

Sinclair Vs. Baker

Sinclair Vs. Baker

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/100901

Court : US Supreme Court

Decided On : May-18-1964

Appeal No. : 377 U.S. 215

Appellant : Sinclair

Respondent : Baker

Judgement :

SINCLAIR v. BAKER - 377 U.S. 215 (1964)

U.S. Supreme Court SINCLAIR v. BAKER, 377 U.S. 215 (1964) **377 U.S. 215**

SINCLAIR v. BAKER ET AL.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT. No. 949.

Decided May 18, 1964.

Appeal dismissed and certiorari denied.

Reported below: 219 Cal. App. 2d 817, 33 Cal. Rptr. 522.

PER CURIAM.

The appeal is dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Treating the papers whereon the appeal was taken as a petition for a writ of certiorari, certiorari is denied.

Page 377 U.S. 215, 216

[377 U.S. 215](#) (1964) "> U.S. Supreme Court LUCKENBACH STEAMSHIP v. FRANCHISE TAX BOARD OF CAL., [377 U.S. 215](#) (1964) **377 U.S. 215**

LUCKENBACH STEAMSHIP CO., INC., v. FRANCHISE TAX BOARD OF CALIFORNIA.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA, THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT. No. 916.

Decided May 18, 1964.

Appeal dismissed for want of a substantial federal question.

Reported below: 219 Cal. App. 2d 710, 33 Cal. Rptr. 544.

Hart H. Spiegel and John Hays for appellant.

Stanley Mosk, Attorney General of California, James E. Sabine, Assistant Attorney General, and Ernest P. Goodman and John J. Klee, Jr., Deputy Attorneys General, for appellee.

PER CURIAM.

The motion to dismiss is granted and the appeal is dismissed for want of a substantial federal question.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com