

MAPP v. OHIO

- 4/28/61 1st Cir. from Clark, J.
- 5/1/61 Note from Douglas, J. saying join me in it.
- 5/1/61 Note from Brennan, J. saying he joins op.
- 5/1/61 Memo from Harlan, J. to Clark, J.
- 5/1/61 Memo from Stewart, J. to Clark, J.
- 5/1/61 Chief Justice: OK.
- 5/4/61 Recir. from Clark, J.
- 5/4/61 "I agree" from Douglas, J. on op. returned.
- 5/8/61 Memo to Conf. from Frankfurter, J. enclosing copy of his 6/25/58 memo in Kanapp v. Schweitzer.
- 5-31-61 Harlan, J. dissenting op.
- 5-31-61 Stewart, J. Pls add following to your op:  
Agreeing fully with Part I of Harlan, J. dissenting op Stewart expresses no view as to the merits of the issue today decided by the Ct. He concurs in the Ct's judgment because he is persuaded that the provision of § 2905 .34 of the Ohio Rev. Code upon which petr's conviction was based is in words of Harlan not "consistent with the rights of free thought and expression assured ag. state action by 14th Am."
- 6-1-61 Douglas, J. concurring op.
- 6-2-61 Phone call from Douglas, J. saying he joins Clark, J. op but also will file his own op.

6/2/61 Recir by Clark, J.  
6/2/61 Recir by Harlan (dissent) joined by FF and CEW

6/3/61 Stewart, J. note saying he will file attached memo  
in lieu of statement he sent to add at foot of Clark, J. op

6/5/61 Frankfurter, J. returned last page of op.  
with notation saying "please delete this; I am  
joining John." portion referred to statement  
to effect Frankfurter, J. will file sep. op. in due course

6/5/61 Recir from Harlan, J. with FF, J. and  
Whittaker, J. joining. dissenting.

6/7/61 Recir Clark &

6/8/61 Douglas J. Concurring of  
recir

6/8/61 Concurring op. from Black, J. 1st cir.

6/12/61 Black, J. Recir Concurring op

6-14-61 Recir from Harlan, J. showing Frankfurter  
and Whittaker, JJ. joining - dissenting.

6-15-61 note from Black J to Clark &

6-15-61 Note from Clark, J. to Black, J.

Agreeing fully with Part I of Harlan, J. dissenting op. Stewart  
expresses no view as to the merits of the issue today de-  
cided by the Ct. He concurs in the Ct's judgment because he  
is persuaded that the provision of § 2902  
of the Ohio Rev. Code upon which petitioner's conviction  
was based is in words of Harlan not  
"consistent with the rights of free thought and expression  
assured by 1st Am."

6-1-61 Douglas, J. concurring op.

6-2-61 Phone call from Douglas, J. saying

he joins Clark, J. op but also will file his own.