



1945

## Attorneys Wanted

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

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



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

(1945) "Attorneys Wanted," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 22: No. 4, Article 3.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol22/iss4/3>

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).

in the ordinary commercial sense of the term. Since there is no property in a dead body, there can be no valid contract to sell one's body, nor to enter a binding contract to make a will disposing of one's dead body for a specific purpose because of lack of consideration. As has been pointed out, one may will his remains to a medical school, but since there is no property in the body, he could not enter into a binding contract for a remuneration therefor. One wishing to secure a body for such purpose would not be safe in extending money during the lifetime of the testator in return for a bequest in the will, for until the testator's death the will is ambulatory and may be revoked at any time. Therefore, although one may now dispose of his body by will, there is no reason why it should be deemed in conflict with public policy, or why it should give rise to any traffic in dead bodies.

Walter H. Lorshbough  
Third Year Law Student.

#### ATTORNEYS WANTED

The American Bar Association has received a request from the Department of State for assistance in the selection of attorneys to serve as "Military Government Court Officers" in Germany. This letter is addressed to you in compliance with that request and in the belief that you can be of assistance. I suggest that, if you know of any qualified men who might be interested, you acquaint them with the contents of this letter and ask them to communicate with:

Boyd Fisher, Recruitment Officer  
Department of State  
2049 Munitions Building  
Washington 25, D. C.

The general requirements and duties of this assignment and the compensation incident thereto have been outlined to us, as follows:

Acceptance of the assignment will necessitate leaving family and commitments here for a year and serving under military leadership in circumstances alien to the experience of established men of the bar. The prestige of the United States rules out any candidates without a high-grade legal education, a broad background in or with a good firm, considerable forensic experience, totaling not less than from three to five years, possibly some civic experience, and certainly inherent qualities pointing to the candidate's capacity to uphold the honor and competence of the American Bar in a wholly unusual setting.

The duties of the assignment will include service at various times as judge or prosecutor in military government courts; preparation of opinions and advice to superiors on military government and German and International Law; making recommendations on proposed German legislation, and reviewing cases already heard in military government courts. Knowledge of German would be desired, but is not requisite.

The salary is based on \$6,230 per annum, with 25% added for overseas maintenance, totaling around \$7,787. The Army fur-

nishes round-trip transportation and provides meals and lodging at a very low rate (around \$50 per month). Many of the qualified civilian leaders already at work have, obviously, earned more than compensation of this order. The appeal of the assignment, therefore, is likely to be partly in the unusual experience it offers and partly in the opportunity it presents to advance the cause of peace.

### OUR SUPREME COURT HOLDS

In *George Lineberg, Administrator, Respt., vs. Board County Commissioners, Benson County, et al., Appls.*

That where, on an appeal from a decision by a Board of County Commissioners in a proceeding instituted before such Board by the state highway commissioner for ascertainment and determination of damages resulting from the taking of land for highway construction, trial by jury is waived and the issues of fact are tried to the district court without a jury, the findings of fact as to the value of the land taken and consequential damages are entitled to appreciable weight on an appeal to the Supreme court, where a trial anew is demanded in the Supreme court.

That where part of a larger tract of land is taken for public use in the construction of a highway no deduction may be made, from the amount of compensation which the owner of the land is entitled to recover for damages resulting to the residue of the larger tract by reason of the severance of the same from the tract taken, for such general benefits as will accrue to and be received by the whole community, and which will flow to the public in general from the highway improvement.

That where a highway is established across a farm on which there is a set of permanent farm buildings, which farm including the buildings thereon constitutes, and is maintained and operated as, a single unit; and a part of such farm is taken for highway purposes and the buildings remain upon the part of the land not taken, the land and the buildings upon it constitute one piece of property, and the value of the farm before the severance is to be ascertained by considering the property as a whole.

That where a Board of County Commissioners in assessing the damages resulting from the taking of a part of a tract of land for highway purposes made an allowance for a fence, and on appeal to the district court neither of the parties challenge the correctness of such allowance and by their conduct imply that the allowance so made by the Board of County Commissioners is satisfactory, they cannot be heard to say in the Supreme Court that the district court erred in including in the compensation adjudged to be due to the owner of the land the amount of the allowance made for the fence by the Board of County Commissioners.

That on appeal to the district court from a decision of a Board of County Commissioners made in a proceeding instituted on the petition of the state highway commissioner for the ascertainment and determination of damages resulting from the taking of land for highway purposes, the members of the Board of County Commissioners are not proper parties respondent and judgment may not be rendered against them. Judgment may be rendered alone against the state highway commissioner that he "pay, or cause to be paid" the award of damages "from the state highway fund, into court, for the benefit of the owners of land to whom such awards have been made, by depositing with the clerk of court of such county cash in the amount of such award or awards."

That where property is taken or damaged for a public use without just compensation having been first made, payment is legally due the owner as of the date of the taking or damaging of the property and interest should be given from the date when the property is taken or damaged.

From a judgment of the District Court of Benson County, DePuy, J., the state highway commissioner and the members of the Board of County Commissioners of Benson County appeal.

**MODIFIED AND REMANDED.**

Opinion of the court by Christianson, Ch.J.