CASES

ON

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

SELECTED FROM DECISIONS OF

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN COURTS

BY

ERNST FREUND

PROFESSOR OF LAW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

AMERICAN CASEBOOK SERIES JAMES BROWN SCOTT GENERAL EDITOR

ST. PAUL
WEST PUBLISHING COMPANY
1911

COPYRIGHT, 1911
BY

WEST PUBLISHING COMPANY

(FR.ADM.LAW)

THE AMERICAN CASEBOOK SERIES

THE first of the American Casebook Series, Mikell's Cases on Criminal Law, issued in December, 1908, contained in its preface an able argument by Mr. James Brown Scott, the General Editor of the Series, in favor of the case method of law teaching. Until 1915 this preface appeared in each of the volumes published in the series. But the teachers of law have moved onward, and the argument that was necessary in 1908 has now become needless. That such is the case becomes strikingly manifest to one examining three important documents that fittingly mark the progress of legal education in America. In 1893 the United States Bureau of Education published a report on Legal Education prepared by the American Bar Association's Committee on Legal Education, and manifestly the work of that Committee's accomplished chairman, William G. Hammond, in which the three methods of teaching law then in vogue—that is, by lectures, by text-book, and by selected cases—were described and commented upon, but without indication of preference. The next report of the Bureau of Education dealing with legal education, published in 1914, contains these unequivocal statements:

"To-day the case method forms the principal, if not the exclusive, method of teaching in nearly all of the stronger law schools of the country. Lectures on special subjects are of course still delivered in all law schools, and this doubtless always will be the case. But for staple instruction in the important branches of common law the case has proved itself as the best available material for use practically everywhere. * * * The case method is to-day the principal method of instruction in the great majority of the schools of this country."

But the most striking evidence of the present stage of development of legal instruction in American Law Schools is to be found in the special report, made by Professor Redlich to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, on "The Case Method in American Law Schools." Professor Redlich, of the Faculty of Law in the University of Vienna, was brought to this country to make a special study of methods of legal instruction in the United States from the standpoint of one free from those prejudices necessarily engendered in American teachers through their relation to the struggle for supremacy so long, and at one time so vehemently, waged among the rival systems. From this masterly report, so replete with brilliant analysis and discriminating comment, the following brief extracts are taken. Speaking of the text-book method Professor Redlich says:

"The principles are laid down in the text-book and in the professor's lectures, ready made and neatly rounded, the predigested essence

of many judicial decisions. The pupil has simply to accept them and to inscribe them so far as possible in his memory. In this way the scientific element of instruction is apparently excluded from the very first. Even though the representatives of this instruction certainly do regard law as a science—that is to say, as a system of thought, a grouping of concepts to be satisfactorily explained by historical research and logical deduction—they are not willing to teach this science, but only its results. The inevitable danger which appears to accompany this method of teaching is that of developing a mechanical, superficial instruction in abstract maxims, instead of a genuine intellectual probing of the subject-matter of the law, fulfilling the requirements of a science."

Turning to the case method Professor Redlich comments as follows: "It emphasizes the scientific character of legal thought; it goes now a step further, however, and demands that law, just because it is a science, must also be taught scientifically. From this point of view it very properly rejects the elementary school type of existing legal education as inadequate to develop the specific legal mode of thinking, as inadequate to make the basis, the logical foundation, of the separate legal principles really intelligible to the students. Consequently, as the method was developed, it laid the main emphasis upon precisely that aspect of the training which the older text-book school entirely neglected—the training of the student in intellectual independence, in individual thinking, in digging out the principles through penetrating analysis of the material found within separate cases; material which contains, all mixed in with one another, both the facts, as life creates them, which generate the law, and at the same time rules of the law itself, component parts of the general system. In the fact that, as has been said before, it has actually accomplished this purpose, lies the great success of the case method. For it really teaches the pupil to think in the way that any practical lawyer—whether dealing with written or with unwritten law—ought to and has to think. It prepares the student in precisely the way which, in a country of case law, leads to full powers of legal understanding and legal acumen; that is to say, by making the law pupil familiar with the law through incessant practice in the analysis of law cases, where the concepts, principles, and rules of Anglo-American law are recorded, not as dry abstractions, but as cardinal realities in the inexhaustibly rich, ceaselessly fluctuating, social and economic life of man. Thus in the modern American law school professional practice is preceded by a genuine course of study. the methods of which are perfectly adapted to the nature of the common law."

The general purpose and scope of this series were clearly stated in the original announcement:

"The General Editor takes pleasure in announcing a series of scholarly casebooks, prepared with special reference to the needs and limi-

PREFACE

tations of the classroom, on the fundamental subjects of legal education, which, through a judicious rearrangement of emphasis, shall provide adequate training combined with a thorough knowledge of the general principles of the subject. The collection will develop the law historically and scientifically; English cases will give the origin and development of the law in England; American cases will trace its expansion and modification in America; notes and annotations will suggest phases omitted in the printed case. Cumulative references will be avoided, for the footnote may not hope to rival the digest. The law will thus be presented as an organic growth, and the necessary connection between the past and the present will be obvious.

