

Editorial Section

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr>

Recommended Citation

Editorial Section, 27 Md. L. Rev. 2 (1967)

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr/vol27/iss4/2>

This Editorial Section is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Journals at DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maryland Law Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. For more information, please contact smccarty@law.umaryland.edu.

Maryland Law Review

Member, National Conference of Law Reviews
Conference of Southern Law Reviews

STUDENT EDITORIAL BOARD

STEVEN P. LOCKMAN, *Editor-in-Chief*
ROBERT R. WINTER, *Articles Editor*
MARGARET P. MAHONEY, *Casenote Editor*
MELVIN ROSEN, *Research Editor*
ROBERT M. WRIGHT, *Recent Developments Editor*
JAMES A. KUSHNER }
H. RICHARD PIET } *Assistant Editors*

W. TAYLOR BROWN
STEVEN M. CRESKOFF
KENNETH B. FRANK

JOHN J. GHLINGER, III
WILLIAM J. RUBIN
JACK N. ZEMIL

HAL M. SMITH, *Faculty Advisor*
LAURENCE M. KATZ, *Ass't Faculty Advisor*

EDITORS' NOTE

In recent years, a number of state legislatures have considered the advisability of passing statutes designed to regulate the close corporation. The Maryland General Assembly enacted such a statute in 1967 after a favorable recommendation by the Commission studying the area. Professor William G. Hall, Jr., Assistant Dean of the Law School and a member of this Commission, is the author of the article entitled, *The New Maryland Close Corporation Law*. Professor Hall, who played a very significant role in the drafting of the statutory language, explains the problems and peculiarities of the close corporation and demonstrates the reasons that regulation is both necessary and appropriate. He then guides the reader section by section through the new statute, noting possible pitfalls for both the courts and the practitioner. Recognizing that the statute is by no means a panacea, Professor Hall concludes that the statute signifies an awareness of the fact that the close corporation demands special treatment by the courts as well as the legislature.

In quite a different vein is the article, *The Trials of Mr. Justice Samuel Chase*, by Robert R. Bair and Robin D. Coblentz. In present-

ing Mr. Justice Chase, the authors describe his development as student, lawyer, legislator, judge, and patriot. While tracing this development, the authors recapture the political scene as it existed in the United States in the early nineteenth century. The article culminates with the courtroom drama of Chase's impeachment, which is generally considered the most important precedent on the issue of judicial impeachment in American legal history.

Mr. Shale D. Stiller, in his review of *Chief Justice — The Judicial World of Charles Doe*, helps bring to life a man who, though not as well known as some of the great Supreme Court Justices, has been called one of the three or four greatest judges in American history. Judge Doe's extensive skills, personal mannerisms, and legal contributions to contemporary jurisprudence are artfully presented, and the result is a most enjoyable acquaintance with a man decades ahead of his time.

The REVIEW is grateful to each of the above contributors for their stimulating and informative treatments of these subjects.

Student contributions in this issue cover a wide range of subjects. For those interested in contemporary constitutional developments, a note on the case of *Maryland v. Wirtz*, recently decided by a three-judge court in Maryland, should be of particular interest. The confrontation between federal power under the commerce clause and states' rights under the tenth amendment is dramatically presented by this case. In addition, a note on a recent decision of the Maryland Court of Appeals recognizing a joint action for loss of consortium in negligence cases is included. This holding raises a number of problems, and the note is addressed to the presentation and, in some instances, attempted resolution of these problems. A Minnesota case which held that the rule of imputed contributory negligence would no longer be the law of that state in automobile cases is also noted. The student author, after considering the doctrinal soundness of this holding, carefully analyzes a series of Maryland cases on this point and arrives at a conclusion which it is hoped will be squarely adopted by the Maryland Court of Appeals when the proper case is presented.

Shorter student works discuss a Maryland case involving the availability of a contributory negligence defense based on the plaintiff's failure to wear an available seat belt, as well as cases on constructive eviction in multi-apartment complexes and the right to counsel in extradition proceedings.

The REVIEW is pleased to announce that a Cumulative Index for the last six volumes is included in the closing pages of this number; that is, Volumes XXII through XXVII. Please see the Table of Contents for a description of the contents of the Index.