



1945

## Our Supreme Court Holds

North Dakota Law Review Associate Editors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr>

---

### Recommended Citation

North Dakota Law Review Associate Editors (1945) "Our Supreme Court Holds," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 22 : No. 2 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol22/iss2/5>

This Note is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in North Dakota Law Review by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

ples declared in these Definitive Recommendations that all members of the Organization should ipso facto be parties to the Statute; that the attainment of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction over legal disputes, applicable to all states, should be a primary objective; that the Statute should confer on the Court compulsory jurisdiction ipso facto and without special agreement between the parties, in all or any of the classes of legal disputes concerning:

- (a) the interpretation of a treaty;
- (b) any question of international law;
- (c) the existence of any fact, which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
- (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

In becoming a party to the Statute, either by becoming a member of the Organization, or otherwise, a State should be permitted to attach reservations to its acceptance of such compulsory jurisdiction, and thereafter to withdraw, waive or limit such reservations; and reservations made by a State should enure to the advantage of any other party to a dispute against which that State may have invoked the Court's jurisdiction.

(Detailed Recommendations approved as to the Court and the Statute, in furtherance of these Definitive Recommendations, are set forth in Schedule "A" attached to this Document.)

(Continued in next issue)

---

### OUR SUPREME COURT HOLDS

In *W. Graham Glass, Pltf. and Applt. vs. Swimaster Corporation*, a corporation, Deft. and Respt.

That an agreement which contemplates procuring personal or political influence to secure the acceptance of a bid on a public contract being let by a government department is against public policy and, therefore, void.

The fact that compensation fixed in an agreement for employment to secure official action is contingent upon success does not establish that the agreement is contrary to public policy and, therefore, void as a matter of law.

The contingent character of compensation provided for in an agreement to secure favorable action upon a bid on a public contract being let by a governmental department may be considered along with other facts and circumstances in determining whether the agreement is violative of public policy.

That evidence examined and it is held that the plaintiff and defendant entered into an agreement for the procurement of favorable action by the Navy Department on bids for the manufacture and sale to the Department of defendant's product; that the agreement provided for payment to the plaintiff of a commission contingent upon success in obtaining awards of contracts; that the agreement included plaintiff's services in connection with the procurement of Navy Contract No. 92925 which contains a covenant against contingent fees; that the agreement, when considered in the light of its construction and performance as disclosed by plaintiff's evidence, contemplated that the parties would procure personal and political influence to secure the acceptance of the defendant's bid and is void as being against public policy.