

210 Mo. 502

Supreme Court of Missouri, Division No. 2.

CITY OF ST. LOUIS

v.

GLONER.

March 17, 1908.

Synopsis

Error to St. Louis Court of Criminal Correction; Hiram N. Moore, Judge.

Jacob Gloner was prosecuted, under a provision of the municipal code of the city of St. Louis, for unlawfully standing on the street corners, and acquitted, and the city brings error. Judgment affirmed.

West Headnotes (2)

[1] **Constitutional Law** 🔑 **Personal Liberty**
Labor and Employment 🔑 **Picketing**
Ordinances

92 Constitutional Law

92VII Constitutional Rights in General

92VII(B) Particular Constitutional Rights

92k1079 Personal Liberty

(Formerly 92k83(1))

231H Labor and Employment

231HXII Labor Relations

231HXII(F) Disputes and Concerted Activities

231HXII(F)1 In General

231Hk1347 Picketing Ordinances

(Formerly 232Ak285 Labor Relations)

St. Louis City Charter, art. 3, § 26, cl. 2, authorizes the city to regulate the use of its streets, and the municipal code of the city, section 1460, provides that any person who shall lounge, stand, or loaf around or at street corners or other public places shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. V.A.M.S.Const. art. 2, § 4, guarantees to every citizen the right of personal liberty. Defendant was prosecuted under section 1460 for standing on the street corners; he being at the time engaged in picketing the premises of a store whose employes were on a strike, and

was conducting himself in an orderly manner and not interfering with travel. *Held*, that defendant had the right to stop and remain on the street, so long as he conducted himself properly and did not interfere with the use of the street, and the ordinance was unconstitutional, as infringing upon the right of personal liberty, and was unreasonable and oppressive.

[23 Cases that cite this headnote](#)

[2] **Municipal Corporations** 🔑 **Reasonableness**
and Validity of Regulations in General

268 Municipal Corporations

268XI Use and Regulation of Public Places, Property, and Works

268XI(A) Streets and Other Public Ways

268k660 Power to Control and Regulate

268k661 In General

268k661(2) Reasonableness and Validity of Regulations in General

While the city of St. Louis, under the direct provisions of article 3, § 26, cl. 2, of its charter, Ann.St.1906, p. 4809, has the power to regulate the use of its streets, it may not do so in a way that interferes with the personal liberty of a citizen as guaranteed to him by the Constitution and laws.

[6 Cases that cite this headnote](#)

Attorneys and Law Firms

*31 Charles W. Bates and Charles P. Williams, for plaintiff in error.

C. J. Anderson, for defendant in error.

Opinion

BURGESS, J.

This was a prosecution under section 1460 of the municipal code of the city of St. Louis, which reads as follows: "Any person who shall, on Sunday or any other day of the week, disturb the peace by any noisy, riotous or disorderly conduct in any park, street, alley, highway, thoroughfare or other public place or public resort for pleasure or amusement or other purposes, or any person or persons who shall lounge, stand or loaf around or about or at street corners or other

public places, in the day or night time, or who shall use indecent, loud or profane language on the public street or other public place or who shall purchase or otherwise obtain any beer, wine or spirituous or malt liquors by the measure or in quantities greater than one-half pint, and drink the same upon the public streets, alleys, parks, or other public thoroughfares or places in the city, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, before either of the police justices, shall be fined in the sum of not less than five or more than fifty dollars. The above provision not to apply to workingmen drinking beer at lunch or dinner at their places of work.” The information substantially charges that the defendant violated said ordinance on the 4th day of August, 1904, and on divers other days and times prior thereto, by unlawfully lounging, standing, and loafing around and about and at certain public street corners and other public places, to wit, Eleventh street and Washington avenue, in the day and night time, in the city of St. Louis. This case was first tried in one of the police courts of said city, whence an appeal was taken to the St. Louis court of criminal correction.

