

**Dozier Vs. Alabama**

**Dozier Vs. Alabama**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/90839](http://sooperkanoon.com/90839)

**Court :** US Supreme Court

**Decided On :** May-31-1910

**Appeal No. :** 218 U.S. 124

**Appellant :** Dozier

**Respondent :** Alabama

**Judgement :**

Dozier v. Alabama - 218 U.S. 124 (1910)

U.S. Supreme Court Dozier v. Alabama, 218 U.S. 124 (1910)

**Dozier v. Alabama**

**No. 105**

**Submitted January 25, 1910**

**Decided May 31, 1910**

**218 U.S. 124**

*ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT*

*OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA*

## SYLLABUS

The protection of the commerce clause of the federal Constitution extends beyond the strict lines of contract, and inseparable incidents of a transaction of interstate commerce based on contract are also interstate commerce.

Where, under the contract to purchase a picture, the purchaser has the option to take at a specified price the frame in which the picture shall be delivered, and both picture and frame are manufactured in and delivered from another state and remain the property of the vendor until paid for, the sale of the frame is a part of the original transaction and protected by the commerce clause of the Constitution.

The imposition of a license tax for soliciting orders for enlargements of photographs and frames on persons not having a permanent place of business in the state and keeping such articles as stock in trade is a regulation of commerce between the states and void under the commerce clause of the federal Constitution, both as to the orders for the picture itself and as to an optional right to take at a price specified in the contract, the frame in which the picture is delivered, and so *held* as to the license tax imposed under 17 of the statute of March 7, 1907, of Alabama.

154 Ala. 83 reversed.

The facts are stated in the opinion.

Page 218 U. S. 126

MR. JUSTICE HOLMES delivered the opinion of the Court.

The plaintiff in error was convicted and sentenced to a fine on a complaint for breach of an Alabama statute of

Page 218 U. S. 127

March 7, 1907. By 17 of that act, a license tax was imposed on persons who did not have a permanent place of business in the state and also keep picture frames as a part of their stock in trade if they solicited orders for the enlargement of photographs or pictures of any character, or for picture frames, whether they made charge for such frames or not, or if they sold or disposed of picture frames. The Chicago Crayon Company, having its only place of business in Chicago, and being engaged in the business of making and enlarging portraits from photographs, and in the manufacturing of picture frames, solicited orders in Alabama without paying the license tax. These orders were given in writing for a portrait of the size and kind wanted, specified the price, cash on delivery, and continued: "I understand that my portrait is to be delivered in an appropriate frame, which this contract entitles me to accept at factory price." The agent of the company gave back a written acceptance, repeating the other terms of the bargain, and adding: "All portraits are delivered in appropriate frames, which this contract entitled the purchaser to accept at factory prices," with particulars purporting to show that these prices were from one third to one-half the retail or usual ones. The plaintiff in error, who also had no permanent place of business in Alabama and had paid no license tax, was an agent of the company, who delivered pictures and frames, and collected for them, in pursuance of the agreed plan. The pictures and frames were sent to the agent, and remained the property of the company until paid for and delivered. On these facts, the Supreme Court of Alabama, while admitting that the dealings concerning the pictures were commerce among the states, sustained the conviction on the ground that the sale of the frames was a wholly local matter. 154 Ala. 83.

No doubt it is true that the customer was not bound to take the frame unless he saw fit, and that the sale of it

Page 218 U. S. 128

took place wholly within the State of Alabama, if a sale was made. But, as was hinted in *Rearick v. Pennsylvania*, [203 U. S. 507](#) , [203 U. S. 512](#) , what is commerce among the states is a question depending upon broader considerations than the existence of a technically binding contract, or the time and place where

the title passed. It was agreed that the frame should be offered along with the picture. The offer was a part of the interstate bargain, and as it was agreed that the frame should be offered "at factory prices," and the company and factory were in Chicago, obviously it was contemplated, if not agreed, that the frame should come on with the picture. In fact, the frames were sent on with the pictures from Chicago, and were offered when the pictures were tendered, as part of a transaction commercially continuous, and one at prices generically fixed by the contract for the pictures, and by that contract represented to be less than retail or usual prices, in consideration, it is implied, of the purchase already agreed to be made. We are of opinion that the sale of the frames cannot be so separated from the rest of the dealing between the Chicago company and the Alabama purchaser as to sustain the license tax upon it. Under the decisions, the statute, as applied to this case, is a regulation of commerce among the states, and void under the Constitution of the United States. Art. I, 8. *Robbins v. Shelby County Taxing District*, [120 U. S. 489](#) ; *Caldwell v. North Carolina*, [187 U. S. 622](#) ; *Rearick v. Pennsylvania*, [203 U. S. 507](#) .

*Judgment reversed.*