

ORDERS FROM FEBRUARY 14 THROUGH  
APRIL 2, 1958.

FEBRUARY 14, 1958.

*Disposed Under Rule 60.*

No. 913, Misc. KANDU ET AL. v. UNITED COOK COUNTY  
MENTAL HEALTH CLINIC SUPERINTENDENT, ET AL. Mo-  
tion for leave to file petition for writ of habeas corpus  
and for other relief as to petitioner Diana Kandou  
granted pursuant to Rule 60 of the Rules of this Court.  
Harry M. Booth for petitioner. Kandou, Edward A.  
Baskin for respondents.

---

---

REPORTER'S NOTE.

The next page is purposely numbered 901. The numbers between  
834 and 901 were intentionally omitted, in order to make it possible  
to publish the orders in the current advance sheets or preliminary  
prints of the United States Reports with *permanent* page numbers,  
thus making the official citations immediately available.

No. 914, Misc. C. A. 7th Cir. Cardonari granted and  
costs taxed. 304 P. 2d 481.

---

---

Attorney General Marshall, Assistant Attorney General  
Turner, Daniel M. Friedman and James H. Friedman  
for petitioner. Hammond E. Chafetz for United Fruit  
Co. and L. Edward Hart, John Paul Strickland, Charles  
A. Raskobold for Bowland Corp., respondents. 304 P. 2d 481.

FEBRUARY 27, 1958.

*Miscellaneous Orders.*

No. 897, Misc. WILLIAMS v. CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURAL  
MACHINERY ET AL. Motion for leave to file petition for writ  
of habeas corpus denied. Petitioner pro se. The Honorable  
George, Attorney General of California, and Robert W.  
Gronlund and John T. Murphy, Deputy Attorneys Gen-  
eral, for respondents.

April 4, 1935.

20112.

## JENKINS v. MARYLAND.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND.

No. 202. Argued April 4, 1935.

Certiorari granted. 295 Md. 431. A writ of habeas corpus was issued by the Court of Appeals of Maryland on April 4, 1935.

The writ was issued to the petitioner, Jenkins, who was confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.

The writ was issued on the ground that the petitioner was unlawfully confined in the State Prison of Maryland.