

CIVIL PROCEDURE

Second Edition

JONATHAN M. LANDERS

Gibson, Dunn, & Crutcher
San Francisco, California

JAMES A. MARTIN

Late Professor of Law
University of Michigan

STEPHEN C. YEAZELL

Professor of Law
University of California, Los Angeles



Little, Brown and Company
Boston Toronto

Copyright © 1988 by Jonathan M. Landers, the estate of
James A. Martin, and Stephen C. Yeazell

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced
in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means in-
cluding information storage and retrieval systems without
permission in writing from the publisher, except by a re-
viewer who may quote brief passages in a review.

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 87-82498

ISBN 0-316-51353-9

Second Edition

MV

Published simultaneously in Canada
by Little, Brown & Company (Canada) Limited

Printed in the United States of America

To the memory of James A. Martin

PREFACE

Process lies at the core of our system of law: It expresses many of our culture's basic ideas about the meaning of fairness; it determines the victor in close cases; and it further determines which cases will be close ones. Procedure is also the area of law least understood and most maligned by lay observers. As a culture, we root for underdogs and insist that the rules not be stacked against them. But we are equally quick to condemn a case for having been decided on a "legal technicality," a phrase that usually means that a procedural rule has come into operation.

One finds similar ambivalence pervading debate about the behavior of courts and lawyers. As a society we demonstrate a healthy belief in the efficacy of lawsuits to solve social, business, and personal problems. But at the same time we worry about what many believe is an excessive willingness to seek such solutions. The ensuing debate ranges from the role of courts in restructuring major social institutions to the question of whether lawyers exacerbate disputes by reflexively behaving in competitive, adversarial ways.

All of these issues are procedural. Lawyers thus need to understand process as a tool of their trade, as a constitutive element of the legal system, and as a focus of debates about social values. Yet civil procedure is, by most accounts, the most difficult and frustrating first-year course. Students come to law school with little experience with procedure and an impression that cases simply arrive at the point of decision. Moreover, first-year students sense that procedure may be the area in which lawyering counts most; the notion that meritorious cases may be lost because of bad lawyering outrages their sense of justice even as it creates anxiety.

Our goal is to show procedure as an essential mechanism for presenting substantive questions and as a system that itself often raises fundamental issues regarding social values and the allocation of costs. We hope that students will begin to appreciate that lawyers move the system and that, to a large extent, clients' fates are necessarily dependent on the wisdom, skill, and judgment of their lawyers. Moreover, although all would agree that cases should not be decided on the basis of "mere" technicalities, fierce dispute quickly arises when one tries to distinguish the rules of mere procedure from those that guard the boundaries of fairness.

In addition to considering such theoretical issues, we have some practical goals. We want students to have a working knowledge of the procedural system and its sometimes arcane terminology. We see the course as an introduction to the techniques of statutory analysis. We hope that

students will better understand the procedural context of the decisions that they read in other courses. To these ends we have tried to select cases that are factually interesting and that do not involve substantive matters beyond the experience of most first-year students. The problems following the cases are intended to be answerable by first-year students and to present real-life issues. Finally, we have incorporated a number of dissenting opinions to dispel the notion that most procedural disputes present clear-cut issues.

The organization of the book follows the sequence that most procedure courses use. After a brief overview of the entire procedural system, we consider jurisdiction, choice of law, remedies, pleading, parties and joinder, discovery, decision without trial, trial, appeal, and former adjudication. Although this organization has the advantage of being in sequential order, there is no particular magic about it. Thus, although one of the authors has followed these chapters in sequence in teaching the course, another first goes through the entire procedural system from pleading through trial and former adjudication and then considers jurisdictional and joinder issues.

Cases have been severely edited to eliminate citations, and they read somewhat differently than real case reports; we hope that they err in the direction of smoothness. Citations are retained when they refer to the writing of important scholars or otherwise seem significant. We have eschewed the temptation to list large numbers of cases or articles following the principal cases. Footnotes have been eliminated without indication. Those that survive retain their original numbers, while the editors' footnotes employ asterisks.

