

Auto Exchange Corp., 262 U. S. 544; *Hanover Fire Ins. Co. v. Harding*, 272 U. S. 494; and *Guinn v. United States*, 238 U. S. 347, 363, require that the Indiana statute in question, as construed and applied in this case, be held void as contravening the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and that the judgment under review be reversed accordingly.

NORRIS v. ALABAMA.

CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA.

No. 534. Argued February 15, 18, 1935.—Decided April 1, 1935.

1. Exclusion of all negroes from a grand jury by which a negro is indicted, or from the petit jury by which he is tried for the offense, resulting from systematic and arbitrary exclusion of negroes from the jury lists solely because of their race or color, is a denial of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed to him by the Fourteenth Amendment. P. 589.
2. Whenever a conclusion of law of a state court as to a federal right is so intermingled with findings of fact that the latter control the former, it is incumbent upon this Court to analyze the facts in order that the enforcement of the federal right may be assured. P. 590.
3. Evidence reviewed and found to establish systematic exclusion of negroes from jury service in two Alabama counties, solely because of their race and color. Pp. 590, 596.
229 Ala. 226; 156 So. 556, reversed.

CERTIORARI, 293 U. S. 552, to review a judgment affirming a conviction of rape.

Mr. Samuel S. Leibowitz for petitioner.

Mr. Thomas E. Knight, Jr., Attorney General of Alabama, with whom Mr. Thomas Seay Lawson, Assistant Attorney General, was on the brief, for respondent.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES delivered the opinion of the Court.

Petitioner, Clarence Norris, is one of nine negro boys who were indicted in March, 1931, in Jackson County, Alabama, for the crime of rape. On being brought to trial in that county, eight were convicted. The Supreme Court of Alabama reversed the conviction of one of these and affirmed that of seven, including Norris. This Court reversed the judgments of conviction upon the ground that the defendants had been denied due process of law in that the trial court had failed in the light of the circumstances disclosed, and of the inability of the defendants at that time to obtain counsel, to make an effective appointment of counsel to aid them in preparing and presenting their defense. *Powell v. Alabama*, 287 U. S. 45.

After the remand, a motion for change of venue was granted and the cases were transferred to Morgan County. Norris was brought to trial in November, 1933. At the outset, a motion was made on his behalf to quash the indictment upon the ground of the exclusion of negroes from juries in Jackson County where the indictment was found. A motion was also made to quash the trial *venire* in Morgan County upon the ground of the exclusion of negroes from juries in that county. In relation to each county, the charge was of long continued, systematic and arbitrary exclusion of qualified negro citizens from service on juries, solely because of their race and color, in violation of the Constitution of the United States. The State joined issue on this charge and after hearing the evidence, which we shall presently review, the trial judge denied both motions, and exception was taken. The trial then proceeded and resulted in the conviction of Norris who was sentenced to death. On appeal, the Supreme Court of the State considered and decided the federal question

which Norris had raised, and affirmed the judgment. 229 Ala. 226; 156 So. 556. We granted a writ of certiorari. 293 U. S. 552.

First. There is no controversy as to the constitutional principle involved. That principle, long since declared, was not challenged, but was expressly recognized, by the Supreme Court of the State. Summing up precisely the effect of earlier decisions, this Court thus stated the principle in *Carter v. Texas*, 177 U. S. 442, 447, in relation to exclusion from service on grand juries: "Whenever by any action of a State, whether through its legislature, through its courts, or through its executive or administrative officers, all persons of the African race are excluded, solely because of their race or color, from serving as grand jurors in the criminal prosecution of a person of the African race, the equal protection of the laws is denied to him, contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. *Strauder v. West Virginia*, 100 U. S. 303; *Neal v. Delaware*, 103 U. S. 370, 397; *Gibson v. Mississippi*, 162 U. S. 565." This statement was repeated in the same terms in *Rogers v. Alabama*, 192 U. S. 226, 231, and again in *Martin v. Texas*, 200 U. S. 316, 319. The principle is equally applicable to a similar exclusion of negroes from service on petit juries. *Strauder v. West Virginia*, *supra*; *Martin v. Texas*, *supra*. And although the state statute defining the qualifications of jurors may be fair on its face, the constitutional provision affords protection against action of the State through its administrative officers in effecting the prohibited discrimination. *Neal v. Delaware*, *supra*; *Carter v. Texas*, *supra*. Compare *Virginia v. Rives*, 100 U. S. 313, 322, 323; *In re Wood*, 140 U. S. 278, 285; *Thomas v. Texas*, 212 U. S. 278, 282, 283.