"The importance and difficulty of the subject as well as the time that can properly be devoted to it will be carefully considered so that each book may be completed within the time allotted to the particular subject. * * If it be granted that all, or nearly all, the studies required for admission to the bar should be studied in course by every student—and the soundness of this contention can hardly be seriously doubted—it follows necessarily that the preparation and publication of collections of cases exactly adapted to the purpose would be a genuine and by no means unimportant service to the cause of legal education. And this result can best be obtained by the preparation of a systematic series of casebooks constructed upon a uniform plan under the supervision of an editor in chief. * *

"The following subjects are deemed essential in that a knowledge of them (with the exception of International Law and General Jurisprudence) is almost universally required for admission to the bar:

Administrative Law.

Agency. Bailments.

Bills and Notes.

Carriers.

Code Pleading.

Common-Law Pleading. Conflict of Laws.

Constitutional Law.

Contracts.
Corporations.
Criminal Law.

Criminal Procedure.

Damages.

Domestic Relations.

Equity.

Equity Pleading.

Evidence. Insurance.

International Law.

Jurisprudence. Legal Ethics. Partnership.

Personal Property.
Public Corporations.
Quasi Contracts.

Real Property.

Sales.
Suretyship.
Torts.
Trusts.

Wills and Administration.

"International Law is included in the list of essentials from its intrinsic importance in our system of law. As its principles are simple in comparison with municipal law, as their application is less technical,

and as the cases are generally interesting, it is thought that the book may be larger than otherwise would be the case.

"The preparation of the casebooks has been intrusted to experienced and well-known teachers of the various subjects included, so that the experience of the classroom and the needs of the students will furnish a sound basis of selection."

Since this announcement of the Series was first made there have been published books on the following subjects:

- Administrative Law. By Ernst Freund, Professor of Law in the University of Chicago.
- Agency. By Edwin C. Goddard, Professor of Law in the University of Michigan.
- Bills and Notes. By Howard L. Smith, Professor of Law in the University of Wisconsin, and Underhill Moore, Professor of Law in Columbia University.
- Carriers. By Frederick Green, Professor of Law in the University of Illinois.
- Conflict of Laws. By Ernest G. Lorenzen, Professor of Law in Yale University.
- Constitutional Law. By James Parker Hall, Dean of the Faculty of Law in the University of Chicago.
- Contracts. By Arthur L. Corbin, Professor of Law in Yale University. Corporations. By Harry S. Richards, Dean of the Faculty of Law in
- the University of Wisconsin.
- Criminal Law. By William E. Mikell, Dean of the Faculty of Law in the University of Pennsylvania.
- Criminal Procedure. By William E. Mikell, Dean of the Faculty of Law in the University of Pennsylvania.
- Damages. By Floyd R. Mechem, Professor of Law in the University of Chicago, and Barry Gilbert, of the Chicago Bar.
- Equity. By George H. Boke, Professor of Law in the University of Oklahoma.
- Evidence. By Edward W. Hinton, Professor of Law in the University of Chicago.
- Insurance. By William R. Vance, Professor of Law in Yale University.
- International Law. By James Brown Scott, Professor of International Law in Johns Hopkins University.
- Legal Ethics, Cases and Other Authorities on. By George P. Costigan, Jr., Professor of Law in Northwestern University.
- Partnership. By Eugene A. Gilmore, Professor of Law in the University of Wisconsin,

- Persons (including Marriage and Divorce). By Albert M. Kales, of the Chicago Bar, and Chester G. Vernier, Professor of Law in Stanford University.
- Pleading (Common Law). By Clarke B. Whittier, Professor of Law in Stanford University, and Edmund M. Morgan, Professor of Law in Yale University.
- Property (Titles to Real Property). By Ralph W. Aigler, Professor of Law in the University of Michigan.
- Property (Personal). By Harry A. Bigelow, Professor of Law in the University of Chicago.
- Property (Rights in Land). By Harry A. Bigelow, Professor of Law in the University of Chicago.
- Property (Wills, Descent, and Administration). By George P. Costigan, Jr., Professor of Law in Northwestern University.
- Property (Future Interests). By Albert M. Kales, of the Chicago Bar.
- Quasi Contracts. By Edward S. Thurston, Professor of Law in Yale University.
- Sales. By Frederic C. Woodward, Professor of Law in the University of Chicago.
- Suretyship. By Crawford D. Hening, formerly Professor of Law in the University of Pennsylvania.
- Torts. By Charles M. Hepburn, Dean of the Faculty of Law in the University of Indiana.
- Trusts. By Thaddeus D. Kenneson, Professor of Law in the University of New York.

