

INDEX

ABSTENTION. See **Procedure**, 5-8.

ACCOUNTING. See **Taxation**; **Trial**, 2.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE. See also **Antitrust Acts**; **Constitutional Law**, II, 3; **Labor**, 1-4; **Natural Gas Act**; **Procedure**, 3; **Public Land**.

1. *Defense contracts—Military secrets—Revocation of security clearance.*—In absence of explicit authorization by the President or Congress, Secretaries of Armed Forces not authorized to revoke security clearance of employee of private contractor developing and producing goods involving military secrets, thereby depriving him of employment, in proceeding in which employee was not afforded safeguards of confrontation and cross-examination. *Greene v. McElroy*, p. 474.

2. *Defense contracts—Revocation and restoration of security clearance—Mootness.*—When security clearance of employee of defense plant was revoked but later restored, his suit to set aside revocation became moot. *Taylor v. McElroy*, p. 709.

ADMIRALTY. See **Procedure**, 3.

ADULTERY. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

ALABAMA. See **Procedure**, 1.

ANTITRUST ACTS. See also **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1; **Trial**, 3.

Robinson-Patman Act—Price discrimination—Competition—Cost justification.—Discrimination in favor of larger customers by furnishing them services and facilities not accorded to smaller customers on equal terms violated § 2 (e) of Clayton Act, as amended by Robinson-Patman Act; record justified finding that the two classes of customers were competitors; neither absence of competitive injury nor presence of cost justification available as defense. *F. T. C. v. Simplicity Pattern Co.*, p. 55.

APPEAL. See **Jurisdiction**, 1-2.

ARMED FORCES. See **Administrative Procedure**, 1-2.

ATTORNEYS.

Suspension from practice—Public speech about pending case—Sufficiency of evidence.—Speech of attorney relating to pending Smith Act trial in which she was one of defense counsel held not sufficient

ATTORNEYS—Continued.

to sustain charge that she had impugned impartiality and fairness of presiding judge; judgment of suspension from practice reversed. In re Sawyer, p. 622.

CARRIERS. See **Labor**, 3-4; **Procedure**, 3.

CENSORSHIP. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2; **Federal Communications Act**.

CERTIORARI. See **Jurisdiction**, 1-2.

CLAYTON ACT. See **Antitrust Acts**.

COMMUNISM. See **Attorneys**; **Constitutional Law**, I; II, 1; III, 1-2, 5.

COMPETITION. See **Antitrust Acts**.

CONDEMNATION. See **Public Land**.

CONFESSIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 7.

CONFRONTATION. See **Administrative Procedure**, 1.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1; III, 2.

CONSPIRACY. See **Criminal Law**, 2.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Jurisdiction**, 2; **Procedure**, 1, 6-8.

I. Federal-State Relations.

Federal-state relations—State sedition laws—Enforceability.—New Hampshire Subversive Activities Act not superseded by Smith Act, forbidding advocacy of overthrow of U. S. Government by force and violence. Uphaus v. Wyman, p. 72.

II. Freedom of Speech and Press.

1. *Congressional investigations—Contempt conviction for refusal to answer—Membership in Communist Party.*—Conviction under 2 U. S. C. § 192 for refusal to answer questions regarding past or present membership in Communist Party did not violate witness' rights under First Amendment. Barenblatt v. United States, p. 109.

2. *Censorship of motion pictures—Advocacy of ideas.*—As construed and applied to deny license for showing of motion picture because it portrayed adultery as proper behavior in some circumstances, New York statute held violative of First and Fourteenth Amendments. Kingsley Pictures Corp. v. Regents of N. Y. Univ., p. 684.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

3. *Order of Labor Board restraining employer.*—Order of Labor Board which did not forbid employers and employees from discussing matters of mutual interest but merely precluded employer from dominating, supporting and interfering with employee committees did not abridge freedom of speech in violation of First Amendment. *Labor Board v. Cabot Carbon Co.*, p. 203.

III. Due Process.

1. *State legislative investigations—Contempt.*—Due Process Clause of Fourteenth Amendment did not preclude State from requiring production of names of guests at summer camp in legislative investigation of subversive activities; conviction of contempt for refusal to do so sustained. *Uphaus v. Wyman*, p. 72.