The question is of the application of this established principle to the facts disclosed by the record. That the question is one of fact does not relieve us of the duty to

determine whether in truth a federal right has been denied. When a federal right has been specially set up and claimed in a state court, it is our province to inquire not merely whether it was denied in express terms but also whether it was denied in substance and effect. If this requires an examination of evidence, that examination must be made. Otherwise, review by this Court would fail of its purpose in safeguarding constitutional rights. Thus, whenever a conclusion of law of a state court as to a federal right and findings of fact are so intermingled that the latter control the former, it is incumbent upon us to analyze the facts in order that the appropriate enforcement of the federal right may be assured. *Creswill v. Knights of Pythias*, 225 U. S. 246, 261; *Northern Pacific Ry. Co. v. North Dakota*, 236 U. S. 585, 593; *Ward v. Love County*, 253 U. S. 17, 22; *Davis v. Wechsler*, 263 U. S. 22, 24; *Fiske v. Kansas*, 274 U. S. 380, 385, 386; *Ancient Egyptian Order v. Michaux*, 279 U. S. 737, 745.

Second. The evidence on the motion to quash the indictment. In 1930, the total population of Jackson County, where the indictment was found, was 36,881, of whom 2688 were negroes. The male population over twenty-one years of age numbered 8801, and of these, 666 were negroes.

The qualifications of jurors were thus prescribed by the state statute (Alabama Code, 1923, § 8603): "The jury commission shall place on the jury roll and in the jury box the names of all male citizens of the county who are generally reputed to be honest and intelligent men, and are esteemed in the community for their integrity, good character and sound judgment, but no person must be selected who is under twenty-one or over sixty-five years of age, or, who is an habitual drunkard, or who, being afflicted with a permanent disease or physical weakness is unfit to discharge the duties of a juror, or who cannot

read English, or who has ever been convicted of any offense involving moral turpitude. If a person cannot read English and has all the other qualifications prescribed herein and is a freholder or householder, his name may be placed on the jury roll and in the jury box." See Gen. Acts, Alabama, 1931, No. 47, p. 59.

Defendant adduced evidence to support the charge of unconstitutional discrimination in the actual administration of the statute in Jackson County. The testimony, as the state court said, tended to show that "in a long number of years no negro had been called for jury service in that county." It appeared that no negro had served on any grand or petit jury in that county within the memory of witnesses who had lived there all their lives. Testimony to that effect was given by men whose ages ran from fifty to seventy-six years. Their testimony was uncontradicted. It was supported by the testimony of officials. The clerk of the jury commission and the clerk of the circuit court had never known of a negro serving on a grand jury in Jackson County. The court reporter, who had not missed a session in that county in twenty-four years, and two jury commissioners testified to the same effect. One of the latter, who was a member of the commission which made up the jury roll for the grand jury which found the indictment, testified that he had "never known of a single instance where any negro sat on any grand or petit jury in the entire history of that county."

That testimony in itself made out a *prima facie* case of the denial of the equal protection which the Constitution guarantees. See *Neal v. Delaware, supra*. The case thus made was supplemented by direct testimony that specified negroes, thirty or more in number, were qualified for jury service. Among these were negroes who were members of school boards, or trustees, of colored schools, and property owners and householders. It also appeared that

negroes from that county had been called for jury service in the federal court. Several of those who were thus described as qualified were witnesses. While there was testimony which cast doubt upon the qualifications of some of the negroes who had been named, and there was also general testimony by the editor of a local newspaper who gave his opinion as to the lack of "sound judgment" of the "good negroes" in Jackson County, we think that the definite testimony as to the actual qualifications of individual negroes, which was not met by any testimony equally direct, showed that there were negroes in Jackson County qualified for jury service.

