satisfied till they had extorted his reluctant consent to a portentous law, a law without a parallel in the history of civilised countries, the great Act of Attainder.

‘A list was framed containing between two and three thousand names. At the top was half the peerage of Ireland. Then came baronets, knights, clergymen, squires, merchants, yeomen, artisans, women, children. No investigation was made. Any member who wished to rid himself of a creditor, a rival, a private enemy, gave in the name to the clerk at the table, and it was generally inserted without discussion. The only debate of which any account has come down to us related to the Earl of Strafford. He had friends in the House who ventured to offer something in his favour. But a few words from \*147 Simon Luttrell settled the question. ‘I have,’ he said, ‘heard the King say some hard things of that lord.’ This was thought sufficient, and the name of Strafford stands fifth in the long table of the proscribed.

‘Days were fixed before which those whose names were on the list were required to surrender themselves to such justice as was then administered to English Protestants in Dublin. If a proscribed person was in Ireland, he must surrender himself by the tenth of August. If he had left Ireland since the fifth of November 1688, he must surrender himself by the first of September. \*\*636 If he had left Ireland before the fifth of November 1688, he must surrender himself by the first of October. If he failed to appear by the appointed day, he was to be hanged, drawn, and quartered without a trial, and his property was to be confiscated. It might be physically impossible for him to deliver himself up within the time fixed by the Act. He might be bedridden. He might be in the West Indies. He might be in prison. Indeed there notoriously were such cases. Among the attainted Lords was Mountjoy. He had been induced by the villany of Tyrconnel to trust himself at Saint Germain: he had been thrown into the Bastille: he was still lying there; and the Irish parliament was not ashamed to enact that, unless he could, within a few weeks, make his escape from his cell, and present himself at Dublin, he should be put to death.

‘As it was not even pretended that there had been any inquiry into the guilt of those who were thus proscribed, as not a single one among them had been heard in his own defence, and as it was certain that it would be physically impossible for many of them to surrender themselves in time, it was clear that nothing but a large exercise of the royal prerogative of mercy could prevent the perpetration of iniquities so horrible that no precedent could be found for them even in the lamentable history of the \*148 troubles of Ireland. The Commons therefore determined that the royal prerogative of mercy should be limited. Several regulations were devised for the purpose of making the passing of pardons difficult and costly: and finally it was enacted that every pardon granted by his Majesty, after the end of November 1689, to any of the many hundreds of persons who had been sentenced to death without a trial, should be absolutely void and of none effect. Sir Richard Nagle came in state to the bar of the Lords and presented the bill with a speech worthy of the occasion. ‘Many of the persons here attainted,’ said he, ‘have been proved traitors by such evidence as satisfies us. As to the rest we have followed common fame.’

‘With such reckless barbarity was the list framed that fanatical royalists, who were, at that very time, hazarding their property, their liberty, their lives, in the cause of James, were not secure from proscription. The most learned man of whom the Jacobite party could boast was Henry Dodwell,

Camdenian Professor in the University of Oxford. In the cause of hereditary monarchy he shrank from no sacrifice and from no danger. It was about him that William (of Orange) uttered those memorable words: ‘He has set his heart on being a martyr; and I have set mine on disappointing him.’ But James was more cruel to friends than William to foes. Dodwell was a Protestant: he had some property in Connaught: these crimes were sufficient; and he was set down in the long roll of those who were doomed to the gallows and the quartering block.

‘That James would give his assent to a bill which took from him the power of pardoning, seemed to many persons impossible. \* \* \* He might also have seen that the right course was the wise course. Had he, on this great occasion, had the spirit to declare that he would not shed the blood of the innocent, and that, even as respected the guilty, he would not divest himself of the power of tempering \*149 judgment with mercy, he would have regained more hearts in England than he would have lost in Ireland. But it was ever his fate to resist where he should have yielded, and to yield where he should have resisted. The most wicked of all laws received his sanction; and it is but a very small extenuation of his guilt that his sanction was somewhat reluctantly given.

‘That nothing might be wanting to the completeness of this great crime, extreme care was taken to prevent the persons who were attainted from knowing that they were attainted, till the day of grace fixed in the Act was passed. The roll of names was not published, but kept carefully locked up in Fitton’s closet. Some Protestants, who still adhered to the cause of James, but who were anxious to know whether any of their friends or relations had been proscribed, \*\*637 tried hard to obtain a sight of the list; but solicitation, remonstrance, even bribery, proved vain. Not a single copy got abroad till it was too late for any of the thousands who had been condemned without a trial to obtain a pardon.

\* \* \* That the colonists, when they had won the victory, grossly abused it, that their legislation was, during many years, unjust and tyrannical, is most true. But it is not less true that they never quite came up to the atrocious example set by their vanquished enemy during his short tenure of power.’

3 Macaulay, History of England from the Accession of James the Second (London, 1855) 216—220. (Footnotes appearing in the original have been omitted.)

Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER, concurring.

The more issues of law are inescapably entangled in political controversies, especially those that touch the passions of



the day, the more the Court is under duty to dispose of a controversy within the narrowest confines \*150 that intellectual integrity permits. And so I sympathize with the endeavor of my brother BURTON to decide these cases on a ground as limited as that which has commended itself to him. Unfortunately, I am unable to read the pleadings as he does. Therefore I must face up to larger issues. But in a case raising delicate constitutional questions it is particularly incumbent first to satisfy the threshold inquiry whether we have any business to decide the case at all. Is there, in short, a litigant before us who has a claim presented in a form and under conditions 'appropriate for judicial determination'? *Aetna Life Ins. Co. of Hartford, Conn. v. Haworth*, 300 U.S. 227, 240, 57 S.Ct. 461, 464, 81 L.Ed. 617.

I.

Limitation on 'the judicial Power of the United States' is expressed by the requirement that a litigant must have 'standing to sue' or, more comprehensively, that a federal court may entertain a controversy only if it is 'justiciable.' Both characterizations mean that a court will not decide a question unless the nature of the action challenged, the kind of injury inflicted, and the relationship between the parties are such that judicial determination is consonant with what was, generally speaking, the business of the Colonial courts and the courts of Westminster when the Constitution was framed. The jurisdiction of the federal courts can be invoked only under circumstances which to the expert feel of lawyers constitute a 'case or controversy.' The scope and consequences of the review with which the judiciary is entrusted over executive and legislative action require us to observe these bounds fastidiously. See the course of decisions beginning with *Hayburn's Case*, 2 Dall. 409, 1 L.Ed. 436, through *Parker v. Los Angeles County*, 338 U.S. 327, 70 S.Ct. 161, 94 L.Ed. 144. These generalities have had myriad applications. Each application, even to a situation not directly pertinent to what \*151 is before us, reflects considerations relevant to decision here. I shall confine my inquiry, however, by limiting it to suits seeking relief from governmental action.

(1) The simplest application of the concept of 'standing' is to situations in which there is no real controversy between the parties. Regard for the separation of powers, see *Muskrat v. United States*, 219 U.S. 346, 31 S.Ct. 250, 55 L.Ed. 246, and for the importance to correct decision of adequate presentation of issues by clashing interests, see *Chicago & G.T.R. Co. v. Wellman*, 143 U.S. 339, 12 S.Ct. 400, 36 L.Ed. 176, restricts the courts of the United States to issues

presented in an adversary manner. A petitioner does not have standing to sue unless he is 'interested in, and affected adversely by, the decision' of which he seeks review. His 'interest must be of a personal, and not of an official, nature.' *Braxton County Court v. State of West Virginia ex rel. Dillon*, 208 U.S. 192, 197, 28 S.Ct. 275, 276, 52 L.Ed. 450; see also *Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, 43 S.Ct. 597, 67 L.Ed. 1078. The interest must not be wholly negligible, as \*\*638 that of a taxpayer of the Federal Government is considered to be, *Frothingham v. Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, 43 S.Ct. 597, 67 L.Ed. 1078; cf. *Crampton v. Zabriskie*, 101 U.S. 601, 25 L.Ed. 1070. A litigant must show more than that 'he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally.' *Frothingham v. Mellon*, *supra*, 262 U.S. at page 488, 43 S.Ct. at page 601.

Adverse personal interest, even of such an indirect sort as arises from competition, is ordinarily sufficient to meet constitutional standards of justiciability. The courts may therefore by statute be given jurisdiction over claims based on such interests. *Federal Communications Commission v. Sanders Bros. Radio Station*, 309 U.S. 470, 642, 60 S.Ct. 693, 84 L.Ed. 869, 1037; cf. *Interstate Commerce Comm. v. Oregon-Washington R. & Nav. Co.*, 288 U.S. 14, 53 S.Ct. 266, 77 L.Ed. 588.

(2) To require a court to intervene in the absence of a statute, however, either on constitutional grounds or in the exercise of inherent equitable powers, something more than adverse personal interest is needed. This additional element is usually defined in terms which assume the answer. \*152 It is said that the injury must be 'a wrong which directly results in the violation of a legal right.' *Alabama Power Co. v. Ickes*, 302 U.S. 464, 479, 58 S.Ct. 300, 303, 82 L.Ed. 374. Or that the controversy 'must be definite and concrete, touching the legal relations of parties having adverse legal interests.' *Aetna Life Ins. Co. of Hartford, Conn. v. Haworth*, *supra*, 300 U.S. at pages 240—241, 57 S.Ct. at page 464. These terms have meaning only when contained by the facts to which they have been applied. In seeking to determine whether in the case before us the standards they reflect are met, therefore, we must go to the decisions. They show that the existence of 'legal' injury has turned on the answer to one or more of these questions: (a) Will the action challenged at any time substantially affect the 'legal' interests of any person? (b) Does the action challenged affect the petitioner with sufficient 'directness'? (c) Is the action challenged sufficiently 'final'? Since each of these questions itself contains a word of art, we must look to experience to find their meaning.

(a) Will the action challenged at any time substantially affect the ‘legal’ interests of any person? A litigant ordinarily has standing to challenge governmental action of a sort that, if taken by a private person, would create a right of action cognizable by the courts. *United States v. Lee*, 106 U.S. 196, 1 S.Ct. 240, 27 L.Ed. 171.<sup>1</sup> Or standing may be based on an interest created by the Constitution or a statute. E.g., *Parker v. Fleming*, 329 U.S. 531, 67 S.Ct. 463, 91 L.Ed. 479; *Coleman v. Miller*, 307 U.S. 433, 59 S.Ct. 972, 83 L.Ed. 1385; cf. *Bell v. Hood*, 327 U.S. 678, 66 S.Ct. 773, 90 L.Ed. 939. But if no comparable common-law right exists and no such constitutional or statutory interest has been created, relief is not available judicially. Thus, at least unless capricious discrimination is asserted, there is no protected interest in contracting with the Government. A litigant therefore has no standing \*153 to object that an official has misinterpreted his instructions in requiring a particular clause to be included in a contract. *Perkins v. Lukens Steel Co.*, 310 U.S. 113, 60 S.Ct. 869, 84 L.Ed. 1108. Similarly, a determination whether the Government is within its powers in distributing electric power may be of enormous financial consequence to a private power company, but it has no standing to raise the issue. *Tennessee Electric Power Co. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, 306 U.S. 118, 59 S.Ct. 366, 83 L.Ed. 543; cf. *Alabama Power Co. v. Ickes*, 302 U.S. 464, 58 S.Ct. 300, 82 L.Ed. 374. The common law does not recognize an interest in freedom from honest competition; a court will give protection from competition by the Government, therefore, only when the Constitution or a statute creates such a right.

\*\*639 (b) Does the action challenged affect petitioner with sufficient ‘directness’? Frequently governmental action directly affects the legal interests of some person, and causes only a consequential detriment to another. Whether the person consequentially harmed can challenge the action is said to depend on the ‘directness’ of the impact of the action on him. A shipper has no standing to attack a rate not applicable to him but merely affecting his previous competitive advantage over shippers subject to the rate. *Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees v. United States*, 263 U.S. 143, 148, 44 S.Ct. 72, 73, 68 L.Ed. 216; *Alexander Sprunt & Son v. United States*, 281 U.S. 249, 255, 257, 50 S.Ct. 315, 318, 74 L.Ed. 832. When those consequentially affected may resort to an administrative agency charged with their protection, courts are especially reluctant to give them ‘standing’ to claim judicial review. See *City of Atlanta v. Ickes*, 308 U.S. 517, 60 S.Ct. 170, 84 L.Ed. 440; cf. *Associated Industries of New York State v. Ickes*, 2 Cir., 134 F.2d 694.<sup>2</sup>

\*154 But it is not always true that only the person immediately affected can challenge the action. The fact that an advantageous relationship is terminable at will does not prevent a litigant from asserting that improper interference with it gives him ‘standing’ to assert a right of action. *Hitchman Coal & Coke Co. v. Mitchell*, 245 U.S. 229, 38 S.Ct. 65, 62 L.Ed. 260. On this principle in alien employee was allowed to challenge a State law requiring his employer to discharge all but a specified proportion of alien employees, *Truax v. Raich*, 239 U.S. 33, 36 S.Ct. 7, 60 L.Ed. 131, and a private school to enjoin enforcement of a statute requiring parents to send their children to public schools, *Pierce v. Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary*, 268 U.S. 510, 45 S.Ct. 571, 69 L.Ed. 1070. The likelihood that the interests of the petitioner will be adequately protected by the person directly affected is a relevant consideration, compare *Columbia Broadcasting System v. United States*, 316 U.S. 407, 423—424, 62 S.Ct. 1194, 1203, 86 L.Ed. 1563, with *Schenley Distillers Corp. v. United States*, 326 U.S. 432, 435, 66 S.Ct. 247, 248, 90 L.Ed. 181, as is, probably, the nature of the relationship involved. See *Davis & Farnum Mfg. Co. v. City of Los Angeles*, 189 U.S. 207, 220, 23 S.Ct. 498, 501, 47 L.Ed. 778; *Truax v. Raich*, 239 U.S. 33, 38—39, 36 S.Ct. 7, 9, 60 L.Ed. 131.<sup>3</sup>

(c) Is the action challenged sufficiently final? Although a litigant is the person most directly affected by the challenged action of the Government, he may not have ‘standing’ to raise his objections in a court if the action has not, as it were, come to rest.<sup>4</sup> Courts do not \*155 review issues, especially constitutional issues, until they have to. See *Parker v. Los Angeles County*, supra, and see Brandeis, J., concurring in *Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, 297 U.S. 288, 341, 56 S.Ct. 466, 480, 80 L.Ed. 688. In part, this practice reflects the tradition that courts, having final power, can exercise it most wisely by restricting \*\*640 themselves to situations in which decision is necessary. In part, it is founded on the practical wisdom of not coming prematurely or needlessly in conflict with the executive or legislature. See *Rochester Telephone Corp. v. United States*, 307 U.S. 125, 130—131, 59 S.Ct. 754, 757, 83 L.Ed. 1147. Controversies, therefore, are often held nonjusticiable ‘(w)here the action sought to be reviewed may have the effect of forbidding or compelling conduct on the part of the person seeking to review it, but only if some further action is taken by the Commission.’ *Rochester Telephone Corp. v. United States*, supra, 307 U.S. at page 129, 59 S.Ct. at page 756; and see *Chicago & Southern Air Lines v. Waterman S.S. Corp.*, 333 U.S. 103, 68 S.Ct. 431, 92

L.Ed. 568. There is no 'standing' to challenge a preliminary administrative determination, although the determination itself causes some detriment to the litigant. *United States v. Los Angeles & S.L.R. Co.*, 273 U.S. 299, 47 S.Ct. 413, 71 L.Ed. 651; cf. *Ex parte Williams*, 277 U.S. 267, 48 S.Ct. 523, 72 L.Ed. 877. Nor does the reservation of authority to act to a petitioner's detriment entitle him to challenge the reservation when it is conceded that the authority will be exercised only on a contingency which appears not to be imminent. *Eccles v. Peoples Bank of Lakewood Village, Cal.*, 333 U.S. 426, 68 S.Ct. 641, 92 L.Ed. 784. Lack of finality also explains the decision in *Standard Computing Scale Co. v. Farrell*, 249 U.S. 571, 39 S.Ct. 380, 63 L.Ed. 780. There the Court was faced by an advisory 'specification' of characteristics desirable in ordinary measuring scales. The specification could be enforced only by independent local officers' withholding their approval of the equipment. Justiciability was denied.<sup>5</sup>

\*156 'Finality' is not, however, a principle inflexibly applied. If the ultimate impact of the challenged action on the petitioner is sufficiently probable and not too distant, and if the procedure by which that ultimate action may be questioned is too onerous or hazardous, 'standing' is given to challenge the action at a preliminary stage. *Terrace v. Thompson*, 263 U.S. 197, 44 S.Ct. 15, 68 L.Ed. 255; *Santa Fe Pac. R. Co. v. Lane*, 244 U.S. 492, 37 S.Ct. 714, 61 L.Ed. 1275; see *Waite v. Macy*, 246 U.S. 606, 38 S.Ct. 395, 62 L.Ed. 892. It is well settled that equity will enjoin enforcement of criminal statutes found to be unconstitutional 'when it is found to be essential to the protection of the property rights, as to which the jurisdiction of a court of equity has been invoked.' E.g., *Philadelphia Co. v. Stimson*, 223 U.S. 605, 621, 32 S.Ct. 340, 345, 56 L.Ed. 570.<sup>6</sup> And if the determination challenged creates a status which enforces a course of conduct through penal sanctions, a litigant need not subject himself to the penalties to challenge the determination. *La Crosse Telephone Corp. v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Board*, 336 U.S. 18, 69 S.Ct. 379, 93 L.Ed. 463; *Shields v. Utah Idaho Central R. Co.*, 305 U.S. 177, 59 S.Ct. 160, 83 L.Ed. 111.

(3) Whether 'justiciability' exists, therefore, has most often turned on evaluating both the appropriateness of the issues for decision by courts and the hardship of denying judicial relief. This explains the inference to be drawn from the cases that 'standing' to challenge official action is more apt to exist when that action is not within the scope of official authority than when the objection to the administrative decision goes only to its correctness. See \*\*641 *United States v. Los*

*Angeles & S.L.R. Co.*, 273 U.S. 299, 314—315, 47 S.Ct. 413, 416, 71 L.Ed. 651; \*157 *Pennsylvania R. Co. v. United States Railroad Labor Board*, 261 U.S. 72, 43 S.Ct. 278, 67 L.Ed. 536; *Ex parte Williams*, 277 U.S. 267, 271, 48 S.Ct. 523, 525, 72 L.Ed. 877.<sup>7</sup> The objection to judicial restraint of an unauthorized exercise of powers is not weighty.<sup>8</sup>

## II.

The injury asserted in the cases at bar does not fall into any familiar category. Petitioner in No. 8, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, is, according to its complaint, an unincorporated association engaged in relief work on behalf of Spanish Republican refugees. \*158 Since its inception it has distributed relief totaling \$1,229,351; currently it is committed to regular monthly remittances of \$5,400. Its revenues have been obtained from public contributions, garnered largely at meetings and social functions. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, petitioner in No. 7, is a nonprofit membership corporation whose purpose is alleged to be to strengthen friendly relations between the United States and the Soviet Union by developing cultural relations 'between the peoples of the two nations' and by disseminating in this country educational materials about Russia. It has obtained its funds through public appeals and through collections at meetings. Petitioner in No. 71 is the International Workers Order. Its complaint states that it is a fraternal benefit society, comprising over 1,800 lodges, with assets totaling approximately \$5,000,000. Its members pay dues for the general expenses of the Order, and many of them make additional contributions for life, sickness and disability insurance. In addition to its insurance activities, the Order 'attempts to encourage the preservation of the cultural heritages and artistic values developed \* \* \* by the peoples of the different countries of the world and brought with them to the United States.'

In November 1947, each of these organizations was included in the list of groups designated by the Attorney General as within the provisions of *Executive Order No. 9835*, the President's Loyalty Order. The list was disseminated to all departments and agencies of the Government. Six months later, each was with more particularity labeled 'communist.' Each alleges substantial \*\*642 injury as a consequence. Publicity and meeting places have become difficult for the Refugee Committee and the Council to obtain. The federal tax exemptions of all three organizations have been revoked; licenses necessary to solicitation of funds have been denied the \*159 Refugee Committee; and the New York

Superintendent of Insurance has begun proceedings, in which a representative of the Attorney General of the United States has appeared, for dissolution of the Order. Most important, each of the organizations asserts that it has lost supporters and members, especially from present or prospective federal employees. Claiming that the injury is irreparable, each asks for relief by way of a declaratory judgment and an injunction.

The novelty of the injuries described in these petitions does not alter the fact that they present the characteristics which have in the past led this Court to recognize justiciability. They are unlike claims which the courts have hitherto found incompatible with the judicial process. No lack of finality can be urged. Designation works an immediate substantial harm to the reputations of petitioners. The threat which it carries for those members who are, or propose to become, federal employees makes it not a finicky or tenuous claim to object to the interference with their opportunities to retain or secure such employees as members. The membership relation is as substantial as that protected in *Truax v. Raich* and *Pierce v. Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary*, *supra*. And it is at least doubtful that the members could or would adequately present the organizations' objections to the designation provisions of the Order.

Only on the ground that the organizations assert no interest protected in analogous situations at common law, by statute, or by the Constitution, therefore, can plausible challenge to their 'standing' here be made. But the reasons which made an exercise of judicial power inappropriate in *Perkins v. Lukens Steel Co.*, *Tennessee Electric Power Co. v. Tennessee Valley Authority* and *Alabama Power Co. v. Ickes*, *supra*, are not apposite here. There the injuries were such that, had they not been inflicted by the Government, they clearly could not have been redressed. In \*160 *Perkins v. Lukens Steel Co.*, it was not asserted that the authority under which the Government acted was invalid; only the correctness of an interpretation of a statute in the course of the exercise of an admitted power was challenged. In the power cases protection from competition was sought; but the thrust of the law is to preserve competition, not to give protection from it. The action there challenged, furthermore, was not directed at named individuals. Here, on the other hand, petitioners seek to challenge governmental action stigmatizing them individually. They object, not to a particular erroneous application of a valid power, but to the validity of the regulation authorizing the action. They point to two types of injury, each of a sort which, were it not for principles of governmental immunity, would be clearly actionable at common law.

This controversy is therefore amenable to the judicial process.<sup>9</sup> Its justiciability does not depend solely on the fact that the action challenged is defamatory. Not every injury inflicted by a defamatory statement of a government officer can be redressed in court. On the balance of all considerations, the exercise here of judicial power accords with traditional canons for access to courts without inroads on the effective conduct of government.

### III.

This brings us to the merits of the claims before the Court. Petitioners are organizations which, on the face of the record, are engaged solely in charitable or insurance activities. They have been designated 'communist' by the Attorney General of \*\*643 the United States. This designation \*161 imposes no legal sanction on these organizations other than that it serves as evidence in ridding the Government of persons reasonably suspected of disloyalty. It would be blindness, however, not to recognize that in the conditions of our time such designation drastically restricts the organizations, if it does not proscribe them. Potential members, contributors or beneficiaries of listed organizations may well be influenced by use of the designation, for instance, as ground for rejection of applications for commissions in the armed forces or for permits for meetings in the auditoriums of public housing projects. Compare Act of April 3, 1948, s 110(c), 62 Stat. 143, 22 U.S.C. (Supp. III) s 1508(c), 22 U.S.C.A. s 1508(c). Yet, designation has been made without notice, without disclosure of any reasons justifying it, without opportunity to meet the undisclosed evidence or suspicion on which designation may have been based, and without opportunity to establish affirmatively that the aims and acts of the organization are innocent. It is claimed that thus to maim or decapitate, on the mere say-so of the Attorney General, an organization to all outward-seeming engaged in lawful objectives is so devoid of fundamental fairness as to offend the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

Fairness of procedure is 'due process in the primary sense.' [Brinkerhoff-Faris Trust & Savings Co. v. Hill](#), 281 U.S. 673, 681, 50 S.Ct. 451, 454, 74 L.Ed. 1107. It is ingrained in our national traditions and is designed to maintain them. In a variety of situations the Court has enforced this requirement by checking attempts of executives, legislatures, and lower courts to disregard the deep-rooted demands of fair play enshrined in the Constitution. '(T)his court has never held, nor must we now be understood as holding, that

administrative officers, when executing the provisions of a statute involving the liberty of persons, may disregard the fundamental principles that inhere in 'due process of law' as understood at the time of the adoption of the Constitution.

\*162 One of these principles is that no person shall be deprived of his liberty without opportunity, at some time to be heard \* \* \*.' *The Japanese Immigrant Case (Yamataya v. Fisher)*, 189 U.S. 86, 100—101, 23 S.Ct. 611, 614, 47 L.Ed. 721. '(B)y 'due process' is meant one which, following the forms of law, is appropriate to the case, and just to the parties to be affected. It must be pursued in the ordinary mode prescribed by the law; it must be adapted to the end to be attained; and wherever it is necessary for the protection of the parties, it must give them an opportunity to be heard respecting the justice of the judgment sought.' *Hagar v. Reclamation District, No. 108*, 111 U.S. 701, 708, 4 S.Ct. 663, 667, 28 L.Ed. 569. 'Before its property can be taken under the edict of an administrative officer, the appellant is entitled to a fair hearing upon the fundamental facts.' *Southern R. Co. v. Commonwealth of Virginia ex rel. Shirley*, 290 U.S. 190, 199, 54 S.Ct. 148, 151, 78 L.Ed. 260. 'Whether acting through its judiciary or through its Legislature, a state may not deprive a person of all existing remedies for the enforcement of a right, which the state has no power to destroy, unless there is, or was, afforded to him some real opportunity to protect it.' *Brinkerhoff-Faris Trust & Savings Co. v. Hill*, *supra*, 281 U.S. at page 682, 50 S.Ct. at page 454.

The requirement of 'due process' is not a fair-weather or timid assurance. It must be respected in periods of calm and in times of trouble; it protects aliens as well as citizens. But 'due process,' unlike some legal rules, is not a technical conception with a fixed content unrelated to time, place and circumstances. Expressing as it does in its ultimate analysis respect enforced by law for that feeling of just treatment which has been evolved through centuries of Anglo-American constitutional history and civilization, 'due process' cannot be imprisoned within the treacherous limits of any formula. Representing a profound attitude of fairness between man and man, and more particularly between the individual and government, 'due process' is compounded of history, \*163 reason, the \*\*644 past course of decisions, and stout confidence in the strength of the democratic faith which we profess. Due process is not a mechanical instrument. It is not a yardstick. It is a process. It is a delicate process of adjustment inescapably involving the exercise of judgment by those whom the Constitution entrusted with the unfolding of the process.

Fully aware of the enormous powers thus given to the judiciary and especially to its Supreme Court, those who founded this Nation put their trust in a judiciary truly independent—in judges not subject to the fears or allurements of a limited tenure and by the very nature of their function detached from passing and partisan influences.

It may fairly be said that, barring only occasional and temporary lapses, this Court has not sought unduly to confine those who have the responsibility of governing by giving the great concept of due process doctrinaire scope. The Court has responded to the infinite variety and perplexity of the tasks of government by recognizing that what is unfair in one situation may be fair in another. Compare, for instance, *Den ex dem. Murray v. Hoboken Land & Improvement Co.*, 18 How. 272, 15 L.Ed. 372, with *Ng Fung Ho v. White*, 259 U.S. 276, 42 S.Ct. 492, 66 L.Ed. 938, and see *Federal Communications Comm. v. WJR*, 337 U.S. 265, 275, 69 S.Ct. 1097, 1103, 93 L.Ed. 1353. Whether the ex parte procedure to which the petitioners were subjected duly observed 'the rudiments of fair play', *Chicago, M. & St. P.R. Co. v. Polt*, 232 U.S. 165, 168, 34 S.Ct. 301, 58 L.Ed. 554, cannot, therefore, be tested by mere generalities or sentiments abstractly appealing. The precise nature of the interest that has been adversely affected, the manner in which this was done, the reasons for doing it, the available alternatives to the procedure that was followed, the protection implicit in the office of the functionary whose conduct is challenged, the balance of hurt complained of and good accomplished—these are some of the considerations that must enter into the judicial judgment.

\*164 Applying them to the immediate situation, we note that publicly designating an organization as within the proscribed categories of the Loyalty Order does not directly deprive anyone of liberty or property. Weight must also be given to the fact that such designation is not made by a minor official but by the highest law officer of the Government. Again, it is fair to emphasize that the individual's interest is here to be weighed against a claim of the greatest of all public interests, that of national security. In striking the balance the relevant considerations must be fairly, which means coolly, weighed with due regard to the fact that this Court is not exercising a primary judgment but is sitting in judgment upon those who also have taken the oath to observe the Constitution and who have the responsibility for carrying on government.

But the significance we attach to general principles may turn the scale when competing claims appeal for supremacy. Achievements of our civilization as precious as they were

hard won were summarized by Mr. Justice Brandeis when he wrote that 'in the development of our liberty insistence upon procedural regularity has been a large factor.' *Burdeau v. McDowell*, 256 U.S. 465, 477, 41 S.Ct. 574, 576, 65 L.Ed. 1048 (dissenting). It is noteworthy that procedural safeguards constitute the major portion of our Bill of Rights. And so, no one now doubts that in the criminal law a 'person's right to reasonable notice of a charge against him, and an opportunity to be heard in his defense—a right to his day in court—are basic in our system of jurisprudence'. *In re Oliver*, 333 U.S. 257, 273, 68 S.Ct. 499, 507, 92 L.Ed. 682. 'The hearing, moreover, must be a real one, not a sham or a pretense.' *Palko v. State of Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319, 327, 58 S.Ct. 149, 153, 82 L.Ed. 288. Nor is there doubt that notice and hearing are prerequisite to due process in civil proceedings, e.g., **\*\*645** *Coe v. Armour Fertilizer Works*, 237 U.S. 413, 35 S.Ct. 625, 59 L.Ed. 1027. Only the narrowest exceptions, justified by history become part of the habits of our people or **\*165** by obvious necessity, are tolerated. *Ownbey v. Morgan*, 256 U.S. 94, 41 S.Ct. 433, 65 L.Ed. 837; *Endicott-Johnson Corp. v. Encyclopedia Press*, 266 U.S. 285, 45 S.Ct. 61, 69 L.Ed. 288; see *Cooke v. United States*, 267 U.S. 517, 536, 45 S.Ct. 390, 394, 69 L.Ed. 767.

It is against this background of guiding considerations that we must view the rather novel aspects of the situation at hand. It is not true that the evils against which the Loyalty Order was directed are wholly devoid of analogy in our own history. The circumstances attending the Napoleonic conflicts, which gave rise to the Sedition Act of 1798, 1 Stat. 596, readily come to mind. But it is true that the executive action now under scrutiny is of a sort not heretofore challenged in this Court. That of itself does not justify the ex parte summary designation procedure. It does make it necessary to consider its validity when judged by our whole experience with the Due Process Clause.

#### IV.

The construction placed by this Court upon legislation conferring administrative powers shows consistent respect for a requirement of fair procedure before men are denied or deprived of rights. From a great mass of cases, running the full gamut of control over property and liberty, there emerges the principle that statutes should be interpreted, if explicit language does not preclude, so as to observe due process in its basic meaning. See, e.g., *Anniston Mfg. Co. v. Davis*, 301 U.S. 337, 57 S.Ct. 816, 81 L.Ed. 1143; *American Power & Light Co. v. Securities and Exchange Commission*,

329 U.S. 90, 107—108, 67 S.Ct. 133, 143, 91 L.Ed. 103; *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath*, 339 U.S. 33, 49, 70 S.Ct. 445, 453, 94 L.Ed. 616. Fair hearings have been held essential for rate determinations<sup>10</sup> and, generally, to deprive **\*166** persons of property.<sup>11</sup> **\*\*646** An opportunity to be heard is constitutionally necessary to deport persons even though they make no claim of citizenship, and is accorded to aliens seeking entry in the absence of specific directions to the contrary.<sup>12</sup> Even in the distribution by the Government of benefits that may be withheld, the opportunity of a hearing is deemed important.<sup>13</sup>

**\*167** The high social and moral values inherent in the procedural safeguard of a fair hearing are attested by the narrowness and rarity of the instances when we have sustained executive action even though it did not observe the customary standards of procedural fairness. It is in these instances that constitutional compulsion regarding fair procedure was directly in issue. Thus it has been held that the Constitution cannot be invoked to prevent Congress from authorizing disbursements on the ex parte determination of an administrative officer that prescribed conditions are met. *United States v. Babcock*, 250 U.S. 328, 39 S.Ct. 464, 63 L.Ed. 1011; cf. *United States ex rel. Dunlap v. Black*, 128 U.S. 40, 9 S.Ct. 12, 32 L.Ed. 354. The importation of goods is a privilege which, if Congress clearly so directs, may likewise be conditioned on ex parte findings. *Buttfield v. Stranahan*, 192 U.S. 470, 24 S.Ct. 349, 48 L.Ed. 525; cf. *Hilton v. Merrett*, 110 U.S. 97, 3 S.Ct. 548, 28 L.Ed. 83. Only by a close division of the Court was it held that at a time of national emergency, when war has not been closed by formal peace, the Attorney General is not required to give a hearing before denying hospitality to an alien deemed dangerous to public security. *Ludecke v. Watkins*, 335 U.S. 160, 68 S.Ct. 1429, 92 L.Ed. 881; *United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537, 70 S.Ct. 309, 94 L.Ed. 317. Again, when decisions of administrative officers in execution of legislation turn exclusively on considerations similar to those on which the legislative body could itself have acted summarily, notice and hearing may not be commanded by the Constitution. *Bi-Metallic Inv. Co. v. State Board of Equalization of Colorado*, 239 U.S. 441, 36 S.Ct. 141, 60 L.Ed. 372.<sup>14</sup> **\*168** Finally, summary administrative procedure may be sanctioned by history or obvious necessity. But these are so rare as to be isolated instances. *Den ex dem. Murray v. Hoboken Land & Improvement Co.*, 18 How. 272, 15 L.Ed. 372; *Springer v. United States*, 102 U.S. 586, 26 L.Ed. 253; *Lawton v. Steele*, 152 U.S. 133, 14 S.Ct. 499, 38 L.Ed. 385.

This Court is not alone in recognizing that the right to be heard before being **\*\*647** condemned to suffer grievous loss of any kind, even though it may not involve the stigma and hardships of a criminal conviction, is a principle basic to our society. Regard for this principle has guided Congress and the Executive. Congress has often entrusted, as it may, protection of interests which it has created to administrative agencies rather than to the courts. But rarely has it authorized such agencies to act without those essential safeguards for fair judgment which in the course of centuries have come to be associated with due process. See *Switchmen's Union of North America v. National Mediation Board*, 320 U.S. 297, 64 S.Ct. 95, 88 L.Ed. 61; *Tutun v. United States*, 270 U.S. 568, 576, 577, 46 S.Ct. 425, 426, 70 L.Ed. 738; *Pennsylvania R. Co. v. United States Railroad Labor Board*, 261 U.S. 72, 43 S.Ct. 278, 67 L.Ed. 536.<sup>15</sup> And When Congress **\*169** has given an administrative agency discretion to determine its own procedure, the agency has rarely chosen to dispose of the rights of individuals without a hearing, however informals.<sup>16</sup>

**\*170** The heart of the matter is that democracy implies respect for the elementary rights of men, however suspect or unworthy; a democratic government must therefore practice fairness; and fairness **\*\*648** can rarely be obtained by secret, one-sided determination of facts decisive of rights.<sup>17</sup>

An opportunity to be heard may not seem vital when an issue relates only to technical questions susceptible **\*171** of demonstrable proof on which evidence is not likely to be overlooked and argument on the meaning and worth of conflicting and cloudy data not apt to be helpful. But in other situations an admonition of Mr. Justice Holmes becomes relevant. 'One has to remember that when one's interest is keenly excited evidence gathers from all sides around the magnetic point \* \* \*'.<sup>18</sup> It should be particularly heeded at times of agitation and anxiety, when fear and suspicion impregnate the air we breathe. Compare *Brown, The French Revolution in English History*. 'The plea that evidence of guilt must be secret is abhorrent to free men, because it provides a cloak for the malevolent, the misinformed, the meddlesome, and the corrupt to play the role of informer undetected and uncorrected.' *United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537, 551, 70 S.Ct. 309, 317, 94 L.Ed. 317 (dissenting). Appearances in the dark are apt to look different in the light of day.

Man being what he is cannot safely be trusted with complete immunity from outward responsibility in depriving others of

**\*\*649** their rights. At least such is the conviction underlying our Bill of Rights. That a conclusion satisfies one's private conscience does not attest its reliability. The validity and moral authority of a conclusion largely depend on the mode by which it was reached. Secrecy is not congenial to truth-seeking and self-righteousness gives too slender an assurance of rightness. No better instrument has been devised for arriving at truth than to give a person in jeopardy of serious loss **\*172** notice of the case against him and opportunity to meet it. Nor has a better way been found for generating the feeling, so important to a popular government, that justice has been done.<sup>19</sup>

V.

The strength and significance of these considerations—considerations which go to the very ethos of the scheme of our society—give a ready answer to the problem before us. That a hearing has been thought indispensable in so many other situations, leaving the cases of denial exceptional, does not of itself prove that it must be found essential here. But it does place upon the Attorney General the burden of showing weighty reason for departing in this instance from a rule so deeply imbedded in history and in the demands of justice. Nothing in the Loyalty Order requires him to deny organizations opportunity to present their case. The Executive Order, defining his powers, directs only that designation shall be made 'after appropriate investigation and determination.' This surely does not preclude an administrative procedure, however informal, which would incorporate the essentials of due process. Nothing has been presented to the Court to **\*173** indicate that it will be impractical or prejudicial to a concrete public interest to disclose to organizations the nature of the case against them and to permit them to meet it if they can. Indeed, such a contention could hardly be made inasmuch as the Loyalty Order itself requires partial disclosure and hearing in proceedings against a Government employee who is a member of a proscribed organization. Whether such procedure sufficiently protects the rights of the employee is a different story. Such as it is, it affords evidence that the wholly summary process for the organizations is inadequate.<sup>20</sup> And we have controlling proof that Congress did not think that the Attorney General's procedure was indispensable for the protection of the public interest. The McCarran Act, passed under circumstances certainly not more serene than when the Loyalty Order was issued, grants organizations a full administrative hearing, subject to judicial

review, before they are required to register as ‘Communist-action’ or ‘Communist-front.’<sup>21</sup>

We are not here dealing with the grant of Government largess. We have not before \*\*650 us the measured action of Congress, with the pause that is properly engendered when the validity of legislation is assailed. The Attorney General is certainly not immune from the historic requirements of fairness merely because he acts, however conscientiously, in the name of security. Nor does he obtain immunity on the ground that designation is not an ‘adjudication’ or a ‘regulation’ in the conventional use of those terms. Due process is not confined in its scope to the particular forms in which rights have heretofore been \*174 found to have been curtailed for want of procedural fairness. Due process is perhaps the most majestic concept in our whole constitutional system. While it contains the garnered wisdom of the past in assuring fundamental justice, it is also a living principle not confined to past instances.

Therefore the petitioners did set forth causes of action which the District Court should have entertained.

Mr. Justice DOUGLAS, concurring.

While I join in the opinion of Mr. Justice BURTON, which would dispose of the cases on procedural grounds, the Court has decided them on the Constitution. And so I turn to that aspect of the cases.

The resolution of the constitutional question presents one of the gravest issues of this generation. There is no doubt in my mind of the need for the Chief Executive and the Congress to take strong measures against any Fifth Column worming its way into government—a Fifth Column that has access to vital information and the purpose to paralyze and confuse. The problems of security are real. So are the problems of freedom. The paramount issue of the age is to reconcile the two.

In days of great tension when feelings run high, it is a temptation to take shortcuts by borrowing from the totalitarian techniques of our opponents. But when we do, we set in motion a subversive influence of our own design that destroys us from within. The present cases, together with No. 49, *Bailey v. Richardson*, 341 U.S. 918, 71 S.Ct. 669, affirmed today by an equally divided Court, are simple illustrations of that trend.

I disagree with Mr. Justice JACKSON that an organization—whether it be these petitioners, the American Red Cross, the Catholic Church, the Masonic Order, or the Boy Scouts

—has no standing to object to being labeled ‘subversive’ in these ex parte proceedings. The opinion \*175 of Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER disposes of that argument. This is not an instance of name calling by public officials. This is a determination of status—a proceeding to ascertain whether the organization is or is not ‘subversive.’ This determination has consequences that are serious to the condemned organizations. Those consequences flow in part, of course, from public opinion. But they also flow from actions of regulatory agencies that are moving in the wake of the Attorney General's determination to penalize or police these organizations.<sup>1</sup> An organization \*\*651 branded as ‘subversive’ by the Attorney General is maimed and crippled. The injury is real, immediate, and incalculable.

