

District of Columbia Vs. Hall

District of Columbia Vs. Hall

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/88369

Court : US Supreme Court

Decided On : Feb-16-1897

Appeal No. : 165 U.S. 340

Appellant : District of Columbia

Respondent : Hall

Judgement :

District of Columbia v. Hall - 165 U.S. 340 (1897)

U.S. Supreme Court District of Columbia v. Hall, 165 U.S. 340 (1897)

District of Columbia v. Hall

No. 619

Submitted January 4, 1897

Decided February 16, 1897

165 U.S. 340

APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS

SYLLABUS

District of Columbia v. Johnson, [165 U. S. 330](#) , approved and followed.

The case is stated in the opinion.

MR. JUSTICE PECKHAM delivered the opinion of the Court.

This is another of the same character of actions as those above disposed of. Hall was one of the contractors for doing work of the same nature, and filed his petition under the act of 1880 in December of that year. In that petition, he alleged that he had done certain work, and that he was paid for his work, under his contract, by certain certificates, which were worth only fifty percent of their face value, and which he consented to receive only at that rate, and he asked for judgment for the other fifty percent of his contract price. He failed in the primary object of that suit, but he did recover on some other ground a small judgment of about \$1,000, which was entered June 1, 1885. Subsequently, and in pursuance of the act of 1895, he applied for a new trial for the purpose of claiming the "board rates" compensation for the work done by him at contract prices, under circumstances mentioned in the foregoing cases. The Court of Claims gave judgment in his favor for that difference between the two rates, and found that, under the true intent and meaning of the acts of 1895 and 1880 the sum for which it gave judgment "became due and payable on the 1st of January, 1877," which was the date when the plaintiff had completed his work under the contract. 31 Ct.Cl. 376.

Page 165 U. S. 341

For the reasons mentioned in the foregoing cases, the judgment of the Court of Claims in this case must also be

Reversed, and the cause remanded for further proceedings not inconsistent with that opinion.