

The Burger Court Opinion Writing Database

Davis v. United States

411 U.S. 233 (1973)

Paul J. Wahlbeck, George Washington University

James F. Spriggs, II, Washington University

Forrest Maltzman, George Washington University



Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAM
THE CHAM

38
April 12, 1973

1 71-6481 - Davis v. U. S.

114-11

Dear Bill:

Please join me.

Regards,

WRB

Mr. Justice Rehnquist

Copies to the Conference

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

March 26, 1973

Dear Thurgood:

Would you like to prepare
the dissent in No. 71-6481 - Davis
v. U. S.?

W. O. D.

Mr. Justice Marshall

B

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

April 10, 1973

Dear Thurgood:

Please join me in your dissent

in 71-6481, Davis v. U.S.

W^{illiam} O. Douglas

Mr. Justice Marshall

cc: The Conference

S

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WM. J. BRENNAN, JR.

March 26, 1973

RE: No. 71-6481 Davis v. United States

Dear Bill:

This was not one in which I had planned to write. Indeed, it is a companion case to Tollett v. Henderson which Bill Rehnquist is also to write. I have so many dissents in the works now that I'd prefer not to write this one. In any event, I think a single dissent for both this case and Tollett should suffice.

Sincerely,

Seil

Mr. Justice Douglas

WD

B

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WM. J. BRENNAN, JR. April 5, 1973

RE: No. 71-6481 Davis v. United States

Dear Thurgood:

Please join me in your dissenting
opinion in the above.

Sincerely,

Bill

Mr. Justice Marshall

cc: The Conference

B
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE POTTER STEWART

March 28, 1973

71-6481 - Davis v. U. S.

Dear Bill,

I am glad to join your opinion for the Court in this case.

Sincerely yours,

P.S.
P.J.

Mr. Justice Rehnquist

Copies to the Conference

(7)

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE BYRON R. WHITE

April 2, 1973

Re: No. 71-6481 - Davis v. United States

Dear Bill:

Please join me in your opinion for the
Court in this case.

Sincerely,



Mr. Justice Rehnquist

Copies to Conference

15
The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Douglas
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

1st DRAFT

From: Marshall, J.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Circulated: APR - 5 1973

No. 71-6481

Recirculated:

Clifford H. Davis, Petitioner, v. United States. } On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

[April —, 1973]

MR. JUSTICE MARSHALL, dissenting.

The opinion of the Court obscures the only sensible argument for the result the majority reaches. I am not persuaded by that argument, and find the majority opinion clearly defective. I believe that Rule 12 (b)(2), properly interpreted in the light of the purposes it serves and the purposes served by making available collateral relief from criminal convictions, does not bar a prisoner from claiming that the grand jury that indicted him was unconstitutionally composed, if he shows that his failure to make that claim before trial was not "an intentional relinquishment or abandonment of a known right or privilege," *Johnson v. Zerbst*, 304 U. S. 458, 464 (1938). But first there is some underbrush to be cleared away.

Davis challenged the "key man" system of selection of grand jurors used in the Northern District of Mississippi in 1968, when he was indicted, because it was implemented to exclude qualified Negroes from the grand jury.¹ Cf. *Glasser v. United States*, 315 U. S. 60, 85-87

¹ Davis alleged, in part:

"(b) that the jury commissioner and Clerk of Court for the Northern District of Mississippi for the past 20 years implementing the "Keyman" and "Selectors," system cause nought to token in their selection of prospective qualifying negro jurymen because of their race and color in violation of Section 1863.

"(c) that the Northern District Court has by its affirmative action taken for the past 20 years has acquiesced to systematically, pur-

1,2,4,11

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Douglas
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

2nd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

in: Marshall, J.

No. 71-6481

Circulated:

Recirculated: APR 11 1973

Clifford H. Davis, Petitioner, v. United States. } On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

[April —, 1973]

MR. JUSTICE MARSHALL, with whom MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS and MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN join, dissenting.

