

# The Burger Court Opinion Writing Database

*Snider v. All State Administrators, Inc.*

414 U.S. 685 (1974)

Paul J. Wahlbeck, George Washington University

James F. Spriggs, II, Washington University in St. Louis

Forrest Maltzman, George Washington University



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

CHAMBERS OF  
THE CHIEF JUSTICE

January 11, 1974

Re: 73-731 - Snider v. All State Administrators

Dear Bill:

Please join me. This per curiam should  
go a long way to settle the problem.

Regards,

WLB

Mr. Justice Rehnquist

Copies to the Conference

HOOPER INSTITUTION  
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE  
Sanford, California 94303-6010



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY  
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT  
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

or distributed without the specific authori-  
zation of the Hoover Institution Archives.

1st DRAFT

# SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FRANCIS SNIDER ET AL. v. ALL STATE  
ADMINISTRATORS, INC., ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED  
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 73-731. Decided January —, 1974

PER CURIAM.

Petitioner has filed a motion to dispense with the printing of the petition for certiorari as required by our Rule 39. He has filed no motion and affidavit in conformity with our Rule 53, dealing with proceedings *in forma pauperis*. While we undoubtedly have authority to waive the application of particular rules in appropriate circumstances, we have during this Term denied a considerable number of similar motions.\* Typically in each of these cases the moving petitioner made generalized allegations of inability to afford payment of printing costs, but made no showing sufficient to comply with Rule 53 governing proceedings *in forma pauperis*. Motions such as these are disfavored, and petitioner's motion is denied.

Rule 39, entitled "Form of appendices, petitions, briefs, etc." contains the following definition:

"Printing, as the term is used in these rules, shall include any process capable of producing a clear black image on white paper but shall not include ordinary carbon copies. If papers are filed in a form which is not clearly legible, the clerk will require that new copies be substituted, but the filing shall not be deemed untimely."

\* See, e. g., *Wallace v. Smith*, No. 73-40, motion denied October 15, 1973; *Broccolino v. Maryland Comm'n on Judicial Disabilities et al.*, No. 73-431, motion denied November 19, 1973; *Chippas v. United States*, No. 73-761, motion denied December 17, 1973.

1/10/74

Wm  
Dear R  
9 Apr  
C  
1/10/74

Sanford California 94303-0000

HOOPER INSTITUTION  
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY  
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT  
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

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

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE WM. J. BRENNAN, JR. January 10, 1974

RE: No. 73-731 Snider v. All State  
Administrators, Inc. et al.

Dear Bill:

I agree with the Per Curiam you have  
prepared in the above.

Sincerely,

WJ

Mr. Justice Rehnquist

cc: The Conference

You have a  
Court

or distributed without the specific authori-  
zation of the Hoover Institution Archives.

HOVER INSTITUTION  
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE  
Stanford, California 94305-5080



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY  
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT  
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

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

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE POTTER STEWART

January 10, 1974

No. 73-731, Snider v. All State Administrators

Dear Bill,

Although I have been out of step with the "Ohio order" procedure, I think it is quite wise for the Court to cast some light on what it is doing. Accordingly, I cheerfully acquiesce in the Per Curiam you have circulated.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Justice Rehnquist

Copies to the Conference

*Just 3 more  
of the*

Sanford, California 94303-0010

HOOPER INSTITUTE  
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY  
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT  
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

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

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE BYRON R. WHITE

January 10, 1974

Re: No. 73-731 - Snider v. All State  
Administrators, Inc.

---

Dear Bill:

Please join me.

Sincerely,



Mr. Justice Rehnquist

Copies to Conference

NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY  
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT  
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

HOOPER INSTITUTE  
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE  
Sanford, California 94305-6010



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY  
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT  
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

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

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE HARRY A. BLACKMUN

January 10, 1974

Re: No. 73-731 - Snider v. All State Administrators, Inc.

Dear Bill:

Please join me in your proposed per curiam.

Sincerely,

H.A. Blackmun

Mr. Justice Rehnquist

cc: The Conference

HOOPER INSTITUTION  
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE  
Sanford, California 94301-6010



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY  
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT  
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

Wm

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

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE LEWIS F. POWELL, JR.

January 18, 1974

102

No. 73-731 Snider v. All State Administrators

Dear Bill:

Please join me.

Sincerely,

*Lewis*

Mr. Justice Rehnquist

lfp/ss

cc: The Conference

*Just TM  
to date now*

or distributed without the specific authori-  
zation of the Hoover Institution Archives.

HOOPER INSTITUTION  
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE  
Sanford, California 94963-0010



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY  
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT  
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)



File

2nd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FRANCIS SNIDER ET AL. v. ALL STATE  
ADMINISTRATORS, INC., ET AL.

1/17/74

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED  
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 73-731. Decided January —, 1974

PER CURIAM.

Petitioner has filed a motion to dispense with the printing of the petition for certiorari as required by our Rule 39. He has filed no motion and affidavit in conformity with our Rule 53, dealing with proceedings *in forma pauperis*. While we undoubtedly have authority to waive the application of particular rules in appropriate circumstances, we have during this Term denied a considerable number of similar motions.\* Typically in each of these cases the moving petitioner made generalized allegations of inability to afford payment of printing costs, but made no showing sufficient to comply with Rule 53 governing proceedings *in forma pauperis*. Motions such as these are disfavored, and petitioner's motion is denied.

Rule 39, entitled "Form of appendices, petitions, briefs, etc." contains the following definition:

"Printing, as the term is used in these rules, shall include any process capable of producing a clear black image on white paper but shall not include ordinary carbon copies. If papers are filed in a form which is not clearly legible, the clerk will require

\* See, e. g., *Wallace v. Smith*, No. 73-40, motion denied October 15, 1973; *Broccolino v. Maryland Comm'n on Judicial Disabilities et al.*, No. 73-431, motion denied November 19, 1973; *Chippas v. United States*, No. 73-761, motion denied December 17, 1973. See also *Morton v. Mancari*, motion to dispense with printing the motion to dismiss or affirm denied January 14, 1974.

of distributed without the specific authori-  
zation of the Hoover Institution Archives.

ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE  
Stanford, California 94305-6000



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY  
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT  
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)