It is earnestly hoped and believed that the books thus far published in this series, with the sincere purpose of furthering scientific training in the law, have not been without their influence in bringing about a fuller understanding and a wider use of the case method.

> WILLIAM R. VANCE, General Editor.

JUNE, 1921.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.

(Page 1.)

PART I.

Administrative Power and Action.

CHAPTER I.

	Executive, Quasi Judicial, and Quasi Legislative Functions.	
Secti	on	Page
1.	The Duty to See That the Laws are Executed	4
2.	Powers of Supervision	6
3.	Orders of Individual Application—Administrative and Quasi Judicial Determinations	10
4.	Same—Enforcing and Directing Powers	18
5.	Same—Conditions Annexed to Grant of License	33
6.	Same-Licensing Power and Power to Revoke Licenses	36
7.	Administrative Powers of Regulation-Scope and Validity	43
	CHAPTER II.	
	A DAVISOR OF THE PROPERTY OF	
	Administrative Discretion.	
8.	Construction of Powers	61
9.	Considerations Guiding Discretion	70
10.	Validity of Unregulated Discretion	82
	CHAPTER III.	
	FORM AND PROOF OF OFFICIAL ACTS.	
11.	Action of Official Bodies-The Body must be Convened	00
12.	Same—Act of Majority Binds Body	86 87
13.	Same—Presumption That All Met or Were Notified	. 89
14.	Evidence of Official Action—On Direct Attack	91
15.	Same—In Enforcement Proceedings	95
16.	Same—In Collateral Proceedings	99
17.	Evidence of Official Character	105
18.	De Facto Office and Authority	111
	Fr.Adm.Law (ix)	1

CHAPTER IV.

			*
	Section	on NOTICE.	Page
1	19.	In Taxation	115
L	20.	In the Exercise of the Police Power	132
	21.	In Revoking Licenses	
	22.	In Removal from Office	
	23.	Sufficiency of Notice	183
	*	BO MARKAGE OF THE	
		CHAPTER V.	
		HEARING AND EVIDENCE.	
	24.	In Connection with Licenses	199
	25.	In Connection with Revenue	
	26.	In Dealing with Nuisances	
	27.	In Removing from Office	214
	28.	Power to Obtain Information	
		CHAPTER VI.	
		A	
	19	Administrative Execution.	
	29.	Distress Warrants	2 35
	30.	Abatement of Nuisances-Recognition and Validity of Power	
	31.	Same—Notice before Abatement	252
	32.	Forfeiture by Administrative Process	258
			G.
		PART II.	
		RELIEF AGAINST ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION.	
		,	
		CHAPTER VII.	
		CHAPTER VII.	
		ACTIONS TO RECOVEB DAMAGES OR MONEY.	
	33.	Against Officers—Judges	269
	34.	Same-Against Administrative Officers, Error and Illegality	280
	35.	Same—Against Federal Officers	
	36.	Same—Liability on Official Bond	
	37.	Same—Actions against Subordinates	332
	38.	Same—Action against Superior Officer	
	39.	Actions against Municipal Corporations—In Tort	
	40.	Same—On Implied Contract	
	41.	Action against State or Government	303

CHAPTER VIII.

Secti	ACTIONS FOR SPECIFIC RELIEF.	Page
42.	In General	382
43.	Injunction—In General	
44.	Same—To Restrain Political Acts and Removal from Office	397
45.	Same—To Restrain Enforcement of Ordinances	408
46.	Same—To Restrain the Assessment and Collection of Taxes	417
47.	Mandamus	420
48.	Same—Nature and Form of Proceeding.	422
49.	Same—The Return	
50.	Same—Interest Required to be Shown	
51.	Mandamus against Board or Public Corporation	
52.	Refusal to Obey Mandamus	432
53.	Province of the Writ of Mandamus	433
54.	Same—Control of Fairness of Discretion	
55.	Mandamus in the Courts of the United States	
56.	Certiorari—Note	
57.	Same—Authorities and Actions Subject to Writ	
58.	Same—Scope of Review: What Kinds of Error Corrected	
59.	Quo Warranto	
60.	Habeas Corpus	
61.	Prohibition—Note	900
62.		
63.	Mandamus Same—Certiorari	
64.	Same—Quo Warranto	
65.	Appeal	
66.	Defense to Enforcement Proceedings—Note	
00.	Detende to Enforcement Proceedings Trotes	020
	OTT I DOWN THE	
	CHAPTER IX.	
	JURISDICTION, CONCLUSIVENESS, AND JUDICIAL CONTROL.	
67.	In General	530
68.	Police Power—Jurisdictional Prerequisites	531
69.	Same—Questions of Fact	542
70.	Military Power	548
71.	Taxation and Revenue-Jurisdictional Prerequisites	
72.	Same—Questions of Law	566
73.	Same—Questions of Fact	572
74.	Same—Questions of Value	
75.	Railroad Rate Regulation	
76.	Corporations	
77.	Immigration—Question of Condition of Alien	
78.	Same—Question of Alienage as Question of Law	
79.	Same—Question of Alienage as Question of Fact	
80.	Public Lands	
81.	Pensions	
82.	Postal Administration	657

