



1943

North Dakota Attorneys with Armed Forces

North Dakota State Bar Association

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



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

North Dakota State Bar Association (1943) "North Dakota Attorneys with Armed Forces," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 20 : No. 7 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol20/iss7/4>

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.

Law, University of Illinois, who will speak on "The Evolution of the Lawyer."

NORTH DAKOTA ATTORNEYS WITH ARMED FORCES

At page fifteen of the Licensed Attorneys List for 1944 there appears the names and home addresses of seventy-eight members of the North Dakota Bar who are with the Armed Forces. This is nearly twenty per cent of the total membership of our association.

OUR SUPREME COURT HOLDS

In *Helena E. Cunningham, Admx. of the estate of William Burton Cunningham, Pltff., vs. G. N. Ry. Company, a corporation, Deft.*

That where the party against whom verdict has been rendered makes timely motion in the alternative for judgment notwithstanding a verdict or for a new trial, and it appears from the record that the evidence does not sustain the verdict and that the moving party was entitled to a verdict, that there is no reasonable probability that the defects in the proofs may be remedied upon another trial and that on the record as a whole the moving party is entitled to verdict and judgment as a matter of law, it is error for the trial court to deny a motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict and order a new trial. Laws 1935, ch. 245.

That in actions under the Federal Employers' Liability Act, 45 USCA, Sections 51-59, 10A F C A title 45, Sections 51-59, wherever brought, the rights and obligations of the parties depend upon such Act and applicable principles of common law as interpreted and applied in the federal courts.

That negligence of the employer is the basis of recovery under the Federal Employers' Liability Act. Without negligence there is no right of action.

That in actions under the Federal Employers' Act, as in other actions at law for injury to employees, the burden is cast upon the plaintiff to show negligent conduct on the part of the employer constituting ground for recovery. The plaintiff must establish a breach of duty on the part of the defendant and show that such misconduct was in fact the proximate cause of his injury.

That the question of negligence is generally one of fact for the jury, it becomes a question of law only when the evidence is such that fair-minded men cannot reasonably draw different conclusions as to the facts or the inferences to be drawn therefrom. But when the state of the evidence is such that fair-minded men in the exercise of reason and judgment could not have reached the conclusion that the person whom the jury by its verdict found to have been negligent in fact had been negligent, then the verdict will be set aside.

That in the instant case it is held, for reasons stated in the opinion, that there is no evidence from which the inference may reasonably be drawn that the defendant was negligent, and that the injuries sustained by plaintiff's intestate were caused by any breach of duty of the defendant; and that upon the record as a whole the defendant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

Appeal from the District Court of Ramsey County, Kneeshaw, J. Action for damages for death of plaintiff's intestate. There was a verdict for plaintiff. Defendant moved in the alternative for judgment notwithstanding the verdict or for a new trial. The court denied the motion for judgment, and ordered a new trial. Both parties appeal. Reversed and action ordered dismissed. Opinion of the Court by Christianson, J.