We have used several special citation forms: F. James and G. Hazard, *Civil Procedure* (3d ed. 1985), is cited as James and Hazard; C. Wright, *Federal Courts* (4th ed. 1983), is cited as Wright, *Federal Courts*; J. Moore, *Federal Practice and Procedure* (1969), is cited as Moore; C. Wright and A. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* (1969), is cited as Wright and Miller.

We gratefully acknowledge the permissions granted to reproduce the following materials. The selection from Cleary, *Presuming and Pleading: An Essay on Juristic Immaturity*, 12 *Stan. L. Rev.* 5, 5-12 (1959), is reprinted by permission of the author and the *Stanford Law Review* (copyright 1959 by the Board of Trustees of Leland Stanford Junior University). The excerpts from Brazil, *The Adversary Character of Civil Discovery: A Critique and Proposals for Change*, 31 *Vand. L. Rev.* 1295 (1978), are reprinted by permission of the *Vanderbilt Law Review* (copyright 1978 by the *Vanderbilt Law Review*).

Those whose assistance was acknowledged in the preface to the first edition built the foundation on which this book rests. This revision has incurred additional debts of its own, benefiting from the help of many persons, particularly Leslye Firestone at Little, Brown. Research for this

edition has been supported by the Dean's Fund of the UCLA School of Law and by the Stanford Legal Research Fund, made possible by a bequest from Ira S. Lillick and other friends of Stanford Law School.

But the greatest contribution, and the one that gives the greatest pain to remember, is the one acknowledged in the dedication. James A. Martin's death has deprived this book of one of its original conceivers. His involvement with the project extended over the several years of writing and editing but drew on a much longer and deeper commitment to law and to teaching. We — and his students — will miss his high intelligence and good cheer, his broad knowledge of procedure, and his dedication to the project. We are consoled by the knowledge that his intelligence and his scholarship survive.

Jonathan M. Landers
Stephen C. Yeazell

January 1988

CONTENTS

Preface

xxv

| | |
|---|----------|
| I. AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROCEDURAL PROCESS | 1 |
| A. The Idea and the Practice of Procedure | 1 |
| B. Where Can the Suit Be Brought? | 3 |
| 1. Subject Matter Jurisdiction | 4 |
| <i>Gordon v. Steele</i> | 5 |
| Notes and Problems | 9 |
| 2. Personal Jurisdiction | 9 |
| Notes and Problems | 10 |
| 3. Venue | 10 |
| Notes and Problems | 11 |
| 4. Service of Process | 12 |
| Notes and Problems | 12 |
| C. Stating the Case — Pleadings | 12 |
| 1. The Lawyer's Responsibility | 12 |
| <i>Smith v. Egger</i> | 12 |
| Notes and Problems | 13 |
| 2. The Complaint | 14 |
| <i>Bell v. Novick Transfer Co.</i> | 14 |
| Notes and Problems | 15 |
| 3. The Response — Answer and Motions | 16 |
| Notes and Problems | 18 |
| Counterclaims | 18 |
| Notes and Problems | 19 |
| Cross-claims | 19 |
| Notes and Problems | 19 |
| Third-party Claims | 19 |
| Answer and Counterclaim | 20 |
| Notes and Problems | 21 |
| 4. Amendment of Pleadings | 21 |
| D. Parties to the Lawsuit | 22 |
| 1. Permissive Joinder | 22 |
| Notes and Problems | 22 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 2. | Compulsory Joinder | 23 |
| 3. | Intervention | 24 |
| | Notes and Problems | 24 |
| | <i>Massachusetts Association of Afro-American Police v. Boston Police Department</i> | 25 |
| | Notes and Problems | 26 |
| 4. | Class Actions | 26 |
| E. | Factual Development — Discovery | 27 |
| | Notes and Problems | 27 |
| | <i>Goldinger v. Boron Oil Co.</i> | 29 |
| | Notes and Problems | 32 |
| F. | Pre-Trial Disposition — Summary Judgment | 32 |
| | <i>Donnelly v. Guion</i> | 33 |
| | Notes and Problems | 37 |
| G. | Trial | 39 |
| | <i>Norton v. Snapper Power Equipment</i> | 42 |
| | Notes and Problems | 44 |
| H. | Litigation and Repose — Former Adjudication | 45 |
| | Notes and Problems | 47 |
| | <i>Rush v. City of Maple Heights</i> | 47 |
| | Notes and Problems | 53 |
| I. | Appeals | 53 |
| | <i>Dunn v. Phoenix Newspapers, Inc.</i> | 55 |
| | Notes and Problems | 58 |
| | Note: Civil Procedure in Your Substantive Courses | 59 |