The requirements for fair trials under our system of government need no elaboration. A party is entitled to \*176 know the charge against him; he is also entitled to notice and opportunity to be heard. Those principles were, in my opinion, violated here.

The charge that these organizations are ‘subversive’ could be clearly defined. But how can anyone in the context of the Executive Order say what it means? It apparently does not necessarily mean ‘totalitarian,’ ‘facist’ or ‘communist’ because they are separately listed. Does it mean an organization with socialist ideas? There are some who lump Socialists and Communists together. Does it mean an organization that thinks the lot of some peasants has been improved under Soviet auspices? Does it include an organization that is against the action of the United Nations in Korea? Does it embrace a group which on some issues of international policy aligns itself with the Soviet viewpoint? Does it mean a group which has unwittingly become the tool for Soviet propaganda? Does it mean one into whose membership some Communists have infiltrated? Or does it describe only an organization which under the guise of honorable activities serves as a front for Communist activities?

No one can tell from the Executive Order what meaning is intended. No one can tell from the records of the cases which one the Attorney General applied. The charge is flexible; it will mean one thing to one officer, another to someone else. It will be given meaning according to the predilections of the prosecutor; ‘subversive’ to some will be synonymous with ‘radical’; ‘subversive’ to others will be synonymous with ‘communist.’ It can be expanded to include those who depart from the orthodox party line—to those whose words and actions (though completely loyal) do not conform to the



orthodox view on foreign or domestic policy. These flexible standards, which vary with the mood or political philosophy of the prosecutor, are weapons which can be made as sharp or as blunt as the occasion requires. Since they are subject \*177 to grave abuse, they have no place in our system of law. When we employ them, we plant within our body politic the virus of the totalitarian ideology which we oppose.

It is not enough to know that the men applying the standard are honorable and devoted men. This is a government of laws not of men. The powers being used are the powers of government over the reputations and fortunes of citizens. In situations far less severe or important than these a party is told the nature of the charge against him. Thus when a defendant is summoned before a federal court to answer to a claim for damages or to a demand for an injunction against him, there must be a 'plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.'<sup>2</sup> If that is necessary for even the most minor claim asserted against a defendant, we should require no less when it comes to determinations that may well destroy the group against whom the charge of being 'subversive' is directed.<sup>3</sup> When the \*\*652 Government becomes the moving party and levels its great powers against the citizen, it should be held to the same standards of fair dealing as we prescribe for other legal contests. To let the Government adopt such lesser ones as suits the convenience of its officers is to start down the totalitarian path.

The trend in that direction is only emphasized by the failure to give notice and hearing on the charges in these cases and by the procedure adopted in *Bailey v. Richardson*, *supra*.

\*178 Notice and opportunity to be heard are fundamental to due process of law. We would reverse these cases out of hand if they were suits of a civil nature to establish a claim against petitioners. Notice and opportunity to be heard are indispensable to a fair trial whether the case be criminal or civil. See *Coe v. Armour Fertilizer Works*, 237 U.S. 413, 424, 35 S.Ct. 625, 629, 59 L.Ed. 1027; *Palko v. State of Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319, 327, 58 S.Ct. 149, 152, 82 L.Ed. 288; *In re Oliver*, 333 U.S. 257, 273, 68 S.Ct. 499, 507, 92 L.Ed. 682. The gravity of the present charges is proof enough of the need for notice and hearing before the United States officially brands these organizations as 'subversive.' No more critical governmental ruling can be made against an organization these days. It condemns without trial. It destroys without opportunity to be heard. The condemnation may in each case be wholly justified. But government in this country cannot by edict condemn or place beyond the pale. The

rudiments of justice, as we know it, call for notice and hearing—an opportunity to appear and to rebut the charge.

The system used to condemn these organizations is bad enough. The evil is only compounded when a government employee is charged with being disloyal. Association with or membership in an organization found to be 'subversive' weighs heavily against the accused. He is not allowed to prove that the charge against the organization is false. That case is closed; that line of defense is taken away. The technique is one of guilt by association—one of the most odious institutions of history. The fact that the technique of guilt by association was used in the prosecutions at Nuremberg<sup>4</sup> does not make it \*179 congenial to our constitutional scheme. Guilt under our system of government is personal. When we make guilt vicarious we borrow from systems alien to ours and ape our enemies. Those short-cuts may at times seem to serve noble aims; but we depreciate ourselves by indulging in them. When we deny even the most degraded person the rudiments of a fair trial, we endanger the liberties of everyone. We set a pattern of conduct that is dangerously expansive and is adaptable to the needs of any majority bent on suppressing opposition or dissension.

It is not without significance that most of the provisions of the Bill of Rights are procedural. It is procedure that spells much of the difference between rule by law and rule by whim or caprice. Steadfast adherence to strict procedural safeguards is our main assurance that there will be equal justice under law. The case of Dorothy Bailey is an excellent illustration of how dangerous a departure from our constitutional standards can be. She \*\*653 was charged with being a Communist and with being active in a Communist 'front organization.' The Review Board stated that the case against her was based on reports, some of which came from 'informants certified to us by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as experienced and entirely reliable.'

\*180 Counsel for Dorothy Bailey asked that their names be disclosed. That was refused.

Counsel for Dorothy Bailey asked if these informants had been active in a certain union. The chairman replied, 'I haven't the slightest knowledge as to who they were or how active they have been in anything.'

Counsel for Dorothy Bailey asked if those statements of the informants were under oath. The chairman answered, 'I don't think so.'

The Loyalty Board convicts on evidence which it cannot even appraise. The critical evidence may be the word of an unknown witness who is 'a paragon of veracity, a knave, or the village idiot.'<sup>5</sup> His name, his reputation, his prejudices, his animosities, his trustworthiness are unknown both to the judge and to the accused. The accused has no opportunity to show that the witness lied or was prejudiced or venal. Without knowing who her accusers are she has no way of defending. She has nothing to offer except her own word and the character testimony of her friends.

Dorothy Bailey was not, to be sure, faced with a criminal charge and hence not technically entitled under the Sixth Amendment to be confronted with the witnesses against her. But she was on trial for her reputation, her job, her professional standing. A disloyalty trial is the most crucial event in the life of a public servant. If condemned, he is branded for life as a person unworthy of trust or confidence. To make that condemnation without meticulous regard for the decencies of a fair trial is abhorrent to fundamental justice.

I do not mean to imply that but for these irregularities the system of loyalty trials is constitutional. I do not see how the constitutionality of this dragnet system of loyalty trials which has been entrusted to the administrative agencies of government can be sustained. Every government **\*181** employee must take an oath of loyalty.<sup>6</sup> If he swears falsely, he commits perjury and can be tried in court. In such a trial he gets the full protection of the Bill of Rights, including trial by jury and the presumption of innocence. I am inclined to the view that when a disloyalty charge is substituted for perjury and an administrative board substituted for the court 'the spirit and the letter of the Bill of Rights' are offended.<sup>7</sup>

The problem of security is real; and the Government need not be paralyzed in handling it. The security problem, however, relates only to those sensitive areas where secrets are or may be available, where critical policies are being formulated, or where sabotage can be committed. The department heads must have leeway in handling their personnel problems in these sensitive areas. The question is one of the fitness or qualifications of an individual for a particular position. One can be transferred from **\*\*654** those areas even when there is no more than a suspicion as to his loyalty. We meet constitutional difficulties when the Government undertakes to punish by proclaiming the disloyalty of an employee and making him ineligible for any government post. The British have avoided those difficulties by applying the loyalty procedure only in sensitive areas and in using it to test the

qualifications of an employee for a particular **\*182** post, not to condemn him for all public employment.<sup>8</sup> When we go beyond that procedure and adopt the dragnet system now in force, we trench upon the civil rights of our people. We condemn by administrative edict, rather than by jury trial.<sup>9</sup> Of course, no one has a constitutional **\*183** right to a government job. But every citizen has a right to a fair trial when his government seeks to deprive him of the privileges of first-class citizenship.

The evil of these cases is only emphasized by the procedure employed in Dorothy Bailey's case. Together they illustrate how deprivation of our citizens of fair trials is subversion from within.

Mr. Justice JACKSON, concurring.

It is unfortunate that this Court should flounder in wordy disagreement over the validity and effect of procedures which have already been pursued for several years. The extravagance of some of the views expressed and the intemperance of their statement may create a suspicion that the decision of the case does not rise above the political controversy that engendered it.

Mr. Justice BURTON, and those for whom he speaks, would rescue the Loyalty Order from inquiry as to its validity by spelling out an admission by the Attorney General that it has been arbitrarily misapplied. Mr. Justice BLACK would have us hold that listing by the Attorney General of organizations alleged to be subversive is the equivalent of a bill of attainder for treason after the fashion of those of the Stuart kings, while Mr. Justice REED contends, in substance, that the designation is a mere press release without legal consequences.

If the Court agreed that an accused employee could challenge the designation, its effect would be only advisory or prima facie; but as I point out later, the Court refuses so to limit the effect of the designation. In view of these and other diversified opinions, none of which has attracted sufficient adherents for a Court and none of which I can fully accept, I shall state rather than argue my view of the matter.

**\*\*655** 1. The Loyalty Order does affect substantive legal rights.—I agree that mere designation as subversive deprives **\*184** the organizations themselves of no legal right or immunity. By it they are not dissolved, subjected to any legal prosecution, punished, penalized, or prohibited from carrying on any of their activities. Their claim of injury is that they cannot attract audiences, enlist members, or

obtain contributions as readily as before. These, however, are sanctions applied by public disapproval, not by law. It is quite true that the popular censure is focused upon them by the Attorney General's characterization. But the right of privacy does not extend to organized groups or associations which solicit funds or memberships or to corporations dependent upon the state for their charters.<sup>1</sup> The right of individuals to assemble is one thing; the claim that an organization of secret undisclosed character may conduct public drives for funds or memberships is another. They may be free to solicit, propagandize, and hold meetings, but they are not free from public criticism or exposure. If the only effect of the Loyalty Order was that suffered by the organizations, I should think their right to relief very dubious.

But the real target of all this procedure is the government employee who is a member of, or sympathetic to, one or more accused organizations. He not only may be discharged, but disqualified from employment, upon no other ground than such membership or sympathetic affiliation. And he cannot attack the correctness of the Attorney General's designation in any loyalty proceeding.<sup>2</sup>

**\*185** Ordinary dismissals from government service which violate no fixed tenure concern only the Executive branch, and courts will not review such discretionary action.<sup>3</sup> However, these are not discretionary discharges but discharges pursuant to an order having force of law. Administrative machinery is publicly set up to comb the whole government service<sup>4</sup> to discharge persons or to declare them ineligible for employment upon an incontestable finding, made without hearing, that some organization is subversive. To be deprived not only of present government employment but of future opportunity for it certainly is no small injury when government employment so dominates the field of opportunity.

The fact that one may not have a legal right to get or keep a government post does not mean that he can be adjudged ineligible illegally. *Perkins v. Elg*.<sup>5</sup>

**\*186** 2. To promulgate with force of law a conclusive finding of disloyalty, without hearing at some stage before such finding **\*\*656** becomes final, is a denial of due process of law.—On this subject, I agree with the opinion of Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. That the safeguard of a hearing would not defeat the effectiveness of a Loyalty Program is apparently the judgment of Congress and of State

Legislatures, for, as he points out, both congressional and state loyalty legislation recognize the right.

3. The organizations may vindicate unconstitutional deprivation of members' rights.—There are two stages at which administrative hearings could protect individuals' legal rights—one is before an organization is designated as subversive, the other is when the individual, because of membership, is accused of disloyalty. Either choice might be a permissible solution of a difficult problem inherent in such an extensive program. But an equally divided Court today, erroneously, I think, rejects the claim that the individual has hearing rights.<sup>6</sup> I am unable to comprehend the process by which those who think the Attorney General's designation is no more than a press release can foreclose attack upon it in the employees' case. Also beyond my understanding is how a Court whose collective opinion is that the designations are subject to judicial inquiry can at the same time say that a discharge based at least in part on them is not.

By the procedures of this Loyalty Order, both groups and individuals may be labeled disloyal and subversive. The Court grants judicial review and relief to the group while refusing it to the individual. So far as I recall, this is the first time this Court has held rights of individuals subordinate and inferior to those of organized groups. I think that is an inverted view of the law—it is justice turned bottom-side up.

**\*187** I have believed that a corporation can maintain an action to protect rights under the Due Process or Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment, e.g., *Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Glander*, 337 U.S. 562, 574, 69 S.Ct. 1291, 1297, 93 L.Ed. 1544. The only practical judicial policy when people pool their capital, their interests, or their activities under a name and form that will identify collective interests, often is to permit the association or corporation in a single case to vindicate the interests of all.

This procedure is appropriate here where the Government has lumped all the members' interests in the organization so that condemnation of the one will reach all. The Government proceeds on the basis that each of these associations is so identical with its members that the subversive purpose and intents of the one may be attributed to and made conclusive upon the other. Having adopted this procedure in the Executive Department, I think the Government can hardly ask the Judicial Department to deny the standing of the organizations to vindicate its members' rights.

Unless a hearing is provided in which the organization can present evidence as to its character, a presumption of disloyalty is entered against its every member-employee, and because of it, he may be branded disloyal, discharged, and rendered ineligible for government service. I would reverse the decisions for lack of due process in denying a hearing at any stage.

Mr. Justice REED, with whom THE CHIEF JUSTICE and Mr. Justice MINTON join, dissenting.

The three organizations named in the caption, together with certain other groups **\*\*657** and individuals, filed suits in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia primarily to have declared unconstitutional [Executive Order No. 9835](#), March 21, 1947, [12 Fed.Reg. 1935](#), as applied against these petitioners. Acting under **\*188** Part III, s 3 of [Executive Order No. 9835](#), note 38 *infra*, the Attorney General, on November 24, 1947, transmitted the required list of organizations to the Loyalty Review Board. This list included the three above-named organizations. The Board promptly disseminated the information to all departments and agencies. It was published as Appendix A to Title 5, Administrative Personnel, CFR s 210.11(b)(6). [13 Fed.Reg. 1471](#). Later, September 17, 1948, the three organizations were designated by the Attorney General as ‘communist.’ [13 Fed.Reg. 6135](#). The relief sought by petitioners was to have the names of the organizations deleted from the allegedly unconstitutionally created lists because of the obvious harm to their activities by reason of their designation.

The list was transmitted to the Board by the Attorney General as a part of the plan of the President, broadly set forth in [Executive Order No. 9835](#), to furnish maximum protection ‘against infiltration of disloyal persons into the ranks of (government) employees, and equal protection from unfounded accusations of disloyalty’ for the loyal employees. [12 Fed.Reg. 1935](#). [Executive Order No. 9835](#) came after long consideration of the problems of possible damage to the Government from disloyalty among its employees. 92 Cong.Rec. 9601. See the Report of the President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty (appointed 1946), p. 23: ‘The presence within the government of any disloyal or subversive persons, or the attempt by any such persons to obtain government employment, presents a problem of such importance that it must be dealt with vigorously and effectively.’ A list of subversive organizations under [Executive Order No. 9300](#), 3 CFR, 1943 Cum.Supp., 1252, was likewise disseminated to government agencies.

[13 Fed.Reg. 1473](#). **\*189** Great Britain (see note 31, *infra*), Australia (Act of October 20, 1950), New Zealand ([Deynzer v. Campbell](#), (1950) N.Z.L.R. 790; 37th Rep., Public Service Comm'n, New Zealand, 1949, p. 14; 38th Rep., Public Service Comm'n, New Zealand, 1950, p. 12), and the Union of South Africa (Act No. 44 of 1950) have taken legislative or administrative steps to control disloyalty among government employees. See The Report of the Royal Commission (Canada) appointed under Order in Council, P.C. 411, February 5, 1946. The method of dealing with communism and communists adopted by the Commonwealth of Australia was held beyond the powers of that government. [Australian Communist Party v. Commonwealth](#), decision of Friday, March 9, 1951, 83 C.L.R. 1.

The procedure for designating these petitioners as communists may be summarized as follows: [Executive Order No. 9835](#), Part III, was issued by the President as Chief Executive, ‘in the interest of the internal management of the Government’ and under the Civil Service Act of 1883, 22 Stat. 403, as amended, 5 U.S.C.A. s 632 et seq., and s 9A of the Hatch Act. 5 U.S.C.Supp. II, s 118j, 5 U.S.C.A. s 118j. The former acts give general regulatory powers over the employment and discharge of government personnel; the latter is more specific.<sup>1</sup> These present **\*\*658** cases do not involve the removal of any employee. **\*190** The Order required investigation of the loyalty of applicants for government employment and similar investigation of present employees. To assure uniformity and fairness throughout the Government in the investigation of employees, a Loyalty Review Board was created to review loyalty cases from any department or agency, disseminate information pertinent to employee loyalty programs, and advise the heads thereof. Standards were provided for employment and discharge. So far as pertinent to the objections of petitioner to inclusion on the list of subversive and communist organizations, they appear in note 3 and in the note below.<sup>2</sup> It was apparently to avoid the necessity of continuous reexamination by all government departments and agencies of the characteristics of organizations suspected of aims inimical to the Government that provision was made in the Order for examination and designation of such organizations by **\*191** the Attorney General. [12 Fed.Reg. 1938](#), Part III, s 3.<sup>3</sup> It was under this plan that the Attorney General made his designations.

The designations made available for the use of the Loyalty Review Board and the departmental or agency loyalty boards, the result of the investigation of the Attorney General into the character of organizations that might fall under suspicion

as totalitarian, fascist, communist or subversive. The list does not furnish a basis for any court action against the organizations so designated. It of course might follow from discovery of facts by the investigation that criminal or civil proceedings would be begun to enforce an applicable criminal statute or to cancel the franchise or some license of a listed organization. In such a proceeding, however, the accused organization would have the usual protections of any defendant. The list is evidence only of the character of the listed organizations in proceedings before loyalty boards to determine whether 'reasonable' grounds exist for belief 'that the employee under consideration' is disloyal to the Government of the United States. See note 2, *supra*. The names were placed on the list by the Attorney General after investigation. If legally permissible, as carried out by the Attorney General, there **\*\*659** is no question but that a single investigation as to the character of **\*192** an organization is preferable to one by each of the more than a hundred agencies of government that are catalogued in the United States Government Organization Manual. To require a determination as to each organization for the administrative hearing of each employee investigated for disloyalty would be impossible. The employee's association with a listed organization does not, under the Order, establish, even *prima facie*, reasonable grounds for belief in the employee's disloyalty.<sup>4</sup>

None of the complaints deny that the Attorney General made an 'investigation' of the organizations to determine whether or not they were totalitarian, fascist, communist or subversive as required by Part III, s 3, or that he had material information concerning disloyal activities on their part. The Council came the nearest to such an allegation in the quoted excerpts from their complaint in note 10, but we read them as no more than allegations of unconstitutionality because 'investigation' without notice and hearing is not 'appropriate.' Certainly there is no specific allegation of the way in which the Attorney General failed to follow the Order. We therefore assume that the designation was made after appropriate investigation and determination.<sup>5</sup>

**\*193** No objection is or could reasonably be made in the records or briefs to an examination by the Government into the loyalty of its employees. Although the Founders of this Republic rebelled against their established government of England and won our freedom, the creation of our own constitutional government endowed that new government, the United States of America, with the right and duty to protect its existence against any force that seeks its overthrow or

changes in its structure by other than constitutional means. Tolerant as we are of all political efforts by argument or persuasion to change the basis of our social, economic or political life, the line if drawn sharply and clearly at any act or incitement to act in violation of our constitutional processes. Surely the Government need not await an employee's conviction of a crime involving disloyalty before separating him from public service. Governments cannot be indifferent to manifestations of subversion. As soon as these are significant enough reasonably to cause concern as to the likelihood of action, the duty to protect the state compels the exertion of governmental power. Not to move would brand a government with a dangerous weakness of will. The determination of the time for action rests with the executive and legislature arms. An objection to consideration of an employee's sympathetic association with an admitted totalitarian, fascist, communist or subversive group, as bearing upon the propriety of his retention or employment as a government employee would have no better standing. The Order gives conclusive indication of the type of organization that **\*\*660** is meant by the four **\*194** word-labels.<sup>6</sup> Following them in Part III, s 3, 12 Fed.Reg. 1938, are the words, 'or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.' Bracketed with membership in listed organizations (Exec.Order No. 9835, Part V) as activities for consideration in determining an employee's loyalty are those listed below. These are the standards that define the type of organization subject to designation.<sup>7</sup> Of course, the Order means that a communist or subversive organization is of the same general character as one that seeks to alter our form of government by unconstitutional means, 13 Fed.Reg. 6137, to wit by force and violence.

Procedure under the Executive Order does not require 'proof' in the sense of a court proceeding that these communist organizations teach or incite to force and violence **\*195** to obtain their objectives.<sup>8</sup> What is required by the Order is an examination and determination by the Attorney General that these organizations are 'communist.' The description 'communist' is adequate for the purposes of inquiry and listing. No such precision of definition is necessary as a criminal prosecution might require. Cf. *United States v. Chemical Foundation*, 272 U.S. 1, 14, 47 S.Ct. 1, 6, 71 L.Ed. 131. Communism is well understood to mean a group seeking to overthrow by force and violence governments such as ours

and to establish a new government based on public ownership and direction of productive property. Undoubtedly, there are reasonable grounds to conclude that accepted history teaches that revolution by force and violence to accomplish this end is a tenet of communists.<sup>9</sup> No more is necessary to justify an organization's designation as communist.

**\*\*661 \*196** As a basis for petitioners' attack on the list, the Refugee Committee set forth facts in its complaint to show its charitable character. These indicate activities and expenditures in aid of the Spanish Republicans in flight from their homeland. The International Workers Order sets forth facts to show that it was a duly organized fraternal benefit society under New York law, furnishing sickness and death benefits as well as life insurance protection to its members. It states other worthy objectives in which it is engaged and asserts it is not an organization such as are referred to in the Order, Part III, s 3, *supra*. The Council, too, sets out its purpose to promote American-Soviet friendship by means of education and information. It asserts: 'In all its activities the National Council has sought to further the best interests of the American people by lawful, peaceful and constitutional means.'

The absence of any provision in the Order or rules for notice to suspected organizations, for hearings with privilege to the organizations to confront witnesses, cross-examine, produce evidence and have representation of counsel or judicial review of the conclusion reached by the Attorney General is urged by the petitioners, as a procedure so fundamentally unfair and restrictive of personal freedoms as to violate the Federal Constitution, specifically the Due Process Clause and the First Amendment. No opportunity was allowed by the Attorney General for petitioners to offer proof of the legality of their purposes or to disprove charges of subversive operations.

**\*197** This is the real gravamen of each complaint, the basis upon which the determination of unconstitutionality is sought.<sup>10</sup>

To these complaints, the Government filed motions to dismiss because of failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. The motions were granted by the District Court and the Court of Appeals affirmed.

Admissions by motions to dismiss.—It is held in Mr. Justice BURTON'S opinion that the motion to dismiss should have been denied. It is said: 'The inclusion of any of the complaining organizations in the designated list solely on the facts alleged in the respective complaints, which must be the basis for our decision here, is therefore an arbitrary

and unauthorized act. In the **\*\*662** two cases where the complaint specifically alleges the factual absence of any **\*198** basis for the designation, and the respondents' motion admits that allegation, the designation is necessarily contrary to the record.' 341 U.S. 137, 71 S.Ct. 631.

I understand Mr. Justice BURTON'S opinion to hold that as a motion to strike for failure to state a cause of action admits all well-pleaded facts, respondents' motion admits such allegations in the complaint as that quoted in the third preceding paragraph from the Council's complaint and the assertions that petitioners are not 'totalitarian, fascist, communist or subversive.' Such statements, however, appear to me to be only conclusions of law as to the effect of facts stated, or empty assertions or conclusions without well-pleaded facts to sustain them.<sup>11</sup> Where the issue is the permissibility of designation without notice or hearing, a motion to strike does not admit an allegation of 'arbitrary' action or that 'all its activities (are) \* \* \* constitutional.' These complaints may not be decided upon any such posture in pleading. Petitioners' charge, that their 'designation' violates due process and the First Amendment, remains the issue.

Standing to sue.—A question is raised by the United States as to petitioners' standing to maintain these actions. It seems unnecessary to analyze that problem in this dissent. If there should be a determination that petitioners' constitutional rights are violated by petitioners' designation under Part III, s 3, of the Order, it would seem they would have standing to seek redress. The 'standing' turns on the existence of the federal right.<sup>12</sup> Does petitioners' designation abridge their rights under the First Amendment? Do petitioners have a constitutional right under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth **\*199** Amendment to require a hearing before the Attorney General designates them as a subversive or communist organization for the purposes of [Executive Order No. 9835](#)?

First Amendment.—Petitioners assert that their inclusion on the disloyal list has abridged their freedom of speech, since listeners or readers are more difficult to obtain for their speeches and publications, and parties interested in their work are more hesitant to become associates. The Refugee Committee brief adds that 'thought' is also abridged. A concurring opinion accepts these arguments to the point of concluding that the publication of the lists 'with or without a hearing' violates the First Amendment.

This Court, throughout the years, has maintained the protection of the First Amendment as a major safeguard to the maintenance of a free republic. This Nation has never

suffered from an enforced conformity of expression or a limitation of criticism. But neither are we compelled to endure espionage and sedition. Wide as are the freedoms of the First Amendment, this Court has never hesitated to deny the individual's right to use the privileges for the overturn of law and order. Reasonable restraints for the fair protection of the Government against incitement to sedition cannot properly be said to be 'undemocratic' or contrary to the guarantees of free speech. Otherwise the guarantee of civil rights would be a mockery.<sup>13</sup> Even when this Court spoke out most strongly against previous restraints, it was careful to recognize that 'The security of the community **\*\*663** life may be protected against incitements to acts of violence and the overthrow by force of orderly government.' *Near v. State of Minnesota*, [ex rel. Olson](#), 283 U.S. 697, 716, 51 S.Ct. 625, 631, 75 L.Ed. 1357.

**\*200** Recognizing that the designation, rightly or wrongly, of petitioner organizations as communist impairs their ability to carry forward successfully whatever legitimate objects they seek to accomplish, we do not accept their argument that such interference is an abridgment of First Amendment guarantees.<sup>14</sup> They are in the position of every proponent of unpopular views. Heresy induces strong expressions of opposition. So long as petitioners are permitted to voice their political ideas, free from suggestions for the opportune use of force to accomplish their social and economic aims, it is hard to understand how any advocate of freedom of expression can assert that their right has been unconstitutionally abridged. As nothing in the orders or regulations concerning this list limits the teachings or support of these organizations, we do not believe that any right of theirs under the First Amendment is abridged by publication of the list.

Due Process.—This point brings us face to face with the argument that whether the Attorney General was right or wrong in listing these organizations, his designation cannot stand because a final decision of ineligibility for employment without notice and hearing rises to the importance of a constitutional defect. If standards for definition of organizations includable on the list are necessary, the order furnishes adequate tests as appears from the text preceding notes 2 and 7 above and the standards set out in those notes. Compare cases cited, note 6, *supra*.

Does due process require notice and hearing for the Department of Justice investigation under [Executive Order No. 9835](#), Part III, s 3, note 3, *supra*, preliminary to listing? As a standard for due process one cannot do better than to accept as a measure that no one may be deprived of liberty or

property without such reasonable **\*201** notice and hearing as fairness requires. This is my understanding of the meaning of the opinions upon due process cited in the concurring opinions. We are not here concerned with the rightfulness of the extent of participation in the investigations that might be claimed by petitioners.<sup>15</sup> **\*\*664** They were given no chance to take part. Their claim is that the listing resulted in a deprivation of liberty or property contrary to the procedure required by the Fifth Amendment.<sup>16</sup>

**\*202** The contention can be answered summarily by saying that there is no deprivation of any property or liberty of any listed organization by the Attorney General's designation. It may be assumed that the listing is hurtful to their prestige, reputation and earning power. It may be such an injury as would entitle organizations to damages in a tort action against persons not protected by privilege. See [Spalding v. Vilas](#), 161 U.S. 483, 16 S.Ct. 631, 40 L.Ed. 780; [Glass v. Ickes](#), 73 App.D.C. 3, 117 F.2d 273, 132 A.L.R. 1328. This designation, however, does not prohibit any business of the organizations, subject them to any punishment or deprive them of liberty of speech or other freedom. The cases relied upon in the briefs and opinions of the majority as requiring notice and hearing before valid action can be taken by administrative officers are where complainant will lose some property or enforceable civil or statutory right by the action taken or proposed.<sup>17</sup> '(A mere abstract declaration' by an administrator regarding the character of an organization, without the effect of forbidding **\*203** or compelling conduct on the part of complainant, ought not to be subject to judicial interference. [Rochester Telephone Corp. v. United States](#), 307 U.S. 125, 129, 143, 59 S.Ct. 754, 756, 763, 83 L.Ed. 1147. That is, it does not require notice and hearing.

These petitioners are not ordered to do anything and are not punished for anything. Their position may be analogized to that of persons under grand jury investigation. Such persons have no right to notice by and hearing before a grand jury; only a right to defend the charge at trial.<sup>18</sup> Property may be taken for government use without notice or hearing by a mere declaration of taking by the authorized official. No court has doubted the constitutionality of such summary action under the due process clause when just compensation must be paid ultimately.<sup>19</sup> Persons may be barred from certain positions merely because of their associations.<sup>20</sup>

**\*\*665** To allow petitioners entry into the investigation would amount to interference with the Executive's discretion, contrary to the ordinary operations of Government. Long ago

Mr. Chief Justice Taney in *Decatur v. Paulding*, 14 Pet. 497, 10 L.Ed. 559, stated the rule and the reason against judicial interference with executive discretion:

‘The head of an executive department of the government, in the administration of the various and important concerns of his office, is continually required to exercise judgment and discretion. \* \* \*

‘If a suit should come before this Court, which involved the construction of any of these laws, the Court certainly would not be bound to adopt the construction given by the head of a department. \*204 And if they supposed his decision to be wrong, they would, of course, no pronounce their judgment. But their judgment upon the construction of a law must be given in a case in which they have jurisdiction, and in which it is their duty to interpret the act of Congress, in order to ascertain the rights of the parties in the cause before them.’ 14 Pet. 515, 10 L.Ed. 559.

‘The interference of the Courts with the performance of the ordinary duties of the executive departments of the government, would be productive of nothing but mischief; and we are quite satisfied that such a power was never intended to be given to them.’ 14 Pet. 516, 10 L.Ed. 559.

That rule still stands. *Larson v. Domestic & Foreign Commerce Corp.*, 337 U.S. 682, 704, 69 S.Ct. 1457, 1468, 93 L.Ed. 1628.<sup>21</sup> This Court applied it recently in *Chicago & Southern Air Lines, Inc., v. Waterman S.S. Corp.*, 333 U.S. 103, 68 S.Ct. 431, 92 L.Ed. 568, as to foreign policy decisions of the President concerning overseas airline licenses.<sup>22</sup> In *State of Louisiana v. McAdoo*, 234 U.S. 627, 34 S.Ct. 938, 940, 58 L.Ed. 1506, the State sought to \*205 enjoin an order of the Secretary of the Treasury fixing the customs rate on sugar as ‘arbitrary, illegal, and unjust’ and irreparably injurious to the State. The Court refused the State permission to file the suit as in reality a suit against the United States, saying an officer may be compelled to act ministerially. ‘But if the matter in respect to which the action of the official is sought, is one in which the exercise of either judgment or discretion is required, the courts will refuse to substitute their judgment or discretion for that of the official intrusted by law with its execution. Interference in such a case would be to interfere with the ordinary functions of government.’ 234 U.S. at page 633, 34 S.Ct. at page 941, 58 L.Ed. 1506. It seems clearly erroneous to suggest that ‘listing’ determines any ‘guilt’ or ‘punishment’ for the \*\*666 organizations or has any finality in determining the loyalty of members. The President and the Attorney General pointed this out.<sup>23</sup> It is

written into the \*206 Code of Federal Regulations, 5 CFR s 210.11(b)(6), note 4, supra. The standard for discharge emphasizes the meaning. See notes 2 and 7, supra.

Before stating our conclusions a comment should be made as to the introduction by the concurring opinions of a discussion of the rights of a member of these organizations. It is suggested by one concurrence that as the ‘Government proceeds on the basis that each of these associations is so identical with its members that the subversive purpose and intents of the one may be attributed to and made conclusive upon the other,’ the organization must be permitted to vindicate the members’ rights or due process is not satisfied. Another concurrence states ‘an employee may lose his job because of the Attorney General’s secret and ex parte action.’ Both concurrences indicate, it seems to me, that as a member of petitioner organizations is denied due process by the effect of listing the organizations, the organization is likewise denied due process in the listing. Without accepting the logic of the concurrences, and waiving inquiry as to the standing of a corporation or unincorporated association to defend the rights of a member to employment, we think the suggestions as to lack of due process are based on an erroneous premise. Employees generally, under executive departments and agencies, whether or not members of listed organizations, without special statutory protection such as permanent employees under the competitive and classified civil service laws and regulations or preference eligibles under the Veterans’ Preference Act of 1944, 58 Stat. 387, 5 U.S.C.A. s 851, 5 U.S.C.A. s 851 et seq., 5 CFR, Parts 9 and 22, and Part 2, s 2.104, are subject to summary removal by the appointing officers.<sup>24</sup> Listing of these organizations \*207 does not conclude the members’ rights to hold government employment. It is only one piece of evidence for consideration.<sup>25</sup> That mere membership in listed organizations does not normally bring about findings of disloyalty is graphically shown by a report of proceedings under the loyalty program.<sup>26</sup> The \*\*667 procedure for removal of employees suspected of disloyalty follows the routine prescribed for the removal of employees on other grounds for dismissal. Employees under investigation have never had the right to confrontation, cross-examination and quasi-judicial hearing. 5 U.S.C. s 652, \*208 5 U.S.C.A. s 652, 37 Stat. 555. Normal removal procedure functions for permanent employees about in this way. The employing agency may remove for the efficiency of the service, including grounds for disqualification of an applicant. 5 CFR, 1947 Supp. s 9.101.<sup>27</sup> Removal requires notice and



charges.<sup>28</sup> Before the loyalty review boards similar procedure is followed.<sup>29</sup> Where initial consideration indicates \*209 a removal of an incumbent for disloyalty may be warranted, notice is provided for.<sup>30</sup> Thus, there is scrupulous care taken to see \*\*668 that an employee who has fallen under suspicion has notice of the charges and an opportunity to explain his actions. The employee has no opportunity to disprove the characterization placed upon the listed organization by the Attorney General for the practical reasons stated following note 2, supra. The employee does have every opportunity to explain his association with that organization. The Constitution requires for the employee no more than this fair opportunity to explain his questioned activities. Such procedure is quite similar to that followed in Great \*210 Britain in the removal or transfer of civil servants from positions 'vital to the security of the State.' The Prime Minister assumed the authority to designate membership in the Communist Party or 'other forms of continuing association' therewith as sufficient to bar employment in sensitive areas.<sup>31</sup>

Conclusion.—In our judgment organizations are not affected by these designations in such a manner as to \*211 permit a court's interference or to deny due process. That conclusion holds good also when we assume the organizations may present their members' grievances over discharge as a part of the organization's case. The administrative hearing granted an employee facing discharge is a statutory modification of the employing agent's former authority to discharge summarily. Such act or grace does not create a constitutional right. Due process is called for in determinations affecting rights.

What petitioners seek is a ruling that the Government cannot designate organizations as communist for the purpose of furthering investigations into employees' loyalty by the employing agencies without giving those organizations an opportunity to examine \*\*669 and meet the information on which the list is based. One can understand that position. There is a natural hesitation against any action that may damage any person or organization through an error that notice and hearing might correct. Such attitude of tolerance is reflected in s 13 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, 64 Stat. 987, 998. A statutory requirement for notice and

administrative hearing, however, \*212 does not mean the existence of a constitutional requirement.<sup>32</sup>

The Executive his authority to gather information concerning the loyalty of its employees as congressional committees have power to investigate matters of legislative interest. A public statement of legislative conclusions on information that later may be found erroneous may damage those investigated but it is not a civil judgment or a criminal conviction. Due process does not apply. Questions of propriety of political action are not for the courts. Information that an employee associates with or belongs to organizations considered communistic may be deemed by the Executive a sound reason for making inquiries into the desirability of the employment of that employee. That is not 'guilt by association.' It is a warning to investigate the conduct of the employee and his opportunity for harm.

While we must be on guard against being moved to conclusions on the constitutionality of action, legislative or executive, by the circumstances of the moment, undoubtedly varying conditions call for differences in procedure. Due process requires appraisal in the light of conditions confronting the executive during the continuation of the challenged action.<sup>33</sup> Power lies in the executive to guard the Nation from espionage, subversion and sedition by examining into the loyalty of employees, and due process in such investigation depends upon the particular exercise of that power in particular conditions.<sup>34</sup> In investigations to determine the purposes of suspected organizations, the Government should be free to proceed without notice or hearing. Petitioners will have protection \*213 when steps are taken to punish or enjoin their activities. Where notice and such administrative hearing as the Code Federal Regulations prescribes precede punishment, injunction or discharge, petitioners and their members' rights to due process are protected.

The judgment of the Court of Appeals should be affirmed.

#### All Citations

341 U.S. 123, 71 S.Ct. 624, 95 L.Ed. 817

#### Footnotes

- 1 E.g., s 9A of the Hatch Political Activity Act, August 2, 1939, 53 Stat. 1148, 5 U.S.C. (1946 ed., Supp. III) s 118j, 5 U.S.C.A. s 118j; Smith Act, June 28, 1940, 54 Stat. 671, now 18 U.S.C. (1946 ed., Supp. III) ss 2385, 2387; Voorhis Anti-Propaganda Act, October 17, 1940, 54 Stat. 1201, now 18 U.S.C. (1946 ed., Supp. III) s 2386; many appropriation act

riders barring the use of funds to pay 'any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: \* \* \* such as that at 55 Stat. 42, s 3; Exec. Order No. 9300, 'Establishing the Interdepartmental Committee to Consider Cases of Subversive Activity on the Part of Federal Employees', February 5, 1943, 3 CFR 1943 Cum.Supp., p. 1252, 8 Fed.Reg. 1701; and Exec. Order No. 9806, 'Establishing the President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty', November 25, 1946, 3 CFR, 1946 Supp., p. 183, 11 Fed.Reg. 13863. See also, *United States v. Lovett*, 328 U.S. 303, 308—313, 66 S.Ct. 1073, 1075—1078, 90 L.Ed. 1252. A later expression of congressional policy appears in Title I (the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950) of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (the McCarran Act) of September 23, 1950, 64 Stat. 987, 50 U.S.C.A. s 781 et seq. This requires any 'Communist-action organization' or 'Communist-front organization' to register with the Attorney General (s 7) and provides for hearings before a newly created 'Subversive Activities Control Board' (ss 12, 13).

## 2 'Part V-Standards

'1. The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States.

'2. Activities and associations of an applicant or employee which may be considered in connection with the determination of disloyalty may include one or more of the following:

'f. Membership in, affiliation with or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group or combination of persons, designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, fascist, communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.' 3 CFR, 1947 Supp., p. 132, 12 Fed.Reg. 1938.

3 As published in the Federal Register, March 20, 1948, the list includes two groups. The first group contains none of the present complainants. The Attorney General explains that that group 'is reported as having been previously named as subversive by the Department of Justice and as having been previously disseminated among the Government agencies for use in connection with consideration of employee loyalty under Executive Order No. 9300, issued February 5, 1943 \* \* \*.' 13 Fed.Reg. 1473. The second group includes each of the complaining organizations. The Attorney General lists this group, with the first, under the general heading 'Appendix A—List of Organizations Designated by the Attorney General Pursuant to Executive Order No. 9835.' 5 CFR, 1949, c. II, Pt. 210, pp. 199—201, 13 Fed.Reg. 1471, 1473. He then places the second group under the following subheading: 'Under Part III, section 3, of Executive Order No. 9835, the following additional organizations are designated: \* \* \*.' Id., at 201, 13 Fed.Reg. 1473.

4 13 Fed.Reg. 6137—6138. This classification was disseminated to all departments and agencies September 21, 1948, and the classified list was published October 21, 1948, as an amendment to 5 CFR, 1949, c. II, Pt. 210, pp. 200—202, 203—205.

5 The six classifications were: 'Totalitarian,' 'Fascist,' 'Communist,' 'Subversive,' 'Organizations Which Have 'Adopted a Policy of Advocating or Approving the Commission of Acts of Force and Violence to Deny Others Their Rights Under the Constitution of the United States, "" and 'Organizations Which 'Seek to Alter the Form of Government of the United States by Unconstitutional Means.'" 5 CFR, 1949, c. II, Pt. 210, pp. 203—205, 13 Fed.Reg. 6137—6138.