The question arose whether names of negroes were in fact on the jury roll. The books containing the jury roll for Jackson County for the year 1930-31 were produced. They were produced from the custody of a member of the jury commission which, in 1931, had succeeded the commission which had made up the jury roll from which the grand jury in question had been drawn. On the pages of this roll appeared the names of six negroes. They were entered, respectively, at the end of the precinct lists which were alphabetically arranged. The genuineness of these entries was disputed. It appeared that after the jury roll in question had been made up, and after the new jury commission had taken office, one of the new commissioners directed the new clerk to draw lines after the names which had been placed on the roll by the preceding commission. These lines, on the pages under consideration, were red lines, and the clerk of the old commission testified that they were not put in by him. The entries made by the new clerk, for the new jury roll, were below these lines.

The names of the six negroes were in each instance written immediately above the red lines. An expert of long experience testified that these names were superim-

posed upon the red lines, that is, that they were written after the lines had been drawn. The expert was not cross-examined and no testimony was introduced to contradict him.¹ In denying the motion to quash, the trial judge expressed the view that he would not "be authorized to presume that somebody had committed a crime" or to presume that the jury board "had been unfaithful to their duties and allowed the books to be tampered with." His conclusion was that names of negroes were on the jury roll.

We think that the evidence did not justify that conclusion. The Supreme Court of the State did not sustain it. That court observed that the charge that the names of negroes were fraudulently placed on the roll did not involve any member of the jury board, and that the charge "was, by implication at least, laid at the door of the clerk of the board." The court, reaching its decision irrespective of that question, treated that phase of the matter as "wholly immaterial" and hence passed it by "without any expression of opinion thereon."

The state court rested its decision upon the ground that even if it were assumed that there was no name of a negro on the jury roll, it was not established that race or color caused the omission. The court pointed out that the statute fixed a high standard of qualifications for jurors (*Green v. State*, 73 Ala. 26; *State v. Curtis*, 210 Ala. 1; 97 So. 291) and that the jury commission was vested with a wide discretion. The court adverted to the fact that more white citizens possessing age qualifications had been omitted from the jury roll than the entire negro population of the county, and regarded the testimony as being to the effect that "the matter of race, color, politics, religion or fraternal affiliations" had not been discussed by

¹ The books containing the jury roll in question were produced on the argument at this bar and were examined by the Court.

the commission and had not entered into their consideration, and that no one had been excluded because of race or color.

The testimony showed the practice of the jury commission. One of the commissioners who made up the jury roll in question, and the clerk of that commission, testified as to the manner of its preparation. The other two commissioners of that period did not testify. It was shown that the clerk, under the direction of the commissioners, made up a preliminary list which was based on the registration list of voters, the polling list and the tax list, and apparently also upon the telephone directory. The clerk testified that he made up a list of all male citizens between the ages of twenty-one and sixty-five years without regard to their status or qualifications. The commissioner testified that the designation "col." was placed after the names of those who were colored. In preparing the final jury roll, the preliminary list was checked off as to qualified jurors with the aid of men whom the commissioners called in for that purpose from the different precincts. And the commissioner testified that in the selections for the jury roll no one was "automatically or systematically" excluded, or excluded on account of race or color; that he "did not inquire as to color, that was not discussed."

But, in appraising the action of the commissioners, these statements cannot be divorced from other testimony. As we have seen, there was testimony, not overborne or discredited, that there were in fact negroes in the county qualified for jury service. That testimony was direct and specific. After eliminating those persons as to whom there was some evidence of lack of qualifications, a considerable number of others remained. The fact that the testimony as to these persons, fully identified, was not challenged by evidence appropriately direct, cannot be

brushed aside. There is no ground for an assumption that the names of these negroes were not on the preliminary list. The inference to be drawn from the testimony is that they were on that preliminary list, and were designated on that list as the names of negroes, and that they were not placed on the jury roll. There was thus presented a test of the practice of the commissioners. Something more than mere general asseverations was required. Why were these names excluded from the jury roll? Was it because of the lack of statutory qualifications? Were the qualifications of negroes actually and properly considered?