TABLE OF CASES

[CASES CITED IN FOOTNOTES ARE INDICATED BY ITALICS. WHERE SMALL CAPITALS ARE USED, THE CASE IS REFERRED TO IN THE TEXT]

	Page		Page
ABEEL V. CLARK	50	Bath County v. Amy	459
Ætna Ins. Co. v. New York	363	Batters v. Dunning66,	
Ætna Life Ins. Co. v. Jones		Baumgartner v. Hasty	244
Allbutt v. General Council of Med-		BEAURAIN V. SIR WM. SCOTT	271
ical Education & Registration	542	Bedford v. Rice	113
Allbutt v. General Council443,	463	Belcher v. Farrar	156
Allegheny City v. Millville, etc.,		Beley v. Naphtaly	645
R. Co	36	Bell's Gap R. Co. v. Common-	
Allen v. Sharp		wealth	
American Casualty Ins. Co. v. Fy-		Belt v. State	372
ler		Bennett'v. Whitney	100 00000
American School of Magnetic		Beyer v. Tanner	
Healing v. McAnnulty		Bissell v. Jeffersonville	99
Amperse v. Kalamazoo		Blacket v. Blizard	88
Amy v. Supervisors	10,000,000	Blue v. Beach	51
	contract of	Board of Com'rs of Huntington	
Amy v. Supervisors303,	LOCAL CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY O	Section Committee of the Committee of th	13
Arms v. Ayer	51	County v. Heaston	
Armstrong v. Murphy		Board of Education of Cincinnati	
Arnson v. Murphy		v. Volk	350
Ashby v. White	200	Board of Health of City of Yon-	20.2.2
ASHBY V. WHITE		kers v. Copcutt	144
Asher v. Cabell		Board of Sup'rs of Bureau County	
Ashley v. Port Huron	See Gilleria	v. Chicago, B. & Q. R. Co	517
Attorney General v. Davy	88	Board of Sup'rs of Stephenson Co.	
Attorney General v. Guilford		v. Manny	362
County Justices		Bollman's Case	517
Attorney General v. Northampton		Boston & M. R. R. v. Folsom	468
Attorney General v. Sullivan	493	Box v. Allen	396
Auffmordt v. Hedden	204	Boyd v. United States	217
Averill v. Smith	316	Boyer v. Jones	242
Ayers, $In re$	396	Boyle, In re	553
Ayers v. Hatch	66	Bradley v. Fisher	276
Ayers v. Hatch	463	BRADLEY V. FISHER	271
		Bridge St., etc., Co. v. Hogadone.,	268
Bagg's Case	423	Brittain v. Kinnaird	535
Baldwin v. Smith	249	Brown v. District Council of Nar-	
Baldwin v. Smith	345	ragunsett	517
Ball v. Pattridge		Brown v. Perkins	
Ballou v. State	372	Brown v. Walker	217
Bartlett v. Boston	87	Burton Stock Car Co. v. Traeger	570
Barton v. Syracuse		Bushell's Case	
Bassett v. Godschall		Butterworth v. United States	
Bates & Guild Co. v. Payne		Buttfield v. Stranahan60,	
Bates & Guild Co. v. Payne		262.	
		was a	OTO
FR.ADM.LAW	(xi	ii) .	