The testimony tends to show that on August 4, 1904, there was a strike of the employes of the Harris Bros. Clothing Company, whose place of business was at 1128 Washington avenue, in the city of St. Louis, and that defendant and three other strikers were doing what is termed “picket duty” at the corner of Eleventh street and Washington avenue, near the business place of said clothing company. Officer Person, who arrested defendant on said August 4th, testified that he had seen defendant at the corner of Eleventh street and Washington avenue the morning he arrested him, and had seen him there on prior mornings and evenings. The police officer further testified as follows: “Q. Was he doing anything but standing on the corner? A. No, sir. Q. Was he blocking the corner? A. No, sir. Q. How wide is the sidewalk there? A. Ten or twelve feet. Q. He was standing on the sidewalk on the corner, and you told him to move on? A. Yes, sir. Q. He wasn't talking to any one? A. No, sir. Q. There was a strike on, and these men were simply doing what is called 'picket duty'? A. Yes, sir. Q. As I understand, picket duty consists in standing around corners and requesting men not to take striker's places. A. Yes, sir. Q. That was what this man was doing as they came from work in the evening? A. Yes, sir. Q. In other words, during this time there was nothing in his action that you as a police officer deemed it necessary to arrest him for? A. I watched him for two or three days. Q. You made the arrest, not because he was obstructing the sidewalk, but because he was doing picket duty? A. Because he was doing picket duty, and I was informed that they must stop it.” The

witness further testified that he saw the defendant stop and talk to some of the employes of the company against which the strike was directed. Three other witnesses, employes of the said company, testified to seeing the defendant standing on the street corner several mornings and evenings before the day he was arrested.

At the close of the city's case the defendant moved the court to discharge him, on the ground that the evidence introduced by the city was insufficient to support a conviction, which motion was sustained, and the court rendered judgment discharging the defendant. Plaintiff filed motion for a new trial, which was overruled by the court. The case is before this court upon a writ of error.

While the city of St. Louis is given power by the second clause of section 26, art. 3, of its charter (Ann. St. 1906, p. 4809), to regulate the use of its streets, the question here presented is as to whether it had the right, under the provisions of its charter, to pass the ordinance upon which this prosecution is based, and which makes it a misdemeanor, punishable by fine, for any person to lounge, stand, or loaf around or about or at street corners or other public places, in the day or night time. There is no pretense that defendant was at the time of this arrest in any way obstructing the street, or interfering with the rights of any other person, or conducting *32 himself in a disorderly manner; the only charge against him being that he violated said ordinance on the 4th day of August, 1904, and on divers other days and times prior thereto, by unlawfully lounging, standing, and loafing around and about and at certain public street corners and other public places, to wit, Eleventh street and Washington avenue, in the day and night time. While the city has the undoubted right, under its charter, to regulate the use of its streets, it has no right to do so in a way that interferes with the personal liberty of the citizen as guaranteed to him by our Constitution and laws. Under this ordinance it is just as much an offense to stand or loaf around upon the corner of one of the streets in the city for five minutes as for two hours or more, time not being an ingredient of the offense; and this, too, regardless of the fact that the offender may not during that time impede the passage of other pedestrians or otherwise interfere with the rights of others. The defendant had the unquestioned right to go where he pleased, and to stop and remain upon the corner of any street that he might desire, so long as he conducted himself in a decent and orderly manner, disturbing no one, nor interfering with any one's right to the use of the street.

Is the ordinance in question, then, restrictive of or in violation of the right of personal liberty guaranteed to every citizen by section 4, article 2, of the Constitution (Ann. St. 1906, p. 128) of this state? In *City of St. Louis v. Roche*, 128 Mo. 541, 31 S. W. 915, a city ordinance making it an offense for any one to knowingly associate with persons having the reputation of being thieves, gamblers, etc., for the purpose of aiding and abetting such persons in their unlawful acts, was held invalid, because an invasion of personal liberty. That case was followed in *Ex parte Smith*, 135 Mo. 223, 36 S. W. 628, 33 L. R. A. 606, 58 Am. St. Rep. 576. In the case of *Pinkerton v. Verberg*, 78 Mich. 573, 44 N. W. 579, 7 L. R. A. 507, 18 Am. St. Rep. 473, it is said: "Personal liberty, which is guaranteed to every citizen under our Constitution and laws, consists of the right of locomotion, to go where one pleases, and when, and to do that which may lead to one's business or pleasure, only so far restrained as the rights of others may make it necessary for the welfare of all other citizens. One may travel along the public highways or in public places; and while conducting themselves in a decent and orderly manner, disturbing no other, and interfering with the rights of no other citizens there, they will be protected under the law, not only in their persons, but in their safe conduct. The Constitution and the laws are framed for the public good, and the protection of all citizens, from the highest to the lowest; and no one may be restrained of his liberty unless he has transgressed some law. Any law which would place the keeping and safe conduct of another in the hands of even a conservator of the peace, unless for some breach of the peace committed in his presence, or upon suspicion of felony, would be most oppressive and unjust, and destroy all the rights which our Constitution guarantees. These are rights which existed long before our Constitution, and we have taken just pride in their maintenance, making them a part of the fundamental law of the land."

