

11-6-1971

11-06-1971 Notes from Oral Argument

Harry A. Blackmun

Associate Justice of the US Supreme Court

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/cartervstanton>



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Blackmun, H.A. Notes from Oral Argument, Carter v. Stanton, 405 U.S. 669 (1972). Box 367, Harry A. Blackmun Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

This Oral Argument is brought to you for free and open access by the U.S. Supreme Court papers, Justice Blackmun at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Carter v. Stanton, 405 U.S. 669 (1972) by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURed@ilstu.edu.

Argued: November 8, 1971

2¹⁰ Mr. Ireland 3 - logical theories.

3 Sturitt = State, Stanton = County.

JD - on this 3 judge it dissolved itself & ∴ act is to v a single judge. But no of it he is unjustly concerned. And although it covered - too it is made only by 3 ds. Also ruled on 7 months after 16 units. (CJ - so what). 3 ds acted here.

Merits - Reg NB on its face. No rational basis for "abstract" need instructor v 6 mos & > 6 mos. Also provides no std for + administrators. Allegedly no uncertainty here into evidence. If 30 keep with + measure goes OK but nothing > 20. Here the applicant for divorce was 1/4 6 mos prior to divorce. Is there was Xg.

It is v seems to be from basis for 31 only. But NB U Danisco & King. The adm review here is nearly anyone - no class action prec 1/4 open in Ind. Will be quite here. We try to subpoena rec but rejected on conference gss.

42172 Danisco v Stanton

1343 pt, we think, was on Hayne v CIO.

2²³

2²³ Mr. Pelen C on dissent Dec. 1971

This appeal belongs in 4/7. Case fully determined. (non-appeal)

The today in his badge, is over-simplified.

Merits - Ind plan based rationally. Soon after for leaves, need it so great as later. Danisco 2²⁷

2²⁷ Mr. Heddes tall meek look, sharp.

We S in 6 in fed it at all. 2 v + ~~cases~~ 115 here if got leave in 3 mos seems fully for divorce. The 6 mos is a guideline - after 6 mos, a covered presumption. S - yes as reference D + E In Danisco & all cited cases, + adm review is a delay & futile. Mr. Heddes says no adm review rec was in 1983. But it also emphasizes judicially.

Is no adm review here - & too to sit on fed ct. In de novo. W - is the adm review? Yes. All admitted review with 5 whos. 7 units who testify read and is < 2 mos. 3⁰⁵

3⁰⁵ Mr. Ireland

2 units got rec only after 6 mos.

70-582.

CJ poor opinion. No + send back

D wd - Scheme of it is NB - need as great in 24 hrs as 6 mos. - + 6 mos in NB - cd deny on basis of no need.

B a 1913 sent - deny in 1913 for appeal. Can define "need" too wa in lt + fed stat

W King v Smith is a 1913 case but we did in favor to an to
So too pages Dandridge

S try descend on grad v lack v ^{might be} SFD. We ~ talk me I in take
regul too reasonable. Remand + say to is fed? - if regul means
what it seems + say, it is fed stat. No need + sphere it seems

W V + remand + let them do their job. Stay being is useful also. Regula
recom, & do a federal, no to limit. Let b hard. Put tog in
prompt assistance. Tie to Calif Sanico case of last term
We prefer to decide all the ?s say to ^{is} a subject + let 2d
do + nec. Hold by let pleaded + 1/2

70-50B2

Here > r t ok as 70-5021 & 5032

LD - confusing but → think it exists

exh report do in common use - U. K. K. K. K. + 1983

Notes - ? re S7Q

6 mo st is a ripid

The Township Tm is to

Prob little substance on + fact.