



1929

Jury Verdicts/Appreciation Expressed

North Dakota Law Review

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

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

Recommended Citation

North Dakota Law Review (1929) "Jury Verdicts/Appreciation Expressed," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 6: No. 2, Article 10.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol6/iss2/10>

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.

cess or order of a court, or designed or calculated by its makeup to lead the person receiving it to believe it to be the order or process of a court, when in fact the same is not the order or process of any court, shall be punishable as a misdemeanor; and another Section, 527, makes it a misdemeanor to sell, offer for sale, print, publish or distribute any form designed or calculated to be taken as, or used as, an order or process of any court when in fact such form is not to be the order or process of any court.

JURY VERDICTS

The following states have enacted legislation which does not require the concurrence of all members of the jury to arrive at a verdict in criminal cases involving misdemeanors: Idaho and Wisconsin, where five-sixth may render the verdict; Oklahoma and Texas, where three-fourths of the jurors may concur and bring in a verdict; and Mantana, which allows concurrence by two-thirds to carry the verdict. All other states require unanimous concurrence in misdemeanor cases, and all of the states make that requirement in felony cases.

In civil cases the following states have adopted some form of majority decision: Minnesota, Nebraska, South Dakota, Washington, and Wisconsin, five-sixth; Arizona, Connecticut, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Texas and Utah, three-fourths; Montana, two-thirds; and Iowa, seven-twelfths. The other twenty-nine, including North Dakota, require unanimous decisions.

APPRECIATION EXPRESSED

Attorney Hugo P. Remington of Lisbon writes in the following vein:

"If there is in the minds of any a doubt as to the Solomon-like wisdom of the justices of our Supreme Court, I would like to refer all doubters to the following recommendation which I received in a letter from a client today.

"I want to thank you for the copy of the decision you sent me in the case of myself vs. G. I assure you I have read the same with great care and interest, and I must say that the Supreme Court decided just the way I would have decided it if I were to decide it. The judges certainly done absolute justice in this case."

"In these days of captious criticism of courts and magistrates such an expression of confidence as this might not be amiss for publication in Bar Briefs."

WHAT PRICE ADVICE?

Paul Campbell, of Minot, is searching the books for an answer to the following question from a client, and sends it on to us, we presume, for the purpose of ascertaining what item of the fee schedule applies:

"i wood lik to now if a president of a Bank cold hold is president ship wen caut smugerlin cattel from canada."