

Drueding Vs. Devlin

Drueding Vs. Devlin

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/101223

Court : US Supreme Court

Decided On : Mar-01-1965

Appeal No. : 380 U.S. 125

Appellant : Drueding

Respondent : Devlin

Judgement :

DRUEDING v. DEVLIN - 380 U.S. 125 (1965)

U.S. Supreme Court DRUEDING v. DEVLIN, 380 U.S. 125 (1965) **380 U.S. 125**

DRUEDING ET AL. v. DEVLIN ET AL.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.

No. 772.

Decided March 1, 1965.

234 F. Supp. 721, affirmed.

Lawrence Speiser, Allison W. Brown, Jr., and Edward L. Genn for appellants.

PER CURIAM.

The judgment is affirmed.

Page 380 U.S. 125, 126

[380 U.S. 125](#) (1965) "> U.S. Supreme Court CITY OF CORONADO v. SAN DIEGO, [380 U.S. 125](#) (1965) **380 U.S. 125**

CITY OF CORONADO ET AL. v. SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT ET AL.
APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA,
FOURTH APPELLATE
DISTRICT. No. 763.
Decided March 1, 1965.

Appeal dismissed for want of a substantial federal question.

Reported below: 227 Cal. App. 2d 455, 38 Cal. Rptr. 834.

George A. Blackstone for appellants.

Aaron W. Reese and Burnham Enersen for San Diego Unified Port District et al., and Thomas C. Lynch, Attorney General, and Ariel C. Hilton, Deputy Attorney General, for the State of California, appellees.

PER CURIAM.

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