	1	Page	:	Page
But	trick v. Lowell	356	COMMONWEALTH V. HAMBB	163
	ne v. Chicago General R. Co.	36	Commonwealth v. Kane	113
			Commonwealth v. Kinsley	160
Cah	a v. United States	217	$Commonwealth\ v.\ Kinsley$	529
		535	Commonwealth v. Shortall	556
		345	Commonwealth v. Sisson	154
		453	Commonwealth v. Sisson	529
	EL V. CHILD	175	Commonwealth v. Slifer	175
		395	Commonwealth v. Wall	19 3
	ter v. Colby	D 70 1	Commonwealth v. Yost	87
		296	Cooper v. Board of Works for	
	y v. Curtis	319	Wadsworth District	2 52
		107	Corcoran v. Board of Aldermen of	
	tral of Georgia Ry. v. Wright	122	$Cambridge \dots 122,$	
	pman v. Limerick	86	Counselman v. Hitchcock	217
		339	Courser v. Powers	111
		193	Coxe Bros. & Co. v. Lehigh Valley	
	ster v. Wabash, etc., Co	36	R. Co	18
		422	Craig v. Charleston	
	cago v. Manhattan Cement Co.	347	Crampton v. Zabriske	422
	cago, M. & St. P. R. Co. v.		CUMMINGS V. BANK	
	tate	594	Cunningham v. Neagle	6
Chie	cago & N. W. R. Co. v. Dey	87	Czarra v. Board of Medical Sup'rs	185
Chie	cago & R. I. R. Co. v. Whipple	480		
	cago, etc., R. Co. v. Nebraska	150	Daniels v. Hathaway	306
Chil	ld v. Bemus	161	Darlington v. Mayor	347
Chi	n Bak Kan v. United States	616	DAUGHERTY V. BROWN	104
Chi	n Yow v. United States	630	Davies, In re	229
Chi	n Yow v. United States	499	DAVIS V. COMMONWEALTH	85
Cice	ero Lumber Co. v. Cicero	84	$Day \ v. \ Day$	
City	of Aurora v. Schoberlien	520	Dc Camp v. Archibald	
City	of Chicago v. Burtice	579	Decatur v. Paulding	438
City	of Chicago v. Chicago City R.		Deems v. Baltimore251,	
	0,	408	Delaney v. Flood	
	of Lowell v. Archambault	36	De Lima v. Bidwell	
	of Ottawa v. People		De Lima v. Bidwell	345
	of Philadelphia v. Scott		Den ex dem. Murray v. Hoboken	
77.55	of Salem v. Eastern R. Co		Land & Improvement Co	235
	of San Antonio v. White		Detroit v. Martin	3 63
	ikenbeard v. United States		Detroit, etc., R. Co. v. Osborn	126
	hrane v. Frostburg		Devine v. Belt	449
	en v. New York		Doane v. Chicago City R. Co	36
	on v. Lisk	268	Dobbins v. Los Angeles	413
	ton v. Hanchett336,		Dodd v. Francisco76,	
	amissioners v. Sellew		Dolan, Appeal of	
	umissioners of Enquiry	217	Doll v. Evans	
	nmissioners of Highways v.	400	Dooley v. United States	376
	Tarper	468	Doolittle v. Supervisors of Broome	400
	nmissioners of Maxton v. Com-	440	County	
	issioners of Robeson County	443	Dorn v. Backer	
	nmon Council of Oshkosh v.	497	DORN V. BACKER	
	tate		Downer v. Lent	
	imonwealth v. Beaumarchais	364	Dows v. Chicago	417

Page	Page
Drewe v. Coulton 293	Genova's License
DUFFIELD V. SCHOOL DIST 50	GIBBONS V. UNITED STATES 371
Dullam v. Willson 172	Gilbert v. Columbia Turnpike Co. 91
Dullam v. Willson 497	Gilbert v. Columbia Turnpike Co. 529
Duncan v. Lunchburg 350	Gillespie v. Palmer 302
Dunn v. Burleigh	Gillespie v. Palmer 204
Durgin v. Minot	Glidden v. Harrington 575
	Golden v. Department of Health 142
Earp v. Lee 244	Gonzales v. Williams 618
Easton v. Calendar 297	Gonzales v. Williams 345, 499
Easton v. Calendar 561	Gordon v. Farrar 296
Eckhardt v. Buffalo 26	Gordon v. Livingston 290
Eckhardt v. Buffalo 421	Gordon v. United States 226
Eddy v. Board of Health 251	GORDON V. UNITED STATES 370
Edson v. Crangle	Governors of Bristol Poor v. Wait 529
Ekin v. United States204, 499	Gray v. Ayres 244
Elbin v. Wilson 303	GREEBWAY V. HURD 317
Eldred v. Sexton 107	Greer v. Downey
Eldred v. Sexton 345	Gregory v. Brooks 290
Elliott v. Swartwout 316	GREGORY V. MAYOR 31
Erskine v. Hohnbach 341	Grindley v. Barker 87
Evans v. Lewis 497	Grindley v. Barker 345
Eve v. State 242	Groenvelt v. Burwell 211, 222, 466
	GROENVELT V. BURWELL 272
Falls v. Cairo 362	Gross' License, In re 80
Fargo v. Hart 421	Gross' License, In re 529
FATH V. KOEPPEL 312	Grove v. Van Duyn 276
Feather v. Regina 372	Guden, In re
Felsenthal v. Johnson 122	Gundling v. Chicago
Field v. People 4	Guptail v. Teft 337
Fields v. Stokley 244	Gwin v. Barton 242
Fire Department of City of New	
York v. Gilmour 544	Hagar v. Reclamation Dist. No.
Fire Department of City of New	108
York v. Gilmour 529	Hagar v. Reclamation Dist. No.
Fischer v. St. Louis 85	108
Fisher v. McGirr 268	Hale v. Henkel
Fitter v. Commonwealth 364	Halloran v. McCullough 285
Fitts v. McGehee 396	Ham v. Board of Police of Boston 175
FLAHERTY, IN RE 84	Hamilton Traction Co. v. Parish 36
Flying Fish, The 332	HAMMOND V. HOWELL
Ft. Plain Bridge Co. v. Smith 243	Harbaugh v. Martin 92
Foster v. Van Wyck 479	Harlow v. Pike
Francis v. Francis, 36	HABMAN V. TAPPENDEN 293
FRENCH V. FYAN 643	Harrington v. Board of Aldermen
Fuller v. Colfax Co 10	of Providence
Fuller v. Colfax Co 529	Harrington v. Glidden 572
	Harrington v. Glidden
Gage v. Censors of New Hamp-	Harris, Ex parte
shire Electric Medical Society 193	Harrison v. People
Gage v. Censors of New Hamp-	Harrison v. People443, 463
shire Electric Medical Society 463	Hart v. Albany
Galbraith v. Littiech 90	Hartman v. Wilmington 16
Galbraith v. Littiech	Hartman v. Wilmington 144, 492
The state of the s	1 22 000 000 00 00 00000000000000000000

