

Honeywood Vs. Rockefeller

Honeywood Vs. Rockefeller

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/100970

Court : US Supreme Court

Decided On : Mar-02-1964

Appeal No. : 376 U.S. 222

Appellant : Honeywood

Respondent : Rockefeller

Judgement :

HONEYWOOD v. ROCKEFELLER - 376 U.S. 222 (1964)

U.S. Supreme Court HONEYWOOD v. ROCKEFELLER, 376 U.S. 222 (1964) **376 U.S. 222**

HONEYWOOD ET AL. v. ROCKEFELLER, GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK, ET AL.
APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN
DISTRICT OF NEW

YORK. No. 267.

Decided March 2, 1964.

214 F. Supp. 897, affirmed.

Moses M. Falk for appellants.

Louis J. Lefkowitz, Attorney General of New York, Irving Galt, Assistant Solicitor General, Sheldon Raab, Assistant Attorney General, and Irving D. Goodstein for

appellees.

PER CURIAM.

The motion to affirm is granted and the judgment is affirmed. Wright v. Rockefeller, ante, p. 52.

[376 U.S. 222](#) (1964) "> U.S. Supreme Court MARTIN v. BUSH, [376 U.S. 222](#) (1964) **376 U.S. 222**

MARTIN, SECRETARY OF STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL. v. BUSH ET AL.
APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS. No. 675.
Decided March 2, 1964.

Judgment affirmed on authority of Wesberry v. Sanders, ante, p. 1, without prejudice to appellants' right to apply to District Court by April 1, 1964, for further equitable relief.

224 F. Supp. 499, affirmed.

Waggoner Carr, Attorney General of Texas, Albert P. Jones and Hawthorne Phillips, First Assistant Attorneys General, Mary K. Wall, Assistant Attorney General, Will D. Davis and Frank C. Erwin, Jr. for appellants.

William B. Cassin and Thad T. Hutcheson for appellees.

Page 376 U.S. 222, 223

PER CURIAM.

The motion to affirm is granted and the judgment is affirmed on the authority of *Wesberry v. Sanders*, ante, p. 1, without prejudice to the right of the appellants to apply by April 1, 1964, to the District Court for further equitable relief in light of the present circumstances including the imminence of the forthcoming election and "the operation of the election machinery of Texas" noted by the District Court in its opinion. [*](#) The stay heretofore granted by MR. JUSTICE BLACK is continued in effect pending timely application for the foregoing relief and final disposition thereof by the District Court.

MR. JUSTICE CLARK joins this disposition, but upon the grounds stated in his separate opinion in *Wesberry v. Sanders*, ante, p. 18.

MR. JUSTICE HARLAN and MR. JUSTICE STEWART would reverse the judgment below for the reasons stated in their dissenting opinions in *Wesberry v. Sanders*, ante, pp. 20, 50.

[[Footnote *](#)] 224 F. Supp. 499, 513.

Page 376 U.S. 222, 224