

January 1924

Constitutional Law—Limiting Medicinal Prescriptions to Spirituous and Vinous Liquors—Due Process—Forbidding Dispensing of Malt Liquor

Follow this and additional works at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview



Part of the [Constitutional Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Constitutional Law—Limiting Medicinal Prescriptions to Spirituous and Vinous Liquors—Due Process—Forbidding Dispensing of Malt Liquor, 10 ST. LOUIS L. REV. 072 (1924).

Available at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol10/iss1/16

This Comment on Recent Decisions is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington University Law Review by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

UNFAIR COMPETITION—PLACING FALSE COVERS ON TELEPHONE DIRECTORIES AND SELLING ADVERTISING SPACE THEREON, CONSTITUTES UNFAIR COMPETITION.

National Telephone Directory Co. v. Dawson Mfg. Co. and Chase Hotel Co.,

263 S. W. 483, St. L. Ct. of App., June, 1924.

Plaintiff had through expenditure of time and money devolved certain local telephone directories into a very valuable advertising medium. The defendant manufacturing company by making false backs to be placed on these directories, and the defendant hotel company in its proposal to use and sell advertising space thereon, are held guilty of acts constituting unfair competition.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—LIMITING MEDICINAL PRESCRIPTIONS TO SPIRITUOUS AND VINOUS LIQUORS—DUE PROCESS—FORBIDDING DISPENSING OF MALT LIQUOR.

Everard's Breweries v. Day, U. S. Adv. Ops. 1923-24, page 655.

Plaintiff was charged with selling intoxicating malt liquors to druggists who dispensed it in prescriptions. Congress had passed the Supplemental Act, which limited prescriptions for medicinal purposes to spirituous and vinous liquors. Held, as the 18th Amendment gave Congress the power to enforce this amendment by appropriate legislation the Supplemental Act was not an arbitrary and unreasonable exercise of this power.

INJUNCTION—JURISDICTION—REMOVAL OF STATE OFFICER.

Walton v. Disney, U. S. Adv. Ops., 1923-24, page 673.

This was a suit in equity to enjoin an impeachment against a state officer. Plaintiff was found guilty and removed from office. Held, that a court of equity has no jurisdiction over the appointment and removal of public officers.

COVENANT BETWEEN PROPERTY OWNERS NOT TO SELL TO NEGROES HELD CONSTITUTIONAL—MAY BE ENFORCED AS BETWEEN THE PARTIES.

Corrigan et als. v. Buckley, 299 Fed. 899.

The plaintiff and defendant with twenty-eight other residents made a covenant not to sell to negroes for twenty-one years, binding on their heirs and assigns. This action was brought by Buckley to enjoin Corrigan from breaching the covenant, and to prevent the defendant, Cartes, from taking possession of the premises in question. There was a judgment for the plaintiff; the defendant took an appeal. The appellants contend that the agreement is unconstitutional in that it deprives negroes of the right to acquire and hold prop-