

Wright Vs. Sill

Wright Vs. Sill

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/81115

Court : US Supreme Court

Decided On : 1862

Appeal No. : 67 U.S. 544

Appellant : Wright

Respondent : Sill

Judgement :

Wright v. Sill - 67 U.S. 544 (1862)

U.S. Supreme Court Wright v. Sill, 67 U.S. 2 Black 544 544 (1862)

Wright v. Sill

67 U.S. (2 Black) 544

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE UNITED

STATES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

SYLLABUS

A question repeatedly argued and decided must be considered as no longer open for discussion, whatever differences of opinion may once have existed on the subject in this Court.

This case was submitted to the Court upon the record, without any argument, written or oral.

MR. JUSTICE SWAYNE.

This is a suit in equity, brought here by appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

The questions presented are whether the 60th section of the Act of the Legislature of Ohio entitled "An act to incorporate the State Bank of Ohio and other Banking Companies," passed February 24, 1845, constitutes a contract upon the subject of taxation which is binding upon the state, and if so whether that contract is impaired by the subsequent act of the legislature, passed April 5, 1859, entitled "An act for the assessment and taxation of all the property in this state, and for levying taxes thereon according to its true value in money."

These questions came before this Court the first time in [*Piqua Branch of the State Bank of Ohio v. Knoop*](#), 16 How.

Page 67 U. S. 545

369, and were resolved in the affirmative. They have since been repeatedly before the Court, and have uniformly been decided in the same way. [*Dodge v. Woolsey*](#), 18 How. 331; [*Mechanics' and Traders' Bank v. Debolt*](#), 18 How. 380; [*Jefferson Branch Bank v. Skelley*](#), 1 Black 436; [*Franklin Branch Bank v. State of Ohio*](#), 1 Black 474.

Whatever differences of opinion may have existed in this Court originally in regard to these questions or might now exist if they were open for reconsideration, it is sufficient to say that they are concluded by these adjudications. The argument upon both sides was exhausted in the earlier cases. It could subserve no useful purpose again to examine the subject.

The decree of the court below is affirmed, with costs.