II. JURISDICTION 61

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| A. | Jurisdiction in Anglo-American Law | 61 |
| 1. | The Idea of Jurisdiction | 61 |
| 2. | Jurisdiction and the Constitution | 62 |
| B. | Personal Jurisdiction | 63 |
| 1. | The Origins | 63 |
| | <i>Pennoyer v. Neff</i> | 64 |
| | Notes and Problems | 69 |
| 2. | The Modern Formulation | 74 |
| a. | Power: The Basic Structure — Statutory Constraints | 75 |
| | <i>Markham v. Anderson</i> | 76 |
| | Notes and Problems | 78 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Note: The Mechanics of Jurisdiction — Challenge and Waiver | 80 |
| Notes and Problems | 80 |
| Power: The Basic Modern Constitutional Formulation | 82 |
| <i>International Shoe Co. v.</i> <i>Washington</i> | 82 |
| Notes and Problems | 87 |
| Power: The Absorption of In Rem Jurisdiction | 90 |
| <i>Shaffer v. Heitner</i> | 91 |
| Notes and Problems | 105 |
| Power: Defining Substantial Justice | 107 |
| <i>Helicopteros Nacionales de</i> <i>Colombia, S.A. v. Hall</i> | 108 |
| Notes and Problems | 114 |
| <i>World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v.</i> <i>Woodson</i> | 115 |
| Notes and Problems | 126 |
| Note: Long-Arm Jurisdiction and the Federal Courts | 127 |
| <i>Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz</i> | 128 |
| Notes and Problems | 134 |
| <i>Asahi Metal Industry Co. v.</i> <i>Superior Court</i> | 137 |
| Notes and Problems | 144 |
| The Outer Limits of Jurisdictional Power: Jurisdiction to Determine Jurisdiction | 147 |
| <i>Insurance Corp. of Ireland v.</i> <i>Compagnie de Bauxites de</i> <i>Guinée</i> | 148 |
| Notes and Problems | 153 |
| b. Consent as an Alternative Basis of Jurisdiction | 154 |
| <i>National Equipment Rental v.</i> <i>Szukhent</i> | 155 |
| Notes and Problems | 158 |
| <i>Overmyer v. Frick</i> | 159 |
| Notes and Problems | 163 |
| c. The Requirement of Notice | 164 |
| <i>Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank</i> <i>& Trust Co.</i> | 166 |
| Notes and Problems | 173 |
| Note: The Mechanics of Service of Process | 174 |

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 3. | Statutory Limitations and Discretionary Refusal of Jurisdiction | 178 |
| a. | Venue as a Further Localizing Principle | 179 |
| | Notes and Problems | 183 |
| | Note: Jurisdiction, Venue, and “Business” | 183 |
| b. | Transferring and Declining Jurisdiction: Transfer and Forum Non Conveniens | 184 |
| | (1) Transfer Under 28 U.S.C. §1404 | 184 |
| | (2) Forum Non Conveniens | 186 |
| | <i>In re Union Carbide Corp. Gas Plant Disaster</i> | 186 |
| | Notes and Problems | 190 |
| C. | Subject Matter Jurisdiction of the Federal Courts | 193 |
| 1. | The Idea and the Structure of Subject Matter Jurisdiction | 193 |
| 2. | Federal Question Jurisdiction | 195 |
| | <i>Louisville v. Mottley & Nashville Railroad</i> | 196 |
| | Notes and Problems | 199 |
| | Note: Raising Objections to Federal Subject Matter Jurisdiction | 201 |
| 3. | Diversity Jurisdiction | 202 |
| | Note: The Reason for Diversity Jurisdiction | 202 |
| | <i>Mas v. Perry</i> | 202 |
| | Notes and Problems | 205 |
| | Note: The Future of Diversity Jurisdiction | 207 |
| | Note: Amount in Controversy | 208 |
| 4. | Pendent and Ancillary Jurisdiction | 210 |
| | Introductory Note | 210 |
| | <i>United Mine Workers v. Gibbs</i> | 212 |
| | Notes and Problems | 217 |
| 5. | Removal | 219 |
| | <i>Bright v. Bechtel Petroleum, Inc.</i> | 219 |
| | Notes and Problems | 224 |