The testimony of the commissioner on this crucial question puts the case in a strong light. That testimony leads to the conclusion that these or other negroes were not excluded on account of age, or lack of esteem in the community for integrity and judgment, or because of disease or want of any other qualification. The commissioner's answer to specific inquiry upon this point was that negroes were "never discussed." We give in the margin quotations from his testimony.²

"Q. Did you ever exclude from the jury rolls any negroes because you found first, he was a man under twenty-one years old or over sixty-five, and he was excluded by reason of his age; secondly because he was a person who wasn't esteemed in the community for being a decent and honorable citizen, for good sound common sense and judgment, did you ever see or hear of them not going to take that negro because he wasn't esteemed in the community for good sense and judgment? A. No, sir.

"Q. Did you ever have occasion to say, I can't take that negro because he is a fellow that has a disease which may affect or does affect, his mentality, did you ever say that to yourself, with reference to any particular negro? A. No, sir, negroes was never discussed.

"Q. Did you ever say to yourself as a jury commissioner in compiling those lists, I am not going to take that negro because he has been convicted before of a crime involving moral turpitude, have you ever excluded a negro on that ground, did you ever find any negro

We are of the opinion that the evidence required a different result from that reached in the state court. We think that the evidence that for a generation or longer no negro had been called for service on any jury in Jackson County, that there were negroes qualified for jury service, that according to the practice of the jury commission their names would normally appear on the preliminary list of male citizens of the requisite age but that no names of negroes were placed on the jury roll, and the testimony with respect to the lack of appropriate consideration of the qualifications of negroes, established the discrimination which the Constitution forbids. The motion to quash the indictment upon that ground should have been granted.

Third. The evidence on the motion to quash the trial venire. The population of Morgan County, where the trial was had, was larger than that of Jackson County, and the proportion of negroes was much greater. The total population of Morgan County in 1930 was 46,176, and of this number 8,311 were negroes.

Within the memory of witnesses, long resident there, no negro had ever served on a jury in that county or had been called for such service. Some of these witnesses were over fifty years of age and had always lived in Mor-

that came within that category, under your personal knowledge in Jackson County? A. I couldn't recall any, no, sir, I don't know.

"Q. Have you ever known of any negro in Jackson County who was excluded by reason of the fact that he could not read English, and that negro at the same time wasn't a free holder or house holder, did you ever say I can't take that negro because he is prohibited under the rules from serving by reason of that provision? A. No, sir.

"Q. Or anybody in your presence? A. It never was discussed.

"Q. You had been a jury commissioner how long? A. I was on it under Bibb Graves administration, 1928, 1929, 1930.

"Q. Three years? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. And you never had occasion to exclude any negro in Jackson County by reason of the disqualifying provisions I have just called to your attention? A. Not to my personal knowledge, no, sir."

gan County. Their testimony was not contradicted. A clerk of the circuit court, who had resided in the county for thirty years, and who had been in office for over four years, testified that during his official term approximately 2500 persons had been called for jury service and that not one of them was a negro; that he did not recall "ever seeing any single person of the colored race serve on any jury in Morgan County."

There was abundant evidence that there were a large number of negroes in the county who were qualified for jury service. Men of intelligence, some of whom were college graduates, testified to long lists (said to contain nearly 200 names) of such qualified negroes, including many business men, owners of real property and householders. When defendant's counsel proposed to call many additional witnesses in order to adduce further proof of qualifications of negroes for jury service, the trial judge limited the testimony, holding that the evidence was cumulative.

We find no warrant for a conclusion that the names of any of the negroes as to whom this testimony was given, or of any other negroes, were placed on the jury rolls. No such names were identified. The evidence that for many years no negro had been called for jury service itself tended to show the absence of the names of negroes from the jury rolls, and the State made no effort to prove their presence. The trial judge limited the defendant's proof "to the present year, the present jury roll." The sheriff of the county, called as a witness for defendants, scanned the jury roll and after "looking over every single name on that jury roll, from A to Z," was unable to point out "any single negro on it."