The opinion of the Court obscures the only sensible argument for the result the majority reaches. I am not persuaded by that argument, and find the majority opinion clearly defective. I believe that Rule 12 (b)(2), properly interpreted in the light of the purposes it serves and the purposes served by making available collateral relief from criminal convictions, does not bar a prisoner from claiming that the grand jury that indicted him was unconstitutionally composed, if he shows that his failure to make that claim before trial was not "an intentional relinquishment or abandonment of a known right or privilege," *Johnson v. Zerbst*, 304 U. S. 458, 464 (1938). But first there is some underbrush to be cleared away.

Davis challenged the "key man" system of selection of grand jurors used in the Northern District of Mississippi in 1968, when he was indicted, because it was implemented to exclude qualified Negroes from the grand jury.¹ Cf. *Glasser v. United States*, 315 U. S. 60, 85-87

¹ Davis alleged, in part:

"(b) that the jury commissioner and Clerk of Court for the Northern District of Mississippi for the past 20 years implementing the "Keyman" and "Selectors," system cause nought to token in their

3
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE HARRY A. BLACKMUN

March 29, 1973

Re: No. 71-6481 - Davis v. United States

Dear Bill:

Please join me.

Sincerely,

H. A. B.

Mr. Justice Rehnquist

cc: The Conference

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE LEWIS F. POWELL, JR.

March 30, 1973

Re: No. 71-6481 Davis v. U. S.

Dear Bill:

Please join me.

Sincerely,

Lewis

Mr. Justice Rehnquist

cc: The Conference

file

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Douglas
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell

From: Rehnquist, J.

2nd DRAFT

Circulated: 3/23/73

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Recirculated:

No. 71-6481

Clifford H. Davis, Petitioner, } On Writ of Certiorari to
v. } the United States Court
United States. } of Appeals for the Fifth
Circuit.

[March —, 1973]

MR. JUSTICE REHNQUIST delivered the opinion of the Court.

We are called upon to determine the effect of Rule 12 (b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure on a post-conviction motion for relief which raises for the first time a claim of unconstitutional discrimination in the composition of a grand jury. An indictment was returned in the District Court charging petitioner Davis, a Negro, and two white men with entry into a federally insured bank with intent to commit larceny in violation of 18 U. S. C. §§ 2 and 2113 (a). Represented by appointed counsel,¹ petitioner entered a not guilty plea at his arraignment and was given 30 days within which to file pretrial motions. He timely moved to quash his indictment on the ground that it was the result of an illegal arrest, but made no other pretrial motions relating to the indictment.

On the opening day of the trial, following *voir dire* of the jury, the District Judge ruled on petitioner's pre-

¹ Petitioner was represented throughout the trial by competent, court-appointed counsel, whose advocacy prompted the Court of Appeals to complement him saying:

"We have rarely witnessed a more thorough or more unstinted expenditure of effort by able counsel on behalf of a client." *Davis v. United States*, 409 F. 2d 1095, 1101 (CA5 1969).

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Douglas
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
~~Mr. Justice Marshall~~
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell

3rd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 71-6481

Recircu-

[March —, 1973]

MR. JUSTICE REHNQUIST delivered the opinion of the Court.

We are called upon to determine the effect of Rule 12 (b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure on a post-conviction motion for relief which raises for the first time a claim of unconstitutional discrimination in the composition of a grand jury. An indictment was returned in the District Court charging petitioner Davis, a Negro, and two white men with entry into a federally insured bank with intent to commit larceny in violation of 18 U. S. C. §§ 2 and 2113 (a). Represented by appointed counsel,¹ petitioner entered a not guilty plea at his arraignment and was given 30 days within which to file pretrial motions. He timely moved to quash his indictment on the ground that it was the result of an illegal arrest, but made no other pretrial motions relating to the indictment.

On the opening day of the trial, following *voir dire* of the jury, the District Judge ruled on petitioner's pre-

¹ Petitioner was represented throughout the trial by competent, court-appointed counsel, whose advocacy prompted the Court of Appeals to complement him saying:

"We have rarely witnessed a more thorough or more unstinted expenditure of effort by able counsel on behalf of a client." *Davis v. United States*, 409 F. 2d 1095, 1101 (CA5 1969).