It is, however, said for the city that "John Smith, a member of the public, has no right for his own private purposes, whatever they may be, to take his stand for a period of two hours every day upon a particular portion of the public street in a great and populous city." That he has such right there can, in our opinion, be no question, providing he conducts himself in a peaceful, orderly manner, disturbs no one, and commits no overt act. In this case, according to the testimony of the officer who made the arrest, he arrested the defendant for the purpose of preventing him from doing "picket duty," which, as explained by the court, consisted in requesting men not

to take the places of strikers. In the case of *Marx & Haas Jeans Clothing Co. v. Watson*, 168 Mo. 133, 67 S. W. 391, 56 L. R. A. 951, 90 Am. St. Rep. 440, Judge Sherwood, speaking for the court, said: "If these defendants are not permitted to tell the story of their wrongs, or, if you please, their supposed wrongs, by word of mouth, or with pen or print, and to endeavor to persuade others to aid them by all peaceable means, in securing redress of such wrongs, what becomes of free speech, and what of personal liberty? The fact that in exercising that freedom they thereby do plaintiff an actionable injury, such fact does not go a hair towards a diminution of their right of free speech, etc., for the exercise of which, if resulting in such injury, the Constitution makes them expressly responsible." In passing upon a similar question in the case of *Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co. v. Saxey*, 131 Mo. 212, 32 S. W. 1106, 52 Am. St. Rep. 622, Judge Valliant, speaking for the court, said: "They are free men, and have a right to quit the employ of plaintiffs whenever they see fit to do so, and no one can prevent them; and whether their act of quitting is wise or unwise, just or unjust, it is nobody's business but their own, and they have a right to use fair persuasion to induce others to join them in their quitting." In *Beaton v. Tarrant*, 102 Ill. App. 124, it was held that workmen may use the streets and highways in a manner not inconsistent with public travel, for the purpose of entreaty, inducement, and peaceable persuasion in good faith. The same rule practically is announced in *Karges Furniture Co. v. Amalgamated Woodworkers Local Union*, 165 Ind. 421, 75 N. E. 877, 2 L. R. A. (N. S.) 788, in which it is said: "Argument and peaceable persuasion are lawful means to prevent laborers from working for an employer *33 against whom the labor union has ordered a strike."

Our conclusion is that the ordinance is unconstitutional and invalid, because it infringes upon the right of personal liberty, and is unreasonable and oppressive.

The judgment is affirmed.

All concur.

All Citations

210 Mo. 502, 109 S.W. 30, 15 L.R.A.N.S. 973, 124 Am.St.Rep. 750

End of Document

© 2021 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S.
Government Works.

Citing References (57)