2. *Congressional investigations—Contempt conviction for refusal to testify.*—Conviction under 2 U. S. C. § 192 for refusal to answer questions before Committee on Un-American Activities sustained; Committee's authority not unconstitutionally vague. *Barenblatt v. United States*, p. 109.

3. *State criminal trial—Knowing use of false testimony.*—In a state trial for murder, failure of the prosecutor to correct testimony of witness he knew to be false denied defendant due process of law in violation of Fourteenth Amendment. *Napue v. Illinois*, p. 264.

4. *State judicial investigation—Refusal to testify in absence of counsel—Contempt.*—Conviction of contempt for refusal to testify in absence of counsel in fact-finding investigation by state judge, analogous to grand jury proceeding, did not violate Due Process Clause of Fourteenth Amendment. *Anonymous v. Baker*, p. 287.

5. *State legislative committee—Self-incrimination—Immunity—Entrapment.*—Convictions in state court for refusing to answer questions about Communistic or subversive activities violated Due Process Clause of Fourteenth Amendment when legislative committee let witnesses rely on privilege against self-incrimination but convictions were sustained by State Supreme Court on ground that state immunity statute had deprived them of its protection. *Raley v. Ohio*, p. 423.

6. *State Unfair Sales Act—Injunction.*—State-court injunction against selling below cost in violation of State Unfair Sales Act did not violate Due Process Clause of Fourteenth Amendment, though defendant's competitors were selling at illegal prices and court refused to enjoin them from giving trading stamps with goods sold at or near cost. *Safeway Stores v. Oklahoma Retail Grocers*, p. 334.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

7. *State trial for murder—Confession not voluntary.*—Confession obtained after eight hours of continuous questioning by state officials, who repeatedly denied accused opportunity to consult counsel, was involuntary, and its admission in evidence violated Due Process Clause of Fourteenth Amendment. *Spano v. New York*, p. 315.

IV. Equal Protection of Laws.

1. *State Unfair Sales Act—Injunction.*—State-court injunction against selling below cost in violation of State Unfair Sales Act did not violate Equal Protection Clause of Fourteenth Amendment, though defendant's competitors were selling at illegal prices and court refused to enjoin them from giving trading stamps with goods sold at or near cost. *Safeway Stores v. Oklahoma Retail Grocers*, p. 334.

2. *State criminal appeals—Indigents.*—When a non-indigent person could have State Supreme Court consider his application for leave to appeal from felony conviction, denial of same right to indigent solely because he was unable to pay filing fee violated Fourteenth Amendment. *Burns v. Ohio*, p. 252.

V. Self-Incrimination.

1. *State grand jury proceedings—Federal offense.*—State-court conviction for contempt for refusal, after being offered immunity from state prosecution, to answer before state grand jury questions which witnesses claimed would expose them to prosecution for federal offense did not violate Fifth Amendment. *Mills v. Louisiana*, p. 230.

2. *State legislative committee—Immunity—Entrapment.*—Convictions in state court for refusing to answer questions about Communist or subversive activities violated Due Process Clause of Fourteenth Amendment when legislative committee let defendants rely on privilege against self-incrimination, but convictions were sustained by State Supreme Court on ground that state immunity statute had deprived them of its protection. *Raley v. Ohio*, p. 423.

VI. Elections.

Qualifications of voters—Literacy test.—North Carolina statute requiring all prospective voters to pass literacy test, irrespective of race or color, does not on its face violate 14th, 15th or 17th Amendments. *Lassiter v. Northampton County Board of Elections*, p. 45.

CONTEMPT. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1; III, 1-2, 4-5; V, 1; **Procedure**, 1.

COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 4, 7.

CRIMINAL LAW. See also **Constitutional Law**, II, 1; III, 2-5, 7; IV, 2; V, 1; **Jurisdiction**; **Trial**, 1-4.

1. *Federal Kidnapping Act—Prosecution for violation—Indictment.*—Under Rule 7(a), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, prosecution for violation of Federal Kidnapping Act, which may be punishable by death in certain circumstances, must be by indictment, not information. *Smith v. United States*, p. 1.

