

---



---

## REVIEW OF RECENT DECISIONS

---



---

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—FORBIDDING SUIT FOR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM SALE OF DEFICIENT FERTILIZER UNTIL AFTER CHEMICAL ANALYSIS THEREOF, NOT A DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION OR DUE PROCESS.

*Jones v. Union Guano Co.*, U. S. Adv. Ops., page 267:

The legislature of North Carolina in 1917 enacted a statute regulating the business of selling fertilizers, providing among other things that no suit for damages from results of use of fertilizer should be brought except after chemical analysis showing deficiency of ingredients. Plaintiff sued in the State court to recover damages alleged to have resulted to his tobacco crop from the use of fertilizer manufactured and sold by the defendant. He failed to prove a chemical analysis had been made before he brought the action, and, notwithstanding he introduced evidence tending to show inferior quality of and deleterious ingredients in the fertilizer, and injury to his crop resulting from its use, the court dismissed the case and entered judgment of nonsuit. The Supreme Court of the State affirmed the judgment. On writ of error to the U. S. Supreme Court, held:

That merely prohibiting actions for damages for sale of deficient fertilizer except after chemical analysis, showing the deficiency, does not substitute the determination of the official for a trial in court, so as to constitute a deprivation of due process of law.

The 14th Amendment of the Federal Constitution does not prevent a State from prescribing a reasonable and appropriate condition to the bringing of a suit of a specified kind or class, so long as the basis of the distinction is real, and the condition imposed has reasonable relation to a legitimate object; and that actions for damages for loss of crops through deficient fertilizer are sufficiently distinguishable from other damage suits to uphold legislation requiring chemical analysis of the fertilizer sold before bringing suit.

---

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—REQUIRING PUBLIC TAXICABS TO CARRY INSURANCE OR GIVE BOND FOR PROTECTION OF PERSONS INJURED BY THEM, AS A DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION AND DUE PROCESS.

*Packard v. Banton*, U. S. Adv. Ops., page 279:

This was a suit to enjoin enforcement of a statute of New York requiring every person, etc., engaged in the business of carrying passengers for hire in