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Discussed by	1. W.E. Stewart Land Co. v. Perkins ¶¶ 234 S.W. 653, 655+ , Mo. Appeal from Circuit Court, Jackson County; Harris Robinson, Judge. Action by the W. E. Stewart Land Company against S. P. Perkins. Judgment for defendant, when plaintiff elected to...	Oct. 11, 1921	Case		—
Discussed by	2. Hughes v. Kansas City Motion Picture Machine Operators, Local No. 170 221 S.W. 95, 98+ , Mo. Appeal from Circuit Court, Jackson County; T. J. Seehorn, Judge. Suit by John E. Hughes and Wesley H. Briner, copartners under the name Eastern Theater, against the Kansas City...	Apr. 01, 1920	Case		—
Discussed by	3. Territory v. Anduha ¶¶ 1930 WL 2894, *2+ , Hawai'i Terr. It is not within the police power of the legislature to enact a statute making it a misdemeanor, punishable by fine or imprisonment or both, for any person, under all...	May 19, 1930	Case		—
Cited by	4. Truax v. Corrigan 42 S.Ct. 124, 142+ , U.S.Ariz. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona. Action by William Truax and another as copartners doing business under the firm name and style of William Truax, against...	Dec. 19, 1921	Case		—
Cited by	5. City of Springfield v. Stevens ¶¶ 216 S.W.2d 450, 462+ , Mo. Freddie Stevens was convicted of violating an ordinance of the city of Springfield, Missouri, prohibiting taxicab drivers from having in their possession or transporting in their...	Jan. 07, 1949	Case		—
Cited by	6. Fred Wolferman, Inc. v. Root 204 S.W.2d 733, 735+ , Mo. Action by Fred Wolferman, Inc., a corporation, against Howard P. Root and another, individually, and as business agent and president respectively, and as representative members of...	Sep. 08, 1947	Case		—
Cited by	7. City of St. Louis v. Sagan 109 S.W. 33, 33 , Mo. Error to St. Louis Court of Criminal Correction; Hiram N. Moore, Judge. Morris Sagan was prosecuted, under a provision of the municipal code of the city of St. Louis, for...	Mar. 17, 1908	Case		—
Cited by	8. City of St. Louis v. Caplan 109 S.W. 33, 33 , Mo. Error to St. Louis Court of Criminal Correction; Hiram N. Moore, Judge. Sam Caplan was prosecuted, under a provision of the municipal code of the city of St. Louis, for unlawfully...	Mar. 17, 1908	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	9. City of St. Louis v. Abramovitz 109 S.W. 33, 33 , Mo. Error to St. Louis Court of Criminal Correction; Hiram N. Moore, Judge. Sam Abramovitz was prosecuted, under a provision of the municipal code of the city of St. Louis, for...	Mar. 17, 1908	Case		—
Cited by	10. Root v. Anderson 207 S.W. 255, 257 , Mo.App. Appeal from St. Louis Circuit Court; Wilson A. Taylor, Judge. "Not to be officially published." Action by Frank L. Root against Roy Anderson and others. Demurrer to petition...	Dec. 03, 1918	Case		—
Cited by	11. Berry Foundry Co. v. International Moulders Union 164 S.W. 245, 245 , Mo.App. Appeal from Circuit Court, Buchanan County; L. J. Eastin, Judge. Action by the Berry Foundry Company against the International Moulders Union and others. From a judgment for...	Jan. 19, 1914	Case		—
Cited by	12. Ex parte Heffron 162 S.W. 652, 659+ , Mo.App. Original habeas corpus proceeding by William H. Heffron and others. Petitioners discharged.	Dec. 31, 1913	Case		—
Cited by	13. Territory of Hawaii v. Anduha 48 F.2d 171, 172 , C.C.A.9 (Hawai'i) Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii. Proceeding between the Territory of Hawaii and Camelio Anduha. Judgment adverse to the Territory was affirmed by the...	Mar. 23, 1931	Case		—
Cited by	14. Orloff v. Los Angeles Turf Club 208 P.2d 987, 994+ , Cal.App. 2 Dist. Appeal from Superior Court, Los Angeles County; Charles S. Burnell, Judge. Action by Morris Orloff against the Los Angeles Turf Club, Inc., and Raymond H. Williams, to enjoin...	Aug. 12, 1949	Case		—
Cited by	15. Soles v. City of Vidalia 90 S.E.2d 249, 252 , Ga.App. Defendant was convicted in City Recorder's Court of violating city ordinance against idling and loitering. The Superior Court, Toombs County, R. H. Humphrey, J., rendered judgment...	Oct. 11, 1955	Case		—
Cited by	16. People v. Owens 164 N.W.2d 712, 721 , Mich.App. Defendant was convicted of contributing to delinquency of a runaway minor girl. The Recorder's Court of Detroit, Wayne County, Frank G. Schemanske, J., entered judgment of...	Sep. 26, 1968	Case		—
Cited by	17. State v. Cooper 285 N.W. 903, 907+ , Minn. Appeal from Municipal Court of Minneapolis; Fred B. Wright, Judge. Jake Cooper was convicted of disorderly conduct under an ordinance, and he appeals. Affirmed.	May 19, 1939	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Cited by	<p> 18. City of Reno v. Second Judicial District Court in and for Washoe County ”</p> <p>95 P.2d 994, 1003+ , Nev.</p> <p>Original certiorari proceedings by the City of Reno against the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe, against William McKnight,...</p>	Nov. 21, 1939	Case		—