2. *Conspiracy—Evasion of wagering tax—Sufficiency of evidence.*—In trial for conspiracy to evade payment of federal wagering tax, evidence held sufficient to support conviction of principals who were liable for tax but not of mere employees who were not liable for tax. *Ingram v. United States*, p. 672.

CROSS-EXAMINATION. See **Administrative Procedure**, 1; **Trial**, 1-2.

DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS ACT. See **Procedure**, 7.

DECREES. See **Procedure**, 9.

DEFAMATION. See **Federal Communications Act**; **Libel**.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS. See **Administrative Procedure**, 1-2.

DISBARMENT. See **Attorneys**.

DISCRIMINATION. See **Antitrust Acts**; **Constitutional Law**, IV.

DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP. See **Procedure**, 4-6.

DOCUMENTS. See **Trial**, 1-3.

DUE PROCESS OF LAW. See **Administrative Procedure**, 1; **Constitutional Law**, III.

EDUCATION. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1; III, 2.

ELECTION OF REMEDIES. See **Public Land**.

ELECTIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

ELKINS ACT. See **Procedure**, 9.

EMINENT DOMAIN. See **Procedure**, 5-6, 8; **Public Land**.

EMPLOYEE COMMITTEES. See **Labor**, 1.

ENTRAPMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 5.

EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAWS. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

EVIDENCE. See **Attorneys**; **Constitutional Law**, III, 3; **Criminal Law**, 2; **Labor**, 2; **Natural Gas Act**.

EXCULPATORY CLAUSES. See Procedure, 3.

FALSE TESTIMONY. See Constitutional Law, III, 3.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION. See Trial, 2.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT.

Radio—Equal time for candidates—Censorship—Liability for defamation.—Under § 315 (a) of Federal Communications Act, requiring "equal opportunities" for candidates for public office, radio station may not censor a candidate's speech and is not liable for any defamatory statement he may make in radio speech. *Farmers Educational Union v. WDAY*, p. 525.

FEDERAL KIDNAPPING ACT. See Criminal Law, 1.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION. See Natural Gas Act.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. See Criminal Law, 1; Trial, 3.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See Constitutional Law, I; III, 1, 3-7; IV, 1-2; V, 1-2; VI; Procedure, 1, 4-8.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION. See Antitrust Acts.

FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT. See Constitutional Law, VI.

FIFTH AMENDMENT. See Constitutional Law, III, 2; V.

FINAL JUDGMENT. See Jurisdiction, 1.

FINANCE COMPANIES. See Taxation.

FIRST AMENDMENT. See Constitutional Law, II, 1-3.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See Constitutional Law, II, 2; III, 1, 3-7; VI.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND PRESS. See Constitutional Law, II.

GAS. See Natural Gas Act.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES. See Libel.

GRAND JURIES. See Constitutional Law, III, 4; V, 1; Trial, 3.

HARMLESS ERROR. See Trial, 2.

HAWAII. See Attorneys.

HIGHWAYS. See Procedure, 8.

IMMUNITY. See Constitutional Law, III, 5; V, 1; Libel.

INCOME TAX. See Taxation.

INDICTMENT. See Criminal Law, 1.

- INDIGENTS.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2; **Jurisdiction**, 1.
- INJUNCTIONS.** See **Constitutional Law**, III, 6; **Procedure**, 7.
- INSPECTION.** See **Trial**, 1-3.
- INSTALLMENT SALES.** See **Taxation**.
- INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT.** See **Procedure**, 3, 9.
- INVESTIGATIONS.** See **Constitutional Law**, I; II, 1; III, 1-2, 4-5.
- JENCKS ACT.** See **Trial**, 1-3.
- JUDGMENTS.** See **Jurisdiction**, 1-2; **Procedure**, 1, 9.
- JURIES.** See **Procedure**, 4; **Trial**, 4.
- JURISDICTION.** See also **Labor**, 3-4; **Natural Gas Act**; **Procedure**.

1. *Supreme Court—Certiorari—“Final judgment” of highest state court.*—Letter of Clerk returning pauper's application for leave to appeal, in accordance with well-publicized and uniform practice sanctioned by highest state court, was “final judgment” of that court within meaning of 28 U. S. C. § 1257. *Burns v. Ohio*, p. 252.

