

January 1930

## Unchristened

Dicta Editorial Board

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Unchristened, 8 Dicta 21 (1930).

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](mailto:jennifer.cox@du.edu), [dig-commons@du.edu](mailto:dig-commons@du.edu).

## UNCHRISTENED\*

THE Editors assume no responsibility for the opinions in articles appearing in Dicta, except to the extent of expressing the view, by the fact of publication, that the subject treated is one which merits attention.

Furthermore, the Editors are execution proof.

Unsolicited manuscripts not accompanied by stamped and addressed envelopes will be used without giving credit, and the Editors will not enter into correspondence concerning them. Payment for articles written by those who stoop to professionalism will be made upon acceptance, without reference to the time of publication.

\* \* \* \* \*

The poetry section of the Board of Editors conferred at length with this leetaylorcasey and authorized him to compose a sonnet or ode or hymn to the five and four barreled law firms. The irresistible meter of this mellifluous line came readily to mind:

Pershing, Nye, Tallmadge, Bosworth and Dick,

but the effort died aborning when confronted with this problem:

Grant, Ellis, Shafroth and Toll.

It might fit if you say it thus: *Grantellis*, Shafroth and Toll, but we never strain. It was then suggested to the firm that it improve itself lyrically by having the letter head read, Ellis, Grant, Shafroth and Toll, but the idea was rejected, Toll not participating. A second solution, offered without fee, that the style of the combination be altered to Shetterly, Johnson, Holland and Toll was declined. Opinion by Toll, decision en banc.

The poetry section will meet again. The chairman is toying with the notion of including common or three member firms.

---

\*With this issue DICTA departs slightly from its hitherto staid deportment and inaugurates a section dealing with certain Bar matters in a less serious style than has heretofore been prevalent in its offerings. A name is needed for this section. The editorial staff, therefore, will award a huge prize to that person who best names it. Mail your suggestions to the Editor, Capitol Life Building, Denver.

## PATRONIZE THE COLORADO REPORTS

Elliott, J. In the preparation of briefs on this motion counsel have been very diligent in searching for the decisions of other States upon this question while entirely overlooking our own. This is a common fault, especially among the older members of the bar, whose habits were formed while our reported decisions were exceedingly limited. But it should be borne in mind that Colorado now has twelve volumes of published reports, covering a variety of subjects; and counsel may save time and aid us materially by citing them whenever they are pertinent. *Crane v. Farmer*, 14 Colo. 295.

\* \* \* \* \*

## IGNORANTIA JURIS NEMINEM EXCUSAT

Campbell, J. If everybody knew the law there would be, as has been aptly said, no need of courts of appeal, whose existence shows that sometimes judges themselves may be ignorant of the law. *Mesa County Assn. v. McKinley*, 81 Colo. 513.

26 district judges can be wrong.

Ibi semper debet fieri triatio ubi juratores meliorem possunt habere notitiam.

\* \* \* \* \*

The statements above while not guaranteed by us, are from sources we believe to be reliable and upon which we acted in purchasing. Prospectus filed with Secretary of State.