

Badgley Vs. Hare

Badgley Vs. Hare

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/101290

Court : US Supreme Court

Decided On : Nov-21-1966

Appeal No. : 385 U.S. 114

Appellant : Badgley

Respondent : Hare

Judgement :

BADGLEY v. HARE - 385 U.S. 114 (1966)

U.S. Supreme Court BADGLEY v. HARE, 385 U.S. 114 (1966) **385 U.S. 114**

BADGLEY ET AL. v. HARE, SECRETARY OF STATE OF MICHIGAN, ET AL.
APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF MICHIGAN.

No. 505.

Decided November 21, 1966.

376 Mich. 410, 137 N. W. 2d 495, 138 N. W. 2d 16; 377 Mich. 396, 140 N. W. 2d 436, appeal dismissed.

William T. Gossett for appellants.

Frank J. Kelly, Attorney General of Michigan, Robert A. Derengoski, Solicitor General, and Curtis G. Beck, Assistant Attorney General, for Hare; Theodore Sachs for Scholle et al., appellees.

PER CURIAM.

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

[385 U.S. 114](#) (1966) "> U.S. Supreme Court BOYDEN v. CALIFORNIA, [385 U.S. 114](#) (1966) **385 U.S. 114**

BOYDEN v. CALIFORNIA.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA,
SECOND

APPELLATE DISTRICT. No. 271, Misc.

Decided November 21, 1966.

Appeal dismissed and certiorari denied.

Appellant pro se.

Thomas C. Lynch, Attorney General of California, William E. James, Assistant Attorney General, and Jack K. Weber, Deputy Attorney General, for appellee.

PER CURIAM.

The motion to dismiss is granted and 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 385 U.S. 114, 115

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