2. *Supreme Court—Appeal or certiorari—State decision not passing on validity of state statute under Federal Constitution.*—When validity of state statute under Federal Constitution was not challenged or passed on in state courts, this Court lacked jurisdiction of appeal under 28 U. S. C. § 1257 (2); but granted certiorari. *Anonymous v. Baker*, p. 287; *Raley v. Ohio*, p. 423.

KIDNAPPING. See **Criminal Law**, 1.

LABOR. See also **Administrative Procedure**, 1-2; **Constitutional Law**, II, 3; **Procedure**, 4.

1. *National Labor Relations Act—“Labor organizations”—Employee committees organized and dealt with by employers.*—Employee committees organized by employers and dealt with concerning grievances and conditions of work were “labor organizations” within meaning of § 2 (5) of Act and employer domination and support of them violated § 8 (a) (2). *Labor Board v. Cabot Carbon Co.*, p. 203.

2. *National Labor Relations Act—Refusal to bargain—Procedure.*—When union charged employer with refusal to bargain but Regional Director refused to issue complaint because of insufficiency of evidence, Board was not precluded from issuing complaint and finding employer guilty because of subsequent conduct. *Labor Board v. Fant Milling Co.*, p. 301.

LABOR—Continued.

3. *Railway Labor Act—Board's exclusive jurisdiction—Retired employee.*—Even though employee had retired, National Railroad Adjustment Board had exclusive primary jurisdiction over dispute arising under collective bargaining agreement, and district court properly dismissed his suit for extra pay. *Pennsylvania R. Co. v. Day*, p. 548.

4. *Railway Labor Act—Board's decision—Common-law action for same grievance.*—When employee's union submitted his grievance to National Railroad Adjustment Board, which decided that his dismissal was justified, he was precluded from seeking damages for dismissal in common-law action. *Union Pacific R. Co. v. Price*, p. 601.

LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, I; II, 1; III, 1-2, 5.

LIBEL. See also **Federal Communications Act**.

Defense to suit—Absolute privilege—Government officials.—In suits by government employees against superior officers for libel, alleging malice, defendants' pleas of absolute privilege sustained when statements were made in connection with performance of their official duties. *Barr v. Matteo*, p. 564; *Howard v. Lyons*, p. 593.

LIMITED ACCESS HIGHWAYS. See **Procedure**, 8.

LITERACY TESTS. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

LOTTERIES. See **Criminal Law**, 2.

LOUISIANA. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 1; **Procedure**, 5.

MILITARY SECRETS. See **Administrative Procedure**, 1-2.

MOOT CASE. See **Administrative Procedure**, 2.

MOTION PICTURES. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

MURDER. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3, 7.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT. See **Labor**, 1-2.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD. See **Labor**, 3-4.

NATURAL GAS ACT.

Applications by producers under § 7 (e)—Sales for resale—Rates—Protection of public.—Before issuing permanent certificates of convenience and necessity to producers under § 7 (e), Federal Power Commission must be satisfied that proposed rate is in public interest or must prescribe such conditions as may be needed to protect public interest; jurisdiction of Commission; sufficiency of evidence. *Atlantic Refining Co. v. Public Service Comm'n*, p. 378.