The Attorney General also explained that—

'Applying the elementary rule of statutory construction, each of these classifications must be taken to be independent and mutually exclusive of the others. It may well be that a designated organization, by reason of origin, leadership, control, purposes, policies or activities, alone or in combination, may fall within more than one of the specified classifications. In such cases a reasonable interpretation of the Executive order would seem to require that designation be predicated upon its dominant characteristics rather than extended to include all other classifications possible on the basis of what may be subordinate attributes of the group. In classifying the designated organizations the Attorney General has been guided by this policy. Accordingly, it should not be assumed that an organization's dominant characteristic is its only characteristic.' Id., at 203, 13 Fed.Reg. 6137.

6 The complaint adds that—'Before the end of the war in Europe, this relief consisted of: (1) the release and assistance of those of the aforesaid refugees who were in concentration camps in Vichy France, North Africa and other countries; (2) transportation and asylum for those of the aforesaid refugees in flight; (3) direct relief and aid, to those of the aforesaid refugees requiring help, through the Red Cross and other international agencies. At the present time, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee relief work is principally devoted to aiding those Spanish Republican refugees, and other anti-fascist refugees who fought against Franco, located in France and Mexico.'

- 7 [Executive Order No. 9835](#) purports to rest, in part, upon the authority of s 9A of the Hatch Act. 3 CFR, 1947 Supp., p. 129, [12 Fed.Reg. 1935](#).
- 8 In this case, unlike the others, the complainant asked that a three-judge District Court be convened, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. (1946 ed.) s 380a, now part of [28 U.S.C. \(1946 ed., Supp. III\) ss 2281—2284](#). The District Court, however, dismissed the complaint without convening such a court.
- 9 The complaint also alleges in Part IV: ‘8. The purpose, objectives and activities of the Order are in no sense subversive. The Order is not an organization within the meaning of Part III, section 3 of [Executive Order No. 9835](#), and it has not adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence, or to deny other persons the rights under the Constitution or as seeking to alter the form of government by unconstitutional means, but on the contrary, the Order is opposed to the commission of acts of force or violence, fights against the denial of rights to any person, and is opposed to the altering of our form of government by any illegal or unconstitutional means. The Order is dedicated to the democratic ideals and traditions of the United States and the principles of freedom and equality embodied in the Constitution.’
- 10 The complaint attacks the constitutionality of s 9A of the Hatch Act but does not ask for the convening of a three-judge District Court.
- In this case, A. L. Drayton, as a member of the order and a civil employee of the United States, sought permission from the District Court to intervene under [Rule 24\(b\) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U.S.C.A.](#), and to have added as defendants three members of the Loyalty Review Board of the Post Office Department. His motion was denied and his appeal from that denial dismissed. The respondents now advise us that, in a separate proceeding, he appealed to the Loyalty Review Board from a decision adverse to his loyalty, with the result that such decision has been reversed and that he has returned to duty. While he has not withdrawn his appeal from the denial of his motion to intervene, we find no reason to review the discretion exercised by the District Court in denying that motion. [Allen Calculators v. National Cash Register Co., 322 U.S. 137, 64 S.Ct. 905, 88 L.Ed. 1188](#); see 4 Moore’s Federal Practice (2d ed. 1950) 62—64.
- 11 The designation of these organizations was not preceded by any administrative hearing. The organizations received no notice that they were to be listed, had no opportunity to present evidence on their own behalf and were not informed of the evidence on which the designations rest. See [Chin Yow v. United States, 208 U.S. 8, 28 S.Ct. 201, 52 L.Ed. 369](#). We have noted the following recitals made by the Attorney General in describing his standard procedure in the preparation of his lists:
- ‘After the issuance of [Executive Order No. 9835](#) by the President, the Department of Justice compiled all available data with respect to the type of organization to be dealt with under that order. The investigative reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning such organizations were correlated. Memoranda on each such organization were prepared by attorneys of the Department. The list of organizations contained herein has been certified to the Board by the Attorney General on the basis of recommendations of attorneys of the Department as reviewed by the Solicitor General, the Assistant Attorneys General, and the Assistant Solicitor General, and subsequent careful study of all by the Attorney General.’ 5 CFR, 1949, c. II, Pt. 210, pp. 199—200, [13 Fed.Reg. 1471](#).
- These recitals, however, relate to the mechanics used rather than to the appropriateness of the determination or the justification for the respective designations. They fall short of disclosing that there has been such an administrative hearing as would offset the admissions of the specific allegations of the complaints which are inherent in the respondents’ motions to dismiss. See [Fed.Rules Civ.Proc., 12\(b\) and 56\(c\)](#), and [Regan v. Farmers’ Loan & Trust Co., 154 U.S. 362, 401—402, 14 S.Ct. 1047, 1055, 1056, 38 L.Ed. 1014](#).
- We have treated the designation of an organization by the Attorney General in his list as including his furnishing of that list to the Loyalty Review Board with knowledge of that Board’s obligation to disseminate it to all departments and agencies of the Government.
- 12 As an illustration of the meaning of s 559, the Restatement suggests: ‘2. A writes in a letter to B that C is a member of the Ku Klux Klan. B lives in a community in which a substantial number of the citizens regard this organization as a discreditable one. A has defamed C.’ See also, [Spanel v. Pegler, 7 Cir., 160 F.2d 619, 171 A.L.R. 699](#); [Wright v. Farm Journal, 2 Cir., 158 F.2d 976](#); [Grant v. Reader’s Digest Ass’n, 2 Cir., 151 F.2d 733](#); [Mencher v. Chesley, 297 N.Y. 94, 75 N.E.2d 257](#); Prosser, Handbook of the Law of Torts s 91; [171 A.L.R. 709—710, Note](#).
- 13 We do not reach either the validity of the Employees Loyalty Program or the effect of the respondents’ acts in furnishing and disseminating a comparable list in any instance where such acts are within the authority purportedly granted by the Executive Order. Cf. [Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238, 289—292, 56 S.Ct. 855, 863—864, 80 L.Ed. 1160](#); [United States v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1, 68—78, 56 S.Ct. 312, 320—325, 80 L.Ed. 477](#); [Linder v. United States, 268 U.S. 5, 17, 45 S.Ct. 446, 448, 69 L.Ed. 819](#); [M’Culloch v. State of Maryland, 4 Wheat. 316, 423, 4 L.Ed. 579](#).

- 14 [Rule 17\(b\) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure](#) gives unincorporated associations the right to sue in their own names for the enforcement of rights existing under the Constitution or laws of the United States. And see Restatement, Torts, s 561(2) and Comment b thereon. See also, [New York Society for Suppression of Vice v. MacFadden Publications](#), 260 N.Y. 167, 183 N.E. 284, 86 A.L.R. 440; cf. [Pullman Standard Car Mfg. Co. v. Local Union No. 2928 of United Steelworkers of America](#), 7 Cir., 152 F.2d 493.
- 15 [Utah Fuel Co. v. National Bituminous Coal Comm.](#), 306 U.S. 56, 59 S.Ct. 409, 83 L.Ed. 483; [Shields v. Utah Idaho Central R. Co.](#), 305 U.S. 177, 59 S.Ct. 160, 83 L.Ed. 111; [Philadelphia Co. v. Stimson](#), 223 U.S. 605, 32 S.Ct. 340, 56 L.Ed. 570.
- 16 [United States v. Los Angeles & S.L.R. Co.](#), 273 U.S. 299, 309—310, 47 S.Ct. 413, 414, 71 L.Ed. 651, does not prescribe a contrary course. In that case we held that the Interstate Commerce Commission order fixing a rate base could not be attacked by a bill in equity when the base could be challenged in subsequent proceedings fixing the rate. No comparable alternative relief is available here.
- 1 In November 1794, there was introduced in Congress a resolution of public disapproval of certain 'self-created Democratic societies' thought to be responsible for stirring up the people to insurrection. Madison opposed the resolution, apparently believing that if it were enacted it would be a bill of attainder. His views in this regard are reported as follows: 'It is in vain to say that this indiscriminate censure is no punishment. If it falls on classes, or individuals, it will be a severe punishment. \* \* \* Is not this proposition, if voted, a vote of attainder?' 4 Annals of Cong. 934 (1794).
- 2 But compare Madison in Federalist Paper No. 42: 'As treason may be committed against the United States, the authority of the United States ought to be enabled to punish it. But as new-fangled and artificial treasons have been the great engines by which violent factions, the natural offspring of free governments, have usually wreaked their alternate malignity on each other, the Convention have, with great judgment, opposed a barrier to this peculiar danger, by inserting a Constitutional definition of the crime, fixing the proof necessary for conviction of it, and restraining the Congress, even in punishing it, from extending the consequences of guilt beyond the person of its author.'
- 3 One purpose of the Attorney General's blacklist under [Executive Order 9835](#) is for use as evidence against government employees tried for disloyalty before loyalty boards acting under the same Executive Order. Proof of membership in a blacklisted organization, or of association with its members, can weigh heavily against a government employee's loyalty. Thus an employee may lose his job because of the Attorney General's secret and ex parte action. This is well illustrated in the case of [Bailey v. Richardson](#), 341 U.S. 918, 71 S.Ct. 669, decided today by an equally divided Court. The Loyalty Board's finding against Miss Bailey appears to have rested in part on her supposed association with such organizations and in part on secret unsworn hearsay statements communicated to the Board by anonymous informers. Judge Edgerton's dissenting opinion demonstrates how the entire loyalty program grossly deprives government employees of the benefits of constitutional safeguards. [Bailey v. Richardson](#), 86 U.S.App.D.C. 248, 182 F.2d 46, 66.
- 4 The Appendix is an illustration of persecution of Protestants by Catholics. For instances of persecution of Catholics by Protestants, see my dissenting opinion in [American Communications Ass'n, C.I.O., v. Douds](#), 339 U.S. 382, 445, 70 S.Ct. 674, 707, 94 L.Ed. 925, particularly notes 3, 4 and 7.
- 1 The decisions are collected in the dissenting opinion in [Larson v. Domestic and Foreign Commerce Corp.](#), 337 U.S. 682, 705, 69 S.Ct. 1457, 1469, 93 L.Ed. 1628.
- 2 A statute may of course confer standing even in this situation. [Federal Communications Commission v. Sanders Bros. Radio Station](#), 309 U.S. 470, 642, 60 S.Ct. 693, 84 L.Ed. 869, 1037; [Columbia Broadcasting System v. United States](#), 316 U.S. 407, 62 S.Ct. 1194, 86 L.Ed. 1563; cf. [Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. United States](#), 295 U.S. 476, 55 S.Ct. 822, 79 L.Ed. 1553; [Stark v. Wickard](#), 321 U.S. 288, 64 S.Ct. 559, 88 L.Ed. 733.
- 3 The [Davis & Farnum](#) case held that a subcontractor did not have standing to enjoin a municipal ordinance which prohibited a construction project in violation of a right of the owner of the land on which it was to be built. The Court held that the petitioner had no legal interest in the controversy, since his interest was only 'indirect.'
- 4 Government action is 'final' in the sense here involved when at no future time will its impact on the petitioner become more conclusive, definite, or substantial. 'Finality' is also employed in a different sense with which we are not here concerned, in reference to judicial action not subject to subsequent revisory executive or legislative action. Cf. [United States v. Ferreira](#), 13 How. 40, 14 L.Ed. 42.
- 5 The Court expressed the decision in terms of the nonlegislative character of the specification. But since the validity of the specification could be determined in an action for injunction or mandamus against the local officers, the decision does not establish that final administrative action is immune from review because it is not legislative in form.
- 6 See also decisions treating as 'justiciable' bills to enjoin regulations which create duties immediately enforceable by imposition of penalties. [Assigned Car Cases](#), 274 U.S. 564, 47 S.Ct. 727, 71 L.Ed. 1204; [United States v. Baltimore & O.R. Co.](#), 293 U.S. 454, 55 S.Ct. 268, 79 L.Ed. 587.

- 7 In the Los Angeles case the Court thus supported its conclusion that the bill was not justiciable under general equity powers: 'The investigation was undertaken in aid of the legislative purpose of regulation. In conducting the investigation, and in making the report, the Commission performed a service specifically delegated and prescribed by Congress. Its conclusions, if erroneous in law, may be disregarded. But neither its utterances, nor its processes of reasoning, as distinguished from its acts, are a subject for injunction.' 273 U.S. at pages 314—315, 47 S.Ct. at page 416, 71 L.Ed. 651. *Pennsylvania R. Co. v. United States Railroad Labor Board*, 261 U.S. 72, 43 S.Ct. 278, 67 L.Ed. 536, was a bill to enjoin the Railroad Labor Board from publishing that the petitioner had violated its decision. Decisions of the Board were not legally enforceable; and the Court therefore concluded that they violated 'no legal or equitable right of the complaining company.' 261 U.S. at page 85, 43 S.Ct. at page 283. The Court considered at length, however, the company's argument that the Board had been given no jurisdiction to decide the particular issue involved. That it found it necessary to decide this issue against the company on the merits indicates that it thought a stronger case for standing would have been presented had the decision been beyond the Board's authority. In *Ex parte Williams*, 277 U.S. at page 271, 48 S.Ct. at page 525, there is a suggestion that a litigant may have standing to enjoin a tax assessment when the challenge is to the validity of the statute authorizing the assessment, although there would be no standing to challenge the assessment on the ground that it denied equal protection of the laws.
- 8 Compare the decisions which hold that certain executive officers are not liable in suits for damages for erroneous or even malicious conduct in office, so long as they are acting within the scope of the authority given them. *Spalding v. Vilas*, 161 U.S. 483, 16 S.Ct. 631, 40 L.Ed. 780; *Gregoire v. Biddle*, 2 Cir., 177 F.2d 579.
- 9 A Denver affiliate of the National Council, joined as petitioner in No. 7, has standing identical with its parent. The individual petitioners in that suit, however, have as officers of the Council an interest which is too remote to justify finding the issues justiciable as to them.
- 10 The reasonableness of rates has of course been held in part a question for the courts. *Ohio Valley Water Co. v. Ben Avon Borough*, 253 U.S. 287, 40 S.Ct. 527, 64 L.Ed. 908; cf. *Chicago, M. & St. P.R. Co. v. State of Minnesota ex rel. Railroad & Warehouse Comm.*, 134 U.S. 418, 10 S.Ct. 462, 33 L.Ed. 970. But to the extent that finality is accorded to the determination of an administrative agency the Court has exacted a high standard of procedural fairness. *Ohio Bell Tel. Co. v. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio*, 301 U.S. 292, 304, 57 S.Ct. 724, 730, 81 L.Ed. 1093; see *Interstate Commerce Comm. v. Louisville & N.R. Co.*, 227 U.S. 88, 33 S.Ct. 185, 57 L.Ed. 431; *United States v. Abilene & S.R. Co.*, 265 U.S. 274, 44 S.Ct. 565, 68 L.Ed. 1016; *West Ohio Gas Co. v. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (No. 1)*, 294 U.S. 63, 55 S.Ct. 316, 79 L.Ed. 761; *Railroad Comm. of California v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co.*, 302 U.S. 388, 58 S.Ct. 334, 82 L.Ed. 319; *Morgan v. United States*, 304 U.S. 1, 58 S.Ct. 773, 999, 82 L.Ed. 1129; cf. *United States v. Illinois Central R. Co.*, 291 U.S. 457, 54 S.Ct. 471, 78 L.Ed. 909.
- 11 In *Southern R. Co. v. Commonwealth of Virginia ex rel. Shirley*, 290 U.S. 190, 54 S.Ct. 148, 78 L.Ed. 260, the Court declared unconstitutional a state officer's ex parte order that a railroad install an overhead crossing. Compare *Monongahela Bridge Co. v. United States*, 216 U.S. 177, 30 S.Ct. 356, 54 L.Ed. 435, in which a comparable order of the Secretary of War, entered after hearing, was upheld. In decisions involving local taxation for improvements, the Court has required that owners be given a hearing on valuation as well as on the question whether their property has been benefited whenever that determination has not been legislatively made. See, e.g., *Embree v. Kansas City & Liberty Boulevard Road Dist.*, 240 U.S. 242, 36 S.Ct. 317, 60 L.Ed. 624; cf. *Anniston Mfg. Co. v. Davis*, 301 U.S. 337, 57 S.Ct. 816, 81 L.Ed. 1143. And although an individual's interest has been created by an ex parte decision, it may not be destroyed 'without that character of notice and opportunity to be heard essential to due process of law.' *United States ex rel. Turner v. Fisher*, 222 U.S. 204, 208, 32 S.Ct. 37, 56 L.Ed. 165; *Garfield v. United States ex rel. Goldsby*, 211 U.S. 249, 29 S.Ct. 62, 53 L.Ed. 168. See also *Ex parte Robinson*, 19 Wall. 505, 22 L.Ed. 205.
- 12 The Japanese Immigrant Case (*Yamataya v. Fisher*), 189 U.S. 86, 23 S.Ct. 611, 47 L.Ed. 721; see *Kwock Jan Fat v. White*, 253 U.S. 454, 40 S.Ct. 566, 64 L.Ed. 1010; *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath*, 339 U.S. 33, 49, 70 S.Ct. 445, 453, 94 L.Ed. 616; cf. *United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537, 70 S.Ct. 309, 94 L.Ed. 317. In *Lloyd Sabaudo Societa Anonima Per Azioni v. Elting*, 287 U.S. 329, 53 S.Ct. 167, 77 L.Ed. 341, the Court held that a steamship company required to pay a fine to obtain port clearance for a ship which had brought a diseased alien to this country was entitled to determination of the facts by fair procedure. The Court disapproved in part *Oceanic Steam Nav. Co. v. Stranahan*, 214 U.S. 320, 29 S.Ct. 671, 53 L.Ed. 1013.
- 13 In *Dismuke v. United States*, 297 U.S. 167, 172, 56 S.Ct. 400, 403, 80 L.Ed. 561, the Court said that 'in the absence of compelling language, resort to the courts to assert a right which the statute creates will be deemed to be curtailed only so far as authority to decide is given to the administrative officer. \* \* \* If he is authorized to determine questions of fact, his decision must be accepted unless he exceeds his authority by making a determination which is arbitrary or capricious

or unsupported by evidence, \* \* \* or by failing to follow a procedure which satisfies elementary standards of fairness and reasonableness essential to the due conduct of the proceeding which Congress has authorized \* \* \*.'

14 Thus, no hearing need be granted on the question whether property is needed for a public use. [Rindge Co. v. Los Angeles County](#), 262 U.S. 700, 43 S.Ct. 689, 67 L.Ed. 1186. Cf. [Martin v. Mott](#), 12 Wheat. 19, 6 L.Ed. 537; [United States v. George S. Bush & Co.](#), 310 U.S. 371, 60 S.Ct. 944, 84 L.Ed. 1259.

15 Cf. [Norwegian Nitrogen Products Co. v. United States](#), 288 U.S. 294, 53 S.Ct. 350, 77 L.Ed. 796. In recent customs legislation Congress has required a hearing on objections to appraisement. 38 Stat. 187, as amended, 19 U.S.C. s 1501, 19 U.S.C.A. s 150; see Freund, *Administrative Powers over Persons and Property*, 163. In numberless other situations Congress has required the essentials of a hearing. Among those that have come before this Court are removal orders of the Federal Reserve Board, [Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System v. Agnew](#), 329 U.S. 441, 67 S.Ct. 411, 91 L.Ed. 408; determinations under the Hatch Act, [State of Oklahoma v. United States Civil Service Commn.](#), 330 U.S. 127, 67 S.Ct. 544, 91 L.Ed. 794; induction orders under the draft law, [Estep v. United States](#), 327 U.S. 114, 66 S.Ct. 423, 90 L.Ed. 567; minimum price orders of the Secretary of Agriculture, [Stark v. Wickard](#), 321 U.S. 288, 64 S.Ct. 559, 88 L.Ed. 733; price control, [Yakus v. United States](#), 321 U.S. 414, 64 S.Ct. 660, 88 L.Ed. 834; minimum wage determinations, [Opp Cotton Mills v. Administrator of Wage and Hour Division of Department of Labor](#), 312 U.S. 126, 657, 61 S.Ct. 524, 85 L.Ed. 624; labor relations regulation, [National Labor Relations Board v. Mackay Radio & Telegraph Co.](#), 304 U.S. 333, 58 S.Ct. 904, 82 L.Ed. 1381; [National Labor Relations Board v. Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.](#), 301 U.S. 1, 47, 57 S.Ct. 615, 629, 81 L.Ed. 893; [Shields v. Utah Idaho Central R. Co.](#), 305 U.S. 177, 59 S.Ct. 160, 83 L.Ed. 111; [Inland Empire District Council, Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union v. Millis](#), 325 U.S. 697, 65 S.Ct. 1316, 89 L.Ed. 1877.

16 In 1941 the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure reported that it 'found in its investigation of the administrative process few instances of indifference on the part of the agencies to the basic values which underlie a fair hearing.' These values it defined as follows: 'Before adverse action is to be taken by an agency, whether it be denying privileges to an applicant or bounties to a claimant, before a cease-and-desist order is issued or privileges or bounties are permanently withdrawn, before an individual is ordered directly to alter his method of business, or before discipline is imposed upon him, the individual immediately concerned should be apprised not only of the contemplated action with sufficient precision to permit his preparation to resist, but, before final action, he should be apprised of the evidence and contentions brought forward against him so that he may meet them. He must be offered a forum which provides him with an opportunity to bring his own contentions home to those who will adjudicate the controversy in which he is concerned. The forum itself must be one which is prepared to receive and consider all that he offers which is relevant to the controversy.' Final Report, p. 62.

The monographs prepared under the direction of the Committee support the conclusion that by statutory direction or administrative interpretation agencies consistently grant at least minimum rights of hearing. For example, the Walsh-Healey Act, 41 U.S.C.A. s 35 et seq., is enforceable by the Government's recovery of liquidated damages and by its withholding further contracts for a three-year period. Administrative hearings are employed for all contested action. Monograph of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, S. Doc. No. 186, 76th Cong., 3d Sess., Part 1, p. 7. It is generally the practice of the Veteran's Administration to grant hearings on request of claimants. Id., Part 2, p. 11. Hearings are granted on request on applications for permits from the Federal Alcohol Administration, id., Part 5, p. 6, and when licenses granted under the Grain Standards Act are suspended or revoked, id., Part 7, p. 10. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation determines admissibility of banks to membership without giving the applicant a hearing or formal opportunity to contradict the bank examiner's report. However, grounds for disapproval are reported to the applicant. Id., Part 13, p. 15. War Department officials grant hearings on applications to construct installations in navigable waters, except when it is clear that the application should or should not be granted. S. Doc. No. 10, 77th Cong., 1st Sess., Part 2, p. 7. A 1939 amendment to the social security law requires hearings in the event a claimant is dissatisfied with the disposition of the case by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. Id., Part. 3, p. 14. The Department of the Interior grants hearings in allocating grazing lands, id., Part 7, pp. 9, 10; in disposing of applications for mineral leases, except where hearing would serve no useful purpose, id., at 26; and in determining questions of fact necessary to issuing mining patents, id., at 36. Hearings are frequently employed in investigations under flexible tariff procedures of the Tariff Commission, id., Part. 14, p. 12.

17 The importance of opportunity to be heard is recognized as well by the English courts. The leading case is [Board of Education v. Rice](#), (1911) A.C. 179. Lord Loreburn said in dictum, 'In such cases the Board of Education will have to ascertain the law and also to ascertain the facts. I need not add that in doing either they must act in good faith and fairly listen to both sides, for that is a duty lying upon every one who decides anything. \* \* \* They can obtain information in any way they think best, always giving a fair opportunity to those who are parties in the controversy for correcting or

contradicting any relevant statement prejudicial to their view.' *Id.*, at 182. This principle has been approved in a long line of decisions. See *Local Government Board v. Arlidge*, (1915) A.C. 120, 132—133; *General Medical Council v. Spackman*, (1943) A.C. 627; *Errington v. Minister of Health*, (1935) 1 K.B. 249; *Rex v. Westminster*, (1941) 1 K.B. 53. The Committee on Minister's Powers reported in 1936 that while in administrative determination in Minister may 'depart from the usual forms of legal procedure or from the common law rules of evidence, he ought not to depart from or offend against 'natural justice. " Three principles of 'natural justice' were stated to be that 'a man may not be a judge in his own cause,' that 'No party ought to be condemned unheard,' and that 'a party is entitled to know the reason for the decision.' Report of Committee on Ministers' Powers, Cmd. 4060, pp. 75—80.

18 Mr. Justice Holmes made this remark in a letter to Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays in 1928. See Bent, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, 312.

19 'In a government like ours, entirely popular, care should be taken in every part of the system, not only to do right, but to satisfy the community that right is done.' 5 *The Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster*, 163. The same thought is reflected in a recent opinion by the Lord Chief Justice. A witness in a criminal case had been interrogated by the court in the absence of the defendant. Quashing the conviction, Lord Goddard said: 'That is a matter which cannot possibly be justified. I am not suggesting for one moment that the justices had any sinister or improper motive in acting as they did. It may be that they sent for this officer in the interests of the accused; it may be that the information which the officer gave was in the interests of the accused. That does not matter. Time and again this court has said that justice must not only be done but must manifestly be seen to be done. \* \* \*' *Rex v. Bodmin JJ.*, (1947) 1 K.B. 321, 325.

20 Other evidence is furnished by the State of New York. The Feinberg Law, comparable in purpose and in its scheme to the Loyalty Order, makes notice and hearing prerequisite to designation of organizations. See *Thompson v. Wallin*, 301 N.Y. 476, 484, 95 N.E.2d 806.

21 Act of September 23, 1950, c. 1024, ss 13, 14, 64 S.Ct. 987, 998, 1001, 50 U.S.C.A. ss 792, 793.

1 The Bureau of Internal Revenue canceled the tax-exempt status of contributions to eight 'subversive' organizations shortly after the Attorney General's list was released. The Bureau's announcement of the revocation indicated that the listing provided the basis for it. Treasury Dept. Press Release No. S—613, Feb. 4, 1948, 5 C.C.H. 1948 Fed. Tax Rep. par. 6075. The New York Feinberg Law, directed at eliminating members of subversive organizations from employment in the public schools, authorizes the Board of Regents to utilize the Attorney General's list in drawing up its own list of subversive organizations. Membership in a listed organization is prima facie evidence of disqualification. Laws of New York 1949, c. 360, Education Law, Mck.Consol.Laws, c. 16, s 3022(2). The New York Superintendent of Insurance recently brought an action to dissolve the International Workers Order, Inc., petitioner in No. 71, on the grounds that it was on the Attorney General's list. Matter of People of New York (International Workers Order, Inc.) Motion 165, Supreme Court of New York County, Dec. 18, 1950. (See 199 Misc. 941, 106 N.Y.S.2d 953.)

The Maryland Ober Law requires candidates for appointive or elective office to certify whether they are members of 'subversive' organizations. Laws of Maryland 1949, c. 86, ss 10—15. The Commission which drafted the Act contemplated that the Attorney General's list would be employed in policing these oaths. Report of Commission on Subversive Activities to Governor Lane and the Maryland General Assembly, January 1949, p. 43.

2 Rule 8(a), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

3 As Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER points out, due process requires no less. But apart from due process in the constitutional sense is the power of the Court to prescribe standards of conduct and procedure for inferior federal courts and agencies. See *McNabb v. United States*, 318 U.S. 332, 63 S.Ct. 608, 87 L.Ed. 819.

4 The International Tribunal tried Nazi organizations to determine whether they were 'criminal.' Art. 9, Charter of the International Military Tribunal, Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression, Vol. 1, Office of U.S. Chief Counsel, U.S. Government Printing Office (1946) p. 6. That procedure, unlike the present one, provided that accused organizations might defend themselves against that charge. *Ibid.* But the finding of guilt as to an organization was binding on an individual who was later brought to trial for the crime of membership in a criminal organization. Article 10 provided: 'In cases where a group or organization is declared criminal by the Tribunal, the competent national authority of any Signatory shall have the right to bring individuals to trial for membership therein before national, military or occupation courts. In any such case the criminal nature of the group or organization is considered proved and shall not be questioned.' *Id.*

5 Barth, *The Loyalty of Free Men* (1951) p. 109.

6 'The oath to be taken by any person elected or appointed to any office of honor or profit either in the civil, military, or naval service, except the President of the United States shall be as follows: 'I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion;

and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God." 23 Stat. 22, R.S. s 1757, 5 U.S.C. s 16, 5 U.S.C.A. s 16. And see Act of Sept. 6, 1950, c. 896, s 1209, 64 Stat. 595, 764.

7 See the address by Benjamin V. Cohen, Cong. R. c., A785, A786.

8 448 H.C.Deb. 1703 et seq., 3418 et seq. (5th Ser. 1947—1948). The meticulous care with which this small select group is handled is reflected in the letter of the Prime Minister, dated Dec. 1, 1948, reporting on the purge of communists and fascists from the civil service. 459 H.C.Deb. 830 (5th Ser. 1948—1949).

The number of cases considered by the end of April 1950, was 86, classified as follows:

See British Information Services, Reference Division, April, 1950.

9 The Civil Service Commission reports as of February, 1951, the following statistics relating to adjudications of loyalty under Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947:

1 [United States v. Morton Salt Co.](#), 338 U.S. 632, 652, 70 S.Ct. 357, 368, 94 L.Ed. 401.

2 'Boards \* \* \* should not enter upon any evidential investigation of the nature of any of the organizations identified in the Attorney General's list, for the purpose of attacking, contradicting, or modifying the controlling conclusion reached by the Attorney General in such list. \* \* \* The Board should permit no evidence or argument before it on the point.' Loyalty Review Board, Memorandum No. 2, March 9, 1948.

3 [Eberlein v. United States](#), 257 U.S. 82, 42 S.Ct. 12, 66 L.Ed. 140; [Keim v. United States](#), 177 U.S. 290, 20 S.Ct. 574, 44 L.Ed. 774.

This is true, although reasons stated are alleged to be false or the officer taking the action is alleged to have acted in a biased, prejudicial and unfair manner. [Golding v. United States](#), 78 Ct.Cl. 682, 685; certiorari denied 292 U.S. 643, 54 S.Ct. 776, 78 L.Ed. 1494.

4 'A total of 3,166 Government employees have quit or have been discharged under President Truman's loyalty program since it began March 21, 1947, the Loyalty Review Board reported today.

'Of these, 294 actually were discharged for disloyalty. The remainder, 2,872, quit while under investigation and might or might not have been found disloyal.' New York Times, January 16, 1951.

5 [307 U.S. 325, 349, 59 S.Ct. 884, 896, 83 L.Ed. 1320](#). That was an action to mandamus the Secretary of State to issue a passport, to which it was conceded Miss Elg had no legal right, its issuance being wholly within Executive discretion which the courts would not attempt to control. Chief Justice Hughes pointed out, however, that its denial to Miss Elg was not grounded in the Secretary's general discretion but 'solely on the ground that she had lost her native born American citizenship.' Finding that ground untenable, this Court directed its decree against the Secretary. The Secretary might say she would get no passport, but he could not, for unjustifiable reasons, say she was ineligible for one.

6 [Bailey v. Richardson](#), 341 U.S. 918, 71 S.Ct. 669.

7 5 U.S.C.Supp. II, s 118j, 5 U.S.C.A. s 118j:

'(1) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any capacity by any agency of the Federal Government, whose compensation, or any part thereof, is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any Act of Congress, to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States.

'(2) Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any Act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person.'

8 See [12 Fed.Reg. 1938, 5 CFR s 210.11\(a\)](#):

'(a) Standard. The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an Executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States. The panel shall reach its decision on consideration of the complete file, arguments, brief and testimony presented to it.

'(b) Activities and associations. Among the activities and associations of an applicant or employee which may be considered in connection with the determination of disloyalty may be one or more of the following:

'(6) Membership in, affiliation with or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group or combination of persons, designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, fascist, communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.'

9 '3. The Loyalty Review Board shall currently be furnished by the Department of Justice the name of each foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group or combination of persons which the Attorney General, after



appropriate investigation and determination, designates as totalitarian, fascist, communist or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

'a. The Loyalty Review Board shall disseminate such information to all departments and agencies.'

4 5 CFR s 210.11(b)(6): 'Such membership, affiliation or sympathetic association is simply one piece of evidence which may or may not be helpful in arriving at a conclusion as to the action which is to be taken in a particular case. \* \* \*'  
See 5 CFR s 200.1.

5 13 Fed.Reg. 1471: 'After the issuance of [Executive Order No. 9835](#) by the President, the Department of Justice compiled all available data with respect to the type of organization to be dealt with under that order. The investigative reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning such organizations were correlated. Memoranda on each such organization were prepared by attorneys of the Department. The list of organizations contained herein has been certified to the Board by the Attorney General on the basis of recommendations of attorneys of the Department as reviewed by the Solicitor General, the Assistant Attorneys General, and the Assistant Solicitor General, and subsequent careful study of all by the Attorney General.'

Cf. [United States v. Chemical Foundation](#), 272 U.S. 1, 14, 47 S.Ct. 1, 6, 71 L.Ed. 131; [Lewis v. United States](#), 279 U.S. 63, 73, 49 S.Ct. 257, 260, 73 L.Ed. 615.

6 Cf. [Nash v. United States](#), 229 U.S. 373, 377, 33 S.Ct. 780, 781, 57 L.Ed. 1232; [New York Central Securities Corp. v. United States](#), 287 U.S. 12, 24, 53 S.Ct. 45, 48, 77 L.Ed. 138; [United States v. Petrillo](#), 332 U.S. 1, 67 S.Ct. 1538, 91 L.Ed. 1877.

7 5 CFR s 210.11(b):

'(1) Sabotage, espionage, or attempts or preparations therefor, or knowingly associating with spies or saboteurs;

'(2) Treason or sedition or advocacy thereof;

'(3) Advocacy of revolution or force or violence to alter the constitutional form of government of the United States;

'(4) Intentional, unauthorized disclosure to any person under circumstances which may indicate disloyalty to the United States, of documents or information of a confidential or non-public character obtained by the person making the disclosure as a result of his employment by the Government of the United States, or prior to his employment;

'(5) Performing or attempting to perform his duties, or otherwise acting, so as to serve the interests of another government in preference to the interests of the United States; \* \* \*.' See also n. 2, supra.

8 In [Schneiderman v. United States](#), 320 U.S. 118, 148, 158, 63 S.Ct. 1333, 1347, 1352, 87 L.Ed. 1796, a review of the evidence of communist theory upon the use of force and violence presented in that record led this Court to hold that the evidence concerning communist teaching upon force and violence was not so 'clear, unequivocal and convincing' as to justify deportation of that defendant. We refused specifically to pass upon the attitude of communism toward force and violence. 320 U.S. at pages 148, 158, 63 S.Ct. at pages, 1347, 1352.

9 The Russian Imperial Government fell quickly in February 1917, because its power had been sapped by bureaucratic rapacity and war losses as well as by communist revolutionary doctrines. Even under those circumstances, there are said to have been more than a thousand casualties in St. Petersburg. I Trotsky, *History of the Russian Revolution*, 141. The doctrine and practices of communism clearly enough teach the use of force against an existing noncommunist government to justify an official of our Government taking steps to protect governmental personnel by screening individuals to determine whether they accept force and violence as a political weapon. From the last paragraphs of the Communist Manifesto to the seizure of the last satellite, force and violence appears as a communist method for gaining control. Lenin, *Collected Works* (1930), Vol. XVIII, pp. 279—280; Trotsky, *op. cit.*, 106, 120, 144, 151; Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, August, 1917, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow (1949), 28, 30, 33. Translations furnished me indicate the same attitude on the part of Stalin. *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 131—137, 185—205, 241—246; Vol. III, pp. 367—370. And see Leites, *The Operational Code of the Politburo* (1950) c. xiii, 'Violence.'

See s 2 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, 64 Stat. 987, [50 U.S.C.A. s 782](#).

10 In the Refugee Committee complaint unconstitutionality of the designation was predicated upon repugnancy:

'(1) It is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States as a deprivation of freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly and association in violation of the First Amendment.

'(2) \* \* \* as a deprivation of the fundamental rights of the people of the United States reserved to the people of the United States by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.

'(3) \* \* \* as a deprivation of liberty and property without due process of law in violation of the Fifth Amendment.'

In the Council case, it was predicated upon a lack of 'any advance notice' and the Attorney General's acting 'without making 'an appropriate investigation and determination' as required' by the Order. It was said:

'The aforesaid actions of the defendants have been arbitrary, capricious, contrary to law, in excess of statutory right and authority. Such actions have violated the rights of the plaintiffs guaranteed by the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution and are contrary to the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.'

The same general allegations of violations of the Due Process Clause and First Amendment appear in No. 71, International Workers Order, Inc.

11 [Nortz v. United States](#), 294 U.S. 317, 324, 55 S.Ct. 428, 429, 79 L.Ed. 907; [Pierce Oil Corp. v. City of Hope](#), 248 U.S. 498, 39 S.Ct. 172, 63 L.Ed. 381; [Straus v. Foxworth](#), 231 U.S. 162, 168, 34 S.Ct. 42, 43, 58 L.Ed. 168.

12 [Bell v. Hood](#), 327 U.S. 678, 681, 684, 66 S.Ct. 773, 775, 776, 90 L.Ed. 939; [Larson v. Domestic & Foreign Commerce Corp.](#), 337 U.S. 682, 690, 69 S.Ct. 1457, 1461, 93 L.Ed. 1628.

13 [United Public Workers of America \(C.I.O.\) v. Mitchell](#), 330 U.S. 75, 95, 67 S.Ct. 556, 567, 91 L.Ed. 754, and cases cited; [American Communications Ass'n, C.I.O. v. Douds](#), 339 U.S. 382, 394—399, 70 S.Ct. 674, 681—684, 94 L.Ed. 925; [Feiner v. People of State of New York](#), 340 U.S. 315, 71 S.Ct. 303, 328.

14 The fairness of that designation is considered under the next point.

15 Perhaps they would insist not only on notice that an investigation is to be had but on an opportunity to be present and to have counsel, to cross-examine, to object to the introduction of evidence, to argue and to have judicial review. Cf. [Hiatt v. Compagna](#), 5 Cir., 178 F.2d 42, affirmed by an equally divided court, 340 U.S. 880, 71 S.Ct. 192. An injunction against listing could have delayed administration until today.

The statutory requirement for a hearing explains the statement in [Morgan v. United States](#), 304 U.S. 1, 14, 58 S.Ct. 773, 775, 999, 82 L.Ed. 1129, that 'in administrative proceedings of a quasi-judicial character the liberty and property of the citizen shall be protected by the rudimentary requirements of fair play. These demand 'a fair and open hearing,' essential alike to the legal validity of the administrative regulation and to the maintenance of public confidence in the value and soundness of this important governmental process. Such a hearing has been described as an 'inexorable safeguard.'" This hearing was a rate determination proceeding.

See the statement in the first [Morgan case](#), 298 U.S. 468, 480, 56 S.Ct. 906, 911, 80 L.Ed. 1288: 'That duty is widely different from ordinary executive action. It is a duty which carries with it fundamental procedural requirements. There must be a full hearing. There must be evidence adequate to support pertinent and necessary findings of fact.'

No enforceable rights to a hearing exist in an alien seeking admission to the United States. [United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy](#), 338 U.S. 537, 544, 70 S.Ct. 309, 313, 94 L.Ed. 317; [Nishimura](#); [Ekiu v. United States](#), 142 U.S. 651, 12 S.Ct. 336, 35 L.Ed. 1146; To the extent that [Ng Fung Ho v. White](#), 259 U.S. 276, 42 S.Ct. 49i, 66 L.Ed. 938, requires a hearing, it is on the issue of alienage, and not of admissibility.

16 Of course, notice to petitioners that an investigation was to be had to determine whether they had seditious purposes would be useless without opportunity for an administrative hearing. That is the effect of petitioners' argument.

17 For example, [Shields v. Utah Idaho Central R. Co.](#), 305 U.S. 177, 59 S.Ct. 160, 83 L.Ed. 111, interpreted a statutory requirement for determination by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the subsection of the railroad to the Railway Labor Act, 45 U.S.C.A. s 151 et seq., to necessitate procedural due process, 'the hearing of evidence and argument'. We held, 305 U.S. at page 183, 59 S.Ct. at page 163, that equity had cognizance of an objection to the proceeding, as 'arbitrary and capricious', 305 U.S. at page 185, 59 S.Ct. at page 165, because failure to post a prescribed notice is punishable as a crime. A 'right' was asserted.

Reliance on [Interstate Commerce Comm. v. Louisville & N.R. Co.](#), 227 U.S. 88, 33 S.Ct. 185, 57 L.Ed. 431, is misplaced. The statute gave a right to a full hearing, 227 U.S. at page 91, 33 S.Ct. at page 186.