Cited by	<p> 19. City of Dayton v. Allen ”</p> <p>271 N.E.2d 574, 579+ , Ohio Mun.</p> <p>Proceedings on motion to dismiss affidavit. The Municipal Court, Rice, J., held that Dayton ordinance, prohibiting one from knowingly congregating in or about place where certain...</p>	May 18, 1971	Case		—
Cited by	<p> 20. Ex parte Mittelstaedt ”</p> <p>297 S.W.2d 153, 155 , Tex.Crim.App.</p> <p>Habeas corpus proceeding by person confined under charge of violation of allegedly void ordinance. The 94th Judicial District Court, Nueces County, Tillman Smith, J., denied...</p>	Nov. 07, 1956	Case		—
Cited by	<p>21. Ex parte Stout</p> <p>198 S.W. 967, 969+ , Tex.Crim.App.</p> <p>Habeas corpus by Tom O. Stout, who was convicted of picketing in violation of an ordinance of El Paso. Relator remanded to custody of marshal.</p>	Nov. 21, 1917	Case		—
Cited by	<p>22. City of Huntington v. Salyer</p> <p>63 S.E.2d 575, 578 , W.Va.</p> <p>Oscar Salyer was convicted in the Circuit Court of Cabell County of vagrancy as defined by ordinance of the City of Huntington, and he brought error. The Supreme Court of Appeals,...</p>	Feb. 13, 1951	Case		—
Cited by	<p>23. The Honorable George M. Kittle</p> <p>43 W. Va. Op. Atty. Gen. 120</p> <p>We have your letter of January 14, 1949, as follows: "The County Court of Barbour County, West Virginia has entered the following order: 'It appearing to the Court that persons...</p>	Feb. 04, 1949	Administrative Decision		—
Mentioned by	<p>24. F.C. Church Shoe Co. v. Turner</p> <p>279 S.W. 232, 236 , Mo.App.</p> <p>Appeal from St. Louis Circuit Court; Frank Landwehr, Judge. Suit in equity by the F. C. Church Shoe Company against Percy Turner and others. Judgment for defendants, and plaintiff...</p>	Jan. 05, 1926	Case		—
Mentioned by	<p>25. City of Carthage v. Block</p> <p>123 S.W. 483, 485 , Mo.App.</p> <p>Appeal from Circuit Court, Jasper County; Howard Gray, Judge. Moses Block was convicted of violating an ordinance of the City of Carthage, and appealed to the circuit court. From...</p>	Dec. 06, 1909	Case		—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Mentioned by	 26. Ricks v. District of Columbia 414 F.2d 1097, 1104 , D.C.Cir. District of Columbia Court of Appeals affirmed a judgment of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, Harold H. Green, C.J., finding defendant guilty of vagrancy, 228...	Dec. 23, 1968	Case		—
Mentioned by	 27. Local Union No. 313, Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance, v. Stathakis 205 S.W. 450, 454 , Ark. Appeal from Pulaski Chancery Court; Jno. E. Martineau, Chancellor. Suit for injunction by Joe Stathakis against Local Union No. 313, Hotel and Restaurant Employéés' International...	July 01, 1918	Case		—
Mentioned by	28. In re Huddleson 40 Cal.Rptr. 581, 587+ , Cal.App. 1 Dist. Two proceedings involving validity of statute prohibiting loitering near schools, etc. In a habeas corpus proceeding, the Superior Court, County of San Francisco, Francis McCarty,...	Sep. 14, 1964	Case		—
Mentioned by	 29. State v. Bloss 613 P.2d 354, 357 , Hawai'i State appealed from a judgment of the District Court, First Circuit, Honolulu Division, City and County of Honolulu, Kenneth W. Harada, J., which found statute prohibiting minors...	June 17, 1980	Case		—
Mentioned by	30. Com. v. Carpenter 91 N.E.2d 666, 667 , Mass. George P. Carpenter was convicted in Superior Court, Buttrick, J., of wilfully and unreasonably sauntering and loitering in a public street for more than seven minutes after being...	Mar. 29, 1950	Case		—
Mentioned by	31. Steffes v. Motion Picture Mach. Operators' Union 161 N.W. 524, 525 , Minn. Appeal from District Court, Hennepin County; Joseph W. Molyneaux, Judge. Action for an injunction by Albert Steffes against the Motion Picture Machine Operators' Union and others. ...	Feb. 23, 1917	Case		—
Mentioned by	 32. State v. Caez 195 A.2d 496, 498+ , N.J.Super.A.D. Defendant was convicted of loitering in violation of city ordinance. The County Court entered judgment, and the defendant appealed. The Appellate Division of the Superior Court,...	Nov. 25, 1963	Case		—
Mentioned by	 33. Elwell v. Township of Lower 2006 WL 3797974, *19 , N.J.Super.L. This action filed on November 28, 2005, presents four legal challenges to the validity of Lower Township's Ordinance No.2005-14 adopted in August 2005, and as amended on December...	Dec. 22, 2006	Case		—


Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
Mentioned by	<p> 34. People v. Beltrand 314 N.Y.S.2d 276, 281 , N.Y.City Crim.Ct.</p> <p>Proceeding on motion to dismiss information and in the alternative to suppress evidence allegedly seized as result of unlawful search and seizure. The Criminal Court of the City...</p>	Sep. 14, 1970	Case		—
Mentioned by	<p>35. Ex parte Smythe 28 S.W.2d 161, 163 , Tex.Crim.App.</p> <p>Commissioners' Decision. Appeal from Harrison County Court; Jno. W. Scott, Judge. Habeas corpus proceedings by A. M. Smythe. From an order remanding relator, he appeals. Reversed,...</p>	May 14, 1930	Case		—
Mentioned by	<p> 36. City of Seattle v. Pullman 514 P.2d 1059, 1064 , Wash.</p> <p>Defendant was convicted before the Superior Court, King County, Stanley Soderland, J., of violating city ordinance prohibiting the accompanying of a child during curfew hours, and...</p>	Sep. 27, 1973	Case		—
Mentioned by	<p> 37. City of Seattle v. Jones 488 P.2d 750, 752 , Wash.</p> <p>Defendant was convicted in the Superior Court, King County, Solie M. Ringold, J., of violations of city prostitute-loitering ordinance, and she appealed. The Court of Appeals,...</p>	Sep. 09, 1971	Case		—
Mentioned by	<p> 38. City of Seattle v. Drew 423 P.2d 522, 524+ , Wash.</p> <p>Prosecution for violation of loitering ordinance. The Superior Court, King County, Howard J. Thompson, J., held the ordinance unconstitutional, and the state appealed. The...</p>	Feb. 02, 1967	Case		—
Mentioned by	<p>39. City of Yakima v. Johnson 553 P.2d 1104, 1105 , Wash.App. Div. 3</p> <p>Defendant was convicted in the Superior Court, Yakima County, Carl L. Loy, J., of soliciting prostitution in violation of ordinance of city of Yakima and she appealed. The Court...</p>	Aug. 20, 1976	Case		—
Mentioned by	<p> 40. City of Mountlake Terrace v. Stone 492 P.2d 226, 229 , Wash.App. Div. 1</p> <p>Defendant was convicted before the Municipal Court of violating city ordinance making it a misdemeanor to refuse or neglect, after due notice, to make or furnish a statement,...</p>	Dec. 20, 1971	Case		—
—	<p>41. Validity, Construction, and Application of State Statutes and Municipal Ordinances Proscribing Failure or Refusal to Obey Police Officer's Order to Move On, or Disperse, on Street, as Disorderly Conduct 52 A.L.R.6th 125</p> <p>Many states and municipalities have statutes and ordinances proscribing the failure to obey a police officer's order to disperse in the context of disorderly conduct. Many...</p>	2010	ALR	—	—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
—	42. Validity, construction, and application of loitering statutes and ordinances 72 A.L.R.5th 1 In an effort to eradicate undesirable behavior, cities, states, and other governmental entities have passed ordinances and statutes prohibiting loitering or loitering for a...	1999	ALR	—	—
—	43. Validity of statute or ordinance against picketing 35 A.L.R. 1200 The reported case for this annotation is Thomas v. City of Indianapolis, 195 Ind. 440, 145 N.E. 550, 35 A.L.R. 1194 (1924). This annotation is supplemented by 108 A.L.R. 1119, 122...	1925	ALR	—	—
—	44. Local Government Law s 14:37, § 14:37. Picketing and labor disputes First Amendment freedoms of speech and association protections apply to the public activities of labor organizations. Local regulatory authority in this area is preempted when in...	2021	Other Secondary Source	—	—
—	45. McQuillin The Law of Municipal Corporations s 24:423, § 24:423. Picketing and strikes Strikes, picketing, and industrial disputes generally are governed, insofar as they are subject to law, by federal and state statutes, however, ordinances relative to picketing...	2020	Other Secondary Source	—	—