Ĭ	Page		Page
Hassel's Case	433	Interstate Commerce Commission	
Hathaway v. Hinton		v. Cincinnati, N. O. & T. P. R.	
Haverty v. Bass		Co	20
Hawes v. Brewer	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	Interstate Commerce Commission	
Hazard v. Israel		v. Cincinnati, etc., R. Co	529
Health Department of City of		Interstate Commerce Commission	
New York v. Rector, etc., of		v. Illinois Cent. R. Co	601
Trinity Church	145	***************************************	
Health Department of City of	220	Yaskan w Danila	475
New York v. Rector, etc., of		Jackson v. People	410
	590	Jacob (Tomlins) Law Dictionary,	04
Trinity Church Heath v. State		London, 1809, v. Discretion	61
	110	Janvrin, In re	26
Heister v. Metropolitan Board of	197	Jeffries v. Ankeny	
Health		Jenkins v. Waldron	
Hendricks v. Gonzales	90,700	John Giles' Case	
Henry v. Barton	70	John Giles' Case	72
Herr v. Central Kentucky Lunatic	00-	Johnson v. Stedman	
Asylum	outroprop II	Johnson v. Stedman	
$Hill\ v.\ Bigge$		Johnson v. $Towsley$	
Hill v. Boston	- CO. CO.	Johnston v. District of Columbia	
Hilton v. Merritt		Jones v. Com'rs of Moore County	
Hines v. Charlotte		Jones v. Williamsburg	
Hoke v. Field	86	Joyce v. Chicago	190
Hopkins v. Smethwick Local		Joyce v. Chicago	492
Board of Health			
Hopson, Appeal of	525	Kansas Home Ins. Co. v. Wilder	602
Horton v. Garrison	89	Kavanagh, Ex parte	196
Houghton v. Payne	667	Keenan v. Perry	
Hover v. Barkhoof	307	Keenan v. Southworth	
Howard v. First Independent	1000	Keiser v. Lines	77
Church	36	Kemp v. Neville	276
Howard v. United States	331	Kendall v. Stokes	
Hubbell v. Goodrich	244	Kendall v. United States 434,	
$Hubbell\ v.\ Goodrich$	345	Kendall v. United States	6
Huey v. Richardson	306	Kentucky & I. Bridge Co. v. Louis-	
Huffmire v . Brooklyn	350	ville & N. R. Co	13
Huling v. Ehrich		Kentucky & I. Bridge Co. v. Louis-	
Huling v. Ehrich		ville & N. R. Co	228
Hutton v. Camden 136,	212	KERRISON V. SPARROW	
Hutton v. Camden	529	King v. Bishop of Litchfield	434
Illinois State Board of Dental Ex-		King v. Bishop of London	
aminers v. People	72	King v. Davenport	
	12	King v. Davenport	
Illinois State Board of Dental Ex-	100	King v. Hayes	
aminers v. People 443,		King v. Venables	
Indiana v. Gobin		King v. Wheeler	
Inhabitants of Quincy v. Kennard	38	King County Elevated R. Co., Mat-	TAU
Inhabitants of Rutland v. Worces-	F04	ter of	20
ter County Com'rs	004	Kinneen v. Wells	36
Interstate Commerce Commission	FOR	Kuntz v. Sumption	10=
v. Alabama Midland R. Co	991		
Interstate Commerce Commission	F(1)(1)	Kursheedt Mfg. Co., In re	010
v. Alabama Midland R. Co	529	T	
Interstate Commerce Commission	000	La Croix v. Commissioners of	200
v. Brimson	222	Fairfield County	500

