

**Holland Vs. Hogan**

**Holland Vs. Hogan**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/101926](http://sooperkanoon.com/101926)

**Court :** US Supreme Court

**Decided On :** Jun-17-1968

**Appeal No. :** 392 U.S. 654

**Appellant :** Holland

**Respondent :** Hogan

**Judgement :**

HOLLAND v. HOGAN - 392 U.S. 654 (1968)

U.S. Supreme Court HOLLAND v. HOGAN, 392 U.S. 654 (1968) **392 U.S. 654**

HOLLAND ET AL. v. HOGAN, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, ET AL.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF

NEW YORK. No. 653.

Decided June 17, 1968.

272 F. Supp. 855, vacated and remanded.

Robert Abelow, Marshall C. Berger, and Donald J. Williamson for appellants.

Frank S. Hogan, H. Richard Uviller, and Michael R. Stack, each pro se, and for  
Yasgur et al., J. Lee Rankin, Norman Redlich, and Stanley Buchsbaum for Adler,  
and Louis J. Lefkowitz, Attorney General of New York, pro se, and Samuel A.

Hirshowitz, First Assistant Attorney General, and Brenda Soloff, Assistant Attorney General, for Lefkowitz, appellees.

PER CURIAM.

The judgment is vacated and the case is remanded to the United States District Court for further consideration in light of *Gardner v. Broderick*, ante, p. 273, and *George Campbell Painting Corp. v. Reid*, ante, p. 286.

MR. JUSTICE BLACK and MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS are of the opinion that probable jurisdiction should be noted and the case set for oral argument.

Page 392 U.S. 654, 655

**SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - [sooperkanoon.com](http://sooperkanoon.com)**