For this long-continued, unvarying, and wholesale exclusion of negroes from jury service we find no justification consistent with the constitutional mandate. We have carefully examined the testimony of the jury commissioners upon which the state court based its decision. One

of these commissioners testified in person and the other two submitted brief affidavits. By the state act (Gen. Acts, Ala., 1931, No. 47, p. 55), in force at the time the jury roll in question was made up, the clerk of the jury board was required to obtain the names of all male citizens of the county over twenty-one and under sixty-five years of age, and their occupation, place of residence and place of business. (*Id.*, p. 58, § 11.) The qualifications of those who were to be placed on the jury roll were the same as those prescribed by the earlier statute which we have already quoted. (*Id.*, p. 59, § 14.) The member of the jury board, who testified orally, said that a list was made up which included the names of all male citizens of suitable age; that black residents were not excluded from this general list; that in compiling the jury roll he did not consider race or color; that no one was excluded for that reason; and that he had placed on the jury roll the names of persons possessing the qualifications under the statute. The affidavits of the other members of the board contained general statements to the same effect.

We think that this evidence failed to rebut the strong *prima facie* case which defendant had made. That showing as to the long-continued exclusion of negroes from jury service, and as to the many negroes qualified for that service, could not be met by mere generalities. If, in the presence of such testimony as defendant adduced, the mere general assertions by officials of their performance of duty were to be accepted as an adequate justification for the complete exclusion of negroes from jury service, the constitutional provision—adopted with special reference to their protection—would be but a vain and illusory requirement. The general attitude of the jury commissioner is shown by the following extract from his testimony: "I do not know of any negro in Morgan County over twenty-one and under sixty-five who is generally reputed to be honest and intelligent and who is esteemed in the community for his integrity, good char-

acter and sound judgment, who is not an habitual drunkard, who isn't afflicted with a permanent disease or physical weakness which would render him unfit to discharge the duties of a juror, and who can read English, and who has never been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude." In the light of the testimony given by defendant's witnesses, we find it impossible to accept such a sweeping characterization of the lack of qualifications of negroes in Morgan County. It is so sweeping, and so contrary to the evidence as to the many qualified negroes, that it destroys the intended effect of the commissioner's testimony.

In *Neal v. Delaware*, *supra*, decided over fifty years ago, this Court observed that it was a "violent presumption," in which the state court had there indulged, that the uniform exclusion of negroes from juries, during a period of many years, was solely because, in the judgment of the officers, charged with the selection of grand and petit jurors, fairly exercised, "the black race in Delaware were utterly disqualified by want of intelligence, experience, or moral integrity, to sit on juries." Such a presumption at the present time would be no less violent with respect to the exclusion of the negroes of Morgan County. And, upon the proof contained in the record now before us, a conclusion that their continuous and total exclusion from juries was because there were none possessing the requisite qualifications, cannot be sustained.

We are concerned only with the federal question which we have discussed, and in view of the denial of the federal right suitably asserted, the judgment must be reversed and the cause remanded for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

Reversed.

MR. JUSTICE McREYNOLDS did not hear the argument and took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

PATTERSON v. ALABAMA.

CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA.

No. 554. Argued February 15, 18, 1935.—Decided April 1, 1935.

1. Upon review of a judgment of a state court disposing of the case on a point of local practice without adjudicating a claim of federal right, this Court must examine the record and determine whether the non-federal ground is adequate to sustain the judgment. P. 602.
2. In the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction over a judgment from a state court, this Court has power, not only to correct error in the judgment under review, but to make such disposition of the case as justice requires; and where any change, either in fact or in law, has supervened since the judgment was entered, which may affect the result, the judgment may be set aside and the cause remanded in order that the state court may be free to act. P. 607.
3. *Semble* that, under § 6434 of the Code of Alabama, the fact that a bill of exceptions was not filed in time, though ground for striking it on motion to the Supreme Court, does not deprive that court of jurisdiction to entertain it. P. 605.
4. The Supreme Court of Alabama affirmed death sentences in two cases in both of which, on the same evidence, it was contended that the defendants, who were negroes, were deprived of constitutional rights by intentional exclusion of all negroes from the grand and petit juries. In one of the cases, this defense was by that court overruled; in the other it was not considered because the bill of exceptions, necessary for its presentation, was held to have been filed too late. Upon review here, this Court, having reversed the judgment in the first case because the constitutional objection was well taken, vacated the judgment in the second case also in order that the state court might be free to reconsider it. P. 607. 229 Ala. 270; 156 So. 567, vacated.