[United States v. Lovett](#), 328 U.S. 303, 316, 66 S.Ct. 1073, 1079, 90 L.Ed. 1252, protected an employee against what this Court held was legislative decree of exclusion from government employment without trial.

[Columbia Broadcasting System v. United States](#), 316 U.S. 407, 418, 62 S.Ct. 1194, 1200, 86 L.Ed. 1563, depends upon this Court's ruling that the regulation there subjected to attack required the Federal Communications Commission to reject applications and cancel outstanding licenses 'on the grounds specified in the regulations without more.'

18 [Duke v. United States](#), 4 Cir., 90 F.2d 840, 112 A.L.R. 317; [United States v. Central Supply Ass'n, D.C.](#), 34 F.Supp. 241.  
19 40 U.S.C.A. s 258a, 46 Stat. 1421, and annotations; [Catlin v. United States](#), 324 U.S. 229, 231, 65 S.Ct. 631, 632, 89 L.Ed. 911.

20 E.g., [Underwriters from bank employment or direction](#). 12 U.S.C. s 78, 12 U.S.C.A. s 78, 48 Stat. 194, as amended, 49 Stat. 709.

- 21 This Court has declared the courts cannot supervise departmental action in discharge for inefficient rating, [Keim v. United States](#), 177 U.S. 290, 20 S.Ct. 574, 44 L.Ed. 774, or enjoin leases of public lands where no contract rights are involved, [Chapman v. Sheridan-Wyoming Co.](#), 338 U.S. 621, 625, 70 S.Ct. 392, 394, 94 L.Ed. 393. Cf. [Work v. United States ex rel. Rives](#), 267 U.S. 175, 45 S.Ct. 252, 69 L.Ed. 561.
- 22 It said, 333 U.S. at page 111, 68 S.Ct. at page 436: 'It would be intolerable that courts, without the relevant information, should review and perhaps nullify actions of the Executive taken on information properly held secret. Nor can courts sit in camera in order to be taken into executive confidences. But even if courts could require full disclosure, the very nature of executive decisions as to foreign policy is political, not judicial. Such decisions are wholly confided by our Constitution to the political departments of the government, Executive and Legislative.'
- And added, 333 U.S. at pages 112—113, 68 S.Ct. at page 437:
- 'Until the decision of the Board has Presidential approval, it grants to privilege and denies no right. It can give nothing and can take nothing away from the applicant or a competitor. It may be a step which if erroneous will mature into a prejudicial result, as an order fixing valuations in a rate proceeding may foreshadow and compel a prejudicial rate order. But administrative orders are not reviewable unless and until they impose an obligation, deny a right or fix some legal relationship as a consummation of the administrative process.'
- 23 5 C.F.R., App.A., p. 200, 13 Fed.Reg. 1471—1473:
- 'In connection with the designation of these organizations, the Attorney General has pointed out, as the President had done previously, that it is entirely possible that many persons belonging to such organizations may be loyal to the United States; that membership in, affiliation with, or sympathetic association with, any organization designated is simply one piece of evidence which may or may not be helpful in arriving at a conclusion as to the action which is to be taken in a particular case. 'Guilt by association' has never been one of the principles of our American jurisprudence. We must be satisfied that reasonable grounds exist for concluding that an individual is disloyal. That must be the guide.'
- 24 [Keim v. United States](#), 177 U.S. 290, 20 S.Ct. 574, 44 L.Ed. 774; [United Public Workers of America \(C.I.O.\) v. Mitchell](#), 330 U.S. 75, 102, 67 S.Ct. 556, 570, 91 L.Ed. 754. Classified civil service employees by statute shall have notice of the charges in writing and the privilege of filing an answer with affidavits. The statute adds, 'No examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer or employee directing the removal or suspension without pay.' 5 U.S.C. s 652, 5 U.S.C.A. s 652, 37 Stat. 555. And cf. Executive Order dated July 27, 1897, amending Civil Service Rule II, in 18th Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, at 282.
- 25 5 CFR s 220.2(a)(6). See note 4, supra.
- 26 'A total of 3,166 Government employees have quit or have been discharged under President Truman's loyalty program since it began March 21, 1947, the Loyalty Review Board reported today.
- 'Of these, 294 actually were discharged for disloyalty. The remainder, 2,872, quit while under investigation and might or might not have been found disloyal.
- 'The loyalty figures cover all 2,000,000 or more Government employees, plus the additional thousands hired since the program was begun in the spring of 1947.
- 'The regular monthly loyalty report showed that loyalty boards of the various Federal agencies had received 13,842 reports from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigating agencies since March 21, 1947. This meant investigators found something about those persons that raised a question about their loyalty.
- 'Of the cases ruled on by loyalty boards, 8,371 were found loyal and 522 disloyal. Of the 522, 294 were discharged, 186 won their jobs back on appeal and forty-two are still waiting decisions.' *New York Times*, January 16, 1951.
- See also n. 9 of Mr. Justice DOUGLAS' concurrence.
- 27 Disqualification grounds are in 5 CFR s 2.104(a):
- '(a) An applicant may be denied examination and an eligible may be denied appointment for any of the following reasons:
- '(1) Dismissal from employment for delinquency or misconduct.
- '(2) Physical or mental unfitness for the position for which applied.
- '(3) Criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct.
- '(4) Intentional false statements or deception or fraud in examination or appointment.
- '(5) Refusal to furnish testimony as required by s 5.3 of this chapter.
- '(6) Habitual use of intoxicating beverages to excess.
- '(7) On all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States.
- '(8) Any legal or other disqualification which makes the applicant unfit for the service.'
- Paragraph (7) is new. Cf. 12 Fed.Reg. 1938.

- 28 5 CFR s 9.102(1): 'No employee, veteran or nonveteran, shall be separated, suspended, or demoted except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service and for reasons given in writing. The agency shall notify the employee in writing of the action proposed to be taken. This notice shall set forth, specifically and in detail, the charges preferred against him. The employee shall be allowed a reasonable time for filing a written answer to such charges and furnishing affidavits in support of his answer. He shall not, however, be entitled to an examination of witnesses, nor shall any trial or hearing be required except in the discretion of the agency.'
- See Part 22 for appeals under Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.
- 29 5 CFR, Part 220.
- 30 5 CFR s 220.2(f) and (g).  
'(g) \* \* \* The notice of proposed removal action required in paragraph (f) of this section shall state to the employee:  
'(1) The charges against him in factual detail, setting forth with particularity the facts and circumstances relating to the charges so far as security considerations will permit, in order to enable the employee to submit his answer, defense or explanation.  
'(2) His right to answer the charges in writing, under oath or affirmation, within a specified reasonable period of time, not less than ten (10) calendar days from the date of the receipt by the employee of the notice.  
'(3) His right to have an administrative hearing on the charges before a loyalty board in the agency, upon his request.  
'(4) His right to appear before such board personally, to be represented by counsel or representative of his own choosing, and to present evidence in his behalf.'  
Id., s 220.3(d):  
'(d) Presentation of evidence. Both the Government and the applicant or employee may introduce such evidence as the board may deem proper in the particular case.  
'The board shall take into consideration the fact that the applicant or employee may have been handicapped in his defense by the non-disclosure to him of confidential information or by the lack of opportunity to cross-examine persons constituting such sources of information.'
- 31 The Prime Minister first described this program in a statement in the House of Commons, March 15, 1948, 448 H.C.Deб. 1703 ff., and in further detail on March 25, id. at 3418 ff. The standards for the program are set forth at 451 H.C.Deб., Written Answers, p. 118, in the form of instructions to three 'advisers on Communists and Fascists in the Civil Service,' retired civil servants designated to perform a function essentially parallel to that of the Loyalty Review Board here:  
'1. The Government have stated that no one who is believed to be:—  
'(i) either a member of the Communist Party or of a Fascist organization; or  
'(ii) associated with either the Communist Party or a Fascist organization in such a way as to raise legitimate doubts about his reliability;  
is to be employed in connection with work the nature of which is vital to the security of the State.  
'2. You have been appointed to advise Ministers, in any cases referred to you, whether in your opinion their prima facie ruling that a civil servant comes under (i) or (ii) above is or is not substantiated. The decision on what employment is to be regarded as involving 'connection with work the nature of which is vital to the security of the State' is one not for you but for Ministers in charge of Departments.  
'3. Your functions do not extend beyond advising the Minister whether the prima facie case has or has not been substantiated. You are not concerned with the action which he may decide to take in relation to the matter.'  
The Prime Minister stated that the civil servant concerned would be informed as specifically as possible of the charges against him, but that 'It is quite impossible—and everyone will realise that it is—that we should give in detail exactly the sources of information. If we do that, we destroy anything like an effective security service.' Id., Vol. 448, at 3423. He would be allowed to appear personally in response to charges. Id. at 3426.  
While the program is primarily intended to effect the transfer of unreliable civil servants to jobs not vital to the security of the state (unless their technical training fits them only for security jobs), nevertheless it has apparently been extended to cover all jobs in certain agencies, such as the Air Ministry Headquarters. Id., Vol. 452, at 940—941.  
The Prime Minister did not answer directly questions as to the scope of the order in relation to 'the telephone service and key telephone exchanges,' id., Vol. 448, at 1705, or 'members of the Services who are engaged in dealing with secret processes.' Id. at 1706.
- 32 Cf. *Standard Computing Scale Co. v. Farrell*, 249 U.S. 571, 39 S.Ct. 380, 63 L.Ed. 780.
- 33 *Hirabayashi v. United States*, 320 U.S. 81, 93, 100, 63 S.Ct. 1375, 1382, 1385, 87 L.Ed. 1774.
- 34 *Home Building & Loan Ass'n v. Blaisdell*, 290 U.S. 398, 426, 442, 54 S.Ct. 231, 235, 241, 78 L.Ed. 413.

End of Document

© 2022 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S.  
Government Works.

**Filings (3)**







<b>Title</b>	<b>PDF</b>	<b>Court</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Type</b>
<b>1. Brief for Petitioners</b> Intern. Workers Order v. McGrath 1950 WL 78508	—	U.S.	Oct. 14, 1950	Brief
<b>2. Brief for Respondents</b> Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath 1950 WL 78458	—	U.S.	Oct. 03, 1950	Brief
<b>3. Brief for Petitioner</b> Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath 1950 WL 78457	—	U.S.	Sep. 20, 1950	Brief

## Negative Treatment

### Negative Citing References (11)

The KeyCited document has been negatively referenced by the following events or decisions in other litigation or proceedings:

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Distinguished by	 1. <a href="#">In the Matter of D-----</a>  4 I. & N. Dec. 578 , BIA "Subversive," deportability-After entry, voluntary member of International Workers' Order-After entry, voluntarily affiliated with Communist Party of the United States of...	Dec. 26, 1951	Administrative Decision		—
Distinguished by	 2. <a href="#">Mahdavi v. Fair Employment Practice Com.</a>  136 Cal.Rptr. 421 , Cal.App. 1 Dist. A resident alien appealed from a judgment of the Superior Court, San Francisco County, Joseph Kennedy, J., denying his petition for peremptory writ of mandate claiming that the...	Jan. 25, 1977	Case		—
Distinguished by	 3. <a href="#">Penobscot Air Services, Ltd. v. F.A.A.</a>   164 F.3d 713 , 1st Cir. Fixed-base operator (FBO) which leased space at county airport petitioned for review of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) order dismissing FBO's claims of discrimination by...	Jan. 19, 1999	Case		—
Distinguished by	 4. <a href="#">People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran v. U.S. Dept. of State</a>  182 F.3d 17 , D.C.Cir. Two groups designated as "foreign terrorist organizations" by United States Secretary of State petitioned for judicial review. The Court of Appeals, Randolph, Circuit Judge, held...	June 25, 1999	Case		—
Distinguished by	5. <a href="#">Giannoukos v. Harp</a>  369 F.Supp.2d 715 , E.D.Va. HEALTH - Discipline. State agencies' reporting of disciplinary order to federal data bank would not violate physician's due process rights.	May 09, 2005	Case		—
Distinguished by	 6. <a href="#">Villalpando v. Reagan</a>  121 P.3d 172 , Ariz.App. Div. 1 CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Government Misconduct. Nomination of substitute prosecutor by conflict-barred prosecutor did not violate defendant's due process rights.	Sep. 22, 2005	Case		—
Distinguished by	7. <a href="#">Gas Drilling Awareness Coalition v. Powers</a>  2011 WL 6151434 , M.D.Pa. We are considering a motion to dismiss filed by defendant, James Powers, Jr., former Director of the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency's Office of Homeland Security...	Dec. 12, 2011	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Distinguished by	 <a href="#">8. Al-Turki v. Tomsic</a> 2016 WL 1179413 , D.Colo. This matter is before the Court on the Motion to Dismiss [# 13], filed by Defendants Ann Tomsic ("Tomsic") and George Brauchler ("Brauchler"); on the Motion to Dismiss [# 22],...	Feb. 25, 2016	Case		—
Distinguished by	<a href="#">9. Gerawan Farming, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd.</a> 253 Cal.Rptr.3d 136 , Cal.App. 5 Dist. LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT — Collective Bargaining. Employee failed to show history of public access to mediation proceedings, as necessary to warrant access to collective bargaining...	Sep. 24, 2019	Case		—
Distinguished by	 <a href="#">10. Oneida Indian Nation v. United States Department of the Interior</a> <b>MOST NEGATIVE</b> 789 Fed.Appx. 271 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) NATIVE AMERICANS — Federal Recognition. Likelihood of confusion between names of tribes was not sufficient injury to confer standing to challenge decision to publish changed name.	Oct. 21, 2019	Case		—
Followed with Reservations by	<a href="#">11. American Bottom Conservancy v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</a> 650 F.3d 652 , 7th Cir.(Ill.) ENVIRONMENTAL LAW - Parties. Environmental organization alleged sufficient facts to establish standing to challenge Army Corps of Engineers permit.	June 14, 2011	Case		—



## History (7)

### Direct History (7)

1. [International Workers Order v. Clark](#)  
88 F.Supp. 873 , D.D.C , Apr. 12, 1949



*Judgment Affirmed in Part, Appeal Dismissed in Part by*


2. [International Workers Order v. McGrath](#)  
182 F.2d 368 , D.C.Cir. , Mar. 22, 1950

*Certiorari Granted by*

3. [International Workers Order v. McGrath](#)  
340 U.S. 805 , U.S.Dist.Col. , Oct. 09, 1950

*AND Judgment Affirmed by*



4. [Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath](#)    
341 U.S. 123 , U.S.Dist.Col. , Apr. 30, 1951


- 
5. [Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. Clark](#)   
177 F.2d 79 , D.C.Cir. , Aug. 11, 1949

*Certiorari Granted by*












6. [Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath](#)  
339 U.S. 910 , U.S.Dist.Col. , Mar. 13, 1950













*AND Judgment Reversed by*


7. [Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath](#)    
341 U.S. 123 , U.S.Dist.Col. , Apr. 30, 1951



























**Citing References (500)**

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Examined by	<p> <b>1. Paul v. Davis</b> ”</p> <p>96 S.Ct. 1155, 1161+ , U.S.Ky.</p> <p>Plaintiff whose name and photograph appeared on a flyer which was captioned "Active Shoplifters" and which was distributed among merchants by police chiefs brought class action....</p>	Mar. 23, 1976	Case		—
Examined by	<p> <b>2. B. C. Morton Intern. Corp. v. Federal Deposit Ins. Corp.</b> ”</p> <p>305 F.2d 692, 696+ , 1st Cir.(Mass.)</p> <p>Action against corporate agency of government for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief. From an adverse judgment of the United States District Court for the District of...</p>	July 03, 1962	Case		—
Examined by	<p><b>3. Veterans of Abraham Lincoln Brigade v. Attorney General of U. S.</b> ”</p> <p>470 F.2d 441, 442+ , D.C.Cir.</p> <p>Following a remand by the Court of Appeals, 133 U.S.App.D.C. 222, 409 F.2d 1139, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, John J. Sirica, Chief Judge, entered...</p>	Oct. 24, 1972	Case		—
Examined by	<p><b>4. Tercero v. Texas Southmost College District</b> ”</p> <p>2018 WL 4333996, *7+ , S.D.Tex.</p> <p>Defendant Texas Southmost College District and Defendants Adela G. Garza, Juan "Trey" Mendez III, Ruben Herrera, Ramon Champion Hinojosa, and Dr. Antonio Zavaleta have moved for...</p>	June 04, 2018	Case		—
Distinguished by	<p><b>5. Gas Drilling Awareness Coalition v. Powers</b></p> <p>2011 WL 6151434, *5+ , M.D.Pa.</p> <p>We are considering a motion to dismiss filed by defendant, James Powers, Jr., former Director of the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency's Office of Homeland Security...</p>	Dec. 12, 2011	Case		—
Distinguished by	<p> <b>6. People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran v. U.S. Dept. of State</b></p> <p>182 F.3d 17, 22+ , D.C.Cir.</p> <p>Two groups designated as "foreign terrorist organizations" by United States Secretary of State petitioned for judicial review. The Court of Appeals, Randolph, Circuit Judge, held...</p>	June 25, 1999	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>7. Lankford v. Idaho</b> ”</p> <p>111 S.Ct. 1723, 1729+ , U.S.Idaho</p> <p>Defendant was convicted of two counts of first-degree murder and sentenced to death. After consolidation of appeals from conviction and from denial of petition for postconviction...</p>	May 20, 1991	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	<p> <b>8. Warth v. Seldin</b> 95 S.Ct. 2197, 2205+ , U.S.N.Y.</p> <p>Various organizations and individuals resident in the Rochester, New York, metropolitan area brought suit against town adjacent to Rochester, and against members of zoning,...</p>	June 25, 1975	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>9. Goss v. Lopez</b> ¶¶ 95 S.Ct. 729, 738+ , U.S.Ohio</p> <p>Class action was brought by a number of Columbus, Ohio public school system students to review their suspensions without hearing, either prior to or within reasonable time...</p>	Jan. 22, 1975	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>10. Arnett v. Kennedy</b> ¶¶ 94 S.Ct. 1633, 1656+ , U.S.Ill.</p> <p>Action was brought by discharged nonprobationary federal employee in the Office of Economic Opportunity for declaratory and injunctive relief on ground of denial of due process in...</p>	Apr. 16, 1974	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>11. Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth</b> ¶¶ 92 S.Ct. 2701, 2707+ , U.S.Wis.</p> <p>Action by assistant professor at state university, who had no tenure rights to continued employment and who was informed that he would not be rehired after first academic year,...</p>	June 29, 1972	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>12. Jenkins v. McKeithen</b> 89 S.Ct. 1843, 1849+ , U.S.La.</p> <p>Action for declaratory or injunctive relief and determination that statute creating Louisiana Labor-Management Commission of Inquiry, which was body limited to investigating...</p>	June 09, 1969	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>13. Communist Party of U.S. v. Subversive Activities Control Bd.</b> ¶¶ 81 S.Ct. 1357, 1396+ , U.S.Dist.Col.</p> <p>Proceeding for review of an order of the Subversive Activities Control Board declaring the Communist Party a Communist-action organization required to register with the Attorney...</p>	June 05, 1961	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>14. Hannah v. Larche</b> ¶¶ 80 S.Ct. 1502, 1519+ , U.S.La.</p> <p>Registrars of voters in the State of Louisiana and private citizens of Louisiana brought suits against members of the Civil Rights Commission to enjoin commission from holding its...</p>	June 20, 1960	Case		—
Discussed by	<p><b>15. Barsky v. Board of Regents of University</b> 74 S.Ct. 650, 652+ , U.S.N.Y.</p> <p>Proceeding to review determination of New York Board of Regents that physician's license should be suspended because of physician's conviction in federal court for misdemeanor in...</p>	Apr. 26, 1954	Case		—













Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	 <b>16. U.S. v. Abuhamra</b> ¶¶ 389 F.3d 309, 322+ , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Bail. Convicted member of al-Qaida's "Buffalo six" denied due process on application for bail.	Nov. 15, 2004	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>17. Grace Line v. Panama Canal Company</b> ¶¶ 243 F.2d 844, 856+ , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Action by Panama Canal users to compel Panama Canal Corporation to prescribe new tolls and to recover damages for corporation's failure to prescribe new tolls. From summary...	Apr. 08, 1957	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>18. State of N.J., Dept. of Environmental Protection and Energy v. Helder Industries, Inc.</b> ¶¶ 989 F.2d 702, 706+ , 3rd Cir.(N.J.) New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) objected to proposed settlement involving distribution of proceeds from sale of substantially all of Chapter 11 debtor's...	Apr. 02, 1993	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>19. In re Trump</b> ¶¶ 958 F.3d 274, 293+ , 4th Cir.(Md.) GOVERNMENT — United States. President's definition of "emoluments" did not show a clear and indisputable right to mandamus relief.	May 14, 2020	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>20. McNeill v. Butz</b> ¶¶ 480 F.2d 314, 318+ , 4th Cir.(N.C.) Suits wherein plaintiffs sought to effect their reinstatement in prior federal employment and to recover back pay. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of...	June 11, 1973	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>21. Sepulvado v. Jindal</b> ¶¶ 739 F.3d 716, 721+ , 5th Cir.(La.) The petition for panel rehearing is DENIED. The court having been polled at the request of one of its members, and a majority of the judges who are in regular active service and...	Dec. 23, 2013	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>22. N. L. R. B. v. Smith Industries, Inc.</b> ¶¶ 403 F.2d 889, 891+ , 5th Cir. Proceeding on petition to enforce National Labor Relations Board order requiring employer to cease and desist from refusing to bargain with union after representation election. ...	Nov. 12, 1968	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>23. Dixon v. Alabama State Bd. of Ed.</b> ¶¶ 294 F.2d 150, 155+ , 5th Cir.(Ala.) Action for former students at state supported college seeking preliminary and permanent injunction restraining State Board of Education and others from obstructing their right to...	Aug. 04, 1961	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	<p> <b>24. Larry v. Lawler</b> ¶¶ 605 F.2d 954, 958+ , 7th Cir.(Ill.)</p> <p>Individual who was rated ineligible for federal employment on ground of alleged alcoholism and abusive behavior problem brought action alleging that manner in which Civil Service...</p>	Aug. 18, 1978	Case		—
Discussed by	<p><b>25. Adams v. Walker</b> ¶¶ 492 F.2d 1003, 1008+ , 7th Cir.(Ill.)</p> <p>Removed chairman of State Liquor Control Commission brought action against the governor seeking reinstatement and damages. The United States District Court for the Southern...</p>	Feb. 25, 1974	Case		—
Discussed by	<p><b>26. Turkish Coalition of America, Inc. v. Bruininks</b> ¶¶ 678 F.3d 617, 622+ , 8th Cir.(Minn.)</p> <p>EDUCATION - Civil Rights. University did not deprive nonprofit organization of right to freedom of speech guaranteed by First Amendment.</p>	May 03, 2012	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>27. Geneva Towers Tenants Organization v. Federated Mortgage Investors</b> 504 F.2d 483, 491+ , 9th Cir.(Cal.)</p> <p>Tenants in two federally financed housing projects brought actions seeking rescission of rent increases granted by Federal Housing Administration and injunctions compelling that...</p>	Oct. 02, 1974	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>28. Kartseva v. Department of State</b> ¶¶ 37 F.3d 1524, 1527+ , D.C.Cir.</p> <p>Government contractor's former employee who lost her job after Department of State expressed security concerns about her brought action against Department and Department officials....</p>	Oct. 28, 1994	Case		—
Discussed by	<p><b>29. Law Offices of Seymour M. Chase, P.C. v. F.C.C.</b> ¶¶ 843 F.2d 517, 524+ , D.C.Cir.</p> <p>Attorney petitioned for review of order of Federal Communications Commission which disqualified him from appearing as counsel in proceeding before Commission. The Court of...</p>	Mar. 25, 1988	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>30. Mosrie v. Barry</b> ¶¶ 718 F.2d 1151, 1158+ , D.C.Cir.</p> <p>Police officer brought civil rights action alleging that his lateral transfer and public criticism of his performance by supervisory officials deprived him of liberty interest and...</p>	Oct. 07, 1983	Case		—
Discussed by	<p> <b>31. Southern Mut. Help Ass'n, Inc. v. Califano</b> ¶¶ 574 F.2d 518, 524+ , D.C.Cir.</p> <p>Action was brought by nonprofit health services provider challenging decision by Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare disapproving, after three years of federal support, an...</p>	Dec. 23, 1977	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	 <b>32. Tarlton v. Saxbe</b> 507 F.2d 1116, 1120+ , D.C.Cir.  Action on pro se complaint to expunge certain information from plaintiff's FBI 'criminal' file. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Matthew F. McGuire,...	Oct. 22, 1974	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>33. Thompson v. Washington</b> ¶ 497 F.2d 626, 635+ , D.C.Cir.  Class action on behalf of tenants of approximately 6,000 rental units of United States Capital Housing Authority for injunctive and declaratory relief with respect to rental...	Dec. 10, 1973	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>34. Fitzgerald v. Hampton</b> ¶ 467 F.2d 755, 764+ , D.C.Cir.  Proceeding on the summary judgment motion of former federal employee in his action to enjoin the United States Civil Service Commission from holding closed hearing relating to the...	Sep. 15, 1972	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>35. National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. v. Subversive Activities Control Bd.</b> 322 F.2d 375, 392+ , D.C.Cir.  Petition to review an order of Subversive Activities Control Board holding that petitioner was a Communist-front organization within Subversive Activities Control Act and ordering...	May 16, 1963	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>36. Coho Salmon v. Pacific Lumber Co.</b> ¶ 61 F.Supp.2d 1001, 1010+ , N.D.Cal.  Environmental groups brought action under Endangered Species Act (ESA) to enjoin logging company's timber harvesting activities that allegedly affected coho salmon. On company's...	Mar. 22, 1999	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>37. Coho Salmon v. Pacific Lumber Co.</b> ¶ 30 F.Supp.2d 1231, 1240+ , N.D.Cal.  Environmental organizations filed citizen suit under Endangered Species Act (ESA) to permanently enjoin logging company from taking threatened species of coho salmon through its...	Dec. 09, 1998	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>38. Parker v. Lester</b> ¶ 112 F.Supp. 433, 440+ , N.D.Cal.  Action by seamen to enjoin enforcement of vessels and waterfront security regulations promulgated pursuant to executive orders and the Magnuson Act, and for a declaration of...	Apr. 21, 1953	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>39. Parker v. Lester</b> ¶ 98 F.Supp. 300, 306+ , N.D.Cal.  Action by Lawrence E. Parker, and others, against J. A. Lester, and others, to enjoin enforcement of San Francisco vessels and waterfront security regulations, and for a...	June 01, 1951	Case		—












Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	<b>40. Dornan v. U.S. Secretary of Defense</b> ¶¶ 676 F.Supp. 6, 7+ , D.D.C.  Senator and congressmen brought action against President and cabinet members for declaratory judgment that Congress was unconstitutionally constraining President from carrying out...	Nov. 20, 1987	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>41. Methodist Federation for Social Action v. Eastland</b> ¶¶ 141 F.Supp. 729, 732+ , D.D.C.  Action by religious social action organization against members of Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Public Printer, and Superintendent of Documents, seeking declaration that...	May 25, 1956	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>42. Bauer v. Acheson</b> ¶¶ 106 F.Supp. 445, 451+ , D.D.C.  Anne Bauer brought an action against Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, to enjoin the denial of her right to a passport, and for other relief. The District Court, Keech and Curran,...	July 09, 1952	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>43. Davis v. Weir</b> ¶¶ 328 F.Supp. 317, 320+ , N.D.Ga.  Class action by apartment tenant against city, city officials and general manager of city water works to enjoin the termination of water service at the tenant's premises and to...	June 17, 1971	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>44. Hinkle v. White</b> ¶¶ 40 F.Supp.3d 1049, 1053+ , S.D.Ill.  CIVIL RIGHTS — Due Process. Reputational damage from investigator's statements was not actionable as due process violation.	May 07, 2014	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>45. Brown v. Donielson</b> ¶¶ 334 F.Supp. 294, 304+ , S.D.Iowa  Complaint seeking declaratory and injunctive relief. The District Court, Hanson, Chief Judge, held that complaint of plaintiff, subpoenaed to testify before grand jury, to enjoin...	Nov. 22, 1971	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>46. Palmer v. Schuette</b> ¶¶ 2016 WL 5477260, *4+ , E.D.Mich.  On December 19, 2014, Plaintiff Brian Palmer filed a three-count Complaint against Defendants Bill Schuette ("Schuette") and Scott Teter ("Teter"). Defendants filed a Motion to...	Sep. 29, 2016	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>47. Crook v. Baker</b> ¶¶ 584 F.Supp. 1531, 1554+ , E.D.Mich.  Holder of master of science degree in geology and mineralogy filed complaint against university, its officers and regents, alleging that defendants, acting under color of state...	May 21, 1984	Case		—



Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	 <b>48. Lake Michigan College Federation of Teachers v. Lake Michigan Community College</b> ¶ 390 F.Supp. 103, 122+ , W.D.Mich. Teachers at junior college and their union brought action against board of trustees of junior college, the junior college, and president of the junior college for reinstatement...	Sep. 27, 1974	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>49. U.S. v. Rasmussen</b> ¶ 222 F.Supp. 430, 434+ , D.Mont. Action by the United States to enjoin defendant from acting as county office manager of a county agricultural stabilization conservation committee. The District Court, Jameson, J.,...	Oct. 07, 1963	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>50. Massieu v. Reno</b> ¶ 915 F.Supp. 681, 703+ , D.N.J. Alien sought declaratory and injunctive relief against deportation based on determination by Secretary of State that he was deportable because of potentially serious adverse...	Feb. 28, 1996	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>51. Storms v. United States</b> ¶ 2017 WL 2684013, *16+ , E.D.N.Y. On December 20, 2015, Plaintiffs Derrick Storms, A1 Procurement, LLC ("A1"), A1 Procurement JVH, A1 Procurement—Transportation Leasing Corp., LLC and A1 Procurement, JVG filed a...	June 20, 2017	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>52. Socialist Workers Party v. Attorney General of U.S.</b> ¶ 463 F.Supp. 515, 524+ , S.D.N.Y. Action was brought against United States by political association under Federal Tort Claims Act involving alleged illegal F.B.I. activity in disrupting political association's...	Dec. 15, 1978	Case		—
Discussed by	 <b>53. Wallace &amp; Tiernan Inc. v. General Elec. Co.</b> 291 F.Supp. 217, 222+ , S.D.N.Y. Action for declaration that defendant patent owner's patent was invalid and not infringed where plaintiff's chemical compounds are used. On owner's motion to dismiss for want of...	Oct. 07, 1968	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>54. deLeiris v. Scott</b> ¶ 642 F.Supp. 1552, 1567+ , D.R.I. Parents brought action against Rhode Island, and Rhode Island officials challenging requirement that parents provide state registrar of vital statistics with personal information...	Sep. 10, 1986	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>55. Quality Technology Co. v. Stone &amp; Webster Engineering Co., Inc.</b> ¶ 745 F.Supp. 1331, 1344+ , E.D.Tenn. Contractor on personal services project with Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) brought action in the Circuit Court, Hamilton County, Tennessee, against other contractors,...	Mar. 27, 1989	Case		—



Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	<b>56. <a href="#">La Union Del Pueblo Entero v. Federal Emergency Management Agency</a></b> ¶ 2017 WL 2539451, *18+ , S.D.Tex.  BE IT REMEMBERED that on February 15, 2017, the Court supplemented its Memorandum Order and Opinion of September 30, 2015. See Mem. Op. and Order, Dkt. No. 156. The Court hereby...	Feb. 15, 2017	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>57. <a href="#">Mohamed v. Holder</a></b> ¶ 2011 WL 3820711, *6+ , E.D.Va.  In this action, plaintiff Gulet Mohamed has asserted a broad range of constitutional and statutory claims arising out of his alleged physical abuse by Kuwaiti authorities with the...	Aug. 26, 2011	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>58. <a href="#">Employers Ins. of Wausau v. Brown</a></b> ¶ 1982 WL 410, *4+ , W.D.Wis.  Before the Court at this time is the issue of subject matter jurisdiction which the Court has raised on its own motion. Plaintiff brought this action for declaratory and other...	Sep. 15, 1982	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>59. <a href="#">Virgin Islands Hotel Ass'n (U. S.) Inc. v. Virgin Islands Water and Power Authority</a></b> ¶ 54 F.R.D. 377, 382+ , D.Virgin Islands  Hotel association brought action to enjoin Water and Power Authority from continuing to give effect to electric rate increase. The District Court, Warren H. Young, J., held that...	Feb. 02, 1972	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>60. <a href="#">In re Tucker</a></b> ¶ 95 Cal.Rptr. 761, 774+ , Cal.  Petition for habeas corpus challenging revocation of petitioner's parole by the Adult Authority. The Supreme Court, Burke, J., held that Adult Authority properly considered...	June 24, 1971	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>61. <a href="#">Endler v. Schutzbank</a></b> 65 Cal.Rptr. 297, 307+ , Cal.  Action brought by former manager of personal property broker licensee for declaratory relief, injunction and writ of mandate in reference to administrative accusation which...	Jan. 26, 1968	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>62. <a href="#">Housing Authority of City of Los Angeles v. Cordova</a></b> ¶ 279 P.2d 215, 217+ , Cal.Super.A.D.  Actions by municipal housing authority for unlawful detainer. The housing authority's motion for summary judgment in each case was granted by the Municipal Court of the Los...	Jan. 19, 1955	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>63. <a href="#">Committee to Elect Dan Forest v. Employees Political Action Committee</a></b> ¶ 853 S.E.2d 698, 715+ , N.C.  LITIGATION — Parties. North Carolina Constitution does not include an injury-in-fact requirement for standing where a purely statutory or common law right is at issue.	Feb. 05, 2021	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	<b>64. DeBruhl v. Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office</b> ¶ 815 S.E.2d 1, 7+ , N.C.App. GOVERNMENT — Weapons. Denial of concealed handgun permit application due to applicant's alleged mental health disorder, did not satisfy procedural due process requirements.	Apr. 17, 2018	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>65. In re W.B.M.</b> ¶ 690 S.E.2d 41, 49+ , N.C.App. FAMILY LAW - Child Protection. Statutory procedure for inclusion of father on Responsible Individuals List (RIL) violated due process.	Mar. 02, 2010	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>66. O'Brien v. Commissioner of Ed.</b> ¶ 173 N.Y.S.2d 265, 269+ , N.Y. Proceeding under Civil Practice Act, s 1283 et seq., to annul a determination of the commissioner of education sustaining special election approving construction of a school...	Mar. 27, 1958	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>67. People ex rel. Fortunato v. Warden, George Motchan Detention Center</b> ¶ 9 N.Y.S.3d 849, 853+ , N.Y.Sup. CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Parole. Failure of Parole Board to consider parolee's mental competency in revocation hearing violated parolee's due process rights.	May 08, 2015	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>68. Board of Ed. of Tuxedo Union Free School Dist. No. 3 of Towns of Tuxedo and Warwick v. State Division of Human Rights</b> ¶ 330 N.Y.S.2d 274, 276+ , N.Y.Sup. Action by board of education for declaratory and injunctive relief against Division of Human Rights. The Supreme Court, Westchester County, Morrie Slifkin, J., held that...	Feb. 11, 1972	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>69. Peters v. New York City Housing Authority</b> ¶ 128 N.Y.S.2d 224, 233+ , N.Y.Sup. Application for declaration of invalidity of New York City Housing Authority resolution requiring as condition of occupancy in federally aided housing projects that applicant or...	July 07, 1953	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>70. Commonwealth v. Ricker</b> ¶ 170 A.3d 494, 515+ , Pa. AND NOW, this 28th day of September, 2017, this appeal is dismissed as having been improvidently granted.	Sep. 28, 2017	Case		—
Discussed by	<b>71. Matter of Deming</b> ¶ 736 P.2d 639, 647+ , Wash. Judicial disciplinary hearing was brought. The Supreme Court, Callow, J., after determining due process rights of a judge accused of misconduct, held that use of position to...	May 07, 1987	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	<p> <b>72. Smallwood v. State</b> ”</p> <p>771 P.2d 798, 809+ , Wyo.</p> <p>On remand, 748 P.2d 1141, defendant was convicted in the District Court, Crook County, Timothy J. Judson, J., of felony child abuse and battery, and he appealed. The Supreme...</p>	Mar. 28, 1989	Case		—
Discussed by	<p><b>73. SECRETARY OF LABOR, MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION (MSHA) v. BRODY MINING, LLC</b> ”</p> <p>36 FMSHRC 2027+</p> <p>These consolidated contest proceedings, which arise under the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, 30 U.S.C. § 801 et seq. (2012) ("Mine Act" or "Act"), are before us on...</p>	Aug. 28, 2014	Administrative Decision		—
Discussed by	<p><b>74. SECRETARY OF LABOR, MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION (MSHA) v. BRODY MINING, LLC</b> ”</p> <p>2014 WL 12940748 (F.M.S.H.R.C.), *44+</p> <p>These consolidated contest proceedings, which arise under the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, 30 U.S.C. § 801 et seq. (2012) ("Mine Act" or "Act"), are before us on...</p>	Aug. 28, 2014	Administrative Decision		—
Distinguished by <span style="border: 1px solid red; padding: 1px;">NEGATIVE</span>	<p> <b>75. Oneida Indian Nation v. United States Department of the Interior</b></p> <p>789 Fed.Appx. 271, 277+ , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)</p> <p>NATIVE AMERICANS — Federal Recognition. Likelihood of confusion between names of tribes was not sufficient injury to confer standing to challenge decision to publish changed name.</p>	Oct. 21, 2019	Case		—
Distinguished by <span style="border: 1px solid red; padding: 1px;">NEGATIVE</span>	<p><b>76. Gerawan Farming, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd.</b></p> <p>253 Cal.Rptr.3d 136, 167 , Cal.App. 5 Dist.</p> <p>LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT — Collective Bargaining. Employee failed to show history of public access to mediation proceedings, as necessary to warrant access to collective bargaining...</p>	Sep. 24, 2019	Case		—
Distinguished by <span style="border: 1px solid red; padding: 1px;">NEGATIVE</span>	<p> <b>77. Al-Turki v. Tomsic</b></p> <p>2016 WL 1179413, *5+ , D.Colo.</p> <p>This matter is before the Court on the Motion to Dismiss [# 13], filed by Defendants Ann Tomsic ("Tomsic") and George Brauchler ("Brauchler"); on the Motion to Dismiss [# 22],...</p>	Feb. 25, 2016	Case		—
Distinguished by <span style="border: 1px solid red; padding: 1px;">NEGATIVE</span>	<p> <b>78. Villalpando v. Reagan</b></p> <p>121 P.3d 172, 174 , Ariz.App. Div. 1</p> <p>CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Government Misconduct. Nomination of substitute prosecutor by conflict-barred prosecutor did not violate defendant's due process rights.</p>	Sep. 22, 2005	Case		—














Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Distinguished by <b>NEGATIVE</b>	 <b>79. Penobscot Air Services, Ltd. v. F.A.A.</b> ¶ 164 F.3d 713, 723+ , 1st Cir.  Fixed-base operator (FBO) which leased space at county airport petitioned for review of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) order dismissing FBO's claims of discrimination by...	Jan. 19, 1999	Case		—
Distinguished by <b>NEGATIVE</b>	 <b>80. Mahdavi v. Fair Employment Practice Com.</b> 136 Cal.Rptr. 421, 428 , Cal.App. 1 Dist.  A resident alien appealed from a judgment of the Superior Court, San Francisco County, Joseph Kennedy, J., denying his petition for peremptory writ of mandate claiming that the...	Jan. 25, 1977	Case		—
Distinguished by <b>NEGATIVE</b>	 <b>81. In the Matter of D-----</b> 4 I. & N. Dec. 578, 588 , BIA  "Subversive," deportability-After entry, voluntary member of International Workers' Order-After entry, voluntarily affiliated with Communist Party of the United States of...	Dec. 26, 1951	Administrative Decision		—
Cited by	 <b>82. Kerry v. Din</b> 135 S.Ct. 2128, 2144 , U.S.  IMMIGRATION - Visas. Consular official's citation to terrorism bar satisfied any due process right that citizen had regarding notice of grounds for denying husband's visa.	June 15, 2015	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>83. Hamdan v. Rumsfeld</b> ¶ 126 S.Ct. 2749, 2798 , U.S.  MILITARY LAW - Court-Martial. Alien detained at Guantanamo Bay could not be tried before military commission.	June 29, 2006	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>84. Town of Castle Rock, Colo. v. Gonzales</b> 125 S.Ct. 2796, 2825 , U.S.  CIVIL RIGHTS - Duty to Protect. Wife did not have protected property interest in police enforcement of restraining order against husband.	June 27, 2005	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>85. Printz v. U.S.</b> 117 S.Ct. 2365, 2395 , U.S.Mont.  GOVERNMENT - States. Provisions of Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act requiring state chief law enforcement officers to conduct background checks of prospective handgun...	June 27, 1997	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>86. Raines v. Byrd</b> 117 S.Ct. 2312, 2323+ , U.S.Dist.Col.  CIVIL PROCEDURE - Standing. Individual members of Congress did not establish Article III standing to maintain suit challenging constitutionality of Line Item Veto Act.	June 26, 1997	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<p> <b>87. United Food and Commercial Workers Local 751 v. Brown Group, Inc.</b> 116 S.Ct. 1529, 1534 , U.S.Mo.</p> <p>LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT - Hours and Wages. Union had standing to bring Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act action seeking damages on behalf of its employee members.</p>	May 13, 1996	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>88. Sandin v. Conner</b> 115 S.Ct. 2293, 2306 , U.S.Hawai'i</p> <p>Prisons. Prisoner did not have due process liberty interest in remaining free from disciplinary segregation.</p>	June 19, 1995	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>89. Liteky v. U.S.</b> ¶¶ 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 , U.S.Ga.</p> <p>Recusal. Extrajudicial source doctrine is applicable to bias and prejudice recusal motions.</p>	Mar. 07, 1994	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>90. U.S. v. James Daniel Good Real Property</b> 114 S.Ct. 492, 502 , U.S.Hawai'i</p> <p>Forfeitures. Real property used in drug transactions could not be forfeited without pre seizure notice and opportunity for hearing.</p>	Dec. 13, 1993	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>91. Connecticut v. Doehr</b> 111 S.Ct. 2105, 2114 , U.S.Conn.</p> <p>Property owner brought suit alleging that Connecticut's ex parte attachment procedure violated his constitutional right of due process. The United States District Court for the...</p>	June 06, 1991	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>92. Siegert v. Gilley</b> ¶¶ 111 S.Ct. 1789, 1798+ , U.S.Dist.Col.</p> <p>Former government employee brought action against former supervisor alleging that former supervisor, in response to request for information on job performance, wrote defamatory...</p>	May 23, 1991	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>93. Caplin &amp; Drysdale, Chartered v. U.S.</b> 109 S.Ct. 2667, 2673 , U.S.Va.</p> <p>For majority opinions of the Court, see 491 U.S. 617, 109 S.Ct. 2646, 105 L.Ed.2d 528, and 491 U.S. 600, 109 S.Ct. 2657, 105 L.Ed.2d 512.</p>	June 22, 1989	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>94. Edwards v. Aguillard</b> 107 S.Ct. 2573, 2596+ , U.S.La.</p> <p>Action was brought challenging constitutionality of Louisiana Balanced Treatment for Creation-Science and Evolution-Science in Public School Instruction Act. On remand from the...</p>	June 19, 1987	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>95. Brock v. Roadway Exp., Inc.</b> ¶¶ 107 S.Ct. 1740, 1756 , U.S.Ga.</p> <p>Common motor carrier brought action against Secretary of Labor and Regional Administrator of Department of Labor for injunctive and declaratory relief, contending that Department's...</p>	Apr. 22, 1987	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>96. International Union, United Auto., Aerospace and Agr. Implement Workers of America v. Brock</b> ¶¶ 106 S.Ct. 2523, 2533 , U.S.Dist.Col.  Action was brought challenging Department of Labor policy which does not permit week in which employee draws nonregular wages to be considered a week of employment for purposes of...	June 25, 1986	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>97. Atkins v. Parker</b> ¶¶ 105 S.Ct. 2520, 2535 , U.S.Mass.  The United States Secretary of Agriculture and the Massachusetts Commissioner of Public Welfare appealed from a judgment entered by the United States District Court for the...	June 04, 1985	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>98. Davis v. Scherer</b> ¶¶ 104 S.Ct. 3012, 3023 , U.S.Fla.  See 468 U.S. 1226, 105 S.Ct. 26. Plaintiff, discharged as an employee of the Florida Highway Patrol, sued under the 1871 civil rights statute for alleged violation of the due...	June 28, 1984	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>99. Olim v. Wakinekona</b> 103 S.Ct. 1741, 1749 , U.S.Hawai'i  Hawaii prisoner, who had been transferred to prison in California, brought action on claim of denial of due process rights arising out of reclassification proceedings. The United...	Apr. 26, 1983	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>100. Hewitt v. Helms</b> 103 S.Ct. 864, 878+ , U.S.Pa.  Pennsylvania prison inmate brought civil rights action claiming that prison officials' actions in confining him to administrative segregation violated his due process rights. The...	Feb. 22, 1983	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>101. Santosky v. Kramer</b> 102 S.Ct. 1388, 1397 , U.S.N.Y.  Parents appealed from judgment of the Family Court, Ulster County, Elwyn, J., which adjudged their children to be permanently neglected. The New York Supreme Court, Appellate...	Mar. 24, 1982	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>102. Valley Forge Christian College v. Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Inc.</b> 102 S.Ct. 752, 769+ , U.S.Pa.  Action was instituted for declaratory and injunctive relief against transfer of government property to religious organization without financial payment therefore. The United...	Jan. 12, 1982	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>103. Rostker v. Goldberg</b> ¶¶ 101 S.Ct. 2646, 2651+ , U.S.Pa.  A three-judge panel of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 509 F.Supp. 586, held that the Military Selective Service Act violated the due...	June 25, 1981	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>104. Little v. Streater</b> ¶¶ 101 S.Ct. 2202, 2205+ , U.S.Conn.  Putative father appealed from a judgment of the Appellate Session of the Connecticut Superior Court affirming a judgment identifying him as an illegitimate child's father and...	June 01, 1981	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>105. Lassiter v. Department of Social Services of Durham County, N. C.</b> 101 S.Ct. 2153, 2166 , U.S.N.C.  The District Court, Durham County, Samuel F. Gantt, J., terminated a mother's parental rights and appeal was taken. The North Carolina Court of Appeals, Robert M. Martin, J., 43...	June 01, 1981	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>106. Marshall v. Jerrico, Inc.</b> ¶¶  100 S.Ct. 1610, 1613 , U.S.Dist.Col.  Employer brought action challenging civil penalty provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia granted plaintiff's...	Apr. 28, 1980	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>107. Barry v. Barchi</b> ¶¶ 99 S.Ct. 2642, 2653 , U.S.N.Y.  Action was brought challenging constitutionality of New York statute authorizing summary suspensions without presuspension hearing and New York State Racing and Wagering Board...	June 25, 1979	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>108. Greenholtz v. Inmates of Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex</b> 99 S.Ct. 2100, 2106+ , U.S.Neb.  Inmates of state prison brought civil rights action against Nebraska State Board of Parole and others alleging due process violations in Board's consideration of inmates'...	May 29, 1979	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>109. Bell v. Wolfish</b> 99 S.Ct. 1861, 1895 , U.S.N.Y.  Pretrial detainees brought suit challenging the constitutionality of numerous conditions of confinement and practices in a federally operated short-term custodial facility. The...	May 14, 1979	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>110. Leis v. Flynt</b> 99 S.Ct. 698, 708 , U.S.Ohio  After an Ohio trial court refused to allow two out-of-state lawyers to represent defendants in a pending state criminal obscenity case, the lawyers and their clients brought suit...	Jan. 15, 1979	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>111. Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division v. Craft</b> 98 S.Ct. 1554, 1563 , U.S.Tenn.  Suit was brought challenging constitutionality of municipal utility's policies pertaining to terminating and refusing to connect electric, gas and water services. The United...	May 01, 1978	Case		—










Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<p> <b>112. Carey v. Piphus</b> 98 S.Ct. 1042, 1051+ , U.S.Ill.</p> <p>Elementary and secondary students who claimed they had been suspended from school without procedural due process brought action against school board. The United States District...</p>	Mar. 21, 1978	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>113. Board of Curators of University of Missouri v. Horowitz</b> 98 S.Ct. 948, 961 , U.S.Mo.</p> <p>Former medical student sued challenging her dismissal from medical school of public university. The United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, 447...</p>	Mar. 01, 1978	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>114. Smith v. Organization of Foster Families For Equality and Reform</b> 97 S.Ct. 2094, 2107+ , U.S.N.Y.</p> <p>Individual foster parents and organization of foster parents brought action for declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to New York State and New York City statutory and...</p>	June 13, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>115. Moore v. City of East Cleveland, Ohio</b> 97 S.Ct. 1932, 1937 , U.S.Ohio</p> <p>Homeowner was convicted in Ohio court of violating East Cleveland housing ordinance which limits occupancy of a dwelling unit to members of a single family and recognizes as a...</p>	May 31, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>116. Ingraham v. Wright</b> </p>	Apr. 19, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>117. Codd v. Velger</b> </p>	Feb. 22, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>118. Bishop v. Wood</b></p> <p>96 S.Ct. 2074, 2081 , U.S.N.C.</p> <p>Former police officer brought action against city, city manager and chief of police contending that his due process rights were violated when he was discharged from his job. The...</p>	June 10, 1976	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>119. Mathews v. Eldridge</b> </p>	Feb. 24, 1976	Case		—








Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<p><b>120. Spady v. Mount Vernon Housing Authority</b> </p> <p>95 S.Ct. 243, 244 , U.S.N.Y.</p> <p>Facts and opinion, 34 N.Y.2d 573, 310 N.E.2d 542, 354 N.Y.S.2d 945.</p>	Oct. 29, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>121. Wolff v. McDonnell</b></p> <p>94 S.Ct. 2963, 2975+ , U.S.Neb.</p> <p>Civil rights action was brought challenging administrative procedures and practices at Nebraska penal and correctional complex. From an order of the United States District Court...</p>	June 26, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>122. Morrissey v. Brewer</b></p> <p>92 S.Ct. 2593, 2600+ , U.S.Iowa</p> <p>Two cases, in each of which the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa denied a petition for writ of habeas corpus for the release of a prisoner following...</p>	June 29, 1972	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>123. Fuentes v. Shevin</b></p> <p>92 S.Ct. 1983, 1994 , U.S.Fla.</p> <p>Actions challenging constitutionality of Florida and Pennsylvania prejudgment replevin statutes. A three-judge United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida,...</p>	June 12, 1972	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>124. Groppi v. Leslie</b> </p> <p>92 S.Ct. 582, 585+ , U.S.Wis.</p> <p>Habeas corpus proceeding by petitioner who was in prison pursuant to resolution by state legislature that he was guilty of contempt. The United States District Court for the...</p>	Jan. 13, 1972	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>125. Wisconsin v. Constantineau</b> </p> <p>91 S.Ct. 507, 510 , U.S.Wis.</p> <p>Action challenging constitutionality of Wisconsin statute pursuant to which plaintiff's name was posted in retail liquor outlets as one to whom intoxicating beverages should not be...</p>	Jan. 19, 1971	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>126. Goldberg v. Kelly</b></p> <p>90 S.Ct. 1011, 1018 , U.S.N.Y.</p> <p>New York City residents receiving financial aid under federally-assisted program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children or under New York State's general Home Relief program...</p>	Mar. 23, 1970	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>127. Flast v. Cohen</b></p> <p>88 S.Ct. 1942, 1950 , U.S.N.Y.</p> <p>Action by federal taxpayers to enjoin expenditure of federal funds for purchase of textbooks and other instructional materials for use in parochial schools. A three-judge panel of...</p>	June 10, 1968	Case		—















Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>128. Whitehill v. Elkins</b> 88 S.Ct. 184, 187 , U.S.Md.  Suit for declaratory relief that a Maryland teacher's oath was unconstitutional. The United States three-judge District Court for the District of Maryland, Harrison L. Winter,...	Nov. 06, 1967	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>129. Spencer v. State of Tex.</b> 87 S.Ct. 648, 657+ , U.S.Tex.  An appeal from the Court of Criminal Appeals of Texas, No. 68, 389 S.W.2d 304, a writ of certiorari to the Court of Criminal Appeals of Texas, No. 69, 387 S.W.2d 411, and a writ of...	Jan. 23, 1967	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>130. Dombrowski v. Pfister</b> 85 S.Ct. 1116, 1122 , U.S.La.  Action under Civil Rights Act for declaratory relief and injunction restraining defendants from prosecuting or threatening to prosecute plaintiffs for alleged violations of...	Apr. 26, 1965	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>131. Aptheker v. Secretary of State</b> 84 S.Ct. 1659, 1667 , U.S.Dist.Col.  Actions for injunctive relief and for declaratory relief in respect to constitutionality of a section of the Subversive Activities Control Act. The three judge United States...	June 22, 1964	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>132. Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan</b> 83 S.Ct. 631, 636+ , U.S.R.I.  Action to declare the Rhode Island law creating Commission to Encourage Morality in Youth unconstitutional and to enjoin the acts and practices of the Commission thereunder. From...	Feb. 18, 1963	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>133. Williams v. Zuckert</b>  83 S.Ct. 403, 406 , U.S.Dist.Col.  Action challenging plaintiff's discharge from his civilian position with the Air Force for alleged misconduct. From a judgment of the United States District Court for the District...	Jan. 14, 1963	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>134. Beard v. Stahr</b> 82 S.Ct. 1105, 1106 , U.S.Dist.Col.  A regular army officer brought an action against the Secretary of the Army and others to enjoin them from removing him from the active list of the regular Army. The United States...	May 28, 1962	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>135. Cafeteria and Restaurant Workers Union, Local 473, AFL-CIO v. McElroy</b>  81 S.Ct. 1743, 1748+ , U.S.Dist.Col.  Action by union and employee against Secretary of Defense and others seeking, among other things, to compel return to employee of her identification badge so that she might be...	June 19, 1961	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>136. Greene v. McElroy</b> 79 S.Ct. 1400, 1412+ , U.S.Dist.Col.  Action, against Secretary of Defense and others, for declaration that revocation of government contractor's employee's security clearance was unlawful and void and for order...	June 29, 1959	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>137. Barenblatt v. U.S.</b>  79 S.Ct. 1081, 1104 , U.S.Dist.Col.  Prosecution for contempt of Congress under 2 U.S.C.A. s 192, for refusal to answer certain questions during defendant's testimony before a subcommittee of the Committee on...	June 08, 1959	Case		—
Cited by	<b>138. Uphaus v. Wyman</b> 79 S.Ct. 1040, 1060 , U.S.N.H.  The New Hampshire Attorney General petitioned the Merrimack County Court to call defendant before it and require compliance with subpoenas. the Merrimack County Court entered...	June 08, 1959	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>139. Harmon v. Brucker</b> 78 S.Ct. 433, 435 , U.S.Dist.Col.  Separate proceedings by inductees seeking judgments declaring actions of Secretary of Army, in issuing to inductees a discharge certificate in form other than honorable on account...	Mar. 03, 1958	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>140. Schware v. Board of Bar Exam. of State of N.M.</b> 77 S.Ct. 752, 760 , U.S.N.M.  Proceeding on original petition to review denial by State Board of Bar Examiners of application to take examination for admission to practice law. The Supreme Court of the State...	May 06, 1957	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>141. Pennsylvania Railroad Company v. Rychlik</b> 77 S.Ct. 421, 431 , U.S.N.Y.  Trainman, on behalf of himself and other railroad employees similarly situated, brought class suit against railroad and brotherhood of railroad trainmen for an injunction...	Feb. 25, 1957	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>142. Frozen Food Exp. v. U.S.</b> 76 S.Ct. 569, 573 , U.S.Tex.  Actions to enjoin order of Interstate Commerce Commission and to have it set aside. Various parties intervened. A three-judge United States District Court for the Southern District...	Apr. 23, 1956	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>143. Peters v. Hobby</b> 75 S.Ct. 790, 794+ , U.S.Dist.Col.  Action by former federal employee against head of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Loyalty Review Board to obtain declaration that former employee's removal and...	June 06, 1955	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>144. Barrows v. Jackson</b> 73 S.Ct. 1031, 1034+ , U.S.Cal.  Actions by parties to, and a successor to a party to, a restrictive covenant against sale of realty to non-Caucasians, for damages from co-covenantor who allegedly conveyed realty...	June 15, 1953	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>145. Stein v. People of State of New York</b> 73 S.Ct. 1077, 1100 , U.S.N.Y.  Prosecution of three defendants for felony murder under New York law. From judgment of conviction, defendants appealed. The Court of Appeals of New York, 303 N.Y. 856, 104 N.E.2d...	June 15, 1953	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>146. Carlson v. Landon</b> 72 S.Ct. 525, 540 , U.S.  Habeas corpus proceedings by four aliens against Herman R. Landon, District Director of Immigration and Naturalization, United States Department of Justice, and a habeas corpus...	Mar. 10, 1952	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>147. Adler v. Board of Education of City of New York</b> 72 S.Ct. 380, 391 , U.S.N.Y.  Irving Adler and others brought a declaratory judgment action praying that the New York Civil Service Law section, relating to ineligibility for employment of any person...	Mar. 03, 1952	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>148. Dennis v. United States</b> 71 S.Ct. 857, 875 , U.S.N.Y.  Eugene Dennis, and others, were convicted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York on an indictment for violation of Section 3 of the Smith Act, 18...	June 04, 1951	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>149. Diaz Ortiz v. Barr</b> 959 F.3d 10, 25 , 1st Cir.  IMMIGRATION — Asylum. Substantial evidence supported adverse credibility determination in denying asylum application filed by native of El Salvador.	May 15, 2020	Case		—
Cited by	<b>150. U.S. v. Paz-Alvarez</b> 799 F.3d 12, 31 , 1st Cir.(Puerto Rico)  CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Sentencing. Sentence enhancement for use of special skill was warranted for defendant's construction of sophisticated secret compartments used to smuggle drugs.	Aug. 21, 2015	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>151. Gorman v. University of Rhode Island</b>  837 F.2d 7, 12+ , 1st Cir.(R.I.)  Student brought action seeking injunctive and compensatory relief under Civil Rights Act for alleged violation of his constitutional rights resulting from series of disciplinary...	Jan. 19, 1988	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<p> <b>152. Camel Hair and Cashmere Institute of America, Inc. v. Associated Dry Goods Corp.</b> 799 F.2d 6, 11+ , 1st Cir.(Mass.)</p> <p>Nonprofit corporation formed to promote use of camel hair and cashmere fibers brought action against clothing marketers, alleging mislabeling in violation of Lanham Act. The...</p>	Sep. 02, 1986	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>153. Griffin v. Burns</b> ” 570 F.2d 1065, 1078 , 1st Cir.(R.I.)</p> <p>A civil rights class action was brought against state officials by voters who voted by absentee or shut-in ballots, later determined to be allowable only in general elections, in...</p>	Jan. 19, 1978	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>154. Sarzen v. Gaughan</b> ” 489 F.2d 1076, 1083+ , 1st Cir.(Mass.)</p> <p>Appeal from an order of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, Andrew A. Caffrey, Chief Judge denying a petition for habeas corpus by individual who...</p>	Dec. 10, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>155. Palmigiano v. Baxter</b> 487 F.2d 1280, 1284 , 1st Cir.(R.I.)</p> <p>Action by prison inmate seeking damages and declaratory and injunctive relief to redress certain alleged deprivations of procedural due process in the administration of discipline...</p>	Nov. 16, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>156. Palkovic v. Johnson</b> 355 Fed.Appx. 513, 515 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)</p> <p>EDUCATION - Seniority and Tenure. Hearing conducted on tenured teacher's mental competence did not violate former tenured teacher's due process rights.</p>	Dec. 09, 2009	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>157. Spinelli v. City of New York</b> 579 F.3d 160, 169 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)</p> <p>CIVIL RIGHTS - Due Process. Gun shop owner's due process rights were violated by suspension of license and seizure of firearms inventory.</p>	Aug. 07, 2009	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>158. Luessenhop v. Clinton County, New York</b> ” 466 F.3d 259, 269 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)</p> <p>TAXATION - Collection. County's effort to provide taxpayer with notice of pending tax foreclosure was insufficient to satisfy due process.</p>	Oct. 11, 2006	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>159. Sira v. Morton</b> ” 380 F.3d 57, 77 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)</p> <p>CIVIL RIGHTS - Prisons. Officials were entitled to qualified immunity with respect to sufficiency challenge.</p>	Aug. 17, 2004	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>160. Donk v. Miller</b> 365 F.3d 159, 163 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)</p> <p>GOVERNMENT - Licensing. Suspension of horse trainers' licenses did not violate due process.</p>	Apr. 22, 2004	Case		—




Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>161. Gully v. National Credit Union Admin. Bd.</b> ¶¶ 341 F.3d 155, 161 , 2nd Cir. FINANCE AND BANKING - Credit Unions. Credit union manager's conduct constituted breach of fiduciary duty supporting prohibition order.	Aug. 21, 2003	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>162. Perry v. McDonald</b> 280 F.3d 159, 174 , 2nd Cir.(Vt.) CIVIL RIGHTS - Free Speech. Vermont's vanity license plates were not a public forum for free speech.	Oct. 17, 2001	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>163. Able v. U.S.</b> 88 F.3d 1280, 1293 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Gay and lesbian members of armed forces sued United States and Secretaries of Defense and Transportation, challenging constitutionality of section of National Defense Authorization...	July 01, 1996	Case		—
Cited by	<b>164. U.S. v. International Broth. of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, AFL-CIO</b> 3 F.3d 634, 640+ , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Independent administrator ruled that employer had violated consent decree entered in civil RICO action against union in firing former employee and awarded employee back wages and...	Aug. 30, 1993	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>165. U.S. v. All Assets of Statewide Auto Parts, Inc.</b> ¶¶ 971 F.2d 896, 902 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) President of business sought order to show cause why ex parte, prenotice seizure of business' assets pursuant to civil forfeiture proceedings should not be dismissed. The United...	Aug. 03, 1992	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>166. Financial Institutions Retirement Fund v. Office of Thrift Supervision</b> ¶¶ 964 F.2d 142, 147 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Multiple employer pension fund brought declaratory action that Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS) was not entitled to any portion of future employer contribution offset (FECO)...	May 15, 1992	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>167. Baden v. Koch</b> ¶¶ 799 F.2d 825, 831 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Demoted supervisory city employee brought suit against mayor and city under § 1983 for damages allegedly resulting from demotion. The United States District Court for the...	Aug. 21, 1986	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>168. In re Grand Jury Subpoena Served Upon Doe</b> ¶¶ 781 F.2d 238, 261 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) By a 9-2 vote, the en banc Court of Appeals reversed and vacated the judgment and opinion of a panel, 759 F.2d 968, thus affirming an order entered in the Eastern District of New...	Jan. 09, 1986	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>169. St. Martin's Press, Inc. v. Carey</b> 605 F.2d 41, 48 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Plaintiff publisher and retail sellers of book sought declaratory and injunctive relief against New York statute defining offense of promoting a sexual performance by a child. The...	Jan. 10, 1979	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>170. McKinnon v. Patterson</b> 568 F.2d 930, 936 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) On cross-appeals by state prisoners and state prison officials from judgment entered in civil rights action in the Southern District of New York, Charles E. Stewart, J., 425...	Sep. 15, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>171. Shepard v. U.S. Bd. of Parole</b> 541 F.2d 322, 326 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Federal parolee serving a state prison sentence for crime committed while on parole appealed from an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of New...	Sep. 07, 1976	Case		—
Cited by	<b>172. Schneider v. Whaley</b> 541 F.2d 916, 920 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Municipal officials appealed from an order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, John M. Cannella, J., 417 F.Supp. 750, granting a preliminary...	Aug. 20, 1976	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>173. Lee v. Thornton</b>  538 F.2d 27, 32 , 2nd Cir.(Vt.) Plaintiffs whose vehicles were detained by customs officials attacked constitutionality of the statutory scheme under which the vehicles had been detained. A Three-Judge District...	July 02, 1976	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>174. Huntley v. Community School Bd. of Brooklyn, New York School Dist. No. 14</b> 543 F.2d 979, 984 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) On appeal from a judgment entered after a bench trial in the Eastern District of New York, Jack B. Weinstein, District Judge, which dismissed the complaint of an acting public...	May 12, 1976	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>175. Cardaropoli v. Norton</b> 523 F.2d 990, 995+ , 2nd Cir.(Conn.) Federal prisoner petitioned for habeas corpus challenging his classification as special offender. The United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, Robert C....	Sep. 29, 1975	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>176. U. S. ex rel. Johnson v. Chairman of New York State Bd. of Parole</b> 500 F.2d 925, 928 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.) State prisoner who had been denied parole brought action seeking statement of reasons for denial. The District Court for the Eastern District of New York, John F. Dooling, Jr.,...	June 13, 1974	Case		—



Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>177. Nieves v. Oswald</b> 498 F.2d 802, 808 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  After remand, 477 F.2d 1109, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, John O. Henderson, J., issued decree in declaratory judgment proceeding and...	Jan. 30, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<b>178. Eisen v. Carlisle &amp; Jacquelin</b> ¶ 479 F.2d 1005, 1013 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  Treble damage antitrust action was brought by odd-lot investor against two brokerage firms and the New York Stock Exchange on behalf of himself and all other odd-lot investors...	May 01, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	<b>179. Winters v. Miller</b> 446 F.2d 65, 71 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  Action was brought pursuant to federal civil rights statutes. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, Anthony J. Travia, J., 306 F.Supp. 1158,...	May 26, 1971	Case		—
Cited by	<b>180. Menechino v. Oswald</b> 430 F.2d 403, 408 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  Action by state prisoner seeking a declaratory judgment to effect that he had a constitutionally protected right to procedural due process at a parole release hearing. The United...	Aug. 05, 1970	Case		—
Cited by	<b>181. Escalera v. New York City Housing Authority</b> ¶ 425 F.2d 853, 861+ , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  Tenants in New York City public housing projects brought four actions against New York City Housing Authority seeking injunctive and declaratory relief and, in two cases, money...	Apr. 29, 1970	Case		—
Cited by	<b>182. Norwalk CORE v. Norwalk Redevelopment Agency</b> 395 F.2d 920, 927 , 2nd Cir.(Conn.)  Appeal from judgment of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, Robert C. Zampano, J., 42 F.R.D. 617, dismissing action by displacees for relief against...	June 07, 1968	Case		—
Cited by	<b>183. Madera v. Board of Ed. of City of New York</b> ¶ 386 F.2d 778, 785 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Constance Baker Motley, J., 267 F.Supp. 356, entered an order April 11, 1967, enjoining the Board of...	Dec. 06, 1967	Case		—
Cited by	<b>184. Birnbaum v. Trussell</b> ¶ 371 F.2d 672, 679 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  Appeal from order of United States District Court for Southern District of New York, Sylvester J. Ryan, Chief Judge, dismissing appellant's complaint for failure to state claim on...	Dec. 28, 1966	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>185. Toilet Goods Ass'n v. Gardner</b> ¶ 360 F.2d 677, 684 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  Appeal by Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and Commissioner of Food and Drugs from an order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York,...	Apr. 13, 1966	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>186. Luckenbach S. S. Co. v. U.S.</b> 312 F.2d 545, 548 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  Action by charterer against United States for declaration of non-liability under charter of government-owned vessels. From a judgment of the United States District Court for the...	Jan. 11, 1963	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>187. United States ex rel. Mezei v. Shaughnessy</b> 195 F.2d 964, 967 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  Petition by Ignatz Mezei, an alien detained at Ellis Island, for writ of habeas corpus, to which Edward J. Shaughnessy, District Director, Immigration and Naturalization Service,...	Mar. 20, 1952	Case		—
Cited by	<b>188. U.S. Lines Co. v. Shaughnessy</b> 195 F.2d 385, 386 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  Action by the United States Lines Company against W. F. Watkins, Director of Immigration and Naturalization Service of New York, for whom his successor, Edward J. Shaughnessy, has...	Mar. 17, 1952	Case		—
Cited by	<b>189. U.S. v. Remington</b> 191 F.2d 246, 252 , 2nd Cir.(N.Y.)  William Remington was convicted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, for perjury for denying under oath that he had been a member of the...	Aug. 22, 1951	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>190. Pennsylvania Psychiatric Soc. v. Green Spring Health Services, Inc.</b> ¶ 280 F.3d 278, 283 , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS - Association. Professional association's associational standing extended to members' third-party claims.	Feb. 06, 2002	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>191. Deibler v. City of Rehoboth Beach</b> ¶ 790 F.2d 328, 338 , 3rd Cir.(Del.)  Potential candidate for vacant nonresident commissioner seat brought action for deprivation of civil rights, seeking declaratory judgment, compensatory and punitive damages against...	May 05, 1986	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>192. Rex v. Cia. Pervana de Vapores, S.A.</b> ¶ 660 F.2d 61, 65 , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Injured longshoreman brought action under Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to recover against owner and operator of foreign merchant vessel. The United States...	Sep. 17, 1981	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>193. Helms v. Hewitt</b> 655 F.2d 487, 494 , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Prison inmate filed action under Civil Rights Act of 1871 requesting damages and injunctive and declaratory relief against certain officials of state correctional institution after...	June 30, 1981	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>194. Neal v. Secretary of Navy and Commandant of Marine Corps</b> ¶¶ 639 F.2d 1029, 1044+ , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Marine who was denied reenlistment brought suit seeking reinstatement with retroactive promotions and back pay. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of...	Feb. 02, 1981	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>195. Kelly v. Railroad Retirement Bd.</b> ¶¶ 625 F.2d 486, 491 , 3rd Cir.  Petition was filed for review from an order of the Railroad Retirement Board denying application for a disabled child's annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act. The Court of...	June 10, 1980	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>196. Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Inc. v. U.S. Dept. of Health, Ed. and Welfare</b> 619 F.2d 252, 256 , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Action was instituted for declaratory and injunctive relief against transfer of government property to a concededly religious organization. The United States District Court for the...	Apr. 08, 1980	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>197. McKnight v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transp. Authority</b> 583 F.2d 1229, 1234+ , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Former employee of Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority brought action against Authority and certain officials of Authority alleging that his discharge constituted a...	Sep. 29, 1978	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>198. Town Court Nursing Center, Inc. v. Beal</b> 586 F.2d 280, 290 , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Nursing home patients brought action against Secretary of Department of Health, Education and Welfare and others alleging that their due process and statutory rights would be...	Sep. 29, 1978	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>199. U.S. v. Long</b> 574 F.2d 761, 770+ , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Borough councilman and recipient of borough garbage removal contract were convicted, following jury trial, of conspiracy, obstruction of justice, and making a false material...	Mar. 06, 1978	Case		—
Cited by	<b>200. U.S. ex rel. Caruso v. U.S. Bd. of Parole</b> 570 F.2d 1150, 1158 , 3rd Cir.(N.J.)  State prisoner petitioned for writ of habeas corpus challenging the lack of an immediate parole revocation hearing with respect to unexecuted federal parole violator warrant. The...	Jan. 05, 1978	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>201. U.S. v. Bazzano</b> ¶ 570 F.2d 1120, 1135 , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Defendants were convicted in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Herbert P. Sorg, J., of operating an illegal gambling business or aiding and...	Dec. 21, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<b>202. West Penn Power Co. v. Train</b> 522 F.2d 302, 312+ , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Power company brought action against Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, and Secretary of DER, for...	July 16, 1975	Case		—
Cited by	<b>203. Mattern v. Weinberger</b> 519 F.2d 150, 161 , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Recipient of disabled widow's benefits brought class action for declaration that procedure for recoupment of overpayments of benefits without provision for hearing until after the...	June 03, 1975	Case		—
Cited by	<b>204. Merriam v. Kunzig</b> 476 F.2d 1233, 1247 , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Unsuccessful bidder for award for 20-year lease of office space to government agency brought action to set aside award and enjoin execution of proposed lease. The United States...	Feb. 16, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	<b>205. U. S. ex rel. Catena v. Elias</b> 465 F.2d 765, 768 , 3rd Cir.(N.J.)  Witness in custody under state contempt order for refusal to answer questions in hearing before state agency brought habeas corpus proceeding. The United States District Court for...	Aug. 08, 1972	Case		—
Cited by	<b>206. Richardson v. U.S.</b> ¶ 465 F.2d 844, 854+ , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Action by taxpayer seeking writ of mandamus to compel Secretary of Treasury to publish an accounting of the receipts and expenditures of the CIA and to enjoin any further...	July 20, 1972	Case		—
Cited by	<b>207. Dispatch, Inc. v. City of Erie</b> 364 F.2d 539, 542 , 3rd Cir.(Pa.)  Action to enjoin city from giving effect to ordinance authorizing community antenna television system franchise and providing for 'franchise payment'. The United States District...	Aug. 05, 1966	Case		—
Cited by	<b>208. Kirk v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration</b> ¶ 987 F.3d 314, 327 , 4th Cir.(S.C.)  SOCIAL SECURITY — Disability Benefits. Social Security Administration's (SSA) redetermination procedures deprived beneficiaries of due process in terminating their benefits based...	Feb. 04, 2021	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>209. Rosenfield v. Wilkins</b> 280 Fed.Appx. 275, 284 , 4th Cir.(Va.)  LEGAL SERVICES - Attorney Fees. Attorney was afforded constitutionally adequate procedural protections in reduction of requested fee award.	May 28, 2008	Case		—
Cited by	<b>210. Sciolino v. City of Newport News, Va.</b> ” 480 F.3d 642, 653 , 4th Cir.(Va.)  LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT - Public Employment. Showing of likelihood that employers would inspect personnel file was required to prove due process violation.	Mar. 12, 2007	Case		—
Cited by	<b>211. Butler v. Rector and Bd. of Visitors of College of William and Mary</b> 121 Fed.Appx. 515, 519+ , 4th Cir.(Va.)  EDUCATION - Student Discipline. Expulsion did not violate college student's due process rights.	Feb. 08, 2005	Case		—
Cited by	<b>212. Invention Submission Corp. v. Rogan</b> 357 F.3d 452, 457 , 4th Cir.(Va.)  PATENTS - Jurisdiction. PTO's conduct in engaging in advertising campaign was not final agency action subject to APA review.	Feb. 11, 2004	Case		—
Cited by	<b>213. U.S. v. Marsh</b> 105 F.3d 927, 931 , 4th Cir.(N.C.)  Government sought forfeiture of real property, and claimant asserted claim and counterclaims. The United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, James...	Jan. 31, 1997	Case		—
Cited by	<b>214. Mallette v. Arlington County Employees' Supplemental Retirement System II</b> 91 F.3d 630, 640+ , 4th Cir.(Va.)  County employee whose application for service-related disability retirement benefits was denied brought action under § 1983, claiming that county violated her constitutional right...	Aug. 01, 1996	Case		—
Cited by	<b>215. Doolin Sec. Sav. Bank, F.S.B. v. F.D.I.C.</b> 53 F.3d 1395, 1404 , 4th Cir.  Depository institution petitioned for review of order of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) terminating its insured status. The Court of Appeals, Donald Russell,...	May 18, 1995	Case		—
Cited by	<b>216. Richardson v. Town of Eastover</b> 922 F.2d 1152, 1159 , 4th Cir.(S.C.)  Nightclub owner brought civil rights action against town, mayor, and members of town council, alleging that he was deprived of property without due process when town did not renew...	Jan. 14, 1991	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>217. Riccio v. County of Fairfax, Va.</b> 907 F.2d 1459, 1469 , 4th Cir.(Va.)  Discharged county police officer brought § 1983 action alleging that process by which decision to discharge him was made violated his procedural due process rights under Fourteenth...	July 12, 1990	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>218. Edwards v. Johnston County Health Dept.</b> 885 F.2d 1215, 1218 , 4th Cir.(N.C.)  Migrant farm workers brought action against county and state officials, alleging that officials' practice of issuing permits for establishment of substandard migrant housing...	Sep. 20, 1989	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>219. McClelland v. Massinga</b>  786 F.2d 1205, 1211 , 4th Cir.(Md.)  Action was brought seeking declaratory and injunctive relief alleging that actions of state officials in certifying child support obligations to Comptroller of Treasury and...	Mar. 18, 1986	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>220. Yates v. Jamison</b> 782 F.2d 1182, 1188 , 4th Cir.(N.C.)  Homeowners brought civil rights action against city and its agents alleging that city and its agents had destroyed a house they owned without notice in violation of due process...	Feb. 03, 1986	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>221. Page v. Bolger</b> 645 F.2d 227, 236 , 4th Cir.(Va.)  Black postal employee, who was twice denied promotions, brought suit claiming racial discrimination in violation of Title VII. The United States District Court for the Eastern...	Apr. 02, 1981	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>222. Clark v. Whiting</b> 607 F.2d 634, 643 , 4th Cir.(N.C.)  Action was instituted by associate professor against university and its officials for alleged violation of constitutional rights. The United States District Court for the Middle...	Sep. 17, 1979	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>223. Bradford v. Weinstein</b> 519 F.2d 728, 732 , 4th Cir.(N.C.)  Inmates of state correctional institutions brought civil rights actions asserting that the proceedings in which they were denied parole did not comport with due process of law. In...	Nov. 22, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>224. U.S. v. Marchetti</b> 466 F.2d 1309, 1313 , 4th Cir.(Va.)  Action by United States against former employee of Central Intelligence Agency to enjoin the former employee from publishing a proposed book in violation of secrecy agreement and...	Sep. 11, 1972	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>225. United Fuel Gas Co. v. Federal Power Commission</b> ¶ 367 F.2d 34, 36 , 4th Cir.  Petition to review and set aside orders of the Federal Power Commission. The Court of Appeals, Sobeloff, Circuit Judge, held that where refunds were created by processes of...	Oct. 04, 1966	Case		—
Cited by	<b>226. Reed v. Franke</b> 297 F.2d 17, 20 , 4th Cir.(Va.)  Suit to enjoin certain naval officers from separating serviceman with general discharge under honorable conditions. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of...	Nov. 07, 1961	Case		—
Cited by	<b>227. Deering Milliken, Inc. v. Johnston</b> 295 F.2d 856, 862+ , 4th Cir.(N.C.)  Proceeding to enjoin Regional Director of National Labor Relations Board from proceeding with further hearings ordered by National Labor Relations Board. The United States...	Oct. 13, 1961	Case		—
Cited by	<b>228. Serrano v. Customs and Border Patrol, U.S. Customs and Border Protection</b> 975 F.3d 488, 496 , 5th Cir.(Tex.)  CIVIL RIGHTS — Due Process. Truck owner's due process rights were not violated by retention of truck by Customs and Border Protection, without prompt post-seizure hearing.	Sep. 16, 2020	Case		—
Cited by	<b>229. Walsh v. Hodge</b> ¶ 975 F.3d 475, 483 , 5th Cir.(Tex.)  EDUCATION — Labor and Employment. Professor suffered deprivation of procedural due process by not being permitted to test student's credibility in university proceeding.	Sep. 15, 2020	Case		—
Cited by	<b>230. Freeman v. City of Dallas</b> ¶ 186 F.3d 601, 607 , 5th Cir.(Tex.)  Owners of vacant apartment buildings sued city under § 1983, alleging that city's seizure and destruction of those buildings, as "urban nuisances," based only on findings and order...	Aug. 18, 1999	Case		—
Cited by	<b>231. Woods v. Federal Home Loan Bank Bd.</b> 826 F.2d 1400, 1412 , 5th Cir.(Tex.)  Savings and loan association and its owners and operators brought suit seeking to enjoin appointment of receiver and, following appointment, to remove receiver appointed by the...	Aug. 27, 1987	Case		—
Cited by	<b>232. Findeisen v. North East Independent School Dist.</b> ¶ 749 F.2d 234, 237 , 5th Cir.(Tex.)  Former tenured school teacher brought section 1983 action against school district, alleging a constructive discharge. The United States District Court for the Western District of...	Dec. 26, 1984	Case		—


Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>233. Phillips v. Vandygriff</b> 711 F.2d 1217, 1223 , 5th Cir.(Tex.)  Suit was brought alleging civil rights and antitrust violations and state tort claims based on allegations to effect that plaintiff was excluded from work in Texas as a manager of...	Aug. 15, 1983	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>234. Duncan v. Poythress</b> 657 F.2d 691, 703 , 5th Cir.(Ga.)  Voters brought action against state officials challenging appointment of person to fill vacancy in state Supreme Court judgeship. The United States District Court for the Northern...	Sep. 28, 1981	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>235. Downing v. Williams</b> 624 F.2d 612, 618 , 5th Cir.(Tex.)  Suit was brought by former staff psychiatrist at Texas State mental health and mental retardation facility alleging that his procedural due process and First Amendment rights had...	Aug. 21, 1980	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>236. Marrero v. City of Hialeah</b> 625 F.2d 499, 520 , 5th Cir.(Fla.)  Suit was brought against city and two state prosecutors for alleged violations of plaintiffs' civil rights. The United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida,...	Aug. 04, 1980	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>237. Glenn v. Newman</b> 614 F.2d 467, 472 , 5th Cir.(Ga.)  Former city police officer brought action against numerous city officials seeking damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief arising from alleged improper dismissal. Without...	Mar. 24, 1980	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>238. Robbins v. U.S. R. R. Retirement Bd.</b> 594 F.2d 448, 451 , 5th Cir.  Claimant sought review of a decision of the Railroad Retirement Board denying his claim for unemployment benefits. The Court of Appeals, 586 F.2d 1034, reversed, holding that the...	May 04, 1979	Case		—
Cited by	<b>239. Carson Products Co. v. Califano</b> 594 F.2d 453, 459 , 5th Cir.(Ga.)  Action was brought challenging Food and Drug Administration's determination that an ingredient in shaving powder was not entitled to classification as a trade secret and thus...	May 04, 1979	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>240. Drummond v. Fulton County Dept. of Family and Children's Services</b>  563 F.2d 1200, 1219 , 5th Cir.(Ga.)  White foster parents brought action to challenge on constitutional grounds the refusal of a county adoption agency to allow them to adopt a child of mixed racial parentage. The...	Nov. 28, 1977	Case		—



Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>241. Barrett v. Roberts</b> 551 F.2d 662, 667 , 5th Cir.(Fla.)  AFDC recipient brought action for injunctive relief with respect to delay in one month's payment which occurred after she received a termination letter and then requested a fair...	May 02, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>242. Ingraham v. Wright</b> 525 F.2d 909, 917+ , 5th Cir.(Fla.)  Action was brought by parents of public school students seeking compensatory and punitive damages and declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to use of corporal punishment...	Jan. 08, 1976	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>243. U.S. v. Briggs</b> ¶¶ 514 F.2d 794, 798+ , 5th Cir.(Fla.)  Persons named as unindicted conspirators in federal grand jury indictment petitioned for order expunging references to them in the indictment. The United States District Court for...	June 13, 1975	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>244. Robison v. Wichita Falls &amp; North Texas Community Action Corp.</b> 507 F.2d 245, 252 , 5th Cir.(Tex.)  Former employee of nonprofit corporation brought civil rights action challenging his discharge. The United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Robert M...	Jan. 15, 1975	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>245. Sims v. Fox</b> ¶¶ 505 F.2d 857, 867 , 5th Cir.(Ga.)  Reserve air force officer sought to enjoin the Air Force from discharging him without first giving him a hearing in person for purpose of presenting proof of his fitness for...	Dec. 30, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<b>246. Boykins v. Fairfield Bd. of Ed.</b> ¶¶ 492 F.2d 697, 701 , 5th Cir.(Ala.)  Following remands, 446 F.2d 973, and 457 F.2d 1091, and implementation of final plan of school desegregation, certain black students who were members of the class who brought the...	Apr. 12, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>247. Moore v. Knowles</b> 482 F.2d 1069, 1073 , 5th Cir.(Tex.)  A suspended nontenured school teacher brought action against members of school board and superintendent of school district under Civil Rights Act praying for equitable relief and...	Aug. 02, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>248. Scarpa v. U.S. Bd. of Parole</b> 477 F.2d 278, 287 , 5th Cir.(Ga.)  Action by federal prisoner alleging denial of fair hearing by parole board which denied him parole. The United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Newell...	Apr. 02, 1973	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>249. Manges v. Camp</b> ¶¶ 474 F.2d 97, 100 , 5th Cir.(Tex.)  Action by owner of controlling interest in stock of national bank for permanent injunction restraining comptroller of the currency from continuing in force order prohibiting...	Mar. 01, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>250. Woodbury v. McKinnon</b> ¶¶ 447 F.2d 839, 843 , 5th Cir.(Ala.)  Action wherein physician alleged that he had been deprived of his surgical privileges in county hospital in violation of his right to due process. The United States District Court...	July 12, 1971	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>251. Simmons v. U.S.</b> 406 F.2d 456, 464 , 5th Cir.(Ga.)  Defendant was convicted in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Newell Edenfield, J., of a violation of the Universal Military Training and...	Jan. 09, 1969	Case		—
Cited by	<b>252. Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. v. Federal Power Commission</b> ¶¶ 357 F.2d 232, 237 , 5th Cir.  Petitions to review orders of Federal Power Commission. The Court of Appeals, Wisdom, Circuit Judge, held that where Federal Power Commission had not made definitive ruling on...	Feb. 07, 1966	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>253. Bowdoin v. Malone</b> ¶¶ 284 F.2d 95, 105+ , 5th Cir.(Ga.)  Action in fictitious form of ejectment in which real defendants were a Federal Forest Service Officer and the United States. The action was removed from the Superior Court, Jasper...	Oct. 25, 1960	Case		—
Cited by	<b>254. Magnolia Petroleum Co. v. Federal Power Com'n</b> 236 F.2d 785, 795 , 5th Cir.  Proceeding upon petition for review of Federal Power Commission's order which petitioner sought to have set aside. The Court of Appeals, Borah, Circuit Judge, held that Federal...	June 30, 1956	Case		—
Cited by	<b>255. Johnson v. City of Saginaw, Michigan</b> 980 F.3d 497, 511 , 6th Cir.(Mich.)  CIVIL RIGHTS — Due Process. City officials were required to provide notice and opportunity to be heard before shutting off water service to restaurant in effort to curb violence.	Nov. 13, 2020	Case		—
Cited by	<b>256. Lipman v. Budish</b> ¶¶ 974 F.3d 726, 752 , 6th Cir.(Ohio)  CIVIL RIGHTS — Due Process. Child's estate stated substantive due process claim against social workers under state-created danger doctrine.	Sep. 04, 2020	Case		—
















Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>257. Gardner v. Evans</b> 811 F.3d 843, 847 , 6th Cir.(Mich.)  CIVIL RIGHTS - Immunity. Building inspectors who sent eviction notices were entitled to qualified immunity in evicted occupants' action alleging due process violation.	Feb. 04, 2016	Case		—
Cited by	<b>258. Shoemaker v. City of Howell</b> 795 F.3d 553, 559 , 6th Cir.(Mich.)  CIVIL RIGHTS - Due Process. City ordinance requiring homeowner to maintain grassy area between sidewalk and street curb did not violate homeowner's substantive due process rights.	July 29, 2015	Case		—
Cited by	<b>259. Moody v. Michigan Gaming Control Bd.</b> 790 F.3d 669, 677 , 6th Cir.(Mich.)  GOVERNMENT - Licensing. Harness drivers had Fifth Amendment right to refuse to answer questions during race-fixing investigation.	June 16, 2015	Case		—
Cited by	<b>260. Reed v. Rhodes</b> 179 F.3d 453, 488 , 6th Cir.(Ohio)  Motion was filed to modify school desegregation consent decree and to terminate judicial supervision of student-school assignments. The United States District Court for the...	June 10, 1999	Case		—
Cited by	<b>261. Flatford v. Chater</b> ¶¶ 93 F.3d 1296, 1306 , 6th Cir.(Tenn.)  Social security disability claimant applied for and Commissioner of Social Security denied benefits. Claimant brought suit in federal court. The United States District Court...	Aug. 28, 1996	Case		—
Cited by	<b>262. Kendall v. Rainwater Oil Field Equipment Co.</b> 862 F.2d 316, 316 , 6th Cir.(Mich.)  E.D. Mich. REVERSED AND REMANDED.	Nov. 14, 1988	Case		—
Cited by	<b>263. Anderson v. Sheppard</b> ¶¶ 856 F.2d 741, 746+ , 6th Cir.(Mich.)  Black employee brought action against employer, complaining that his layoff and employer's failure to recall him were in retaliation for his filing an EEOC complaint. The United...	Sep. 07, 1988	Case		—
Cited by	<b>264. Walker v. Hughes</b> 558 F.2d 1247, 1251 , 6th Cir.(Mich.)  Residents of federal medium security institution for young offenders brought class action alleging that procedures in disciplinary hearings deprived them of due process. The United...	June 24, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<b>265. Malamud v. Sinclair Oil Corp.</b> 521 F.2d 1142, 1146 , 6th Cir.(Ohio)  Officers, directors and sole shareholders of petroleum distributing company and three real estate investment companies and the companies brought antitrust action against gasoline...	Aug. 19, 1975	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>266. Davis v. Paul</b>  505 F.2d 1180, 1182+ , 6th Cir.(Ky.) Class action challenging distribution by chiefs of police of city and county police departments of flyer which was captioned 'Active Shoplifters' and which contained names and mug...	Oct. 22, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>267. Preston v. Piggman</b>  496 F.2d 270, 273 , 6th Cir.(Ky.) Proceeding for parole revocation. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Howard David Hermansdorfer, J., dismissed the petition, and the parolee...	Apr. 18, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>268. Palmer v. Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc.</b> 479 F.2d 153, 165 , 6th Cir.(Ohio) Action was brought by gas consumers against the gas company for injunctive and declaratory relief and for damages alleging unconstitutional termination of gas service under color...	May 22, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>269. Imboden v. U.S.</b> 194 F.2d 508, 513 , 6th Cir.(Ohio) Loy Vernal Imboden was convicted in the Federal District Court, Southern District of Ohio, Eastern Division, Mell G. Underwood, J., for refusing service in the armed forces, and he...	Feb. 06, 1952	Case		—
Cited by	<b>270. United States v. Vizcarra-Millan</b> 15 F.4th 473, 496 , 7th Cir.(Ind.) CRIMINAL JUSTICE — Counsel. District court did not abuse its discretion in denying defendant's motion to withdraw his waiver of conflict-free counsel as made in bad faith.	Sep. 30, 2021	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>271. Doe v. Purdue University</b>  928 F.3d 652, 663 , 7th Cir.(Ind.) EDUCATION — Student Discipline. Student adequately pled that procedures employed by university in proceeding arising from accusation of sexual violence were fundamentally unfair.	June 28, 2019	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>272. Ramirez v. Young</b> 906 F.3d 530, 536 , 7th Cir.(Ill.) CIVIL RIGHTS — Prisons. Administrative remedies described to prisoner only in language he could not understand did not render those remedies "available."	Oct. 09, 2018	Case		—
Cited by	<b>273. Dietchweiler by Dietchweiler v. Lucas</b>  827 F.3d 622, 629+ , 7th Cir.(Ill.) EDUCATION — Student Discipline. Administrators did not violate high-school student's right to procedural due process before imposing suspension.	June 28, 2016	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>274. Doyle v. Camelot Care Centers, Inc.</b> 305 F.3d 603, 623 , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  CIVIL RIGHTS - Due Process. Illinois child neglect investigation process violated due process.	Aug. 30, 2002	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>275. Townsend v. Vallas</b>  256 F.3d 661, 671+ , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  EDUCATION - Labor and Employment. Temporary transfer of tenured teacher was not deprivation of a cognizable property right.	July 09, 2001	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>276. Club Misty, Inc. v. Laski</b> 208 F.3d 615, 617 , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  GOVERNMENT - Licensing. Single-address local option provision violated due process.	Apr. 03, 2000	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>277. Ryan v. Illinois Dept. of Children and Family Services</b> 185 F.3d 751, 762 , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  Employees of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) brought civil rights actions against DCFS and individual agency officials, alleging, inter alia, that...	July 16, 1999	Case		—
Cited by	<b>278. U.S. v. Accra Pac, Inc.</b> 173 F.3d 630, 633 , 7th Cir.(Ind.)  After parties entered settlement in government's action against owner of aerosol-can facility, owner moved for modification of approval, by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA),...	Apr. 16, 1999	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>279. Levenstein v. Salafsky</b> 164 F.3d 345, 351 , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  Medical school professor sued three officials at public university, alleging that they violated his constitutional rights by improperly suspending him, denying him a fair hearing,...	Dec. 16, 1998	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>280. Olivieri v. Rodriguez</b> 122 F.3d 406, 407+ , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  Discharged probationary police officer sued police superintendent, claiming that denying him hearing into harassment charges deprived him of liberty interest without due process by...	Aug. 15, 1997	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>281. Dehainaut v. Pena</b> 32 F.3d 1066, 1071 , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  Former air traffic controllers, who had been discharged for striking against federal government, filed class action suit against Department of Transportation (DOT), Federal...	Aug. 09, 1994	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>282. Abbs v. Sullivan</b> 963 F.2d 918, 927+ , 7th Cir.(Wis.)  State university professor and board of regents brought action seeking declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to investigation by National Institutes of Health (NIH) into...	May 01, 1992	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>283. Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Federal Crop Ins. Corp.</b> 947 F.2d 269, 279+ , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  Private crop insurers sought review of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's (FCIC) administrative determination that it was entitled to recover overpayments made to insurers in its...	Nov. 04, 1991	Case		—
Cited by	<b>284. Kaczmarczyk v. I.N.S.</b> ¶¶ 933 F.2d 588, 596+ , 7th Cir.  Petitioners appealed from decision of Board of Immigration Appeals affirming immigration judge's denial of applications for asylum and withholding of deportation. The Court of...	May 31, 1991	Case		—
Cited by	<b>285. Faheem-EL v. Klincar</b> 814 F.2d 461, 467 , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  Class action was brought by parolees challenging state's policies of customarily refusing to allow parolees to present witnesses or cross-examine adverse witnesses at preliminary...	Mar. 18, 1987	Case		—
Cited by	<b>286. Colaizzi v. Walker</b> 812 F.2d 304, 307 , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  Former untenured public officials whose firings by governor for alleged misconduct had been announced in press conference filed civil rights suit against governor. On appeal...	Feb. 12, 1987	Case		—
Cited by	<b>287. Perry v. F.B.I.</b> ¶¶ 759 F.2d 1271, 1279 , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  Job applicant sued the FBI and other federal agencies because the release of information by the FBI to the agencies allegedly precluded his hiring for federal employment. The...	Apr. 11, 1985	Case		—
Cited by	<b>288. Lister v. Hoover</b> ¶¶ 706 F.2d 796, 801+ , 7th Cir.(Wis.)  In case challenging constitutionality of Wisconsin's procedures for determining residency of individuals for tuition purposes at state universities, the United States District...	May 16, 1983	Case		—
Cited by	<b>289. U.S. v. Banks</b> ¶¶ 687 F.2d 967, 978 , 7th Cir.(Ind.)  Defendants were convicted in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Hammond Division, Phil M. McNagny, J., of knowingly and intentionally...	Aug. 23, 1982	Case		—
Cited by	<b>290. Ciechon v. City of Chicago</b> ¶¶ 686 F.2d 511, 517 , 7th Cir.(Ill.)  Discharged paramedic with Chicago Fire Department brought civil rights action complaining that discharge violated due process and equal protection. The United States District...	Aug. 10, 1982	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<p> <b>291. Choudhry v. Jenkins</b> 559 F.2d 1085, 1087 , 7th Cir.(Ind.)</p> <p>Employee of state prison brought civil rights action against prison officials alleging that his dismissal had unconstitutionally infringed upon his First Amendment rights. The...</p>	July 22, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>292. Macklin v. Butler</b> 553 F.2d 525, 528 , 7th Cir.(Ind.)</p> <p>Action was brought against various defendants charging essentially racial discrimination on part of each of the defendants and in concert in operation of the Indianapolis plan,...</p>	Apr. 15, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>293. Fern v. Thorp Public School ¶¶</b> 532 F.2d 1120, 1133 , 7th Cir.(Wis.)</p> <p>Following adverse community reaction to a teacher's distribution of certain materials to students, the teacher was faced with possible discharge and obtained a preliminary...</p>	Apr. 01, 1976	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>294. Old Ben Coal Corp. v. Interior Bd. of Mine Operations Appeals, U. S. Dept. of Interior</b> 523 F.2d 25, 41 , 7th Cir.</p> <p>Coal mine operator petitioned for review of three separate decisions of the Secretary of the Interior issued by the Secretary's delegate, Interior Board of Mine Operations Appeals,...</p>	June 13, 1975	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>295. Groppi v. Leslie ¶¶</b> 436 F.2d 331, 333 , 7th Cir.(Wis.)</p> <p>Habeas corpus proceeding commenced by petitioner summarily sentenced to jail by state legislature for contempt. The United States District Court for the Western District of...</p>	Jan. 06, 1971	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>296. Hahn v. Burke</b> 430 F.2d 100, 103 , 7th Cir.(Wis.)</p> <p>Petition attacking petitioner's state incarceration. The United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, James E. Doyle, J., denied petition, and petitioner...</p>	Aug. 19, 1970	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>297. Dace v. Mickelson ¶¶</b> 816 F.2d 1277, 1283 , 8th Cir.(S.D.)</p> <p>Prisoner brought § 1983 action against members of South Dakota Board of Pardons and Paroles alleging that Board deprived him of liberty without due process. The United States...</p>	Apr. 28, 1987	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>298. White v. Wyrick ¶¶</b> 727 F.2d 757, 758 , 8th Cir.(Mo.)</p> <p>State prison inmate brought civil rights suit against warden and other employees of the State Department of Corrections. The United States District Court for the Western District...</p>	Feb. 13, 1984	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>299. Pollock v. Baxter Manor Nursing Home</b>  706 F.2d 236, 237+ , 8th Cir.(Ark.) Discharged employee alleged that nursing home had deprived her of procedural due process of law in discharging her from employment under stigmatizing conditions without according...	Apr. 27, 1983	Case		—
Cited by	<b>300. Bergstrom v. Bergstrom</b>  623 F.2d 517, 519+ , 8th Cir.(N.D.) Child, nine years of age, by her guardian ad litem sued her divorced parents, seeking to restrain her mother from carrying out directive of the Superior Court for the District of...	June 13, 1980	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>301. Inmates of Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex v. Greenholtz</b> 576 F.2d 1274, 1277 , 8th Cir.(Neb.) Inmates of state prison brought civil rights action against Nebraska State Board of Parole and others alleging due process violations in Board's consideration of inmates'...	May 18, 1978	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>302. Brown v. Bathke</b> 566 F.2d 588, 592 , 8th Cir.(Neb.) A former high school teacher brought an action against school officials to redress termination of her teaching contract after the officials discovered that, although single, she...	Nov. 10, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>303. Mattis v. Schnarr</b> 502 F.2d 588, 597 , 8th Cir.(Mo.) Father whose son had been shot and killed while attempting to escape arrest brought action against police officers. The District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri,...	Aug. 23, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>304. Park View Heights Corp. v. City of Black Jack</b> 467 F.2d 1208, 1215 , 8th Cir.(Mo.) Civil rights action against city and its officials by two not-for-profit corporations concerned with developing federally assisted housing project in city and individuals...	Sep. 25, 1972	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>305. Morrissey v. Brewer</b> 443 F.2d 942, 956 , 8th Cir.(Iowa) Two cases, in each of which the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, Roy L. Stephenson, Chief Judge, denied a petition for writ of habeas corpus for the...	Apr. 21, 1971	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>306. Association of Data Processing Service Organizations, Inc. v. Camp</b>  406 F.2d 837, 843 , 8th Cir.(Minn.) Data processors' association and data processing corporation sought declaratory judgment, injunction, and compensatory damages in action against national bank and the Comptroller...	Feb. 06, 1969	Case		—



Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>307. Rural Electrification Administration v. Northern States Power Co.</b> ¶ 373 F.2d 686, 693+ , 8th Cir.(Minn.) Action to restrain Rural Electrification Administrator from disbursing proceeds of loan. The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, Edward J. Devitt, Chief...	Feb. 28, 1967	Case		—
Cited by	<b>308. U.S. ex rel. Heikkinen v. Gordon</b> ¶ 190 F.2d 16, 21 , 8th Cir.(Minn.) Proceeding by the United States of America, on relation of Knut Einar Heikkinen against Harry Gordon, officer in charge, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of...	June 20, 1951	Case		—
Cited by	<b>309. Wright v. Beck</b> 981 F.3d 719, 733 , 9th Cir.(Cal.) CIVIL RIGHTS — Due Process. Initial seizure of firearms did not provide sufficient notice of police's intent to seek ex parte destruction order.	Dec. 01, 2020	Case		—
Cited by	<b>310. Nettles v. Grounds</b> 830 F.3d 922, 938 , 9th Cir.(Cal.) CRIMINAL JUSTICE — Habeas Corpus. A § 1983 action is the exclusive vehicle for claims brought by state prisoners that are not within the core of habeas corpus.	July 26, 2016	Case		—
Cited by	<b>311. Vasquez v. Rackauckas</b> ¶ 734 F.3d 1025, 1050 , 9th Cir.(Cal.) CIVIL RIGHTS - Due Process. County violated procedural due process by subjecting plaintiffs to anti-gang order without adequate determination of gang membership.	Nov. 05, 2013	Case		—
Cited by	<b>312. Blantz v. California Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Div. of Correctional Health Care Services</b> ¶ 727 F.3d 917, 926 , 9th Cir.(Cal.) LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT - Public Employment. Documents received by nurse at orientation did not create property interest in position with state prison health department.	Aug. 15, 2013	Case		—
Cited by	<b>313. Redding v. Safford Unified School Dist. No.1</b> 531 F.3d 1071, 1084 , 9th Cir.(Ariz.) EDUCATION - Civil Rights. Strip search of middle school student to find ibuprofen was not reasonable.	July 11, 2008	Case		—
Cited by	<b>314. Mattel, Inc. v. Walking Mountain Productions</b> ¶ 353 F.3d 792, 808 , 9th Cir.(Cal.) TRADEMARKS - Name or Likeness. Photographer's parodic use of "Barbie" mark was not infringing.	Dec. 29, 2003	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>315. Biggs v. Terhune</b> 334 F.3d 910, 917 , 9th Cir.(Cal.)  CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Parole. Denial of parole based upon gravity of offense did not violate due process.	June 30, 2003	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>316. Scott v. Pasadena Unified School Dist.</b>  306 F.3d 646, 662 , 9th Cir.(Cal.)  EDUCATION - Admission. Parents lacked standing to raise equal protection challenge to admissions lottery.	Sep. 04, 2002	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>317. Casas Chavez v. I.N.S.</b> 300 F.3d 1088, 1090 , 9th Cir.  IMMIGRATION - Appeals. Aliens subject to deportation order satisfied specificity requirement of summary dismissal rule.	Aug. 20, 2002	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>318. Weinberg v. Whatcom County</b> 241 F.3d 746, 752 , 9th Cir.(Wash.)  REAL PROPERTY - Contractors and Developers. Vacating developer's plats for environmental violations without first holding hearing violated due process.	Feb. 27, 2001	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>319. Brewster v. Board of Educ. of Lynwood Unified School Dist.</b> 149 F.3d 971, 983 , 9th Cir.(Cal.)  A terminated teacher sued his former school district, alleging violation of his free speech and due process rights. The United States District Court for the Central District of...	July 13, 1998	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>320. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee v. Reno</b>  70 F.3d 1045, 1069 , 9th Cir.(Cal.)  Aliens filed action challenging Immigration and Naturalization Service's (INS) use of confidential information in adjudicating their applications for legalization. The United...	Nov. 08, 1995	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>321. Boardman v. Estelle</b> 957 F.2d 1523, 1526 , 9th Cir.(Cal.)  Petition for writ of habeas corpus was denied by the United States District Court for the Central District of California, Alicemarie H. Stotler, J., and petitioner appealed. ...	Jan. 09, 1992	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>322. Van Strum v. Lawn</b> 927 F.2d 612, 612 , 9th Cir.(Or.)  D.OR. AFFIRMED IN PART, REVERSED IN PART AND REMANDED.	Mar. 05, 1991	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>323. Coleman v. McCormick</b> 874 F.2d 1280, 1286 , 9th Cir.(Mont.)  Petitioner sentenced to death in state court for crime of aggravated kidnapping sought writ of habeas corpus. The United States District Court for the District of Montana, James...	May 05, 1989	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>324. Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of Fort Peck Indian Reservation v. Board of Oil and Gas Conservation of State of Montana</b> ¶¶ 792 F.2d 782, 787 , 9th Cir.(Mont.)  Indian tribes filed action alleging that Secretary of Interior unlawfully delegated his authority as to applications for placement of oil and gas wells on lands held in trust for...	June 17, 1986	Case		—
Cited by	<b>325. Arizona Farmworkers Union v. Buhl</b> ¶¶ 747 F.2d 1269, 1271 , 9th Cir.(Ariz.)  Farmworkers union appealed from judgment of the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, Charles L. Hardy, J., based on a ruling that Department of Labor...	Nov. 20, 1984	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>326. Evers v. Custer County</b> 745 F.2d 1196, 1202 , 9th Cir.(Idaho)  Property owner brought action against county, neighboring property owners, and county commissioners arising out of county's declaration that road crossing property owner's land was...	Oct. 22, 1984	Case		—
Cited by	<b>327. Sierra Club v. U.S. Postal Service</b> 549 F.2d 1199, 1202 , 9th Cir.(Cal.)  Public interest environmental organization brought action for review of Postal Service's revocation of the organization's preferred second and third class mailing rates. The...	Dec. 15, 1976	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>328. Lokey v. Richardson</b> 527 F.2d 949, 952 , 9th Cir.(Cal.)  A state prisoner confined in the San Quentin Penitentiary and serving a life sentence without possibility of parole brought an action against officials of the California Department...	Dec. 09, 1975	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>329. Burdeau v. Trustees of California State Colleges</b> ¶¶ 507 F.2d 770, 773 , 9th Cir.(Cal.)  Nontenured assistant professor, who was not rehired, brought action against trustees of California state colleges. The United States District Court for the Central District of...	Nov. 29, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<b>330. Rainbow Val. Citrus Corp. v. Federal Crop Ins. Corp.</b> 506 F.2d 467, 469 , 9th Cir.(Ariz.)  Citrus growers in particular area of county filed an action challenging a decision of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to discontinue citrus insurance in particular area. ...	Nov. 07, 1974	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>331. Clutchette v. Proconier</b> 497 F.2d 809, 814+ , 9th Cir.(Cal.) State prisoners brought civil rights action challenging constitutionality of prison disciplinary procedures. The District Court for the Northern District of California, 328...	Apr. 25, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<b>332. U.S. v. One 1967 Porsche, Model 911-Targa Serial No. 500-677, Motor No. 912-018</b> 492 F.2d 893, 895 , 9th Cir.(Cal.) Appeal from a judgment in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Charles B. Renfrew, J., ordering that automobile used to transport narcotics be...	Feb. 20, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<b>333. Weiss v. Burr</b> 484 F.2d 973, 985 , 9th Cir.(Ariz.) Habeas corpus proceeding brought by petitioner who had been sentenced for criminal contempt by state trial court. The United States District Court for the District of Arizona, C...	May 21, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	<b>334. Government of Guam ex rel. Camacho v. Bird</b> 398 F.2d 314, 315 , 9th Cir.(Guam) Action seeking injunctive relief against importation of alcoholic beverages for use within military reservations in Guam. The United States District Court for the District of...	May 27, 1968	Case		—
Cited by	<b>335. Marshall v. Sawyer</b> 365 F.2d 105, 111 , 9th Cir.(Nev.) Civil rights action brought by plaintiff who was excluded from and refused service in premises of establishments that maintained gambling casinos after gaming commission had listed...	Aug. 10, 1966	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>336. Turner v. Kings River Conservation Dist.</b> 360 F.2d 184, 198 , 9th Cir.(Cal.) Action by owners of riparian and overlying lands against officials operating Pine Flat dam and reservoir, built by the United States on the Kings river in California pursuant to...	Mar. 08, 1966	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>337. Ogden v. U.S.</b> 303 F.2d 724, 745 , 9th Cir.(Cal.) Prosecution for making false statement in matter within jurisdiction of United States department or agency. The United States District Court for the Southern District of...	May 16, 1962	Case		—
Cited by	<b>338. Department and Specialty Store Emp. Union, Local 1265, R.C.I.A. AFL-CIO v. Brown</b> 284 F.2d 619, 629+ , 9th Cir.(Cal.) Action by union for injunctive relief against representation election directed by Regional Director of National Labor Relations Board. The United States District Court for the...	Nov. 15, 1960	Case		—











Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>339. Richfield Oil Corp. v. U.S.</b> 207 F.2d 864, 869+ , 9th Cir.(Cal.)  Action assertedly under the Administrative Procedure Act, complaining of acts by the Maritime Commission of the Department of Commerce, and by the United States Maritime Commission...	Oct. 21, 1953	Case		—
Cited by	<b>340. U.S. v. Gray</b> 207 F.2d 237, 242 , 9th Cir.(Wash.)  Prosecution against defendants for unlawfully entering upon and accepting employment on merchant vessels of the United States without first having obtained merchant marine...	Sep. 22, 1953	Case		—
Cited by	<b>341. Fahey v. O'Melveny &amp; Myers</b> 200 F.2d 420, 445 , 9th Cir.(Cal.)  Action involving propriety of order for payment of interim attorneys' fees to Federal Home Loan Bank which was contesting validity of transfer of assets to another Home Loan Bank...	Nov. 06, 1952	Case		—
Cited by	<b>342. Gonzales v. City of Castle Rock</b> 366 F.3d 1093, 1111+ , 10th Cir.(Colo.)  FAMILY LAW - Protection Orders. Wife had constitutional	Apr. 29, 2004	Case		—
Cited by	<b>343. U.S. v. Jones</b> ” 160 F.3d 641, 646+ , 10th Cir.(N.M.)  After government obtained order restraining allegedly forfeitable assets of defendants charged with health care fraud, defendants moved for postrestraint, pretrial hearing to...	Nov. 16, 1998	Case		—
Cited by	<b>344. U.S. v. Eufrazio-Torres</b> ” 890 F.2d 266, 270 , 10th Cir.(Kan.)  Defendant was convicted in the United States District Court for the District of Kansas, Earl E. O'Connor, Chief Judge, of transporting illegal aliens and he appealed. The Court...	Nov. 22, 1989	Case		—
Cited by	<b>345. Koerpel v. Heckler</b> ” 797 F.2d 858, 869 , 10th Cir.(Utah)  Physician sought preliminary injunction to prevent Department of Health and Human Services from enforcing its decision to exclude him from eligibility for reimbursements under the...	July 23, 1986	Case		—
Cited by	<b>346. Jones v. Nuclear Pharmacy, Inc.</b> ” 741 F.2d 322, 325 , 10th Cir.(N.M.)  Appeal was taken from an order of the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, Edwin L. Mechem, J., which approved the terms of a settlement agreement in a...	Aug. 22, 1984	Case		—













Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<p> <b>347. Shimabuku v. Britton</b> 503 F.2d 38, 43 , 10th Cir.(Kan.)</p> <p>An action was brought by prisoners of a federal penitentiary attacking prison disciplinary procedures. The United States District Court for the District of Kansas, Arthur J....</p>	Sep. 10, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>348. Murray v. Page</b> </p> <p>429 F.2d 1359, 1361 , 10th Cir.(Okla.)</p> <p>Proceeding by state prisoner for writ of habeas corpus. The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, Frederick A. Daugherty, J., 305 F.Supp. 1043,...</p>	Aug. 11, 1970	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>349. Utah State Farm Bureau Federation v. National Farmers Union Service Corp.</b></p> <p>198 F.2d 20, 23 , 10th Cir.(Utah)</p> <p>Libel action. The United States District Court for the District of Utah, Central Division, Willis W. Ritter, J., rendered judgment for plaintiffs and defendants appealed. The...</p>	June 11, 1952	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>350. Boyd v. Warden, Holman Correctional Facility</b></p> <p>856 F.3d 853, 883+ , 11th Cir.(Ala.)</p> <p>CRIMINAL JUSTICE — Death Penalty. Death row inmate failed to state method-of-execution claim under Eighth Amendment.</p>	May 09, 2017	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>351. Alvarez v. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement</b> </p> <p>818 F.3d 1194, 1225 , 11th Cir.(Fla.)</p> <p>CIVIL RIGHTS - Constitutional Torts. Court had jurisdiction to review claim that officials continued alien's detention despite being unable to deport him.</p>	Mar. 24, 2016	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>352. Jones v. Commissioner, Georgia Dept. of Corrections</b></p> <p>812 F.3d 923, 934 , 11th Cir.(Ga.)</p> <p>A petition for hearing en banc having been filed, a member of this Court in active service having requested a poll on whether this case should be heard by the Court sitting en...</p>	Feb. 02, 2016	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>353. Stansell v. Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia</b> </p> <p>771 F.3d 713, 741 , 11th Cir.(Fla.)</p> <p>LITIGATION - Garnishment. Third-party claimant's asset was not blocked at time amended writ of garnishment was filed.</p>	Oct. 16, 2014	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>354. Akins v. U.S.</b></p> <p>312 Fed.Appx. 197, 200 , 11th Cir.(Fla.)</p> <p>CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Weapons. Reclassification of apparatus as prohibited firearm did not violate inventor's due process rights.</p>	Feb. 04, 2009	Case		—



Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>355. Wexler v. Anderson</b> 452 F.3d 1226, 1233 , 11th Cir.(Fla.) GOVERNMENT - Elections. Manual recount procedures for Florida counties using paperless touchscreen voting machines did not violate equal protection.	June 20, 2006	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>356. Midrash Sephardi, Inc. v. Town of Surfside</b> ¶¶ 366 F.3d 1214, 1238 , 11th Cir.(Fla.) REAL PROPERTY - Zoning and Planning. Zoning ordinance excluding synagogues from business district violated RLUIPA.	Apr. 21, 2004	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>357. U.S. v. 408 Peyton Road, S.W., Atlanta, Fulton County, Ga.</b> ¶¶ 162 F.3d 644, 651+ , 11th Cir.(Ga.) Government brought forfeiture proceeding against property suspected of being acquired and developed through drug-trafficking activities. The United States District Court for the...	Dec. 08, 1998	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>358. U.S. v. 408 Peyton Road, S.W., Atlanta, Fulton County, Ga.</b> ¶¶ 112 F.3d 1106, 1112+ , 11th Cir.(Ga.) Government brought forfeiture proceeding against property suspected of being acquired and developed through drug-trafficking activities. The United States District Court for the...	May 15, 1997	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>359. Buxton v. City of Plant City, Fla.</b> 871 F.2d 1037, 1043 , 11th Cir.(Fla.) Discharged police officer brought civil rights action against city, chief of police and city manager alleging that his due process rights were violated when stigmatizing...	May 01, 1989	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>360. Gilmore v. City of Atlanta, Ga.</b> 864 F.2d 734, 748 , 11th Cir.(Ga.) Estate of decedent, who was shot and killed by police, brought § 1983 action against police, supervisors and city. The United States District Court for the Northern District of...	Jan. 30, 1989	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>361. Sims v. State of Fla., Dept. of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles</b> ¶¶ 862 F.2d 1449, 1470 , 11th Cir.(Fla.) Owner of gray market vehicle and trade association brought action challenging constitutionality of statute preventing owner of gray market vehicle from acquiring title and vehicle...	Jan. 11, 1989	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>362. Hatcher v. Board of Public Educ. and Orphanage for Bibb County</b> ¶ 809 F.2d 1546, 1553 , 11th Cir.(Ga.)  Elementary school principal who was displaced by school closing brought Section 1983 action against school board, school board members, and superintendent of schools. The United...	Feb. 17, 1987	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>363. Schiffahrtsgesellschaft Leonhardt &amp; Co. v. A. Bottacchi S.A. De Navigacion</b> ¶ 773 F.2d 1528, 1535+ , 11th Cir.(Ga.)  Owner of bunkers and stores aboard vessel brought motion to dismiss complaint and quash process of maritime attachment. The United States District Court for the Southern District...	Oct. 01, 1985	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>364. Ford v. Wainwright</b> ¶ 752 F.2d 526, 533 , 11th Cir.(Fla.)  Habeas corpus petition was filed on behalf of death row prisoner. The United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Norman C. Roettger, Jr., J., denied...	Jan. 17, 1985	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>365. Schiffahrtsgesellschaft Leonhardt &amp; Co. v. A. Bottacchi S.A. De Navigacion</b> 732 F.2d 1543, 1546 , 11th Cir.(Ga.)  Owner of foreign vessel brought motion to dismiss complaint and quash process of maritime attachment and garnishment. The United States District Court for the Southern District...	May 29, 1984	Case		—
Cited by	<b>366. Mobility Workx, LLC v. Unified Patents, LLC</b> 15 F.4th 1146, 1165 , Fed.Cir.  PATENTS — Patent and Trademark Office. Any financial interest that PTAB members had in instituting proceedings to generate fees to fund agency did not violate patentee's due...	Oct. 13, 2021	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>367. Serrao v. Merit Systems Protection Bd.</b> ¶ 95 F.3d 1569, 1579 , Fed.Cir.  Special Agent in Department of Commerce's Office of Export Enforcement petitioned for review of final decision of Merit Systems Protection Board that board lacked jurisdiction over...	Sep. 17, 1996	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>368. Al Bahlul v. U.S.</b> 767 F.3d 1, 16 , D.C.Cir.  CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Terrorism. MCA unambiguously authorized defendant's prosecution based on conduct that occurred before enactment.	July 14, 2014	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>369. Cobell v. Kempthorne</b> 455 F.3d 317, 332 , D.C.Cir.  NATIVE AMERICANS - Trusts. Court lacked authority to order government to provide notice of continuing inability to discharge fiduciary duties.	July 11, 2006	Case		—






Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>370. Foretich v. U.S.</b> 351 F.3d 1198, 1211 , D.C.Cir.  FAMILY LAW - Visitation. D.C. statute foreclosing visitation by parent was unconstitutional bill of attainder.	Dec. 16, 2003	Case		—
Cited by	<b>371. Advanced Management Technology, Inc. v. F.A.A.</b> 211 F.3d 633, 636 , D.C.Cir.  GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS - Remedies. Federal contractor did not have standing to petition for review of misrepresentation findings.	May 12, 2000	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>372. Clean Air Implementation Project v. E.P.A.</b> 150 F.3d 1200, 1204 , D.C.Cir.  Various industry trade associations filed petition for review of order of Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) rule permitting use of credible evidence to prove or disprove...	Aug. 14, 1998	Case		—
Cited by	<b>373. Beo v. District of Columbia</b> 44 F.3d 1026, 1028 , D.C.Cir.  Inmate filed § 1983 action against prison officials, asserting that transfer to another prison breached settlement agreement in violation of inmate's due process rights. The...	Jan. 27, 1995	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>374. Branton v. F.C.C. ¶¶</b> 993 F.2d 906, 908 , D.C.Cir.  Listener petitioned for review of a letter ruling of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) refusing to take action against radio network for broadcasting indecent language. ...	June 01, 1993	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>375. Propert v. District of Columbia</b> 948 F.2d 1327, 1331 , D.C.Cir.  Owner of automobile which was towed and destroyed brought action against District of Columbia and officer who ordered car towed, challenging constitutionality of district's policy...	Nov. 19, 1991	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>376. Penthouse Intern., Ltd. v. Meese</b> 939 F.2d 1011, 1016 , D.C.Cir.  Publishers brought action against the former Attorney General and members of his Commission on Pornography arising from letters sent to distributors of adult magazines indicating...	July 19, 1991	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>377. Escobar v. I.N.S.</b> 896 F.2d 564, 570 , D.C.Cir.  This appeal from a District Court order dismissing the complaint and denying appellants' motion for summary judgment presents for our decision the constitutionality of Section 5 of...	Feb. 02, 1990	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>378. Dellums v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Com'n</b> 863 F.2d 968, 982 , D.C.Cir.  Members of Congress, antiapartheid groups, antinuclear proliferation organization, exiled black South African, and unemployed American uranium worker brought suit challenging...	Dec. 16, 1988	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>379. Hazardous Waste Treatment Council v. U.S. E.P.A.</b> 861 F.2d 277, 285 , D.C.Cir.  National trade organization of firms engaged in treatment of hazardous waste and manufacture of equipment for that purpose petitioned for review of Environmental Protection...	Oct. 07, 1988	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>380. Haitian Refugee Center v. Gracey ¶¶</b> 809 F.2d 794, 817+ , D.C.Cir.  Nonprofit membership corporation organized to assist Haitian refugees and two members brought action challenging program to interdict undocumented aliens on high seas. The United...	Jan. 09, 1987	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>381. Center for Auto Safety v. National Highway Traffic Safety Admin.</b> 793 F.2d 1322, 1331 , D.C.Cir.  Nonprofit consumer organizations filed a petition for review challenging the validity of a National Highway Traffic Safety Administration rule amending its previously published...	June 20, 1986	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>382. U.S. v. Exxon Corp. ¶¶</b> 773 F.2d 1240, 1302 , Temp.Em.App.  Department of Energy brought suit against operator of unitized oil field, arising from overcharges in violation of oil price regulations. The United States District Court for the...	July 01, 1985	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>383. National Organization for Women, Washington, D.C. Chapter v. Social Sec. Admin. of Dept. of Health and Human Services</b> 736 F.2d 727, 729+ , D.C.Cir.  Appeal was taken from a judgment of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Oliver Gasch, J., which preliminarily enjoined release of much of the material...	May 25, 1984	Case		—
Cited by	<b>384. Rosen v. N.L.R.B. ¶¶</b> 735 F.2d 564, 570 , D.C.Cir.  Attorney and his law firm brought civil action against the National Labor Relations Board seeking relief from a finding by an administrative law judge that attorney had suborned...	May 18, 1984	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>385. Family Div. Trial Lawyers of Superior Court-D.C., Inc. v. Moultrie</b> 725 F.2d 695, 706 , D.C.Cir.  Practitioners in Family Division of District of Columbia Superior Court brought action challenging constitutionality of scheme for appointing pro bono counsel to represent indigent...	Jan. 06, 1984	Case		—
Cited by	<b>386. RKO General, Inc. v. F.C.C.</b> ” 670 F.2d 215, 232 , D.C.Cir.  Appeals were taken from orders of the Federal Communications Commission denying renewal of television licenses to licensee in three cities. The Court of Appeals, Mikva, Circuit...	Dec. 04, 1981	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>387. Hatch v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission</b> 654 F.2d 825, 835 , D.C.Cir.  Applicant petitioned for review of order of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission denying his application to hold simultaneously positions of director of a public utility and...	June 26, 1981	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>388. Gray Panthers v. Schweiker</b> ” 652 F.2d 146, 161+ , D.C.Cir.  Elderly participants in federal medicare program brought class action challenging procedures for resolving disputes concerning program benefits of less than \$100. The United States...	Oct. 24, 1980	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>389. Old Dominion Dairy Products, Inc. v. Secretary of Defense</b> 631 F.2d 953, 965 , D.C.Cir.  Dairy products supplier, which was denied substantial government contracts based on government agency contracting officers' determinations that it lacked integrity and...	July 29, 1980	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>390. Chamber of Commerce of U.S. v. Occupational Safety and Health Administration</b> 636 F.2d 464, 471 , D.C.Cir.  Action was brought seeking declaration that Occupational Safety and Health Administration's interpretation of antidiscrimination provisions of the Occupational Safety and Health...	July 10, 1980	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>391. Harborlite Corp. v. I. C. C.</b> ” 613 F.2d 1088, 1092+ , D.C.Cir.  On petition for review of an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Court of Appeals, Tamm, Circuit Judge, held that the ICC, which dismissed mining company's complaint...	Dec. 13, 1979	Case		—
Cited by	<b>392. Knehans v. Alexander</b> 566 F.2d 312, 319 , D.C.Cir.  A former major in the United States Army brought an action to invalidate his discharge in grounds of procedural noncompliance, the United States District Court for the District of...	Oct. 03, 1977	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>393. Expeditions Unlimited Aquatic Enterprises, Inc. v. Smithsonian Inst.</b> 566 F.2d 289, 295+ , D.C.Cir.  In an action for defamation, brought against a federal government museum and an officer thereof, summary judgments for the defendants were granted by the United States District...	Sep. 16, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<b>394. Mazaleski v. Treusdell</b> ¶¶ 562 F.2d 701, 711 , D.C.Cir.  Terminated federal employee brought action for declaratory and injunctive relief, alleging that administrative procedures followed in terminating his commission violated his due...	Apr. 26, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<b>395. Pickus v. U.S. Bd. of Parole</b> 543 F.2d 240, 243 , D.C.Cir.  An appeal was taken from a judgment of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, June L. Green, J., pertaining to prisoners' rights with respect to rule...	June 09, 1976	Case		—
Cited by	<b>396. Utz v. Cullinane</b> ¶¶ 520 F.2d 467, 481+ , D.C.Cir.  Four individuals arrested for and charged with local criminal offenses brought a class action for injunctive and declaratory relief to enjoin the Chief of Police and the Director...	Oct. 03, 1975	Case		—
Cited by	<b>397. Ripon Soc., Inc. v. National Republican Party</b> ¶¶ 525 F.2d 567, 574 , D.C.Cir.  Nine individual plaintiffs and an organization brought suit for declaratory and injunctive relief on ground that formula fixed by political party for allocation of delegates to...	Sep. 30, 1975	Case		—
Cited by	<b>398. Childs v. U.S. Bd. of Parole</b> 511 F.2d 1270, 1277 , D.C.Cir.  Federal prisoners brought class action against the United States Board of Parole claiming that their rights to due process had been violated by the Board's failure to reveal the...	Dec. 19, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<b>399. Ring v. Schlesinger</b> 502 F.2d 479, 487 , D.C.Cir.  A teacher, hired to teach navy dependents at the United States Naval Station on Midway Island for a one-year probationary period, sought a declaratory judgment against the...	Aug. 16, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<b>400. Wilderness Soc. v. Morton</b> 479 F.2d 842, 887 , D.C.Cir.  Consolidated actions by environmental groups and unincorporated association of commercial fishermen against Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, pipeline...	Feb. 09, 1973	Case		—










Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>401. U.S. v. Bland</b> 472 F.2d 1329, 1345 , D.C.Cir.  Proceeding on motion to dismiss indictment for lack of jurisdiction over 16-year-old defendant. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Aubrey E. Robinson,...	Sep. 06, 1972	Case		—
Cited by	<b>402. Cogar v. Schuyler</b>  464 F.2d 747, 755 , D.C.Cir.  Action was brought by an inventor for injunctive relief against the issuance of a patent on application by his proprietary agent. A motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim...	Mar. 28, 1972	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>403. D. C. Federation of Civic Associations, Inc. v. Volpe</b> 434 F.2d 436, 461 , D.C.Cir.  Action against federal and District of Columbia officials to enjoin construction of bridge. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Sirica, J., 308 F.Supp...	Apr. 06, 1970	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>404. Scott v. U.S.</b> 419 F.2d 264, 278 , D.C.Cir.  Defendant was convicted before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, John J. Sirica, J., of robbery, and he appealed. The Court of Appeals, Bazelon, Chief...	Feb. 13, 1969	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>405. Powell v. McCormack</b> 395 F.2d 577, 590 , D.C.Cir.  Action for injunctive and other relief on basis of unconstitutionality of House Resolution excluding Congressman-elect from membership in House of Representatives. The United...	Feb. 28, 1968	Case		—
Cited by	<b>406. Industrial Workers of World v. Clark</b> 385 F.2d 687, 689+ , D.C.Cir.  Action challenging organization's listing on Attorney General's list. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Alexander Holtzoff, J., dismissed the action,...	Sep. 26, 1967	Case		—
Cited by	<b>407. States Marine Lines, Inc. v. Federal Maritime Commission</b> 376 F.2d 230, 239 , D.C.Cir.  Proceeding by ocean common carrier to review order of Federal Maritime Commission approving self-policing system adopted by two shipping conferences. The Court of Appeals, J...	Mar. 08, 1967	Case		—
Cited by	<b>408. Smith v. Katzenbach</b> 351 F.2d 810, 814 , D.C.Cir.  North Carolina taxpayers brought suit in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia against the Assistant Attorney General, the Acting Attorney General, the...	Aug. 27, 1965	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>409. Fugazy Travel Bureau, Inc. v. C. A. B.</b> 350 F.2d 733, 738 , D.C.Cir.  Proceeding on petition for review of orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Court of Appeals, Tamm, Circuit Judge, held, inter alia, that an order of Board approving agreement...	June 18, 1965	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>410. Scott v. Macy</b> ¶ 349 F.2d 182, 184+ , D.C.Cir.  The action of United States Civil Service Commission excluding applicant from public employment was approved by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia,...	June 16, 1965	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>411. Pennsylvania R. Co. v. Dillon</b> 335 F.2d 292, 294 , D.C.Cir.  Actions for declaratory and injunctive relief. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Burnita Shelton Matthews, J., gave judgment dismissing the complaints,...	June 26, 1964	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>412. Gonzalez v. Freeman</b> 334 F.2d 570, 574+ , D.C.Cir.  Action for declaratory and injunctive relief brought against the Secretary of Agriculture and others and relating to administrative action debarring plaintiffs from participating...	May 07, 1964	Case		—
Cited by	<b>413. Application of President and Directors of Georgetown College, Inc.</b> ¶ 331 F.2d 1010, 1015+ , D.C.Cir.  Proceeding arising out of application for permission to administer blood transfusions to an emergency patient. J. Skelly Wright, Circuit Judge, in Chambers, 118 U.S.App.D.C. ,...	Feb. 03, 1964	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>414. Pauling v. McNamara</b> ¶ 331 F.2d 796, 798 , D.C.Cir.  Declaratory judgment action by United States citizens and foreign citizens to enjoin the Secretary of Defense and others from detonating any nuclear weapons that produce radiation...	Dec. 23, 1963	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>415. Hyser v. Reed</b> ¶ 318 F.2d 225, 239 , D.C.Cir.  Parole revocation proceedings. Judgments were rendered in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by Burnita Shelton Matthews, J., in No. 16716, by Luther W....	Apr. 11, 1963	Case		—
Cited by	<b>416. Kennedy v. Rabinowitz</b> 318 F.2d 181, 185+ , D.C.Cir.  Action for judgment declaring that plaintiffs were exempt from registering under Foreign Agents Registration Act. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia,...	Apr. 04, 1963	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>417. Kukatush Min. Corp. (N.P.L.) v. Securities and Exchange Commission</b> 309 F.2d 647, 650+ , D.C.Cir.  Suit by a Canadian corporation to require Securities and Exchange Commission to strike names of corporations from 'canadian Restricted List.' The United States District Court for...	Oct. 11, 1962	Case		—
Cited by	<b>418. Borrow v. F.C.C.</b> 285 F.2d 666, 669+ , D.C.Cir.  Proceeding on appeal from the Federal Communications Commission which dismissed application for radio operator's license renewal. The Court of Appeals, Prettyman, Chief Judge,...	June 30, 1960	Case		—
Cited by	<b>419. George v. Mitchell</b> 282 F.2d 486, 490 , D.C.Cir.  Action by corporation and individuals against Secretary of labor and Comptroller General for declaratory judgment that contracts to sell coal to Atomic Energy Commission were not...	June 23, 1960	Case		—
Cited by	<b>420. Cafeteria and Restaurant Workers Union, Local 473, AFL-CIO v. McElroy</b> 284 F.2d 173, 185+ , D.C.Cir.  Action by union and employee against Secretary of Defense and other government officials and employer for declaratory judgment, injunctive relief, vacation of arbitration award and...	Apr. 14, 1960	Case		—
Cited by	<b>421. Commissariat A L'Energie Atomique v. Watson</b> 274 F.2d 594, 597 , D.C.Cir.  Proceeding to review by mandamus the refusal of Commissioner of Patents to revive application for patent and civil action to obtain patent. The United States District Court for...	Jan. 21, 1960	Case		—
Cited by	<b>422. National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. v. Brownell</b> 243 F.2d 222, 225+ , D.C.Cir.  Action by organization listed by Attorney General as subversive, for declaratory judgment that such listing was invalid and for injunction. The United States District Court for...	Feb. 28, 1957	Case		—
Cited by	<b>423. State Dept. Federal Credit Union v. Folsom</b> 238 F.2d 258, 259+ , D.C.Cir.  Action for declaratory and injunctive relief by corporations, which had been created under the Federal Credit Union Act, against Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and...	Oct. 25, 1956	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>424. Rudder v. U.S.</b> 226 F.2d 51, 53 , D.C.Cir.  Action by United States for possession of government housing unit. The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, 105 A.2d 741, affirmed a judgment for the United...	July 21, 1955	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>425. National Lawyers Guild v. Brownell</b> 225 F.2d 552, 556+ , D.C.Cir.  Action by national bar association to enjoin United States Attorney General from designating association as Communistic and to obtain judgment declaring executive orders under...	July 14, 1955	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>426. Shachtman v. Dulles</b> 225 F.2d 938, 942+ , D.C.Cir.  Proceeding to enjoin Secretary of State and others from denying, for the reason assigned by the Secretary, a passport application, and for judgment declaring that the denial had...	June 23, 1955	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>427. Kansas City Power &amp; Light Co. v. McKay</b> 225 F.2d 924, 937 , D.C.Cir.  Suit by private electric power companies to enjoin federal officers and agencies from carrying out federally supported power program. The defendants' motion to dismiss was...	Apr. 28, 1955	Case		—
Cited by	<b>428. Gadsden v. U.S.</b> 223 F.2d 627, 633 , D.C.Cir.  Prosecution on three counts of robbery. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Edward A. Tamm, J., entered judgment of conviction on verdict of guilty on...	Apr. 21, 1955	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>429. Silver v. McCamey</b> 221 F.2d 873, 875 , D.C.Cir.  Action by taxicab operator to require Board of Revocation and Review of Hackers' Identification Licenses to restore his license. The United States District Court for the District...	Mar. 31, 1955	Case		—
Cited by	<b>430. Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. Brownell</b> 215 F.2d 870, 872 , D.C.Cir.  Actions to restrain United States Attorney General, and others, from designating plaintiffs as communist organizations and to obtain judgment declaring such designation to be in...	Aug. 05, 1954	Case		—
Cited by	<b>431. National Lawyers Guild v. Brownell</b> 215 F.2d 485, 487 , D.C.Cir.  Action attacking validity of executive order establishing security requirements for governmental employees and procedural rules adopted by Attorney General in its implementation,...	May 04, 1954	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>432. Isbrandtsen Co. v. U.S.</b> 211 F.2d 51, 56 , D.C.Cir.  Independent steamship line filed a petition to review order of the Federal Maritime Board permitting proposed dual rate system of voluntary association composed of eighteen common...	Jan. 21, 1954	Case		—





Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>433. Farmer v. United Elec., Radio and Mach. Workers of America (UE)</b> 211 F.2d 36, 40+ , D.C.Cir.  Labor unions brought suits against members of the National Labor Relations Board for declaratory judgment and injunction. The United States District Court for the District of...	Dec. 04, 1953	Case		—
Cited by	<b>434. B.F. Goodrich Co. v. Federal Trade Commission</b> 208 F.2d 829, 834+ , D.C.Cir.  Actions by manufacturers, purchasers and dealers in rubber tire and tube business for declaratory relief and injunction against order of Federal Trade Commission which limited...	July 16, 1953	Case		—
Cited by	<b>435. Jasper v. Sawyer</b> ¶¶ 205 F.2d 700, 702 , D.C.Cir.  Suit to enjoin taking of property, more than one-half mile distant from plaintiff's farm for use as airport. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia granted...	Feb. 19, 1953	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>436. Quinn v. U.S.</b> 203 F.2d 20, 30 , D.C.Cir.  Defendant was convicted in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia of refusing to answer a question asked by a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American...	Dec. 19, 1952	Case		—
Cited by	<b>437. Kutcher v. Gray</b> 199 F.2d 783, 789+ , D.C.Cir.  Proceeding for reinstatement of federal civil service employee, Cross motions were filed for summary judgment. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia...	Oct. 16, 1952	Case		—
Cited by	<b>438. Susan J. v. Riley</b> ¶¶ 254 F.R.D. 439, 450 , M.D.Ala.  LITIGATION - Class Actions. Two subclasses were certified in action seeking relief from Alabama's deprivation of Medicaid rights to disabled adults.	Oct. 24, 2008	Case		—
Cited by	<b>439. Ogburia v. Alabama Agricultural &amp; Mechanical University</b> ¶¶ 2008 WL 11379978, *12 , N.D.Ala.  Before the court is Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (doc. 27). Defendants have briefed the issues (docs. 28, 33, 39), as has the Plaintiff (docs. 30,...	Jan. 07, 2008	Case		—
Cited by	<b>440. Smith v. McGriff</b> 434 F.Supp. 673, 680 , M.D.Ala.  Action was brought attacking the constitutionality of an Alabama statute and certain practices of the Alabama Department of Public Safety insofar as they required or permitted...	Nov. 12, 1976	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>441. Porter v. Mathews</b> 428 F.Supp. 711, 717+ , N.D.Ala.  Action was brought by nonprobationary federal civil service employee to review her 30-day suspension without pay from Social Security Administration's Southeastern Program Center. ...	Sep. 07, 1976	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>442. Diamond v. Thompson</b> 364 F.Supp. 659, 664 , M.D.Ala.  Class action by prisoners claiming denial of due process of law by actions of prison officials in reclassifying and confining prisoners to administrative segregation and punitive...	July 30, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>443. First Amendment Coalition of Arizona, Inc. v. Ryan</b>  188 F.Supp.3d 940, 952 , D.Ariz.  CRIMINAL JUSTICE — Death Penalty. Arizona prisoners stated Eighth Amendment claim as to three-drug lethal injection protocol.	May 18, 2016	Case		—
Cited by	<b>444. Jackson v. Napolitano</b>  2010 WL 94110, *6 , D.Ariz.  This matter arises on Defendant Janet Napolitano' October 28, 2009 Motion to Dismiss, contending that, pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, pro se...	Jan. 05, 2010	Case		—
Cited by	<b>445. Langan v. Town of Cave Creek</b> 2007 WL 1238896, *5 , D.Ariz.  Pending before the Court are Plaintiff Jim Langan's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 16) and Defendant Town of Cave Creek's (Town) Cross Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 35) both...	Apr. 26, 2007	Case		—
Cited by	<b>446. Thomas v. Mundell</b> 2007 WL 9734327, *3 , D.Ariz.  Pending before the Court is Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) and Rule 12(b) (6). (Dkt. 23). The Motion is fully briefed. Plaintiffs allege that Maricopa...	Feb. 23, 2007	Case		—
Cited by	<b>447. Peacock v. Board of Regents of Universities and State Colleges of Arizona</b> 380 F.Supp. 1081, 1088 , D.Ariz.  Action for money damages and equitable relief stemming from termination and suspension of plaintiff as head and professor of surgery at university's college of medicine. The...	May 03, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<b>448. Arkansas Medical Soc., Inc. v. Reynolds</b> 834 F.Supp. 1097, 1101 , E.D.Ark.  State moved to reconsider preliminary injunction which prevented implementation of 20% reduction in reimbursement rates to Medicaid providers of obstetric and pediatric care, as...	Aug. 18, 1992	Case		—













Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>449. Finney v. Mabry</b> 455 F.Supp. 756, 777 , E.D.Ark.  Inmates confined in the Arkansas Department of Correction brought a class action challenging the constitutionality of the disciplinary practices and procedures at the Cummins unit....	June 30, 1978	Case		—
Cited by	<b>450. Wagner v. Little Rock School Dist. ¶¶</b> 373 F.Supp. 876, 881 , E.D.Ark.  Action against school district by teacher who claimed her employment was wrongfully terminated. The District Court, Eisele, J., held that court had jurisdiction of suit, that...	Sep. 17, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	<b>451. Green v. Montgomery</b> 2020 WL 11929878, *12+ , C.D.Cal.  This Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) is submitted to the Honorable Josephine L. Staton, United States District Judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and General Order 05-07 of the...	Oct. 16, 2020	Case		—
Cited by	<b>452. Pennington v. Adams</b> 2020 WL 11923180, *11+ , C.D.Cal.  This Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) is submitted to the Honorable Josephine L. Staton, United States District Judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and General Order 05-07 of the...	Aug. 14, 2020	Case		—
Cited by	<b>453. Gregory v. Fresno County</b> 2019 WL 2420548, *30 , E.D.Cal.  Currently before the Court is California Department of Justice (“DOJ”), Registry of Charitable Trusts (“RCT”), Xavier Becerra, David Eller, Walter Garcia, Kamala Harris, Tanya M....	June 10, 2019	Case		—
Cited by	<b>454. Spindler v. City of Los Angeles</b> 2018 WL 6164793, *14 , C.D.Cal.  Plaintiff, a practicing attorney proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983 on January 11, 2017. The original Complaint named as...	Apr. 17, 2018	Case		—
Cited by	<b>455. Youth Justice Coalition v. City of Los Angeles</b> 2018 WL 11302063, *5 , C.D.Cal.  On January 29, 2018, Plaintiffs Youth Justice Coalition, Peter Arellano (“Arellano”), and Jose Reza (“Reza”) for themselves and on behalf of a class of similarly-situated...	Mar. 15, 2018	Case		—
Cited by	<b>456. Youth Justice Coalition v. City of Los Angeles</b> 264 F.Supp.3d 1057, 1069 , C.D.Cal.  CIVIL RIGHTS — Injunction. Purported gang member was likely to prevail on merits of his claim that anti-gang injunction violated his procedural due process rights.	Sep. 07, 2017	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>457. Osbispo v. Colvin</b> 2015 WL 5705610, *5 , C.D.Cal.  On May 27, 2014, plaintiff Esteban B. Obispo filed a complaint against the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration ("Commissioner"), seeking a review of a denial of a...	Sep. 28, 2015	Case		—
Cited by	<b>458. Gill v. Department of Justice</b> 2015 WL 757278, *4 , N.D.Cal.  In this action brought under the Administrative Procedures Act ("APA"), plaintiffs challenge certain aspects of the National Suspicious Activity Reporting Initiative ("NSI"), a...	Feb. 20, 2015	Case		—
Cited by	<b>459. In re Pitts</b> 515 B.R. 317, 325 , C.D.Cal.  BANKRUPTCY - Discharge. State statute of limitations did not apply to IRS's administrative-collection procedures against debtor.	Aug. 12, 2014	Case		—
Cited by	<b>460. Pontius v. I.R.S.</b> 2014 WL 2153942, *2 , E.D.Cal.  On April 4, 2014, an order issued adopting the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations and Petitioner's motion to quash IRS summonses was denied and this action was closed....	Apr. 23, 2014	Case		—
Cited by	<b>461. Rector v. Scott</b> 2014 WL 580158, *5 , C.D.Cal.  Linda Kanter, Courtroom Deputy. This is a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Of the sixteen remaining defendants, four have filed an answer and the other twelve have not...	Feb. 11, 2014	Case		—
Cited by	<b>462. GlobalMedia Group, LLC v. Logitech, Inc.</b> 2012 WL 2061554, *3 , N.D.Cal.  This matter comes before the court on the petition of GlobalMedia Group, LLC to compel arbitration with Logitech, Inc. For the reasons set forth below, the petition is granted. In...	June 07, 2012	Case		—
Cited by	<b>463. Carter v. Munoz</b> 2010 WL 2196003, *4 , E.D.Cal.  Plaintiff Desha M. Carter ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this...	May 26, 2010	Case		—
Cited by	<b>464. Thompson v. Sisto</b> 2010 WL 1444583, *5 , E.D.Cal.  CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Parole. Evidence supported denial of parole to inmate who had been convicted of two brutal murders.	Apr. 12, 2010	Case		—
Cited by	<b>465. City of Oakland v. Abend</b> 2007 WL 2023506, *8 , N.D.Cal.  This action consists of two cases that were originally filed in state court. The first case, filed on September 19, 2006, was initiated by the City of Oakland against William...	July 12, 2007	Case		—





Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<b>466. U.S. v. Mendoza</b> ¶ 2004 WL 1191118, *4, C.D.Cal.  On July 22, 2003, an Indictment was filed in the above-entitled case charging Defendant, ROBERT MENDOZA (hereinafter MENDOZA or Defendant), with seven (7) counts: Count One: 18...	Jan. 12, 2004	Case		—
Cited by	<b>467. Guru Nanak Sikh Society of Yuba City v. County of Sutter</b> ¶ 326 F.Supp.2d 1140, 1158, E.D.Cal.  CIVIL RIGHTS - Religion. Double building permit denial violated RLUIPA.	Nov. 19, 2003	Case		—
Cited by	<b>468. Washington Mut. Bank v. Bellatrix</b> ¶ 2 F.Supp.2d 1458, 1459, N.D.Cal.  Bank brought action against vessel owners to collect on a promissory note and preferred ship mortgage constituting a maritime lien. On owners' motion to set aside the warrant for...	Aug. 08, 1997	Case		—
Cited by	<b>469. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee v. Reno</b> ¶ 883 F.Supp. 1365, 1376, C.D.Cal.  Aliens filed action challenging Immigration and Naturalization Service's (INS) use of confidential information in adjudicating their applications for legalization under Immigration...	Jan. 24, 1995	Case		—
Cited by	<b>470. Clemente v. U.S.</b> 568 F.Supp. 1150, 1168, C.D.Cal.  Civilian air force employee, a white female, asserted employment discrimination claims against the Air Force in connection with a reduction in force and also asserted due process...	Aug. 12, 1983	Case		—
Cited by	<b>471. Blodgett v. Santa Cruz County</b> ¶ 553 F.Supp. 1090, 1101, N.D.Cal.  Property owners brought civil rights action alleging that their constitutional rights had been violated by board of supervisors' denial of their applications for minor land...	Sep. 23, 1981	Case		—
Cited by	<b>472. Saal v. Middendorf</b> 427 F.Supp. 192, 195, N.D.Cal.  Plaintiff was separated from the Navy and assigned to a reenlistment code designating persons ineligible for reenlistment. She brought action to challenge the validity of an...	Feb. 08, 1977	Case		—
Cited by	<b>473. City of Santa Clara, Cal. v. Kleppe</b> 418 F.Supp. 1243, 1259, N.D.Cal.  Suit was brought by city challenging decision of Bureau of Reclamation in withdrawing from city certain low-cost federal hydroelectric power emanating from Bureau's California...	July 23, 1976	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>474. Ponce v. Housing Authority of Tulare County</b> 389 F.Supp. 635, 649 , E.D.Cal.  Tenants instituted action to have court declare invalid, and to enjoin, an assessment of rent increases at low-rent farm labor housing projects operated by county housing authority...	Jan. 16, 1975	Case		—
Cited by	<b>475. Perkins v. Regents of University of California</b>  353 F.Supp. 618, 623 , C.D.Cal.  Assistant professor brought suit against university officials asking for wage losses, a writ of mandate directing defendants to inform her of the reasons for her dismissal, and a...	Jan. 19, 1973	Case		—
Cited by	<b>476. Anderson v. Nelson</b> 352 F.Supp. 1124, 1127 , N.D.Cal.  State prisoner filed petition to challenge 1970 redetermination of his sentence by the California Adult Authority and, in a supplemental traverse, also challenged 1970 revocation...	Dec. 29, 1972	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>477. Keller v. Kate Maremount Foundation</b> 365 F.Supp. 798, 801 , N.D.Cal.  Tenants in publicly financed housing project brought action seeking relief on theory that rent increases were approved by HUD in violation of due process. On parties' motions for...	June 15, 1972	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>478. Clutchette v. Procnunier</b> 328 F.Supp. 767, 780 , N.D.Cal.  Civil action under 1871 civil rights statute, for alleged deprivation of constitutional rights of plaintiff prison inmates. The inmates sought declaratory judgment, preliminary and...	June 21, 1971	Case		—
Cited by	<b>479. Pickell v. Reed</b> 326 F.Supp. 1086, 1089 , N.D.Cal.  Suit by enlisted man to restrain his separation from Navy with an undesirable discharge. On plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction to restrain discharge during pendency of...	Apr. 07, 1971	Case		—
Cited by	<b>480. Hester v. Craven</b>  322 F.Supp. 1256, 1265 , C.D.Cal.  Petition for federal habeas corpus by state prisoner. The District Court, Ferguson, J., held that even if it was civil or administrative rather than criminal in nature, action of...	Feb. 17, 1971	Case		—
Cited by	<b>481. Petersen v. Clark</b> 285 F.Supp. 700, 705 , N.D.Cal.  Action to enjoin induction. Defendants moved to dismiss. The District Court, Zirpoli, J., held that statute prohibiting judicial review of selective service orders, except as...	May 28, 1968	Case		—


Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>482. U.S. v. American Honda Motor Co.</b> 271 F.Supp. 979, 987 , N.D.Cal.  Motion by defendant corporation charged with violation of Sherman Act to dismiss indictment. The District Court, Sweigert, J., held, inter alia, that conspiracy to violate...	Sep. 01, 1967	Case		—
Cited by	<b>483. Sugarman v. Forbragd</b> 267 F.Supp. 817, 825 , N.D.Cal.  Action to review refusal to admit coffee beans offered for import. The District Court, Zirpoli, J., held that determination of admissibility of food offered for import was...	May 11, 1967	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>484. Unglesby v. Zimny</b> ¶¶ 250 F.Supp. 714, 718 , N.D.Cal.  Action by enlisted man to prevent his separation from naval service, seeking temporary injunction and declaratory judgment. The United States District Court for the Northern...	Nov. 16, 1965	Case		—
Cited by	<b>485. Hills v. Eisenhart</b> 156 F.Supp. 902, 905 , N.D.Cal.  Action by group of civilian employees at air force base for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief preserving job status free from the demotions incident to a reduction in...	Nov. 15, 1957	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>486. Jeffries v. Olesen</b> 121 F.Supp. 463, 474+ , S.D.Cal.  Action to enjoin enforcement of fraud order issued by Postmaster General. The District Court, Mathes, J., held, inter alia, that evidence was insufficient to sustain findings of...	May 13, 1954	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>487. U.S. v. Schneiderman</b> ¶¶ 102 F.Supp. 52, 68 , S.D.Cal.  A prosecution of William Schneiderman and others for conspiracy to commit offenses against the United States prohibited by the Smith Act was consolidated, pursuant to Federal Rules...	Nov. 28, 1951	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>488. Ex parte Wells</b> 99 F.Supp. 320, 323 , N.D.Cal.  Proceeding in the matter of application of Wesley Robert Wells for a writ of habeas corpus. The District Court, Goodman, J., held that provision of the California Penal Code...	June 18, 1951	Case		—
Cited by	<b>489. Morgan v. Mansfield</b> ¶¶ 569 F.Supp. 710, 712+ , D.Colo.  Action was brought for compensatory and punitive damages against five officers and employees of United States Department of Energy's Office of Inspector General. Upon defendants'...	Aug. 23, 1983	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	 <b>490. Romero v. Schauer</b> 386 F.Supp. 851, 856 , D.Colo.  Civil rights class action brought by state hospital patients who had been transferred to state penitentiary after an administrative determination that they were too dangerous for...	Nov. 14, 1974	Case		—
Cited by	<b>491. Chiaravallo v. Middletown Transit District</b>  2019 WL 4278937, *7 , D.Conn.  This case arises out of Andrew Chiaravallo's ("Chiaravallo") termination as the Administrator of Middletown Transit District (also known as "Middletown Area Transit" or "MAT"),...	Sep. 10, 2019	Case		—
Cited by	<b>492. Martorelli v. Cossette</b> 2012 WL 1067631, *4 , D.Conn.  Plaintiff David Martorelli has brought this lawsuit against Defendant Jeffrey W. Cossette, Chief of Police of the City of Meriden, in both his individual and official capacities....	Mar. 30, 2012	Case		—
Cited by	<b>493. Belanger v. Blum</b> 2010 WL 1286857, *4+ , D.Conn.  The Plaintiffs presently ask the Court to reconsider its [Doc. # 43] June 10, 2009 decision to grant the [Doc. # 32] Defendants' Motion to Dismiss. The Plaintiffs seek this relief...	Mar. 30, 2010	Case		—
Cited by	<b>494. Doe v. Gonzales</b>  386 F.Supp.2d 66, 71 , D.Conn.  CIVIL RIGHTS - Free Speech. Ban on disclosure of FBI information disclosure demand letter receipt would be preliminarily enjoined.	Sep. 09, 2005	Case		—
Cited by	<b>495. Adoption Services of Connecticut, Inc. v. Ragaglia</b> 178 F.Supp.2d 139, 146 , D.Conn.  GOVERNMENT - Licensing. Immediate suspension of private adoption agency's license did not violate procedural due process.	Dec. 17, 2001	Case		—
Cited by	 <b>496. Sun City Taxpayers' Ass'n v. Citizens Utilities Co.</b> 847 F.Supp. 281, 284+ , D.Conn.  Not-for-profit corporation that claimed to represent residential real estate owners in city brought action against utility under Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act...	Feb. 01, 1994	Case		—
Cited by	<b>497. Hoffman v. City of Willimantic</b> 680 F.Supp. 504, 507 , D.Conn.  Probationary police officer sought relief under § 1983 by reason of his dismissal from police training course and termination of his employment. Several claims were adjudicated,...	Mar. 08, 1988	Case		—
















Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<p><b>498. Wilkinson v. Forst</b> 591 F.Supp. 403, 411 , D.Conn.</p> <p>Imperial Wizard of the Invisible Empire Knights of the Ku Klux Klan brought action challenging actions of state officials in obtaining orders to stop and search all persons...</p>	July 11, 1984	Case		—
Cited by	<p> <b>499. Mercer v. Birchman</b> ” 510 F.Supp. 99, 106 , D.Conn.</p> <p>In a class action against administrative law judges who had first heard Medicare claims and against Secretary of the then Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and on motion...</p>	Mar. 05, 1981	Case		—
Cited by	<p><b>500. Gonzalez v. Leonard</b> 497 F.Supp. 1058, 1072 , D.Conn.</p> <p>Suit was brought against federal and state officials allegedly responsible for disseminating to law enforcement agencies a telex message that erroneously accused plaintiffs of...</p>	Aug. 28, 1980	Case		—










## Table of Authorities (172)

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	<p> <b>1. Aetna Life Ins. Co. of Hartford, Conn. v. Haworth</b></p> <p>57 S.Ct. 461, U.S.Mo., 1937</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Suit by the AEtna Life Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut, against Edwin P....</p>	Case		”	637+
Cited	<p> <b>2. Alabama Power Co. v. Ickes</b></p> <p>58 S.Ct. 300, U.S.Dist.Col., 1938</p> <p>On Writs of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Two suits for injunction by the Alabama Power Company against Harold L. Ickes, as Federal...</p>	Case		”	638+
Mentioned	<p> <b>3. Alexander Sprunt &amp; Son v. U.S.</b></p> <p>50 S.Ct. 315, U.S.Tex., 1930</p> <p>Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas. Consolidated suits by Alexander Sprunt &amp; Son, Inc., and others, and by the Texas &amp; New...</p>	Case			639
Cited	<p><b>4. Allen Calculators v. National Cash Register Co.</b></p> <p>64 S.Ct. 905, U.S.Ohio, 1944</p> <p>Suit by the United States of America against the National Cash Register Company to restrain defendant from acquiring ownership or control of a competitor. By a decree the...</p>	Case			629
Cited	<p> <b>5. American Communications Ass'n, C.I.O., v. Douds</b></p> <p>70 S.Ct. 674, U.S.N.Y., 1950</p> <p>Action by the American Communications Association, C.I.O., and others against Charles T. Douds, individually and as Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board, Second...</p>	Case			634+
Mentioned	<p> <b>6. American Power &amp; Light Co. v. Securities and Exchange Commission</b></p> <p>67 S.Ct. 133, U.S., 1946</p> <p>Proceeding by Securities and Exchange Commission against the American Power &amp; Light Company, and Electric Power &amp; Light Corporation, wherein orders were entered requiring the...</p>	Case			645
Cited	<p> <b>7. Anniston Mfg. Co. v. Davis</b></p> <p>57 S.Ct. 816, U.S.Ala., 1937</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Suit by the Anniston Manufacturing Company against Harwell G. Davis, Collector of...</p>	Case			645+

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	<p><b>8. Application of Bohlinger</b></p> <p>106 N.Y.S.2d 953, N.Y.Sup., 1951</p> <p>Proceeding in the matter of the application of the People of the State of New York by Alfred J. Bohlinger, Superintendent of Insurance of the State, for an order directing...</p>	Case			651
Cited	<p> <b>9. Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority</b></p> <p>56 S.Ct. 466, U.S.Ala., 1936</p> <p>Mr. Justice McREYNOLDS, dissenting. On Writs of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Suit by George Ashwander and others against the...</p>	Case			639
Cited	<p><b>10. Assigned Car Cases</b></p> <p>47 S.Ct. 727, U.S.Pa., 1927</p> <p>Mr. Justice McReynolds, dissenting. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Action by the Berwind-White Coal Mining Company...</p>	Case			640
Mentioned	<p> <b>11. Associated Industries of New York State v. Ickes</b></p> <p>134 F.2d 694, C.C.A.2, 1943</p> <p>Proceeding on the petition of Associated Industries of New York State, Inc., against Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of Interior, and Dan H. Wheeler, Director of the Bituminous Coal...</p>	Case			639
Cited	<p> <b>12. Bailey v. Richardson</b></p> <p>71 S.Ct. 669, U.S.Dist.Col., 1951</p> <p>Action by Dorothy Bailey against Seth W. Richardson and others for a declaratory judgment and for an order directing plaintiff's reinstatement in the government employ. The United...</p>	Case			634+
Cited	<p> <b>13. Bailey v. Richardson</b></p> <p>182 F.2d 46, D.C.Cir., 1950</p> <p>Action by Dorothy Bailey against Seth W. Richardson, and others, for a declaratory judgment and for an order directing plaintiff's reinstatement in the government employ. The...</p>	Case			634
Cited	<p> <b>14. Bell v. Hood</b></p> <p>66 S.Ct. 773, U.S.Cal., 1946</p> <p>Action by Arthur L. Bell, individually, and as an associate of and division superintendent of Mankind United, a voluntary association, and others, against R. B. Hood and others for...</p>	Case			638+

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	<p> <b>15. Bi-Metallic Inv. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization</b></p> <p>36 S.Ct. 141, U.S.Colo., 1915</p> <p>IN ERROR to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado to review a decree which, reversing a decree of the District Court of the City and County of Denver, in that state, directed...</p>	Case			646
Cited	<p> <b>16. Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System v. Agnew</b></p> <p>67 S.Ct. 411, U.S.Dist.Col., 1947</p> <p>Proceeding by John Agnew and another against the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and others for a writ of certiorari, or, in the alternative, a mandatory...</p>	Case			647
Cited	<p> <b>17. Braxton County Court v. State of West Virginia</b></p> <p>28 S.Ct. 275, U.S.W.Va., 1908</p> <p>IN ERROR to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia to review a judgment awarding a writ of mandamus to compel the County Court of Braxton County, in that state,...</p>	Case			637
Cited	<p> <b>18. Brinkerhoff-Faris Trust &amp; Savings Co. v. Hill</b></p> <p>50 S.Ct. 451, U.S.Mo., 1930</p> <p>On Certiorari to the Supreme Court of State of Missouri. Suit by the Brinkerhoff-Faris Trust &amp; Savings Company against Walter O. Hill, Treasurer of Henry County, Mo. Judgment for...</p>	Case		”	643+
Mentioned	<p> <b>19. Buchanan v. Warley</b></p> <p>38 S.Ct. 16, U.S.Ky., 1917</p> <p>In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky. Action by Charles H. Buchanan against William Warley. A decree for defendant was affirmed by the Court of Appeals of...</p>	Case			633
Cited	<p> <b>20. Burdeau v. McDowell</b></p> <p>41 S.Ct. 574, U.S.Pa., 1921</p> <p>Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania. Petition in the District Court by J. C. McDowell for an order for the return to him of...</p>	Case		”	644
Cited	<p> <b>21. Butfield v. Stranahan</b></p> <p>24 S.Ct. 349, U.S.N.Y., 1904</p> <p>IN ERROR to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York to review a judgment entered on a verdict directed for defendant in an action against the...</p>	Case			646

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	<p> <b>22. Carter v. Carter Coal Co.</b></p> <p>56 S.Ct. 855, U.S. Dist. Col., 1936</p> <p>Mr. Chief Justice HUGHES dissenting in part, and Mr. Justice CARDOZO, Mr. Justice BRANDEIS, and Mr. Justice STONE dissenting. On Writs of Certiorari to the United States Court of...</p>	Case			632
Cited	<p> <b>23. Case of Hayburn</b></p> <p>1792 WL 575, U.S. Pa., 1792</p> <p>THIS was a motion for a mandamus, to be directed to the circuit court for the district of Pennsylvania, commanding the said court to proceed in a certain petition of William...</p>	Case			637
Cited	<p> <b>24. Catlin v. U.S.</b></p> <p>65 S.Ct. 631, U.S. Ill., 1945</p> <p>Condemnation proceeding by the United States of America against Daniel K. Catlin and others, as trustees under a deed dated February 1, 1921. To review a judgment of the Circuit...</p>	Case			664
Cited	<p> <b>25. Chapman v. Sheridan-Wyoming Coal Co.</b></p> <p>70 S.Ct. 392, U.S. Dist. Col., 1950</p> <p>Action by Sheridan-Wyoming Coal Company, Incorporated, a lessee of coal mining rights in public lands, against Oscar L. Chapman, Department of Interior, to prevent leasing of coal...</p>	Case			666
Cited	<p><b>26. Chicago &amp; G.T. Ry. Co. v. Wellman</b></p> <p>12 S.Ct. 400, U.S. Mich., 1892</p> <p>Action by Thomas Wellman against the Chicago &amp; Grand Trunk Railway Company to recover damages for a refusal to carry him as a passenger. Verdict and judgment for plaintiff, which...</p>	Case			637
Discussed	<p> <b>27. Chicago &amp; Southern Air Lines v. Waterman S. S. Corp.</b></p> <p>68 S.Ct. 431, U.S., 1948</p> <p>See 166 F.2d 1021. Petition by the Waterman Steamship Corporation for review of an order of the Civil Aeronautics Board denying a certificate of public convenience and necessity...</p>	Case		”	640+
Mentioned	<p> <b>28. Chicago, M. &amp; St. P. Ry. Co. v. State of Minn. ex rel. R.R. &amp; Warehouse Com'n</b></p> <p>10 S.Ct. 462, U.S. Minn., 1890</p> <p>This is a writ of error to review a judgment of the supreme court of the state of Minnesota, awarding a writ of mandamus against the Chicago, Milwaukee &amp; St. Paul Railway Company....</p>	Case			646