- NAVY.** See Libel.
- NEGROES.** See Constitutional Law, VI; Procedure, 1, 7.
- NEW HAMPSHIRE.** See Constitutional Law, I; III, 1.
- NEWSPAPERS.** See Trial, 4.
- NEW YORK.** See Constitutional Law, II, 2; III, 4.
- NORTH CAROLINA.** See Constitutional Law, VI.
- OFFICE OF RENT STABILIZATION.** See Libel.
- OHIO.** See Constitutional Law, III, 5; IV, 2; Procedure, 2.
- OIL.** See Procedure, 9.
- OKLAHOMA.** See Constitutional Law, III, 6.
- PAUPERS.** See Constitutional Law, IV, 2; Jurisdiction, 1.
- PENNSYLVANIA.** See Procedure, 4, 6, 8.
- PERJURY.** See Constitutional Law, III, 3.
- PIPELINES.** See Natural Gas Act; Procedure, 9.
- PREJUDICIAL ERROR.** See Criminal Law, 1; Trial, 4.
- PRICE CUTTING.** See Constitutional Law, III, 6.
- PRICE DISCRIMINATION.** See Antitrust Acts.
- PRIVILEGE.** See Libel.
- PROCEDURE.** See also Administrative Procedure, 1-2; Constitutional Law, III, 3; IV, 2; Criminal Law, 1; Labor, 2; Trial, 1-4.
1. *Supreme Court—Reversal of state-court judgment—Effect.*—Supreme Court of United States having reversed judgment of State Supreme Court after being led by both parties and state of the record to treat as sole issue before it the question whether State could compel petitioner to produce its membership lists in court, State Supreme Court was precluded from again affirming contempt conviction for failure to produce other documents. *N. A. A. C. P. v. Alabama*, p. 240.
 2. *Supreme Court—Appeal—Noting probable jurisdiction.*—By vote of 4 to 4, Court noted probable jurisdiction of appeal in case believed by four Members voting against such action to turn on same question as that decided recently by 5-to-4 vote in another case. *Ohio ex rel. Eaton v. Price*, p. 246.

PROCEDURE—Continued.

3. *Courts of Appeals—Failure to pass on all issues—Referral of one issue to I. C. C.*—Court of Appeals correctly ruled that exculpatory clause in tariff filed with I. C. C. by water carrier should not be struck down without opportunity for consideration by I. C. C.; but it should not have ordered that question referred to I. C. C. without first passing on other issues which might have disposed of case. *Southwestern Sugar & Molasses Co. v. River Terminals Corp.*, p. 411.

4. *District Courts—Diversity jurisdiction—Factual issues for jury.*—In a Federal District Court having jurisdiction because of diversity of citizenship, all disputed issues of fact necessary for determining whether decedent was defendant's employee within meaning of State Workmen's Compensation Act were for jury determination, regardless of practice in state courts, unless their assignment by State to judge was "integral part of special relationship created by the statute." *Magenau v. Aetna Freight Lines*, p. 273.

5. *District Courts—Diversity jurisdiction—Eminent domain—State law—Reference to state courts.*—When authority of city under state law to expropriate private property was challenged in Federal District Court having diversity jurisdiction and such authority was doubtful and had never been passed on by state courts, District Court properly stayed proceedings until State Supreme Court had opportunity to pass on question. *Louisiana Power & Light Co. v. City of Thibodaux*, p. 25.

6. *District Courts—Diversity jurisdiction—Eminent domain—State-law questions—Abstention.*—Federal District Court should not have abstained from exercising properly invoked diversity jurisdiction in state eminent domain case when no constitutional question, no danger to federal-state relationships and no difficult issue of unsettled state law involved. *Allegheny County v. Frank Mashuda Co.*, p. 185.

7. *District Courts—Constitutionality of state statutes never construed by state courts—Reference to state courts.*—Suit to declare unconstitutional and enjoin enforcement of state statutes which had never been construed by state courts should have been held by Federal District Court until state courts had reasonable opportunity to construe them. *Harrison v. N. A. A. C. P.*, p. 167.

8. *District Courts—Suit to enjoin state officials from designating limited access highway—Abstention.*—Federal District Court should have declined to adjudicate controversy involving constitutionality of state statute authorizing designation of limited access highways and providing no compensation for "consequential damages where no property is taken." *Martin v. Creasy*, p. 219.

PROCEDURE—Continued.

9. *Elkins Act—Decree—Interpretation.*—When oil and pipeline companies had for 16 years adhered to an interpretation of consent decree against them under Elkins and Interstate Commerce Acts, which was consistent with language of decree, Government had acquiesced, and trial court concluded it was interpretation intended by parties, this Court will not reject it simply because Government now contends that a different interpretation would be more consistent with its reasons for entering into agreement in first place. *United States v. Atlantic Refining Co.*, p. 19.

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1; **Trial**, 1-3.

PUBLIC LAND.

Revocable lease—Revocation or condemnation—Election of remedies.—When Government undertook to revoke lease of land but lessee declined to vacate, Government was not required to abandon right to revoke lease in order to exercise its right to obtain immediate possession under condemnation law. *United States v. 93.970 Acres*, p. 328.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION. See **Constitutional Law**, VI; **Procedure**, 1, 7.

