

COLLECTION OF THE OCTOBER TERM, 1973  
RECORDED JANUARY 20, 1974

Table of Contents of Volumes

No. 75-1575. *Thompson v. United States*, 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. Supreme Court decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

---

---

REPORTER'S NOTE

The next page is purposely numbered 801. The numbers between 620 and 801 were intentionally omitted, in order to make it possible to publish the orders in the current preliminary print of the United States Reports with *permanent* page numbers, thus making the official citations immediately available.

---

---

No. 75-1576. *Thompson v. United States*, 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. Supreme Court decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

No. 75-1577. *Thompson v. United States*, 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. Supreme Court decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

October 9, 1974

Preliminary Jurisdiction Notes

No. 75-1578. *Thompson v. United States*, 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. Supreme Court decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

No. 75-1579. *Thompson v. United States*, 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. Supreme Court decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia decided September 24, 1974. See also 17 U.S. 385.

that is required by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

6. Despite its sporadic challenges, the Court has been unshaken on a two-by-two system (weighted heavily in favor of females and with little hope under attack) of the respective state statutes in this area. Thus, even as a long and unswerving arm, and provides no satisfactory answers to issues of constitutional significance.

7. The Court's judgment in the present case of *Georgia*.

#### THE COURT'S JUDGMENT

The Court's decision in *Georgia* is based on the premise that a two-by-two system is required by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court's decision in *Georgia* is based on the premise that a two-by-two system is required by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court's decision in *Georgia* is based on the premise that a two-by-two system is required by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.