CERTIORARI, 293 U. S. 554, to review a judgment affirming a conviction of rape. Cf. *Norris v. Alabama*, *ante*, p. 587.

Mr. Walter H. Pollak, with whom Messrs. Osmond K. Fraenkel and Carl S. Stern were on the brief, for petitioner.

Mr. Thomas E. Knight, Jr., Attorney General of Alabama, with whom Mr. Thomas Seay Lawson, Assistant Attorney General, was on the brief, for respondent.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES delivered the opinion of the Court.

Petitioner, Haywood Patterson, was indicted with Clarence Norris (the petitioner in No. 534, *ante*, p. 587) and seven other negro boys in Jackson County, Alabama, for the crime of rape. Judgment of conviction was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the State. That judgment, and like judgments in the case of Norris and others, were reversed by this Court. *Powell v. Alabama*, 287 U. S. 45.

After the remand, all of the cases were transferred for trial to Morgan County. Patterson was the first of those retried. The jury found a verdict against him which the trial judge set aside as against the weight of evidence. He was then brought to trial for a third time before another Judge, in November, 1933, and was again convicted. The judgment was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the State. 229 Ala. 270; 156 So. 567. This Court granted a writ of certiorari. 293 U. S. 554.

At the beginning of the last trial, as on the previous trial, a motion was made on Patterson's behalf to quash the indictment upon the ground of the exclusion of negroes from juries in Jackson County where the indictment was found. Defendant also moved to quash the trial *venire* in Morgan County because of the exclusion of negroes from jury service in that county. In each of these motions, defendant contended that there was a long-continued, systematic and arbitrary exclusion of qualified negroes from jury service, solely by reason of their race or color, in violation of the Federal Constitution. These motions were the same as those which were made on the trial of Norris, which immediately followed this third trial of Patterson. It was stipulated in the case of

Norris, and the trial court there ruled, that the papers filed and the testimony adduced upon the similar motions on the trial of Patterson should be treated as applicable, and the motions in the case of Norris were thus heard upon evidence which had been submitted on the trial of Patterson. The opinions of the trial judge denying these motions were the same in both cases.

In this aspect, the federal question now sought to be presented on behalf of Patterson is precisely the same as that which we have considered and decided in Norris' case, *ante*, p. 587. But the State, by its Attorney General, contends that this Court has no jurisdiction in the instant case, in the view that the decision of the state court rested entirely upon a question of state appellate procedure and that no federal question is involved. Counsel for defendant opposes that view, and it becomes necessary for us to examine the record in order to determine whether the judgment of the state court is based upon a non-federal ground adequate to sustain it. *Ward v. Love County*, 253 U. S. 17, 22; *Davis v. Wechsler*, 263 U. S. 22, 24, 25; *Broad River Power Co. v. South Carolina*, 281 U. S. 537, 540; *Abie State Bank v. Bryan*, 282 U. S. 765, 773; *Lawrence v. State Tax Comm'n*, 286 U. S. 276, 282.

The question arises from the action of the Supreme Court of the State in striking defendant's bill of exceptions, which contained the evidence taken by the trial court on the motions to quash, upon the ground that the bill had not been presented in time. So holding, the Supreme Court of the State disregarded all questions reviewable alone by bill of exceptions, and, finding no error in the record as thus considered, affirmed the judgment. The court did not discuss the federal question.