—	46. Am. Jur. 2d Constitutional Law s 624, § 624. Rights in public vehicles and places for purposes of liberty interest of Due Process Clause Am. Jur. 2d Constitutional Law Under the constitutional guarantee of liberty one may, under normal conditions, move at his or her own inclination along the public highways or in public places, and while...	2021	Other Secondary Source	—	—
—	47. Am. Jur. 2d Highways, Streets, and Bridges s 197, § 197. Loitering or the like Am. Jur. 2d Highways, Streets, and Bridges Loitering on a public way in such a manner or to such an extent that it interferes with travelers constitutes a public nuisance. Municipalities have the authority to prohibit the...	2021	Other Secondary Source	—	—
—	48. CHICAGO'S BAN ON GANG LOITERING: MAKING SENSE OF VAGUENESS AND OVERBREADTH IN LOITERING LAWS 83 Calif. L. Rev. 379 , 417 Concern about increasing crime has motivated many municipalities across the county to enact loitering laws specifically aimed at drug activity, prostitution, violent crime, and...	1995	Law Review	—	—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
—	49. HAGUE v. CIO AND THE ROOTS OF PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINE: TRANSLATING LIMITS OF POWERS INTO INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS 28 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev. 533 , 566 Just as generations of American school children were taught that Columbus "discovered" America in 1492, generations of law students have been taught that Justices Holmes and...	1993	Law Review	—	—
—	50. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - PERSONAL RIGHTS: CIVIL - ORDINANCE REQUIRING PERSONS ON STREET AFTER ONE A.M. TO HAVE AND DISCLOSE LAWFUL PURPOSE HELD CONSTITUTIONAL. 63 Harv. L. Rev. 1060 , 1061 A municipal ordinance provided: "Between the hours of 1:00 and 5:00 o'clock A. M.... it shall be unlawful for any person to roam or be upon any street, alley or public place without...	1950	Law Review	—	—
—	51. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - DUE PROCESS OF LAW: PERSONAL RIGHTS - PROHIBITION OF LOITERING IN PUBLIC PLACES 45 Harv. L. Rev. 184 , 184 The defendant was prosecuted under a statute providing that "any person who shall habitually loaf, loiter, and/or idle upon any public street or highway or in any public place...	1931	Law Review	—	—
—	52. PROVING IDENTITY 44 Pepp. L. Rev. 731 , 798 United States law, over the past two hundred years or so, has subjected people whose race rendered them noncitizens or of dubious citizenship to a variety of rules requiring that...	2017	Law Review	—	—
—	53. A ROAD NOT TAKEN 26 Seton Hall Legis. J. 415 , 458 I. PREFACE. 416 II. INTRODUCTION. 416 III. POLICE POWER. 419 A. Initial Discretion. 419 B. Search and Seizure. 431 C. Warrants. 432 D. Relevant Factors. 433 E. Court...	2002	Law Review	—	—
—	54. STALKING HUMANS: IS THERE A NEED FOR FEDERALIZATION OF ANTI-STALKING LAWS IN ORDER TO PREVENT RECIDIVISM IN STALKING? 50 Syracuse L. Rev. 1067 , 1125 Introduction. 1068 I. Prevalence of Stalking. 1071 II. Psychological Aspects of Stalking. 1072 III. Cases Leading to Current Anti-Stalking Legislation. 1074 IV. Current...	2000	Law Review	—	—
—	55. VAGRANCY-TYPE LAW AND ITS ADMINISTRATION 104 U. Pa. L. Rev. 603 , 650 This study combines analysis of the history, theory and purposes of vagrancy-type laws with a report of their administration by the police, magistrates and correctional authorities...	1956	Law Review	—	—