RADIO. See **Federal Communications Act**.

RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD. See **Labor**, 3-4.

RAILWAY LABOR ACT. See **Labor**, 3-4.

REMEDIES. See **Public Land**.

RES JUDICATA. See **Procedure**, 1.

REVOCAION. See **Public Land**.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT. See **Antitrust Acts**.

RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. See **Criminal Law**, 1; **Trial**, 3.

SECURITY CLEARANCE. See **Administrative Procedure**, 1-2.

SEDITION LAWS. See **Constitutional Law**, I; III, 1, 5; V, 2.

SELF-INCRIMINATION. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

SEVENTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

SHERMAN ACT. See **Trial**, 3.

SLANDER. See **Federal Communications Act**; **Libel**.

SMITH ACT. See **Attorneys**; **Constitutional Law**, I.

STATEMENTS. See **Trial**, 1-2.

SUBVERSION. See **Constitutional Law**, I; II, 1; III, 1-2, 5; V, 2.

SUPREME COURT. See **Jurisdiction**, 1-2; **Procedure**, 1-2.

TARIFFS. See **Procedure**, 3.

TAXATION. See also **Criminal Law**, 2.

Income tax—Accrued income—Dealers' "reserve accounts" on books of finance companies.—Retail automobile dealers making tax returns on accrual basis and selling installment sales paper to finance companies must treat amounts credited to them in "reserve accounts" on books of finance companies as income accrued to them during tax years in which such amounts are so credited. *Commissioner v. Hansen*, p. 446.

TRADING STAMPS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 6.

TRANSPORTATION. See **Labor**, 3-4; **Procedure**, 3.

TRIAL. See also **Attorneys**; **Constitutional Law**, III, 3; **Procedure**.

1. *Criminal cases—Cross-examination—Right to inspect government documents under Jencks Act—"Statement."*—A 600-word memorandum summarizing part of 3½-hour interrogation of witness by a government agent was not "statement" of kind required to be produced under 18 U. S. C. § 3500. *Palermo v. United States*, p. 343.

2. *Criminal cases—Cross-examination—Right to inspect F. B. I. files under Jencks Act.*—Certain reports of F. B. I. investigators not "statements" required to be produced under 18 U. S. C. § 3500; others need not be produced when defense already has information; failure to produce others harmless error when same information had been revealed on cross-examination and questioning by judge. *Rosenberg v. United States*, p. 367.

3. *Criminal cases—Production of government documents—Grand jury minutes.*—In trial for violation of Sherman Act, defendants not entitled to production of grand jury minutes without showing particularized need for them; matter committed to sound discretion of trial judge under Rule 6 (c) of Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure; *Jencks v. United States*, 353 U. S. 657, and 18 U. S. C. § 3500 inapplicable. *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. United States*, p. 395.

4. *Criminal cases—Prejudicial newspaper stories read by jurors—New trial.*—When jurors in Federal District Court saw and read newspaper stories containing information prejudicial to defendant which had been denied admission into evidence in criminal trial, resulting harm to defendant required new trial. *Marshall v. United States*, p. 310.

UNFAIR COMPETITION. See **Antitrust Acts; Constitutional Law**, III, 6.

VAGUENESS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.

VIRGINIA. See **Procedure**, 7.

VOTERS. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

WAGERING. See **Criminal Law**, 2.


WATER CARRIERS. See **Procedure**, 3.


WITNESSES. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1; III, 1-5; V, 1-2.


WORDS.


1. "*Final judgment.*"—28 U. S. C. § 1257. *Burns v. Ohio*, p. 252.
2. "*Labor organizations.*"—National Labor Relations Act, § 2 (5). *Labor Board v. Cabot Carbon Co.*, p. 203.
3. "*Offense which may be punishable by death.*"—18 U. S. C. § 1201. *Smith v. United States*, p. 1.
4. "*Statement.*"—18 U. S. C. § 3500. *Palermo v. United States*, p. 343; *Rosenberg v. United States*, p. 367.


WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION. See **Procedure**, 4.




























OAMGENPUB1116