III. THE *ERIE* PROBLEM 225

| | | |
|----|----------------------------------|-----|
| A. | State Law in the Federal Courts | 225 |
| 1. | When State Law Must Be Applied | 225 |
| | <i>Erie Railroad v. Tompkins</i> | 226 |

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| | Notes and Problems | 232 |
| | <i>Guaranty Trust Co. v. York</i> | 234 |
| | Notes and Problems | 238 |
| | <i>Byrd v. Blue Ridge Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.</i> | 240 |
| | Notes and Problems | 243 |
| | <i>Hanna v. Plumer</i> | 246 |
| | Notes and Problems | 255 |
| | Note: Recent <i>Erie</i> Issues in the Lower Courts | 260 |
| 2. | The Determination of State Law | 261 |
| | <i>McKenna v. Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp.</i> | 261 |
| | Notes and Problems | 272 |
| | Note: Abstention and Certification | 273 |
| B. | Federal Common Law | 275 |
| | <i>Illinois v. City of Milwaukee</i> | 276 |
| | Notes and Problems | 279 |
| C. | Borrowing State Law in Federal Courts | 281 |
| | <i>Occidental Life Insurance Co. v. EEOC</i> | 281 |
| | Notes and Problems | 284 |

IV. REMEDIES 287

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| A. | Adjudication and Its Alternatives | 287 |
| B. | Damages | 288 |
| | 1. Compensatory Damages | 288 |
| | <i>United States v. Hatahley</i> | 289 |
| | Notes and Problems | 290 |
| | 2. Other Forms of Damages | 291 |
| C. | Non-Monetary Remedies | 292 |
| | 1. The Idea of Specific Relief | 292 |
| | 2. An Excursus on Equity and on Remedial Hierarchy | 293 |
| | <i>Sigma Chemical Co. v. Harris</i> | 295 |
| | Notes and Problems | 297 |
| | Note: Equitable Remedies | 298 |
| | 3. Declaratory Relief | 299 |
| D. | Attorneys' Fees | 300 |
| | Notes and Problems | 303 |
| | Notes and Problems | 305 |
| | <i>Evans v. Jeff D.</i> | 307 |
| | Notes and Problems | 311 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| E. | Provisional Remedies | 312 |
| 1. | Preliminary Injunctions and Temporary Restraining Orders: The Basic Problem | 313 |
| | <i>William Inglis & Sons Baking Co. v. ITT Continental Baking Co.</i> | 313 |
| | Notes and Problems | 315 |
| 2. | Prejudgment Garnishment and Attachment | 317 |
| | <i>Fuentes v. Shevin</i> | 318 |
| | Notes and Problems | 329 |
| F. | Resolving Disputes Without Judicial Adjudication | 332 |
| 1. | Lawyers, Clients, and Goals | 333 |
| 2. | Other Ways of Disputing | 334 |
| a. | Negotiation | 335 |
| | Notes and Problems | 336 |
| | Notes and Problems | 337 |
| b. | Mediation | 337 |
| | Notes and Problems | 338 |
| c. | Minitrials | 339 |
| | Notes and Problems | 340 |
| d. | Arbitration | 340 |
| | Notes and Problems | 341 |
| e. | Nonadjudicative Resolutions <i>Within</i> Litigation | 342 |
| | Notes and Problems | 343 |
| | Notes and Problems | 344 |
| | Notes and Problems | 345 |
| 3. | Choosing Adjudication or Its Alternatives | 345 |

