

Fay Vs. Crozer

Fay Vs. Crozer

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/90864

Court : US Supreme Court

Decided On : May-02-1910

Appeal No. : 217 U.S. 455

Appellant : Fay

Respondent : Crozer

Judgement :

Fay v. Crozer - 217 U.S. 455 (1910)

U.S. Supreme Court Fay v. Crozer, 217 U.S. 455 (1910)

Fay v. Crozer

No. 165

Argued April 21, 22, 1910

Decided May 2, 1910

217 U.S. 455

ERROR TO THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

SYLLABUS

A writ of error based on constitutional question will not lie unless the controversy is a substantial one and the question open to discussion. If the identical question has been determined in a suit involving a state statute, it is foreclosed although it may subsequently arise in connection with the provision of the constitution of the state under which the statute was enacted, and the writ of error will be dismissed. There is no greater objection under the Constitution of the United States to the forfeiture of land for five years' neglect to pay taxes than there is to a similar forfeiture by the statute of limitations for neglect to assert title against one by whom the former owner has been disseized.

The questions involved in this case having been determined in *King v. Mullin*, [171 U. S. 404](#) , *King v. West Virginia*, [216 U. S. 92](#) , the writ of error is dismissed.

The facts are stated in the opinion.

Page 217 U. S. 456

PER CURIAM.

This is a writ of error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, brought directly to this Court, and as such falls within the rule that the controversy must be substantial and the question open to discussion. Tested by that rule, we think the writ of error must be dismissed on the authority of *King v. Mullins*, [171 U. S. 404](#) ; *King v. West Virginia*, [216 U. S. 92](#) . And see *King v. Panther Lumber Co.*, [171 U. S. 437](#) ; *Swann v. West Virginia*, 188 U.S. 739. It is contended that the question of the forfeiture of plaintiffs' title under the Constitution of West Virginia was not ruled in those cases, because they also involved the statute of the state referred to, while this case presents the validity of the forfeiture provision of the state constitution alone. But it was pointed out in *King v. West Virginia*, [216 U. S. 100](#) , that the right to redeem, given by the statute, was not coextensive with the forfeiture under the state constitution, and yet the Constitution was upheld, as it was in *King v. Mullins*, [171 U. S. 404](#) . It

follows, therefore, that the state constitution must be upheld in the present case. The only hearing that could be necessary would be whether the facts constitute a forfeiture, and that question, when it arises between a former owner and a claimant under the state, can be tried in a case between those parties, as it was here. There is no greater objection under the Constitution of the United States to the forfeiture of land for five years' neglect to pay taxes than there is to a similar forfeiture by the statute of limitations for neglect to assert title against one by whom the former owner has been disseized. We think that the question suggested is so plainly covered by the preceding cases that the writ of error must be dismissed.

It is so ordered.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com