Page	Page
La Croix v. County Commissioners 16	Martin v. Symonds 72
Laidlaw v. Abraham 570	Mason v. Fearson 70
Lanborn v. County Com'rs 363	Meeker v. Van Rensselaer 93
Landau v. New York 354	Meeker v. Van Rensselaer 243, 345
Lange v. Benedict 269	Metropolitan Board of Health 'v.
Langenberg v. Decker 217	Heister 137
Langenberg v. Decker 499	Metropolitan Board of Health v.
Langford v. United States 368	Heister 421, 521
Lantz v. Hightstown 39, 487	Metropolitan Milk & Cream Co. v.
Lauterjung, Matter of 482	New York 40
Lawton v. Steele 262	Miles v. Worcester 350
Lawton v. Steele 345	Mill v. Hawker 339
Lem Moon Sing v. United States 616	Miller v. Horton 535
Levin v. Burlington 356	Miller v. Horton 154, 251, 313, 345
Levy v. New York 346	Miller v. Wade 77
Licenses, In re 82	Mills v. Brooklyn
Lillienfeld v. Commonwealth 198	Milwaukee Iron Co. v. Schubel 479
Lillienfeld's Case 185, 529	Morford v. Board of Health of As-
Lincoln v. Hapgood 290	bury Park 30
Lincoln v. Smith 268	Mostyn v. Fabrigas 280
Lincoln v. Worcester 359	MOVERS V. SMEDLEY 396
Lingo v. Burford 102	Muller v. Com'rs of Buncombe Co. 70
Lingo v. Burford	Munk v. Frink
Little v. Barreme	Munn v. Corbin
Little v. Barreme 552	Murray v. Hoboken Land & Im-
Little v. Denn	provement Co
Little v. Madison	Musgrove v. Chun Teeong Toy 284
Livingston v. Jefferson 284	Mygatt v. Washburn 301
Loesch v. Koehler	MYGATT V. WASHBURN 560
2000 5, 6 2009 5 7	
1700000 0. 200000000000000000000000000000	Nealy v. Brown
Lowe v. Conroy	Nealy v. Brown 529
Lowell v. Archambault 421	NEALY V. BROWN 90
Lynde v. Winnebago Co 86	Neff v. Paddock 243
Lynae v. winneougo co	Neff v. Paddock 345
McCord v. High 303	Nelson v. State Board of Health 29
McCormick v. Fitch 242	New London v. Brainard 422
McCoy v. Curtice 89, 107	Newman v. Supervisors of Living-
McCoy v. Curtice 345	ston County 362
McGregor v. Supervisors 92	New Orleans v. Railroad Co 579
McIlhenney v. Wilmington 356	NICHOLS V. UNITED STATES 377
McLean v. Jephson 556	Nichols v. Walker 561
McLean v. Jephson 301, 529	Nickerson v. Thompson 290
McLeod v. Scott	Nishimura Ekiu v. United States 611
McNutt v. Livingston 345	Nishimura Ekiu v. United States 499
Magnetic School of Healing v. Mc-	Noble v. Union River Logging R.
Annulty 422	Co 63\$
Maguire v. Smock 36	Noble v. Union River Logging R.
Magwire v. Tyler	Co
Martin v. Lemon 88	Noel v. People
Martin v. Mott	North American Cold Storage Co.
Martin v. Mott 284, 345	v. Chicago
Martin v. State	North American Cold Storage Co.
Martin v. State 529	v. Chicago154, 251, 421

TABLE OF CASES.