V. PLEADING 347

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| A. | Common Law Pleading, Forms of Action, and Equity: A Brief Overview | 347 |
| 1. | Common Law Procedure | 348 |
| a. | Plaintiff | 349 |
| b. | Defendant | 350 |
| c. | Plaintiff | 352 |
| d. | Defendant | 352 |
| e. | Later Pleadings | 352 |
| f. | Closing the Pleadings | 352 |
| g. | Consistency in Pleading | 353 |
| h. | Singleness of Issue | 353 |
| i. | Joinder of Claims and Parties | 354 |
| j. | Demurrer Opens the Record | 355 |
| | Notes and Problems | 355 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 2. | The Forms of Action | 356 |
| a. | Trespass and Case | 358 |
| | <i>Scott v. Shepherd</i> | 359 |
| | Notes and Problems | 363 |
| b. | Recovery of Personal Property | 365 |
| | Notes and Problems | 366 |
| c. | Recovery of Land | 367 |
| d. | Contract — Special Assumpsit and General Assumpsit | 368 |
| | Notes and Problems | 370 |
| 3. | Equity | 372 |
| a. | Scope of Equity | 374 |
| b. | Doctrines of Equity | 377 |
| c. | Equity Procedure | 378 |
| | Notes and Problems | 381 |
| B. | Code Pleading | 381 |
| 1. | Theory of Pleading | 383 |
| | <i>Ross v. Mather</i> | 383 |
| | Notes and Problems | 387 |
| 2. | Stating the “Facts” | 391 |
| | <i>Gillispie v. Goodyear Service Stores</i> | 391 |
| | Notes and Problems | 393 |
| C. | Federal Pleading | 395 |
| 1. | Stating a Claim: General Principles | 395 |
| | <i>Rannels v. S. E. Nichols, Inc.</i> | 395 |
| | Notes and Problems | 399 |
| | Note: Consistency in Pleading | 402 |
| 2. | Ethical Limitations and Disfavored Cases | 403 |
| a. | Ethical Principles as a Limitation | 403 |
| | <i>Eastway Construction Corp. v. City of New York</i> | 404 |
| | Notes and Problems | 408 |
| b. | Disfavored Claims? | 411 |
| (1) | Fraud | 411 |
| | <i>Ross v. A. H. Robins Co.</i> | 411 |
| | Notes and Problems | 414 |
| (2) | Civil Rights | 415 |
| | <i>Fisher v. Flynn</i> | 417 |
| | Notes and Problems | 419 |
| 3. | Allocating the Elements | 421 |
| | Cleary, Presuming and Pleading: An Essay on Juristic Immaturity | 422 |
| | <i>Gomez v. Toledo</i> | 429 |
| | Notes and Problems | 433 |

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| D. | Responding to the Complaint | 434 |
| | Notes and Problems | 434 |
| 1. | Pre-Answer Motion | 434 |
| | Notes and Problems | 435 |
| 2. | Answer | 438 |
| a. | Denials | 438 |
| | <i>Zielinski v. Philadelphia Piers, Inc.</i> | 439 |
| | Notes and Problems | 443 |
| b. | Affirmative Defenses | 443 |
| | <i>Layman v. Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.</i> | 444 |
| | Notes and Problems | 446 |
| 3. | Reply | 449 |
| | Notes and Problems | 449 |
| 4. | Amendments | 450 |
| a. | The Basic Problem: Prejudice | 450 |
| | <i>Beeck v. Aquaslide 'N' Dive Corp.</i> | 450 |
| | Notes and Problems | 454 |
| b. | Statute of Limitations and Relation Back | 457 |
| | <i>Barnes v. Callaghan & Co.</i> | 457 |
| | Notes and Problems | 460 |
| | <i>Schiavone v. Fortune</i> | 461 |
| | Notes and Problems | 466 |

VI. JOINDER OF CLAIMS AND PARTIES 469

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| A. | Joinder of Claims | 469 |
| 1. | Joinder of Claims by Plaintiff | 469 |
| a. | Historical Background | 469 |
| b. | Federal Rules | 470 |
| 2. | Counterclaims | 470 |
| | <i>Plant v. Blazer Financial Services, Inc.</i> | 471 |
| | Notes and Problems | 475 |
| B. | Joinder of Parties | 478 |
| 1. | As Plaintiffs or Defendants | 478 |
| | <i>Mosley v. General Motors Corp.</i> | 478 |
| | Notes and Problems | 482 |
| 2. | Third-Party Claims | 484 |
| | <i>Frazier v. Harley Davidson Motor Co.</i> | 484 |
| | Notes and Problems | 485 |

