

217 U. S.

Syllabus.

SHEDD *v.* PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
EX REL. HEALY, STATE'S ATTORNEY.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS.

No. 708. Motion to dismiss or affirm submitted May 16, 1910.—Decided
May 31, 1910.A judgment of ouster rendered in *quo warranto* proceeding, 241 Illinois,
155, affirmed without opinion.THE facts involved the validity of a judgment of
ouster rendered by the Supreme Court of Illinois in a
quo warranto proceeding.*Mr. Harry S. Mecartney* for plaintiffs in error.*Mr. James Hamilton Lewis* for defendant in error.*Per Curiam.* Judgment affirmed with costs.THOMAS RHODUS *v.* MANNING.SAME *v.* SAME.BIRCH F. RHODUS *v.* SAME.SAME *v.* SAME.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS.

Nos. 739, 740, 741, 742. Motions to dismiss or affirm submitted May 16,
1910.—Decided May 31, 1910.Judgments of the state court committing plaintiffs in error for failure
to comply with orders of the court directing them to turn over
property to receiver of a corporation, affirmed without opinion

notwithstanding contention that the orders amounted to unreasonable searches, required plaintiffs in error to incriminate themselves and denied them due process of law.

THE state court entered orders requiring plaintiffs in error to turn over property to defendant in error received of a corporation and adjudging them in and committing them for contempt for failure to comply.

Plaintiffs in error sued out writs of error assigning as error that they were denied rights secured by the Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Federal Constitution.

Defendant in error moved to dismiss:

Because the provisions of the Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments do not apply to the compulsory production of evidence in a court of a State.

Because the record does not present a case of either a search or seizure, or of the production of evidence; but shows, on the contrary, non-compliance with a decree for relief upon an undisputed title to possession.

Because it is manifest that the writs of error herein were taken for delay only, and that the contention on which the jurisdiction depends is so frivolous as not to require further argument.

Mr. Benjamin C. Bachrach and Mr. Joseph B. David for plaintiffs in error.

Mr. Samuel Alschuler, Mr. Charles R. Holden and Mr. Joseph Weissenbach for defendants in error.

Per Curiam. Judgments affirmed with costs.