Under the Code of Alabama, a bill of exceptions must be presented "within ninety days from the day on which the judgment is entered," or "within ninety days after the granting or refusing of a motion for a new trial."

000

Opinion of the Court.

Ala. Code, § 6433. Another section of the Code provides that "after the lapse of thirty days from the date on which a judgment or decree was rendered, the court shall lose all power over it, as completely as if the end of the term had been on that day, unless a motion to set aside the judgment or decree, or grant a new trial has been filed and called to the attention of the court, and an order entered continuing it for hearing to a future day." Ala. Code, § 6670.

The jury found its verdict against Patterson on December 1, 1933, and the court then adjudged him guilty as charged. On December 6, 1933, he was sentenced to death. The bill of exceptions was presented on March 5, 1934.

Upon the return of the verdict on December 1st, defendant's counsel requested an extension beyond thirty days within which to file a motion for a new trial, stating that a transcript of the testimony would be needed in order to prepare a proper motion. The application was denied, the trial judge stating in effect that defendant's counsel had thirty days within which to make a motion for a new trial, and that, after a motion so made, he might apply to the trial judge for "additional thirty day periods" in order to file an amended motion based upon the transcript. The motion for a new trial was filed on December 29, 1933, and it appears that a copy of the motion papers was received by the Attorney General without objection. On request of defendant's counsel, the motion was continued by the trial judge until February 24, 1934. The Attorney General then moved to strike the motion upon the ground that it had been filed after the expiration of the term of court, at which defendant was tried, and hence that the court was without jurisdiction. It appeared that the term had expired on December 23, 1933. The trial judge granted the motion to strike and the Supreme Court of the State sustained the ruling.

Opinion of the Court.

294 U.S.

The state court pointed out that the ruling was in accord with *Morris v. Corona Coal Co.* (1926), 215 Ala. 47; 109 So. 278, in which the question had been directly presented.¹ The court said that the governing statutes, including § 6670, above quoted, were codified from the Act of 1915, page 707, §§ 1 and 3; that, previously, all motions for new trials were required to be made within the terms; that, as to cases at law, terms were not abolished; that the statute making judgments final after thirty days was restrictive of the rule which had theretofore obtained by which the judgments were deemed to be within the breast of the court until the end of the term; and that the effect of the decision in the *Morris* case was to hold that the statute had not abrogated "the established rule that all judgments become final with the end of the term" and did not extend the thirty day period beyond that time. The court cited several cases to show that the ruling was "in keeping with former decisions through a long period of years."

But the striking of the motion for a new trial did not dispose of the bill of exceptions. It would still have been in time if it had been presented within ninety days from the day of the judgment. It was in time if that day was December 6, 1933, when defendant was sentenced, but it was too late if judgment was entered on December 1, 1933. The Supreme Court of the State took the latter view. The court held that the time for presenting bills of exceptions "runs from the date of the judgment of guilty, not from the date of sentence." The court cited the case of *Lewis v. State* (1915), 194 Ala. 1; 69 So. 913, where that rule had been laid down. And in view of this long established rule in Alabama as to the day from which

¹ In the *Morris* case the verdict and judgment were of December 19, 1924; the motion for a new trial was of December 27, 1924, after the term had expired; and the motion had been passed to January 5, 1925, for hearing.

the time should be reckoned, the state court was undoubtedly at liberty, without violating any federal right, to hold that the bill of exceptions had not been presented within the designated period of ninety days.

There remains, however, a further question. For it does not appear that the failure to file a bill of exceptions in time is sufficient in itself to deprive the state appellate court of jurisdiction. On the contrary, the statute of Alabama expressly denies to the court the authority, on its own motion, to strike a bill of exceptions because not filed in time, and provides for that action only upon motion of a party to the record or his attorney. The statute in terms allows parties to waive the objection. We quote its provisions: "The appellate court may strike a bill of exceptions from the record or file because not presented or signed within the time required by law, but shall not do so *ex mero motu*, but only on motion of a party to the record or his attorney; the object and effect of this statute being to allow parties to waive or consent for the time of signing bills of exceptions." Ala. Code, § 6434. The state court cited its former decisions which construed the "waiver or consent," to which the provision referred, to be "such as is indicated by a failure to move to strike upon submission of the cause on appeal," and held that when such a motion is made, it is the duty of the court to grant it. *Baker v. Central of Georgia Ry. Co.*, 165 Ala. 466; 51 So. 796; *Ex parte Hill*, 205 Ala. 631; 89 So. 58; *Ettore v. State*, 214 Ala. 99; 106 So. 508; *Beatty v. McMullan*, 226 Ala. 405; 147 So. 180.

