

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: <https://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.

My new chair is here today

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 imposed, conventional. And otherwise 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 but
u & m & > 6 mos. Also provides no std for + administrators. Allegedly no
merits here into evidence. If 30 keep with + measure goes OK but nothing > 2
E here to apply for divorce need 1/4 6 mos prior is required. Is there was K.

It is v seems to be from basis for 31 only. But NB U Danico & 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 go's.
H2172 Danico v Stanton

1343 pt, we think, was on Hayne v CIO. 2²³

2²³ Mr. Pelen C on dissent Dec. 1962.

This appeal belongs in 4/7. Case fully determined. Merits.

The today in his badge, is over simplified.

Merits - Ind plan based rationally. Soon after for leaves, need u so great
as later. Danico v 2²⁷

2²⁷ Mr. Heddes tall meek look, sharp.

We I u & m fed it at all. 2 v + ~~times~~ 115 here if got term 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 Danico & all cited cases, +
admits review is a case & futile. Mr. Heddes says no admits review rec was U
1983." But it also emphasizes judicially.

Is no admits review here - & too to sit on fed ct. In de novo. W - is to
admits 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 to say, it is fed stat. No need to explain it seems
- W V + remand + let two 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 ^{by} a subst + 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

ments - ? re S7Q

6 mo st is a ripid

The Township Tm is to

Prob little substance on + fact.