

195 U. S.

Opinion of the Court.

## SCHWEER v. BROWN.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR  
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS.

No. 162. Submitted October 31, 1904.—Decided November 7, 1904.

Where the question is whether a District Court sitting in bankruptcy could proceed in a summary way in the particular instance, the jurisdiction of the United States court as such is not in question and section 5 of the judiciary act of March 3, 1891, has no application.

*Mueller v. Nugent*, 184 U. S. 1; *Louisville Trust Company v. Comingor*, 184 U. S. 18, approved on the point that the bankruptcy court has jurisdiction to determine in the first instance whether a summary proceeding can be maintained. If it errs in so proceeding the remedy is under section 24b of the bankruptcy law.

THE facts are stated in the opinion.

*Mr. Daniel W. Jones* for appellants.

*Mr. Robert E. Wiley* for appellee.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE: This was a summary proceeding in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, in bankruptcy, requiring the payment to the trustee in bankruptcy of the sum of two thousand dollars as part of the assets of the bankrupt's estate. In return to a rule, one of the respondents alleged that he had paid the money over to the other and denied the jurisdiction of the court. The other, Mrs. Schweer, denied that she had or ever had had any money belonging or due to the estate, and denied jurisdiction. The matter was heard before a referee, who made findings of fact and conclusions of law, and ordered the return of the money. It was then carried to the District Court and there heard *de novo*. The District Court sustained the referee and entered decree for the payment of the money to the trustee. Thereupon an appeal was taken directly to this court on the

ground that the case fell within the first of the classes of cases enumerated in section five of the judiciary act of March 3, 1891. But that class only includes cases where the question is as to the jurisdiction of courts of the United States as such, and the question has to be certified. That was not the question raised here, and none such was certified. And it is settled that the District Court had jurisdiction to determine whether any adverse claim to the money was asserted at the time the petition was filed. *Mueller v. Nugent*, 184 U. S. 1; *Louisville Trust Company v. Comingor*, 184 U. S. 18.

If the court erred in retaining jurisdiction on the merits, the remedy was by petition to the Circuit Court of Appeals under § 24*b* of the bankruptcy law. *Holden v. Stratton*, 191 U. S. 115.

*Appeal dismissed.*

---

### AMADO *v.* UNITED STATES.

ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF PORTO RICO.

No. 33. Submitted October 25, 1904.—Decided November 7, 1904.

The review of the final judgment of the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico by this court is not restricted to cases in which the Constitution or a treaty of the United States or an act of Congress is brought in question and the right claimed under it is denied. There may be cases, certainly civil cases, which if determined in a Supreme Court of one of the Territories of the United States could be reviewed although not involving any right of a distinctly Federal nature.

But a criminal case like this arising under § 3082 Rev. Stat., could not be reviewed by this court in virtue of the words, in § 35 of the Porto Rico act of April 12, 1900, "in the same cases as from the Supreme Courts of the Territories of the United States."

Nor will the words in the same act, "in all cases where the Constitution of the United States, or a treaty thereof, or an act of Congress is brought in question and the right claimed thereunder is denied," authorize this court to review a judgment of conviction in a criminal case in the court below under § 3082 Rev. Stat., when the only claim at the trial was that the