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 3. | More Complex Litigation | 487 |
| | <i>Owen Equipment & Erection Co.</i> | |
| | <i>v. Kroger</i> | 488 |
| | Notes and Problems | 498 |
| | <i>Amco Construction Co. v.</i> | |
| | <i>Mississippi State Building</i> | |
| | <i>Commission</i> | 499 |
| | Notes and Problems | 502 |
| 4. | Compulsory Joinder | 503 |
| | <i>Bank of California National</i> | |
| | <i>Association v. Superior Court</i> | 505 |
| | Notes and Problems | 510 |
| | <i>Helzberg's Diamond Shops, Inc. v.</i> | |
| | <i>Valley West Des Moines</i> | |
| | <i>Shopping Center, Inc.</i> | 513 |
| | Notes and Problems | 516 |
| 5. | Real Party in Interest | 519 |
| 6. | Capacity to Sue or Be Sued | 521 |
| C. | Intervention | 523 |
| | <i>Natural Resources Defense</i> | |
| | <i>Council, Inc. v. United States</i> | |
| | <i>Nuclear Regulatory Commission</i> | 523 |
| | Notes and Problems | 529 |
| | <i>Planned Parenthood v. Citizens for</i> | |
| | <i>Community Action</i> | 530 |
| | Notes and Problems | 534 |
| D. | Interpleader | 535 |
| | <i>State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v.</i> | |
| | <i>Tashire</i> | 538 |
| | Notes and Problems | 543 |
| E. | Class Actions | 545 |
| 1. | Introduction | 545 |
| 2. | The Constitutional Foundations | 547 |
| | <i>Hansberry v. Lee</i> | 547 |
| | Notes and Problems | 552 |
| 3. | Statutory Requirements | 555 |
| | <i>In re Northern District of</i> | |
| | <i>California Dalkon Shield</i> | |
| | <i>Products Liability Litigation</i> | 555 |
| | Notes and Problems | 560 |
| 4. | Problems of Notice | 563 |
| | <i>Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin</i> | 563 |
| | Notes and Problems | 571 |
| | <i>Phillips Petroleum v. Shutts</i> | 574 |
| | Notes and Problems | 580 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|------------|
| | Note: Federal Jurisdiction in Class Actions | 581 |
| 5. | Attorneys' Fees | 581 |
| | <i>Boeing Co. v. van Gemert</i> | 581 |
| | Notes and Problems | 586 |
| 6. | Damages and Injunctive Relief | 587 |
| 7. | Settlement and Dismissal | 588 |
| VII. | DISCOVERY | 591 |
| A. | General Rules for Discovery | 593 |
| 1. | Scope — Relevance and Privilege | 593 |
| | <i>Blank v. Sullivan & Cromwell</i> | 594 |
| | Notes and Problems | 595 |
| 2. | Work Product | 598 |
| | <i>Hickman v. Taylor</i> | 598 |
| | Notes and Problems | 607 |
| 3. | Expert Information | 610 |
| | <i>Grinnell Corp. v. Hackett</i> | 611 |
| | Notes and Problems | 616 |
| 4. | The Culture of Discovery and the Discovery Conference | 618 |
| B. | Depositions | 620 |
| | <i>Haviland & Co. v. Montgomery Ward & Co.</i> | 620 |
| | <i>Davis v. Lower Bucks Hospital</i> | 621 |
| | Notes and Problems | 626 |
| C. | Interrogatories | 628 |
| 1. | Overbroad Questions | 629 |
| 2. | Unknown Answer | 630 |
| 3. | Opinions and Contentions | 631 |
| 4. | Burdensomeness | 631 |
| | Notes and Problems | 633 |
| D. | Documents | 634 |
| | Notes and Problems | 634 |
| E. | Requests for Admission | 635 |
| | <i>Morast v. Auble</i> | 635 |
| | Notes and Problems | 638 |
| F. | Physical and Mental Examination | 640 |
| | <i>Schlagenhauf v. Holder</i> | 640 |
| | Notes and Problems | 648 |
| G. | Sanctions | 649 |
| | <i>Cine Forty-Second Street Theatre Corp. v. Allied Artists Pictures Corp.</i> | 649 |