

**Shaw Vs. Garrison**

**Shaw Vs. Garrison**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/101851](http://sooperkanoon.com/101851)

**Court :** US Supreme Court

**Decided On :** Dec-09-1968

**Appeal No. :** 393 U.S. 220

**Appellant :** Shaw

**Respondent :** Garrison

**Judgement :**

SHAW v. GARRISON - 393 U.S. 220 (1968)

U.S. Supreme Court SHAW v. GARRISON, 393 U.S. 220 (1968) **393 U.S. 220**

SHAW v. GARRISON ET AL.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA. No. 579.

Decided December 9, 1968.

Affirmed.

Herve Racivitch for appellant.

Eberhard P. Deutsch and Rene H. Himel, Jr., for appellees.

PER CURIAM.

The motion to affirm is granted and the judgment is affirmed.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

---

[393 U.S. 220](#) (1968) "> U.S. Supreme Court LANDRY v. BOYLE, [393 U.S. 220](#)  
(1968) **393 U.S. 220**

LANDRY ET AL. v. BOYLE, CHIEF JUDGE, ET AL.  
APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS. No. 659.  
Decided December 9, 1968.

280 F. Supp. 938, appeal dismissed.

Robert L. Tucker, R. Eugene Pincham, Jean F. Williams, Leonard Karlin, William M. Kunstler, and Arthur Kinoy for appellants.

PER CURIAM.

The appeal is dismissed for failure to comply with Rule 13 (1).

Page 393 U.S. 220, 221