F	age		Page
North German Lloyd S. S. Co. v.		People v. Busse	447
Hedden	566	People v. Butler Street Foundry	
Norwalk St. R. Co.'s Appeal	0.000.000.000	Co	217
		People v. Collier	
Origet v. Hedden	208	People v. Collins	
Oshkosh v. State	166	People v. Collins	463
Otis v. Bacon	334	People v. Common Council of Syr-	0000000
		acuse	500
Palmer v. McMahon	257	PEOPLE V. DENTAL EXAMINERS	73
Partridge v. General Council of		People v. Department of Health	
Medical Education and Regis-		People v. Department of Health of	
tration of United Kingdom	285	City of New York	167
Pascal v. Sullivan	576	People v. Dunne	
Pasmore v. Oswaldthistle Urban		People v. Fairchild	7-2-2
Council	448	People v. Fairchild	
Patterson v. Miller	109	People v. Feitner	
Patterson v. Miller 113,	345	People v. French	
Payne v. United States	667	People v. French 215,	
Peavey v. Robinson	296	People v. Glennon	
Peck, In re	193		
Pehrson v. Ephraim City	185	People v. Goodwin	
Pennsylvania R. Co. v. Montgom-		People v. Grant 70,	
ery County Pass. R. Co	86	People v. Healy	
People v. Allegany County Sup'rs	503	People v. Healy 463, 497,	
People v. Barker 204,	483	PEOPLE V. HIGGINS	
People v. Bell		People v. Hilliard	70
People v. Board of Assessors of		People v. Hopson	112
City of Brooklyn	478	People v. Hopson	529
People v. Board of Com'rs of Po-		People v. Humphrey 185,	492
lice	500	People v. Illinois State Board of	
People v. Board of Com'rs of Po-	Ī	Dental Examiners	62
lice and Excise of City of		People v. Illinois State Board of	
Brooklyn	192	Dental Examiners	463
People v. Board of County Can-		People v. Kelly	217
vassers of Onondaga County	445	People v. Lindblom	
People v. Board of Education of		People v. McCoy	165
City of Quincy	495	People v. McCoy	529
People v. Board of Health of City		People v. McGlyn	
of Yonkers	139	People v. Meyers	164
People v. Board of Health of City		People v. Morton	179
of Yonkers 474, 492,	542	People v. Morton	
People v. Board of Police of Met-		People v. Murray	
ropolitan Police Dist. of State		People v. National Bank	242
The second secon	480	People v. New York, L. E. & W.	44 J. Au
People v. Board of Railroad		R. Co	9
	474	People v. Norton	
People v. Board of Sup'rs of		People v. O'Brien	217
	443	People v. Olsen	509
People v. Board of Sup'rs of Mad-	1.0	People v. Parker	488
ison County	95	People v. Railroad Com'rs	474
People v. Board of Sup'rs of Mad-		People v. Regents of University of	112
	463	Michigan	429
and the second s	468	People v. Rice	
People v. Burt		People v. Supervisors of Queens	
	474	County	500

7			Page
People v. Supervisors of St. Law-	age	RESERVOIR CO. V. MACKENZIE	31
rence County	474	Rex v. Archbishop of Canterbury	
People v. Supervisors & Town		Rex v. Askew	
Clerk of Ohio Grove Tp., Mercer			465
County	427		449
	500	Rex v. Rosewell	
	507	Rex v. Venables	
	497	Rex v. Williams	
	113	Rex v. Young & Pitts	
	497	Rexford v. State	
A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR	178	Reynolds v. Schultz	
	497	Reynolds v. Schultz	
People v. Willcox	26	Richmond Co. v. Ellis	
People v. Williams	91	Riggs v. Johnson Co	462
People ex rel. Linton v. Brooklyn		RIPLEY V. GELSTON	318
Heights R. Co	10	Roberts v. United States	
People's Nat. Bank v. Marye	421	Robertson v. Sichel	345
	296	Rockland v. Rockland Water Co.	579
Fersons, Ex parte	72	Rodman v. Harcourt	113
(*) talenta analitika (*) (*) (*) (*) (*) (*) (*) (*) (*) (*)	529	Romero v. United States	114
Pike County Com'rs v. People	428	Rooke v. Withers 301,	
Pittsburgh, C., C. & St. L. R. Co.		Rosenbaum v. Bauer	462
	122	Rosenthal v. State Board of Can-	
Pittsburgh, C., C. & St. L. R. Co.		vassers	
	421	Rounds v. Mansfield	107
Pittsburg, etc., Ry. v. Board of		Runkle v. United States	86
Public Works of West Virginia	00.600000000		
Platt Bros. v. Waterbury		St. Joseph v. Levin	
Porter v. Purdy	306	Salem v. Eastern R. Co 251,	
Post v. Township Board of Spar-	154	SALEM V. RAILBOAD CO	
ta 443,	10.00000	Sanborn, In re	226
Potts v. Breen	43	Sangamon County v. Brown	523
Potts v. Breen 345,	487	Saranac Land & Timber Co. v.	000
Powell v. Bullis Provident Saving Life Assur. Soc.	101	Roberts	396
	604	SAVACOOL V. BOUGHTON	340
	257	Sawyer, In re	399
Traces of Doct	án U i	Sawyer, In re	499
QUEEN V. ARCHBISHOP OF CANTER-		Sawyer v. Railroad	99
	174	Sawyer v. State Board of Health	
	492	Schaezlein v. Cabaniss	56
Queen v. Justices of Walsall		SCHLAUDECKER V. MARSHALL	79
Queen v. Licensing Justices		Schoemaker, In re	196
CONT.	492	Schwuchow v. Chicago	10000
Queen, The, v. Wood		Seaman v. Patten	70
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Shoup v. Shields	
Raaf v. State Board of Medical		Shumway v. Baker Co	
	528	Shurtleff v. United States	
	296	Silver v. Ladd	
	276	Sims, Matter of	
Raymond v. Fish		Skinner v. Morgan	
Regina v. Bartlett		Smith, In re	
Regina v. Boteler	70	South v. Maryland	
Regina v. Bowman	33		
The second state of the second			