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	<p> <b>29. Chicago, M. &amp; St. P.R. Co. v. Polt</b></p> <p>34 S.Ct. 301, U.S.S.D., 1914</p> <p>IN ERROR to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota to review a judgment which affirmed a judgment of the Circuit Court of Aurora County, in that state, awarding double...</p>	Case			644
Cited	<p> <b>30. Chin v. U.S.</b></p> <p>28 S.Ct. 201, U.S.Cal., 1908</p> <p>APPEAL from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California to review an order denying the petition for a writ of habeas corpus in behalf of a...</p>	Case			631
Cited	<p><b>31. City of Atlanta v. Ickes</b></p> <p>60 S.Ct. 170, U.S.Dist.Col., 1939</p> <p>Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. Facts and opinion, City of Atlanta v. National Bituminous Coal Comm., 26 F.Supp. 606.</p>	Case			639
Cited	<p> <b>32. Coe v. Armour Fertilizer Works</b></p> <p>35 S.Ct. 625, U.S.Fla., 1915</p> <p>IN ERROR to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida to review a judgment by which, on a second writ of error, a judgment of the Circuit Court of Manatee County, in that state,...</p>	Case			644+
Mentioned	<p> <b>33. Coleman v. Miller</b></p> <p>59 S.Ct. 972, U.S.Kan., 1939</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas. Original proceeding in mandamus by Rolla W. Coleman and others, as members of the State Senate, and of the House...</p>	Case			638
Discussed	<p> <b>34. Columbia Broadcasting System v. U.S.</b></p> <p>62 S.Ct. 1194, U.S.N.Y., 1942</p> <p>Action by the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., against the United States of America to enjoin enforcement of an order of the Federal Communications Commission, wherein the...</p>	Case		”	633+
Discussed	<p> <b>35. Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Mellon</b></p> <p>43 S.Ct. 597, U.S.Dist.Col., 1923</p> <p>Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. Original suit by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts against Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, and others,...</p>	Case		”	637+
Cited	<p><b>36. Compagna v. Hiatt</b></p> <p>71 S.Ct. 192, U.S.Ga., 1950</p> <p>Former decision, 339 U.S. 955, 70 S.Ct. 977. Facts and opinion, D.C., 82 F.Supp. 295, 178 F.2d 42.</p>	Case			664

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Mentioned	<p> <b>37. Cooke v. U.S.</b></p> <p>45 S.Ct. 390, U.S.Tex., 1925</p> <p>Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Clay Cooke was adjudged in contempt, and to review a judgment of the Circuit Court of Appeals (295...</p>	Case			645
Mentioned	<p> <b>38. Crampton v. Zabriskie</b></p> <p>1879 WL 16624, U.S.N.J., 1879</p> <p>APPEAL from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey. 'The Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Hudson,' in the State of New Jersey, adopted,...</p>	Case			638
Cited	<p> <b>39. Davis &amp; Farnum Mfg. Co. v. City of Los Angeles</b></p> <p>23 S.Ct. 498, U.S.Cal., 1903</p> <p>ON APPEAL from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of California to review a decree which dismissed a bill to enjoin the enforcement of certain...</p>	Case			639+
Discussed	<p> <b>40. Decatur v. Paulding</b></p> <p>1840 WL 4624, U.S.Dist.Col., 1840</p> <p>For Justice Baldwin's concurring opinion, see 39 U.S. 599.</p>	Case		”	665+
Cited	<p> <b>41. Den ex dem. Murray v. Hoboken Land &amp; Imp. Co.</b></p> <p>1855 WL 8216, U.S.N.J., 1855</p> <p>THESE three cases came up from the circuit court of the United States for the district of New Jersey, upon a certificate of division in opinion between the judges thereof. As the...</p>	Case			644+
Cited	<p> <b>42. Dismuke v. U.S.</b></p> <p>56 S.Ct. 400, U.S.Ga., 1936</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Suit by Frederick D. Dismuke against the United States. To review a judgment of the...</p>	Case		”	646
Cited	<p><b>43. Duke v. U.S.</b></p> <p>90 F.2d 840, C.C.A.4 (Va.), 1937</p> <p>Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Jesse C. Duke was convicted of attempting to influence a grand jury, and he...</p>	Case			664
Cited	<p><b>44. Eberlein v. U.S.</b></p> <p>42 S.Ct. 12, U.S.Ct.Cl., 1921</p> <p>Appeal from the Court of Claims. Suit by Louis H. Eberlein against the United States. From a judgment of the Court of Claims (53 Ct. Cl. 466) in favor of the United States, the...</p>	Case			655















Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	<p> <b>45. Eccles v. Peoples Bank of Lakewood Village, Cal.</b></p> <p>68 S.Ct. 641, U.S.Dist.Col., 1948</p> <p>Action by the Peoples Bank of Lakewood Village, Cal., against Marriner S. Eccles and others, as members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for a declaratory...</p>	Case			640
Cited	<p> <b>46. Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees v. U.S.</b></p> <p>44 S.Ct. 72, U.S.Ill., 1923</p> <p>Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois. Suit by Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees and others against the United States and...</p>	Case			639
Mentioned	<p> <b>47. Ekiu v. U.S.</b></p> <p>12 S.Ct. 336, U.S.Cal., 1892</p> <p>Appeal from the circuit court of the United States for the northern district of California. Affirmed.</p>	Case			664
Cited	<p> <b>48. Embree v. Kansas City &amp; Liberty Boulevard Road Dist.</b></p> <p>36 S.Ct. 317, U.S.Mo., 1916</p> <p>IN ERROR to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri to review a decree which affirmed a decree of the Circuit Court of Clay County, in that state, in favor of defendants in a...</p>	Case			646
Mentioned	<p> <b>49. Endicott-Johnson Corporation v. Encyclopedia Press</b></p> <p>45 S.Ct. 61, U.S.N.Y., 1924</p> <p>In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York. Action by the Encyclopedia Press, Inc., against the Endicott-Johnson Corporation. From a judgment of the Court of Appeals of...</p>	Case			645
Cited	<p> <b>50. ESTABLISHING THE INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER CASES OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY ON THE PART OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES</b></p> <p>1943 WL 4056, Pres.Exec.Order, 1943</p> <p>By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 1753 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, Title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (Public Law 354—77th Congress), and...</p>	Administrative Decision & Guidance			626+
Mentioned	<p><b>51. ESTABLISHING THE PRESIDENT'S TEMPORARY COMMISSION ON EMPLOYEES LOYALTY</b></p> <p>1946 WL 3905, Pres.Exec.Order, 1946</p> <p>By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 1753 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, section 214 of the act of May 3, 1945 (Public Law 49, 79th Congress), and as...</p>	Administrative Decision & Guidance			626



Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	<p> <b>52. Estep v. U.S.</b></p> <p>66 S.Ct. 423, U.S.Pa., 1946</p> <p>William Murray Estep and Louis Dabney Smith were convicted of refusing to submit to induction into the armed forces, their convictions were affirmed, 150 F.2d 768,148 F.2d 288, and...</p>	Case			647
Cited	<p> <b>53. Ex parte Robinson</b></p> <p>1873 WL 16067, U.S.Ark., 1873</p> <p>ON petition by J. S. Robinson, an attorney at law, for mandamus to the judge of the District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, the case being thus: On the 16th of July,...</p>	Case			646
Cited	<p><b>54. Ex parte Williams</b></p> <p>48 S.Ct. 523, U.S.Neb., 1928</p> <p>Petition for a Writ of Mandamus. Petition for a Writ of Mandamus. of Nebraska, and others, for a writ of mandamus, to be directed to District Judge Woodrough. On return to rule...</p>	Case			640+
Cited	<p> <b>55. F.C.C. v. Sanders Bros. Radio Station</b></p> <p>60 S.Ct. 693, U.S.Dist.Col., 1940</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Proceeding in the matter of the application of the Telegraph Herald for a construction...</p>	Case			638+
Mentioned	<p> <b>56. Federal Communications Commission v. WJR, The Goodwill Station</b></p> <p>69 S.Ct. 1097, U.S.Dist.Col., 1949</p> <p>Proceeding by the Coastal Plains Broadcasting Company, Inc., for a permit to construct a radio broadcasting station wherein WJR, the Goodwill Station, Inc., filed a petition for...</p>	Case			644
Mentioned	<p> <b>57. Feiner v. New York</b></p> <p>71 S.Ct. 303, U.S.N.Y., 1951</p> <p>Irving Feiner was convicted in the Court of Special Sessions in the City of Syracuse, Bamerick, J., of disorderly conduct in violation of Penal Law New York, s 722, subds. 1—3,...</p>	Case			663
Mentioned	<p> <b>58. Garfield v. U.S. ex rel. Goldsby</b></p> <p>29 S.Ct. 62, U.S.Dist.Col., 1908</p> <p>IN ERROR to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia to review a judgment which affirmed a judgment of the Supreme Court of the District, granting a writ of mandamus to...</p>	Case			646

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Mentioned	<b>59. <a href="#">Glass v. Ickes</a></b> 117 F.2d 273, App.D.C., 1940 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. Action of defamation by John D. Glass against Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Department of the...	Case			664
Cited	<b>60. <a href="#">Golding v. U.S.</a></b> 1934 WL 2044, Ct.Cl., 1934 The Reporter's statement of the case:	Case			655
Mentioned	<b>61. <a href="#">Grant v. Reader's Digest Ass'n, Inc.</a></b> 151 F.2d 733, C.C.A.2 (N.Y.), 1945 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Action for libel by Sidney S. Grant against the Reader's Digest Association, Inc. From a...	Case			632
Mentioned	<b>62. <a href="#">Gregoire v. Biddle</a></b> 177 F.2d 579, 2nd Cir.(N.Y.), 1949 Armand Gregoire sued Francis Biddle and others to recover for false arrest of plaintiff as an enemy alien. The District Court, Southern District, New York, dismissed the complaint,...	Case			641
Cited	<b>63. <a href="#">Hagar v. Reclamation Dist. No. 108</a></b> 4 S.Ct. 663, U.S.Cal., 1884 Appeals from the United States Circuit Court for the District of California.	Case		”	643
Cited	<b>64. <a href="#">Hiatt v. Compagna</a></b> 178 F.2d 42, 5th Cir.(Ga.), 1949 Habeas corpus proceeding by Louis Compagna and another against William H. Hiatt, Warden, United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia. From judgments of the District Court for the...	Case			664
Mentioned	<b>65. <a href="#">Hilton v. Merritt</a></b> 3 S.Ct. 548, U.S.N.Y., 1884 In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. This was a suit brought by the plaintiffs in error, who were plaintiffs in the circuit...	Case			646
Cited	<b>66. <a href="#">Hirabayashi v. U.S.</a></b> 63 S.Ct. 1375, U.S., 1943 On Certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit. Gordon Kiyoshi Hirabayashi was convicted in the District Court of violating the Act of Congress...	Case			669


Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	<p> <b>67. Hitchman Coal &amp; Coke Co. v. Mitchell</b></p> <p>38 S.Ct. 65, U.S.W.Va., 1917</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Suit by the Hitchman Coal &amp; Coke Company against John Mitchell and others. A final...</p>	Case			639
Cited	<p> <b>68. Home Bldg. &amp; Loan Ass'n v. Blaisdell</b></p> <p>54 S.Ct. 231, U.S.Minn., 1934</p> <p>Action by John H. Blaisdell and wife against the Home Building &amp; Loan Association. Judgment for plaintiff was affirmed by the state Supreme Court (249 N.W. 893) on the authority...</p>	Case			669
Discussed	<p> <b>69. In re Oliver</b></p> <p>68 S.Ct. 499, U.S.Mich., 1948</p> <p>Habeas corpus proceeding by William Oliver. To review a judgment of the Supreme Court of Michigan, 318 Mich. 7, 27 N.W.2d 323, dismissing that petition, the petitioner brings...</p>	Case		”	634+
Discussed	<p><b>70. Inland Empire Dist. Council, Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union, Lewiston, Idaho, v. Millis</b></p> <p>65 S.Ct. 1316, U.S.Dist.Col., 1945</p> <p>Action by Inland Empire District Council, Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union, Lewiston, Idaho, and others, against Harry A. Millis, individually and as Chairman and Member of the...</p>	Case			628+
Cited	<p><b>71. International Workers Order v. Clark</b></p> <p>88 F.Supp. 873, D.D.C, 1949</p> <p>The International Workers Order, Inc., brought action against Tom C. Clark, individually and as Attorney General of the United States, and others. On motion to dismiss. The...</p>	Case			630
Cited	<p><b>72. International Workers Order v. McGrath</b></p> <p>71 S.Ct. 39, U.S.Dist.Col., 1950</p> <p>Facts and opinion, D.C., 88 F.Supp. 873; 86 U.S.App.D.C. 287, 182 F.2d 368.</p>	Case			627
Judgment Affirmed	<p><b>73. International Workers Order v. McGrath</b></p> <p>182 F.2d 368, D.C.Cir., 1950</p> <p>Action by the International Workers Order, Inc., against J. Howard McGrath, individually and as Attorney General of the United States, and others, to obtain an injunctive order...</p>	Case			630
Cited	<p> <b>74. Interstate Commerce Commission v. Louisville &amp; N.R. Co.</b></p> <p>33 S.Ct. 185, U.S.Com.Ct., 1913</p> <p>APPEAL from the United States Commerce Court to review a decree which annulled an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission reducing rates. Reversed. See same case below, 195...</p>	Case			646+

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Mentioned	<p> <b>75. Interstate Commerce Commission v. Oregon-Washington R. &amp; Nav. Co.</b></p> <p>53 S.Ct. 266, U.S.Or., 1933</p> <p>Suit by the Oregon-Washington Railroad &amp; Navigation Company against the United States, wherein the Southern Pacific Company and others intervened in support of the petition, and...</p>	Case			638
Judgment Reversed	<p> <b>76. Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. Clark</b></p> <p>177 F.2d 79, D.C.Cir., 1949</p> <p>The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee sought an injunction to restrain Tom C. Clark, Attorney General, and others, from designating the complainant as a subversive organization...</p>	Case			627+
Cited	<p> <b>77. Keim v. U.S.</b></p> <p>20 S.Ct. 574, U.S.Ct.Cl., 1900</p> <p>APPEAL from the Court of Claims to review a decree dismissing a petition for salary of a clerk who had been discharged. Affirmed. See same case below, 33 Ct. Cl. 174.</p>	Case			655+
Mentioned	<p> <b>78. Kwock v. White</b></p> <p>40 S.Ct. 566, U.S.Cal., 1920</p> <p>On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Petition for habeas corpus by Kwock Jan Fat against Edward White, as Commissioner of...</p>	Case			646
Cited	<p> <b>79. La Crosse Tel. Corp. v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Bd.</b></p> <p>69 S.Ct. 379, U.S.Wis., 1949</p> <p>Separate actions by the La Crosse Telephone Corporation and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local B—953, A.F. of L., petitioners, for the review of a...</p>	Case			640
Discussed	<p> <b>80. Larson v. Domestic &amp; Foreign Commerce Corp.</b></p> <p>69 S.Ct. 1457, U.S.Dist.Col., 1949</p> <p>Action by Domestic &amp; Foreign Commerce Corporation against Robert M. Littlejohn, as War Assets Administrator and Surplus Property Administrator, for an injunction enjoining sale by...</p>	Case		”	632+
Mentioned	<p> <b>81. Lawton v. Steele</b></p> <p>14 S.Ct. 499, U.S.N.Y., 1894</p> <p>In error to the supreme court of the state of New York.</p>	Case			646

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Mentioned	<p><b>82. Lewis v. U.S.</b></p> <p>49 S.Ct. 257, U.S.Okla., 1929</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Allie E. Lewis and another were convicted of violating the National Banking Act,...</p>	Case			659
Mentioned	<p> <b>83. Linder v. U.S.</b></p> <p>45 S.Ct. 446, U.S.Wash., 1925</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. C. O. Linder was convicted of violation of the Harrison Anti-Narcotic Law, and to review...</p>	Case			632
Cited	<p> <b>84. Lloyd Sabaudo Societa Anonima Per Azioni v. Elting</b></p> <p>53 S.Ct. 167, U.S.N.Y., 1932</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Suit by Lloyd Sabaudo Societa Anonima Per Azioni against Philip Elting, Collector of...</p>	Case			646
Cited	<p> <b>85. Ludecke v. Watkins</b></p> <p>68 S.Ct. 1429, U.S.N.Y., 1948</p> <p>Habeas corpus proceeding by the United States, on the relation of Kurt G. W. Ludecke, against W. Frank Watkins, as District Director of Immigration, seeking relator's release from...</p>	Case			634+
Mentioned	<p> <b>86. M'Culloch v. State</b></p> <p>1819 WL 2135, U.S.Md., 1819</p> <p>United States Bank.—Implied power.—Taxing power. Congress has power to incorporate a bank. The government of the Union is a government of the people; it emanates from them; its...</p>	Case			632
Cited	<p> <b>87. Martin v. Mott</b></p> <p>1827 WL 3051, U.S.N.Y., 1827</p> <p>ERROR to the Court for the Trial of Impeachments and Correction of Errors of the State of New-York. This was an action of replevin, originally brought in the Supreme Court of...</p>	Case			646
Cited	<p> <b>88. McNabb v. U.S.</b></p> <p>63 S.Ct. 608, U.S.Tenn., 1943</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. Benjamin McNabb, Freeman McNabb, and Raymond McNabb were convicted of murder in the...</p>	Case			652

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Mentioned	<p> <b>89. Mencher v. Chesley</b></p> <p>75 N.E.2d 257, N.Y., 1947</p> <p>Appeal from Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Second Department. Action by Max Mencher against Adolph J. Chesley for libel. Cross-Appeals, by permission of the Appellate Division...</p>	Case			632
Mentioned	<p><b>90. Moore v. People of State of N.Y.</b></p> <p>68 S.Ct. 705, U.S.N.Y., 1948</p> <p>George Cornelius Moore and Lester Haughton were convicted of murder in the first degree, the convictions were affirmed by the Court of Appeals of New York, 297 N.Y. 734, 77 N.E.2d...</p>	Case			634+
Cited	<p> <b>91. Morgan v. U.S.</b></p> <p>58 S.Ct. 773, U.S.Mo., 1938</p> <p>Suit by Fred O. Morgan, doing business as Fred O. Morgan Sheep Commission Company, and others against the United States of America and the Secretary of Agriculture to determine...</p>	Case		”	646+
Cited	<p> <b>92. Morgan v. U.S.</b></p> <p>56 S.Ct. 906, U.S.Mo., 1936</p> <p>Suits by Fred O. Morgan, doing business as the Fred O. Morgan Sheep Commission Company, and others against the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture. From a joint and...</p>	Case		”	664
Cited	<p> <b>93. Muskrat v. U.S.</b></p> <p>31 S.Ct. 250, U.S.Ct.Cl., 1911</p> <p>APPEALS from the Court of Claims to review decrees dismissing petitions in suits by Cherokee Indians against the United States, brought solely to determine the validity of certain...</p>	Case			637
Mentioned	<p> <b>94. Myers v. U.S.</b></p> <p>47 S.Ct. 21, U.S.Ct.Cl., 1926</p> <p>Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Holmes, dissenting. Appeal from Court of Claims. Suit by Lois P. Myers, administratrix of the estate of Frank S....</p>	Case			630
Mentioned	<p> <b>95. N.L.R.B. v. Jones &amp; Laughlin Steel Corp.</b></p> <p>57 S.Ct. 615, U.S., 1937</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Proceeding by the National Labor Relations Board against the Jones &amp; Laughlin Steel...</p>	Case			647










Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	<p> <b>96. N.L.R.B. v. Mackay Radio &amp; Telegraph Co.</b></p> <p>58 S.Ct. 904, U.S., 1938</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Petition by the National Labor Relations Board for the enforcement of an order against...</p>	Case			647
Cited	<p> <b>97. Nash v. U.S.</b></p> <p>33 S.Ct. 780, U.S.Ga., 1913</p> <p>ON WRIT of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to review a judgment which affirmed a conviction in the Circuit Court for the Southern...</p>	Case			660
Cited	<p> <b>98. Near v. State of Minnesota ex rel. Olson</b></p> <p>51 S.Ct. 625, U.S.Minn., 1931</p> <p>Mr. Justice BUTLER, Mr. Justice VAN DEVANTER, Mr. Justice McREYNOLDS, and Mr. Justice SUTHERLAND, dissenting. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota. Suit by the...</p>	Case		”	663
Mentioned	<p> <b>99. New York Cent. Securities Corporation v. U.S.</b></p> <p>53 S.Ct. 45, U.S.N.Y., 1932</p> <p>Suit by the New York Central Securities Corporation against the United States of America and others, to annul and set aside certain orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission...</p>	Case			660
Cited	<p><b>100. New York Soc. for Suppression of Vice v. Macfadden Publications</b></p> <p>183 N.E. 284, N.Y., 1932</p> <p>Action by the New York Society for the Supression of Vice against the MacFadden Publications, Inc., and another. Judgment of the Supreme Court, Trial Term, in favor of plaintiff...</p>	Case			632
Cited	<p> <b>101. Ng Fung Ho v. White</b></p> <p>42 S.Ct. 492, U.S.Cal., 1922</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Habeas corpus proceedings by Ng Fung Ho, otherwise known as Ung Kip, and others, against...</p>	Case			644+
Cited	<p> <b>102. Nortz v. U.S.</b></p> <p>55 S.Ct. 428, U.S.Ct.Cl., 1935</p> <p>On Certificate from the Court of Claims. Suit by F. Eugene Nortz against the United States. Defendant demurred to the petition, and the Court of Claims certifies certain questions...</p>	Case			662

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	 <b>103. Norwegian Nitrogen Products Co. v. U.S.</b> 53 S.Ct. 350, U.S.Cust. & Pat.App., 1933 On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. Proceedings by the United States of America involving the assessment and collection of duties on...	Case			647
Cited	 <b>104. Oceanic Steam Nav. Co. v. Stranahan</b> 29 S.Ct. 671, U.S.N.Y., 1909 In ERROR to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York to review a judgment in favor of defendant in an action to recover back a penalty paid to...	Case			646
Cited	 <b>105. Ohio Bell Tel. Co. v. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio</b> 57 S.Ct. 724, U.S.Ohio, 1937 Proceedings by the Ohio Bell Telephone Company against the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. From a decree of the Supreme Court of Ohio (131 Ohio St. 539, 3 N.E.(2d) 475),...	Case			646+
Cited	 <b>106. Ohio Valley Water Co. v. Borough of Ben Avon</b> 40 S.Ct. 527, U.S.Pa., 1920 In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania. Proceeding instituted before the Public Service Commission of Pennsylvania by Ben Avon Borough and others against the...	Case			646
Cited	 <b>107. Oklahoma v. U.S. Civil Service Com'n</b> 67 S.Ct. 544, U.S.Okla., 1947 Action by the State of Oklahoma against the United States Civil Service Commission to review an order of the commission directing the suspension from office of France Paris, a...	Case			647
Cited	 <b>108. Opp Cotton Mills v. Administrator of Wage and Hour Division of Department of Labor</b> 61 S.Ct. 524, U.S., 1941 On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Petition by Opp Cotton Mills, Incorporated, and others, against the Administrator of the...	Case			647
Cited	 <b>109. Ownbey v. Morgan</b> 41 S.Ct. 433, U.S.Del., 1921 In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware. Action by John Pierpont Morgan and others, as executors of John Pierpont Morgan, deceased, against James A. Ownbey. A...	Case			645



Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	 <b>110. Palko v. State of Connecticut</b> 58 S.Ct. 149, U.S.Conn., 1937 Frank Palko was convicted of murder in the first degree, and he appeals from a judgment (122 Conn. 529, 191 A. 320), affirming the judgment of conviction. Affirmed. Mr. Justice...	Case		”	644+
Cited	<b>111. Parker v. Fleming</b> 67 S.Ct. 463, U.S.Em.App., 1947 Action by Jack Parker and others against Paul A. Porter, administrator, Office of Price Administration, to set aside orders granting eviction certificates. A judgment was entered...	Case			638+
Cited	<b>112. Parker v. Los Angeles County</b> 70 S.Ct. 161, U.S.Cal., 1949 Helen Parker and others and Julia Learned Steiner brought actions against County of Los Angeles and others to enjoin defendants from requiring plaintiffs to execute loyalty...	Case			637
Discussed	 <b>113. Pennsylvania R. Co. v. U.S. Railroad Labor Board</b> 43 S.Ct. 278, U.S.Ill., 1923 Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Suit by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company against the United States Railroad Labor Board and the...	Case		”	641+
Cited	 <b>114. Perkins v. Elg</b> 59 S.Ct. 884, U.S.Dist.Col., 1939 On Writs of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Suit by Marie Elizabeth Elg against Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, Edward...	Case			655
Cited	 <b>115. Perkins v. Lukens Steel Co.</b> 60 S.Ct. 869, U.S.Dist.Col., 1940 Mr. Justice McREYNOLDS dissenting. On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. Action by the Lukens Steel Company and others...	Case			638+
Cited	 <b>116. Philadelphia Co. v. Stimson</b> 32 S.Ct. 340, U.S.Dist.Col., 1912 APPEAL from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia to review a decree affirming a decree of the Supreme Court of the District, sustaining a demurrer to a bill to set...	Case		”	632+

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Mentioned	<p><b>117. Pierce Oil Corp. v. City of Hope</b></p> <p>39 S.Ct. 172, U.S.Ark., 1919</p> <p>In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas. Suit by the Pierce Oil Corporation against the City of Hope. Decree sustaining demurrer to the complaint was affirmed by the...</p>	Case			662
Cited	<p> <b>118. Pierce v. Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary</b></p> <p>45 S.Ct. 571, U.S.Or., 1925</p> <p>Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon. Two suits, one by the Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, the other by the...</p>	Case			633+
Examined	<p> <b>119. PRESCRIBING PROCEDURES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF AN EMPLOYEES LOYALTY PROGRAM IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT</b></p> <p>1947 WL 4684, Pres.Exec.Order, 1947</p> <p>WHEREAS each employee of the Government of the United States is endowed with a measure of trusteeship over the democratic processes which are the heart and sinew of the United...</p>	Administrative Decision & Guidance			625+
Cited	<p><b>120. President, Managers &amp; Co of Monongahela Bridge Co v. U S</b></p> <p>30 S.Ct. 356, U.S.Pa., 1910</p> <p>IN ERROR to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania to review a conviction of a bridge company for failing to make the alterations in a...</p>	Case			646
Mentioned	<p> <b>121. Pullman Standard Car Mfg. Co. v. Local Union No. 2928 of United Steelworkers of America</b></p> <p>152 F.2d 493, C.C.A.7 (Ill.), 1945</p> <p>Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division; Michael L. Igoe, Judge. Action for libel by the Pullman Standard Car...</p>	Case			632
Mentioned	<p> <b>122. Railroad Commission of California v. Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Co.</b></p> <p>58 S.Ct. 334, U.S.Cal., 1938</p> <p>Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California. Suit by the Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Company against the Railroad Commission of the State...</p>	Case			646
Mentioned	<p> <b>123. Reagan v. Farmers' Loan &amp; Trust Co.</b></p> <p>14 S.Ct. 1047, U.S.Tex., 1894</p> <p>Appeal from the circuit court of the United States for the western district of Texas.</p>	Case			631

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	 <b>124. Rindge Co. v. Los Angeles County</b> 43 S.Ct. 689, U.S.Cal., 1923 In Error to the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, Second Appellate District, Division 1. Condemnation proceedings by the County of Los Angeles against the Rindge...	Case			646
Discussed	 <b>125. Rochester Telephone Corporation v. U.S.</b> 59 S.Ct. 754, U.S.N.Y., 1939 Suit in equity by the Rochester Telephone Corporation against the United States of America and the Federal Communications Commission to review an order of the Federal...	Case		”	640+
Mentioned	<b>126. Santa Fe Pac. R. Co. v. Lane</b> 37 S.Ct. 714, U.S.Dist.Col., 1917 APPEAL from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia to review a decree which affirmed a decree of the Supreme Court of the District, dismissing the bill in a suit to...	Case			640
Cited	 <b>127. Schenley Distillers Corp. v. U.S.</b> 66 S.Ct. 247, U.S.Del., 1946 Action by Schenley Distillers Corporation and Schenley Distilleries Motor Division, Inc., against the United States and others to set aside an order of the Interstate Commerce...	Case			639
Cited	 <b>128. Schneiderman v. U.S.</b> 63 S.Ct. 1333, U.S.Cal., 1943 On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Action by the United States of America against William Schneiderman for cancellation of...	Case			660+
Discussed	 <b>129. Shields v. Utah Idaho Cent. R. Co.</b> 59 S.Ct. 160, U.S.Utah, 1938 On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. Suit by the Utah Idaho Central Railroad Company against Dan B. Shields, individually and...	Case			632+
Cited	 <b>130. Southern Ry. Co. v. Commonwealth of Virginia ex rel. Shirley</b> 54 S.Ct. 148, U.S.Va., 1933 Proceeding by the Commonwealth of Virginia, at the relation of H. G. Shirley, State Highway Commissioner, against the Southern Railway Company, to force defendant to build an...	Case		”	643+

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	 <b>131. Spalding v. Vilas</b> 16 S.Ct. 631, U.S.Dist.Col., 1896 Error to the Supreme Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.	Case			632+
Cited	 <b>132. Spanel v. Pegler</b> 160 F.2d 619, C.C.A.7 (Ill.), 1947 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division; Elwyn R. Shaw, Judge. Libel action by A. N. Spanel and the...	Case			632+
Mentioned	<b>133. Springer v. U.S.</b> 1880 WL 18806, U.S.Ill., 1880 The central and controlling question in this case is whether the tax which was levied on the income, gains, and profits of the plaintiff in error, as set forth in the record, and...	Case			646
Cited	<b>134. Standard Computing Scale Co. v. Farrell</b> 39 S.Ct. 380, U.S.N.Y., 1919 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Suit by the Standard Computing Scale Company against John F. Farrell, State...	Case			640+
Cited	 <b>135. Stark v. Wickard</b> 64 S.Ct. 559, U.S.Dist.Col., 1944 A class action by Delbert O. Stark, A.F. Stratton, A. R. Denton, G. Stebbins, and F. Walsh against Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to enjoin the...	Case			639+
Cited	<b>136. State of Louisiana v. McAdoo</b> 34 S.Ct. 938, U.S.La., 1914 MOTION for leave to file a petition against the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to review their official judgment as to the rate of duty to be exacted on...	Case		”	665+
Mentioned	<b>137. Straus v. Foxworth</b> 34 S.Ct. 42, U.S.N.M., 1913 APPEAL from the Supreme Court of the Territory of New Mexico to review a decree which affirmed a decree of the District Court for the County of Quay, in that territory, sustaining...	Case			662
Mentioned	 <b>138. Sung v. McGrath</b> 70 S.Ct. 445, U.S.Dist.Col., 1950 Habeas corpus proceeding by Wong Yang Sung, opposed by Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, and Watson B. Miller, United States Commissioner of Immigration and...	Case			645+

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	 <b>139. Switchmen's Union of North America v. National Mediation Board</b> 64 S.Ct. 95, U.S.Dist.Col., 1943 Action by Switchmen's Union of North America, in its own right, etc., T. C. Cashen and others, against National Mediation Board, George A. Cook, William M. Leiserson, and others,...	Case			647
Cited	 <b>140. Tennessee Elec. Power Co. v. Tennessee Val. Authority</b> 59 S.Ct. 366, U.S.Tenn., 1939 On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee. Suit in equity by the Tennessee Electric Power Company and others, against the Tennessee...	Case			638+
Cited	 <b>141. Terrace v. Thompson</b> 44 S.Ct. 15, U.S.Wash., 1923 Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. Suit in equity by Frank Terrace and others against Lindsay L. Thompson, Attorney General of the...	Case			640
Cited	<b>142. Thompson v. Wallin</b> 95 N.E.2d 806, N.Y., 1950 Separate actions by Robert Thompson, as Chairman of the Communist Party of the State of New York, and others, against William J. Wallin, and others constituting the Board of...	Case			649
Discussed	 <b>143. Truax v. Raich</b> 36 S.Ct. 7, U.S.Ariz., 1915 APPEAL from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona to review a decree enjoining the enforcement of the Arizona anti-alien labor law. Affirmed. See same...	Case			633+
Mentioned	 <b>144. Tutun v. U.S.</b> 46 S.Ct. 425, U.S.N.Y., 1926 On Certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. On Certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit...	Case			647
Mentioned	 <b>145. U. S. v. Baltimore &amp; O. R. Co.</b> 55 S.Ct. 268, U.S.Ohio, 1935 Suit by Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company and others against United States and others. Decree for plaintiffs (5 F.Supp. 929), and defendants appeal. Affirmed.	Case			640

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Mentioned	 <b>146. U.S. ex rel. Dunlap v. Black</b> 9 S.Ct. 12, U.S.Dist.Col., 1888 Errors to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.	Case			646
Discussed	 <b>147. U.S. ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy</b> 70 S.Ct. 309, U.S.N.Y., 1950 Habeas corpus proceedings by the United States, on the relation of Ellen Knauff, against Edward J. Shaughnessy, Acting Director of Immigration and Naturalization, to determine the...	Case			646+
Cited	 <b>148. U.S. ex rel. Turner v. Fisher</b> 32 S.Ct. 37, U.S.Dist.Col., 1911 IN ERROR to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia to review a judgment which, on a second appeal, affirmed a judgment of the Supreme Court of the District, refusing...	Case		”	646
Mentioned	 <b>149. U.S. v. Abilene &amp; S. Ry. Co.</b> 44 S.Ct. 565, U.S.Kan., 1924 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas. Suit by the Abilene & Southern Railway Company and others against the United States and another....	Case			646
Cited	 <b>150. U.S. v. Babcock</b> 39 S.Ct. 464, U.S.Ct.Cl., 1919 Appeals from the Court of Claims. Two actions, one by Conrad S. Babcock and the other by Herbert B. Hayden, against the United States. From judgments for plaintiffs (53 Ct. Cl....	Case			646
Mentioned	 <b>151. U.S. v. Butler</b> 56 S.Ct. 312, U.S.Mass., 1936 Mr. Justice STONE, Mr. Justice BRANDEIS, and Mr. Justice CARDOZO, dissenting. On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit...	Case			632
Mentioned	<b>152. U.S. v. Central Supply Ass'n</b> 34 F.Supp. 241, N.D.Ohio, 1940 Action by the United States of America against the Central Supply Association and others. On motions for an order releasing witnesses before grand jury from oath of secrecy and...	Case			664
Cited	 <b>153. U.S. v. Chemical Foundation</b> 47 S.Ct. 1, U.S.Del., 1926 Appeal from the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Action by the United States against the Chemical Foundation, Incorporated. Judgment of the District Court,...	Case			659+

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	 <b>154. U.S. v. Ferreira</b> 1851 WL 6673, U.S.Fla., 1851 (Mr. Justice WAYNE did not sit in this cause.) THIS was an appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida. The facts of the case are...	Case			640
Mentioned	 <b>155. U.S. v. George S. Bush &amp; Co., Inc.</b> 60 S.Ct. 944, U.S., 1940 Mr. Justice McREYNOLDS dissenting. On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. Proceeding by George S. Bush & Company, Incorporated, against the...	Case			646
Cited	 <b>156. U.S. v. Hellard</b> 64 S.Ct. 985, U.S.Okla., 1944 Action commenced in the State District Court of Oklahoma by D. B. Hellard against the heirs of intestate allottee by restricted tax-exempt Indian land, to quiet title to such land...	Case			649
Mentioned	<b>157. U.S. v. Illinois Cent. R. Co.</b> 54 S.Ct. 471, U.S.Del., 1934 Suit by the Illinois Central Railroad Company and others against the United States and others. From an adverse decree (3 F.Supp. 1005), defendants appeal. Reversed.	Case			646
Cited	 <b>158. U.S. v. Lee</b> 1 S.Ct. 240, U.S.Va., 1882 In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.	Case			638
Discussed	 <b>159. U.S. v. Los Angeles &amp; S.L.R. Co.</b> 47 S.Ct. 413, U.S.Cal., 1927 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California. Suit by the Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company against the United States, with...	Case		”	633+
Discussed	 <b>160. U.S. v. Lovett</b> 66 S.Ct. 1073, U.S.Ct.Cl., 1946 Actions by Robert Morss Lovett, by Goodwin B. Watson, and by William E. Dodd, Jr., against the United States to recover compensation for services rendered. To review adverse...	Case			626+
Cited	 <b>161. U.S. v. Morton Salt Co.</b> 70 S.Ct. 357, U.S.Ill., 1950 Actions by the United States against the Morton Salt Company and the International Salt Company for mandatory injunctions commanding the respondents to file special and additional...	Case			655

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Mentioned	<p> <b>162. U.S. v. Petrillo</b></p> <p>67 S.Ct. 1538, U.S.III., 1947</p> <p>James C. Petrillo was charged by information with violating the Communications Act of 1934, s 506, as added in 1946, 47 U.S.C.A. s 506, by attempting to coerce and compel a...</p>	Case			660
Discussed	<p> <b>163. United Public Workers of America (C.I.O.) v. Mitchell</b></p> <p>67 S.Ct. 556, U.S.Dist.Col., 1947</p> <p>Action by the United Public Workers of America (C.I.O.) and others against Harry B. Mitchell and others, to enjoin enforcement as to petitioners of a provision in Section 9(a) of...</p>	Case			630+
Cited	<p><b>164. Utah Fuel Co. v. National Bituminous Coal Commission</b></p> <p>59 S.Ct. 409, U.S.Dist.Col., 1939</p> <p>On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Suit by the Utah Fuel Company and others against the National Bituminous Coal Commission...</p>	Case			632
Mentioned	<p> <b>165. Waite v. Macy</b></p> <p>38 S.Ct. 395, U.S.N.Y., 1918</p> <p>Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Bill by George H. Macy, Oliver C. Macy, George S. Clapp, T. Ridgway Macy, and Irving K. Hall, doing...</p>	Case			640
Mentioned	<p> <b>166. West Ohio Gas Co. v. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio</b></p> <p>55 S.Ct. 316, U.S.Ohio, 1935</p> <p>Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio. Proceedings by the West Ohio Gas Company to review a gas rate ordinance of the City of Lima. An order of the Public Utilities...</p>	Case			646
Cited	<p> <b>167. Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Glander</b></p> <p>69 S.Ct. 1291, U.S.Ohio, 1949</p> <p>Proceedings by C. Emory Glander, Tax Commissioner of Ohio, wherein ad valorem taxes had been assessed against intangible property owned by the Wheeling Steel Corporation, and the...</p>	Case			656
Cited	<p> <b>168. Work v. U.S. ex rel. Rives</b></p> <p>45 S.Ct. 252, U.S.Dist.Col., 1925</p> <p>Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. Mandamus by the United States, on the relation of Logan Rives, against Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior....</p>	Case			666



Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Mentioned	<p><b>169. Wright v. Farm Journal</b></p> <p>158 F.2d 976, C.C.A.2 (N.Y.), 1947</p> <p>Appeal from the United States for the District Court for the Souther District of New York. Action by Archie Wright against Farm Journal, Inc., and another, to recover damages for...</p>	Case			632
Cited	<p> <b>170. Yakus v. U. S.</b></p> <p>64 S.Ct. 660, U.S.Mass., 1944</p> <p>Albert Yakus, Benjamin Rottenberg, and B. Rottenberg, Inc., were convicted of making sales of wholesale cuts of beef at prices above maximum prices prescribed by Revised Maximum...</p>	Case			647
Cited	<p> <b>171. Yamataya v. Fisher</b></p> <p>23 S.Ct. 611, U.S.Wash., 1903</p> <p>ON APPEAL from the District Court of the United States for the District of Washington to review a decree dismissing a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the detention of an...</p>	Case		”	643+
Mentioned	<p><b>172. Youngstown Sheet &amp; Tube Co. v. U. S.</b></p> <p>55 S.Ct. 822, U.S.Ohio, 1935</p> <p>Suit by the Youngstown Sheet &amp; Tube Company, the Republic Steel Corporation and others against the United States of America and others. From a decree (7 F.Supp. 33) dismissing the...</p>	Case			639