

**Perk Vs. Ohio**

**Perk Vs. Ohio**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/102230](http://sooperkanoon.com/102230)

**Court :** US Supreme Court

**Decided On :** Dec-08-1969

**Appeal No. :** 396 U.S. 113

**Appellant :** Perk

**Respondent :** Ohio

**Judgement :**

PERK v. OHIO - 396 U.S. 113 (1969)

U.S. Supreme Court PERK v. OHIO, 396 U.S. 113 (1969) **396 U.S. 113**

PERK, AUDITOR OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY v. OHIO EX REL. CORRIGAN,  
PROSECUTING

ATTORNEY OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY

APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO No. 590.

Decided December 8, 1969

19 Ohio St. 2d 1, 249 N. E. 2d 525, appeal dismissed.

Gerald A. Donahue and Donald M. Robiner for appellant.

John T. Corrigan, pro se, and John L. Dowling for appellee.

PER CURIAM.

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

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS is of the opinion that probable jurisdiction should be noted.

---

[396 U.S. 113](#) (1969) "> U.S. Supreme Court MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT v. CAPITAL ELEC. POW. ASSN., [396 U.S. 113](#) (1969) **396 U.S. 113**

MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT CO. v. CAPITAL ELECTRIC POWER ASSN.  
APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF MISSISSIPPI

No. 611.

Decided December 8, 1969

222 So.2d 399, appeal dismissed.

Bernard G. Segal, Samuel D. Slade, Sherwood W. Wise, Garner W. Green, and Joshua Green for appellant.

T. Harvey Hedgepeth for appellee.

PER CURIAM.

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

Page 396 U.S. 113, 114

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