While we must have proper regard to this ruling of the state court in relation to its appellate procedure, we cannot ignore the exceptional features of the present case. An important question under the Federal Constitution was involved, and, from that standpoint, the case did not stand alone. As the opinion of the state court observes, there was "being considered along with this cause, the ap-

peal of *Clarence Norris v. Alabama*, 156 So. 556, from a conviction under the same indictment." 156 So. pp. 567, 568. The validity of the common indictment had been challenged by a motion on behalf of both defendants because of the unconstitutional discrimination. It is true that the *Patterson* case was brought up on a separate appeal, and on a separate record, but it appeared from the record before the court in the *Norris* case that the evidence upon the motions to quash was the same evidence (introduced by stipulation) as that which had been taken in the *Patterson* case. The bills of exceptions had been presented in both cases on the same day, March 5, 1934. When the Attorney General, on February 24, 1934, had moved to strike the motion for a new trial, he had expressly referred to the judgment as having been rendered on December 6, 1933, a statement not obviously inaccurate, because there was an entry of a formal judgment of sentence on that day, and, coming from the Attorney General, the statement may have misled defendant's counsel. If that statement had been correct, the bill of exceptions would have been timely. The Attorney General did not make his motion until May 25, 1934. We are not advised that previous state decisions had dealt with a situation having such unusual incidents.

The decisions in the two cases were announced on the same day. The state court decided the constitutional question against *Norris*, and it was manifestly with that conclusion in mind that the court approached the decision in the case of *Patterson* and struck his bill of exceptions. We are not satisfied that the court would have dealt with the case in the same way if it had determined the constitutional question as we have determined it. We are not convinced that the court, in the presence of such a determination of constitutional right, confronting the anomalous and grave situation which would be created by a reversal of the judgment against *Norris*, and an affirmance of the judgment of death in the companion case of *Patter-*

son, who had asserted the same right, and having regard to the relation of the two cases and the other circumstances disclosed by the record, would have considered itself powerless to entertain the bill of exceptions or otherwise to provide appropriate relief. It is always hazardous to apply a judicial ruling, especially in a matter of procedure, to a serious situation which was not in contemplation when the ruling was made. At least the state court should have an opportunity to examine its powers in the light of the situation which has now developed. We should not foreclose that opportunity.

We have frequently held that in the exercise of our appellate jurisdiction we have power not only to correct error in the judgment under review but to make such disposition of the case as justice requires. And in determining what justice does require, the Court is bound to consider any change, either in fact or in law, which has supervened since the judgment was entered. We may recognize such a change, which may affect the result, by setting aside the judgment and remanding the case so that the state court may be free to act. We have said that to do this is not to review, in any proper sense of the term, the decision of the state court upon a non-federal question, but only to deal appropriately with a matter arising since its judgment and having a bearing upon the right disposition of the case. *Gulf, C. & S. F. Ry. Co. v. Dennis*, 224 U. S. 503, 507; *Watts, Watts & Co. v. Unione Austriaca*, 248 U. S. 9, 21; *Dorchy v. Kansas*, 264 U. S. 286, 289; *Missouri ex rel. Wabash Ry. Co. v. Public Service Comm'n*, 273 U. S. 126, 131.

Applying that principle of decision, we vacate the judgment and remand the case to the state court for further proceedings.

Judgment vacated.

MR. JUSTICE McREYNOLDS did not hear the argument and took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.



END

of film

Please Rewind

MICROFILM *by* PHOTO SERVICES
of CORNELL UNIVERSITY

ITHACA, NEW YORK

14853

