

Denver Law Review

Volume 9 | Issue 6

Article 7

January 1932

Dictaphun

Dicta Editorial Board

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/dlr>

Recommended Citation

Dictaphun, 9 Dicta 171 (1932).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Denver Law Review at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Denver Law Review by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

* * * *Dictaphun* * * *

THOUSANDS LIKE THIS ARE ON FILE IN OUR
OFFICE

"Congratulations! Dictaphun is 'The best legal humorous column published *anywhere*'."

(Signed) BENTLEY McMULLIN.

You will be pleased to know that Mr. McMullin was not paid one single dime for this testimonial. He has been a reader of Dictaphun for one and one-half years. Before that he smoked another brand.

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS, INC.

The valued *North Side Monitor's* copy reader wrestles earnestly with the problem of writing heads to announce the advent of Fairfield, Gould and Woods. Witness (head on page one):

"LEGAL COMPANY WINS OUTSTANDING HONORS.— Firm of Fairfield, Gould and Woods Rated High in Denver Professional Circles." And (head on page 5 continuing the good news):

"LEGAL FRATERNITY WINS GREAT HONORS."

WHICH REMINDS US OF THIS ONE

The equally valued *Congressional Record* immortally embalms these bitter words of Representative Wood (Rep.) of Indiana:

"It is too easy for gentlemen, with utter disregard of the truth, with utter disregard of the situation, with utter disregard of the effect their blackened speeches may have, to get up on this floor and attack the character of men who have no chance to be heard. I say this is all wrong and ought to be condemned by all right-thinking men."

THIS COMES UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The same valuable family journal (*Congressional Record* to you) sets forth how statesmen and potential presidents occupy their time, and that of the Government Printing Office:

"MR. JOHNSON, of California, presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Camino and Placerville, Calif., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia."

IN THOSE DAYS THEY CALLED THEM PANICS

From literature distributed in behalf of a candidate for the United States Senate at the ensuing hustings, we seize upon this gem:

"He returned to Colorado, opened a law office in ———, and engaged in mining."

AT FIRST BLUSH THIS WOULD APPEAR TO BE VICARIOUS

The esteemed *New York Times* chronicles what happened in *Hill v. Hill*, before Mr. Justice Hendrick of the Supreme Court as follows:

"An absolute divorce was granted to Mrs. Ora Manning Hill from her husband, Dudley S. Hill, son of Dr. Charles G. Hill, on the grounds of the latter's marital infidelity."

ON THE RIGHTS OF DOGS IN GEORGIA

We are indebted to Dayton Denious, Esq., for citation to *Montgomery v. Maryland Casualty Company*, 169 Ga. 746. Certain of the syllabi, which we quote, furnish but a clue to the wondrous delights of the opinion as a whole. Q. v. it.

"Under the law and the evidence of this case, the dog was not a part of the watchman's equipment . . ."

"The dog can not legally be classified as a fellow workman . . ."

"The act of the watchman in attempting to rescue the dog, which had fallen into the river, was not an emergency . . . within the scope of the employment."

THE DOG RULE IN NEW YORK SEEMS *CONTRA*

In *Wiley v. Slater*, 22 Barb. 508, the Court confesses: "This is the first time I have been called upon to administer the law in the case of a pure dog fight, or a fight in which the dogs, instead of the owners, were the principal actors. . . . The branch of the law applicable to direct conflicts between dog and dog is entirely new to me. . . . I am constrained to admit total ignorance of the code duello among dogs, or what constitutes a just cause of offense and justifies a resort to the *ultima ratio regem* . . . ; whether jealousy is a just cause of war, or what difference degrees and kinds of insult or slight, or what violation of the rules of etiquette entitle the injured or offended beast to insist upon prompt and appropriate satisfaction, I know not. . . . It is not claimed upon either side that the struggle was not in all respects dog-like and fair. . . . (I conclude) that this was one of the few privileges which this class of animals still retained when they entered into and became a part of the domestic institution, to settle and avenge, in their own way, all individual wrongs and insults, without regard to what Blackstone or any other jurist might write, think or speak. . . ."