



1931

## Our Administrative Imperfections

Richard E. Wenzel

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Wenzel, Richard E. (1931) "Our Administrative Imperfections," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 8 : No. 3 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol8/iss3/1>

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).

# BAR BRIEFS

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT BISMARCK

—By—

## STATE BAR ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA

Richard E. Wenzel, Editor

Entered as Second Class Matter Jan. 15, 1925, at the Postoffice at Bismarck,  
North Dakota, Under the Act of August 24, 1912

VOL. 8

FEBRUARY, 1932

NO. 3

### OUR ADMINISTRATIVE IMPERFECTIONS

We have discussed this subject on a number of occasions. In an editorial in the May, 1930, issue of Bar Briefs we made reference to the case of the bootlegger who received a sentence in Federal Court of three days so that he might travel home at government expense. In the issue immediately following (June, 1930) we reviewed the Malusky case, in which our Own Supreme Court held the violator of the liquor law guilty of "moral turpitude" and subject to the "habitual offender" act. In numerous other articles and talks we have suggested that a discrepancy existed between the judgment of \$6,000 for a fractured leg and the judgment of \$5,000 for loss of life (personal injury cases tried to juries the same week in localities not over 200 miles apart). We have further cited the case of the bigamist who received a sentence of five years, and, during those five years, saw a friend of his enter the same emporium to serve two sentences for the same offense, one of nine months and one of sixteen months.

These references have not been made for the sole purpose of being critical. They have been made for the purpose of inviting sufficient interest on the part of the legal profession to the end that Einstein's theory of relativity may be more happily applied. They have been made for the purpose of indicating that we are a long way from an approximation of the ideal conditions that ought to prevail. They have been made for the purpose of acknowledging the responsibility of the Bench and Bar for the achievement of a more uniform interpretation of law and a more equitable application of law to facts.