

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.