Treatment	Title	Date	Type	Depth	Headnote(s)
—	56. USE OF VAGRANCY-TYPE LAWS FOR ARREST AND DETENTION OF SUSPICIOUS PERSONS 59 Yale L.J. 1351 , 1364 Individual liberty and the competing demands of crime prevention in the modern, highly-mobile community are often hard to reconcile. Faced with increasing crime as urban...	1950	Law Review	—	—
—	57. CONSTITUTIONALITY OF ANTI-PICKETING ORDINANCES 48 Yale L.J. 308 , 315+ Ever since the use of the labor injunction has been curtailed by the Norris-LaGuardia Act and its state prototypes, there has been an increasing resort to the sanctions of the...	1938	Law Review	—	—

Table of Authorities (7)

Treatment	Referenced Title	Type	Depth	Quoted	Page Number
Cited	<p>1. Beaton v. Tarrant 102 Ill.App. 124, Ill.App. 1 Dist., 1902</p> <p>Appellants, in an appendix to their brief, have favored us with the opinion of the learned chancellor who heard this case and who entered the restraining order herein. A careful...</p>	Case			32
Cited	<p>2. City of St. Louis v. Roche 31 S.W. 915, Mo., 1895</p> <p>Appeal from St. Louis criminal court; James R. Claiborne, Judge. Thomas Roche was convicted of knowingly associating with persons having the reputation of being thieves, and...</p>	Case			32
Cited	<p>3. Ex parte Smith 36 S.W. 628, Mo., 1896</p> <p>Proceedings in habeas corpus by Walter Smith, confined in the workhouse of the city of St. Louis under executions based on two judgments rendered against petitioner for infractions...</p>	Case			32
Cited	<p>4. Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co. v. Saxey 32 S.W. 1106, Mo., 1895</p> <p>Appeal from St. Louis circuit court. Bill by the Hamilton-Brown Shoe Company to enjoin A. J. Saxey and others from attempting, by threats and intimidation, to force complainant's...</p>	Case		”	32
Cited	<p> 5. Karges Furniture Co. v. Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 131 75 N.E. 877, Ind., 1905</p> <p>Appeal from Superior Court, Vanderburgh County; John H. Foster, Judge. Suit by the Karges Furniture Company against the Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 131 and others....</p>	Case			32
Cited	<p>6. Marx & Haas Jeans Clothing Co. v. Watson 67 S.W. 391, Mo., 1902</p> <p>In banc. Appeal from St. Louis circuit court; Leroy B. Valliant, Judge. Injunction by the Marx & Haas Jeans Clothing Company against Anthony Watson and others. A temporary...</p>	Case			32
Cited	<p>7. Pinkerton v. Verberg  44 N.W. 579, Mich., 1889</p> <p>Error to circuit court, Kalamazoo county; GEORGE M. BUCK, Judge.</p>	Case			32

Negative Treatment

There are no Negative Treatment results for this citation.

History

There are no History results for this citation.

Filings

There are no Filings for this citation.