



1925

U.S. Supreme Court Decisions

North Dakota Law Review

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

Recommended Citation

North Dakota Law Review (1925) "U.S. Supreme Court Decisions," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 2 : No. 2 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol2/iss2/3>

This Decision 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.

U. S. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution prohibits the search of a dwelling without a search warrant except as an incident to a lawful arrest therein.—*Agnello vs. U. S.*, 46 Sup. Ct. Rep. 4.

The power of a Federal Court to issue writ of habeas corpus for relief from arrest under process of a State Court of first instance is not to be exerted except in cases of unusual urgency.—*U. S. vs. Tyler*, 46 Sup. Ct. Rep. 1.

Sec. 4 of the "Act to Regulate Commerce" provides: "It shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the provisions of this Act to charge any greater compensation as a through rate than the aggregate of the intermediate rates subject to the provisions of this Act." Under an amendment which required railroads to make application to the I. C. C. for the introduction of a different rate, such application was brought, but was undetermined. Shippers brought suit for the recovery of \$30,000 alleged to have been illegally exacted. And it was held, Justice Brandeis delivering the opinion, that the I. C. C. had power to deal with the matter, and the shippers could not recover where adequate and timely application had been made by the carriers, though undetermined.—*Patterson vs. Ry. Co.*, 46 Sup. Ct. Rep. 8.

A debt due in German marks is to be valued at the value of the mark on the date when the account was stated and the debt due. Interest for the period of the war was included.—*Hicks vs. Guinness*, 46 Sup. Ct. Rep. 46.

The construction and delivery of materials to a subcontractor by a foreign corporation which has a contract to erect a bridge within the state is held to be doing business within the state, and the failure to comply with certain prerequisites required by the state statutes before doing such business constitutes a violation and makes such corporation subject to fine.—*Kansas City Structural Steel Co. vs. Arkansas*, 46 Sup. Ct. Rep. 59.

The statutory provision which inhibits an attorney from accepting more than three dollars for services performed in the collection of claims against the Bureau of War Risk Insurance is valid, and does not relate solely to the clerical work of filling out the necessary papers. "The only compensation which it permits a claim agent or attorney to receive where no legal proceeding has been commenced is three dollars for assistance in preparation and execution of necessary papers. And the history of the enactment indicates plainly enough that Congress did not fail to choose apt language to express its purpose," said Justice Reynolds in writing the opinion.—*Margolin vs. U. S.*, 46 Sup. Ct. Rep. 64.