

GRIFFITH *v.* CALIFORNIA ET AL.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA,  
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT.

No. 457. Decided December 5, 1960.

Appeal dismissed for want of a substantial federal question.  
Reported below: 179 Cal. App. 2d 558, 4 Cal. Rptr. 531.

*J. B. Tietz* for appellant.

*Robert E. Reed* and *R. B. Pegram* for the State of California, and *Roger Arneberg* and *Bourke Jones* for the City of Los Angeles, appellees.

PER CURIAM.

The motions to dismiss are granted and the appeal is dismissed for want of a substantial federal question.

---

RAY *v.* OHIO.

APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO.

No. 237, Misc. Decided December 5, 1960.

Appeal dismissed for want of a substantial federal question.  
Reported below: 170 Ohio St. 201, 163 N. E. 2d 176.

*Ralph Atkinson* for appellant.

PER CURIAM.

The motion for leave to supplement the jurisdictional statement is granted. The appeal is dismissed for want of a substantial federal question.

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS is of the opinion that probable jurisdiction should be noted.