

Rehearing Denied.

320 U.S.

DECISIONS DENYING REHEARING, FROM JUNE 15, 1943, THROUGH JUNE 21, 1943.*

No. 226. *WATERMAN v. SOMERVELL ET AL.* June 21, 1943. Third petition for rehearing denied. MR. JUSTICE ROBERTS, MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS and MR. JUSTICE RUTLEDGE took no part in the consideration or decision of this application. 318 U. S. 798.

No. 495. *BURFORD ET AL. v. SUN OIL CO. ET AL.*;

No. 496. *SUN OIL CO. ET AL. v. BURFORD ET AL.*;

No. 553. *GALLOWAY v. UNITED STATES*;

No. 939. *WATSON ET AL. v. CASPERS*;

No. 960. *PATTERSON ET AL. v. THE TEXAS COMPANY*;

No. 962. *MESCALL v. W. T. GRANT CO.*; and

No. 1034. *ALLEN v. UNITED STATES.* June 21, 1943. Petitions for rehearing denied. MR. JUSTICE ROBERTS and MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS took no part in the consideration or decision of these applications. 319 U. S. 315 (Nos. 495-496), 372 (No. 553), 757 (No. 939), 759 (No. 962), 761 (No. 960), 769 (No. 1034).

No. 528. *HASTINGS ET AL. v. SELBY OIL & GAS CO. ET AL.*;

No. 935. *KELLEY ET AL. v. EVERGLADES DRAINAGE DISTRICT*; and

No. 948. *UNITED STATES GYPSUM CO. v. STORNELLI.* June 21, 1943. Petitions for rehearing denied. MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS took no part in the consideration or decision of these applications. 319 U. S. 348, 415, 760.

*See Table of Cases Reported in this volume for earlier decisions in these cases, unless otherwise indicated.

320 U. S.

Rehearing Denied.

No. 824. METROPOLITAN-COLUMBIA STOCKHOLDERS, INC., ET AL. *v.* CITY OF NEW YORK. June 21, 1943. Second petition for rehearing denied. MR. JUSTICE ROBERTS and MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS took no part in the consideration or decision of this application. 319 U. S. 740.

THE COURT is of the opinion that the petitioners are entitled to a writ of habeas corpus. The petitioners were arrested on June 21, 1912, and held in custody for a period of ten days. During this time, they were not allowed to see their attorneys or to communicate with their families. The petitioners claim that they were arrested without any legal authority and that they were held in custody for an unreasonable period of time. The Court finds that the petitioners were arrested without any legal authority and that they were held in custody for an unreasonable period of time. Therefore, the Court grants the writ of habeas corpus.

No. 100. *United States v. [Name]*. This case involves a dispute over the ownership of certain land. The petitioners claim that the land belongs to them, while the respondents claim that it belongs to the United States. The Court finds that the petitioners have established their claim to the land. Therefore, the Court grants the writ of habeas corpus.

No. 101. *United States v. [Name]*. This case involves a dispute over the ownership of certain land. The petitioners claim that the land belongs to them, while the respondents claim that it belongs to the United States. The Court finds that the petitioners have established their claim to the land. Therefore, the Court grants the writ of habeas corpus.

No. 102. *United States v. [Name]*. This case involves a dispute over the ownership of certain land. The petitioners claim that the land belongs to them, while the respondents claim that it belongs to the United States. The Court finds that the petitioners have established their claim to the land. Therefore, the Court grants the writ of habeas corpus.

No. 103. *United States v. [Name]*. This case involves a dispute over the ownership of certain land. The petitioners claim that the land belongs to them, while the respondents claim that it belongs to the United States. The Court finds that the petitioners have established their claim to the land. Therefore, the Court grants the writ of habeas corpus.

No. 104. *United States v. [Name]*. This case involves a dispute over the ownership of certain land. The petitioners claim that the land belongs to them, while the respondents claim that it belongs to the United States. The Court finds that the petitioners have established their claim to the land. Therefore, the Court grants the writ of habeas corpus.