

any remedy through a deed she might have had. But, reading the act, as the view of the Supreme Court compels us to do, as taking away her right to maintain her possession, we are of opinion that it materially impairs the obligation of her contract, and deprives her of property without due process.

Judgment reversed and cause remanded for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

BRADLEY v. LIGHTCAP. No. 2.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS.

No. 306. Argued April 21, 1904.—Decided May 31, 1904.

This case having been decided by the state court on the authority of its own decision in a case between the same parties which has been reversed by this court, this judgment is also reversed on the authority of *Bradley v. Lightcap, ante*, p. 1.

THE facts are stated in the opinion of the court.

Mr. John S. Miller, with whom *Mr. Merritt Starr* and *Mr. W. W. Hammond* were on the brief, for plaintiff in error.

Mr. George W. Wall and *Mr. E. A. Wallace*, with whom *Mr. Lyman Lacey, Jr.*, was on the brief, for defendant in error.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE FULLER delivered the opinion of the court.

After the decision reported 186 Illinois, 510, Mrs. Bradley filed her bill in equity in the Circuit Court of Fulton County, Illinois, to quiet her title to the land in controversy in the action in ejectment and for appropriate relief. The bill was dismissed on demurrer and Mrs. Bradley carried the case to the Supreme Court of Illinois, which affirmed the decree below.

195 U. S.

Opinion of the Court.

Bradley v. Lightcap, 202 Illinois, 154, April 24, 1903. Three of the members of the court dissented. The opinion of the Supreme Court proceeded on the strength of the decisions in 186 Illinois, 510, and 201 Illinois, 511.

As we have reversed the judgment in the prior case, this case must take the same course.

Decree reversed and cause remanded for further proceedings not inconsistent with our opinion in No. 243.

BRADLEY v. LIGHTCAP. No. 3.

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR
THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

No. 343. Argued April 21, 1904.—Decided May 31, 1904.

A case does not necessarily arise under the constitution or laws of the United States every time a writ of error would lie to the judgment of the state court.

THE facts are stated in the opinion of the court.

Mr. John S. Miller, with whom *Mr. Merritt Starr* and *Mr. W. W. Hammond* were on the brief, for plaintiff in error.

Mr. George W. Wall and *Mr. E. A. Wallace*, with whom *Mr. Lyman Lacey, Jr.*, was on the brief, for defendant in error.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE FULLER delivered the opinion of the court.

This was a bill filed by Mrs. Bradley, to quiet her title to the premises in controversy in No. 243, and for appropriate relief, in the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was dismissed for want of jurisdiction, May 22, 1902.