

Introduction parties  
involved in law suit.  
the



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

## **Introduction**

The purpose of this essay is to compare the various court decisions made by the Supreme Court before and after 1937. The United States Supreme Court is the highest federal court in the United States and it is charged with the mandate of deciding cases based on a majority vote by the various judiciaries who make up the court. The Supreme Court faced a re-organization in 1937 with the introduction of the Judiciary Reorganization Bill by President Franklin Roosevelt to add more court justices to the US Supreme Court and to also obtain more favourable rulings in court cases and decisions (Mckenna 413). As part of his election campaign, President Roosevelt launched his New Deal initiative that was meant to promote economic recovery within the United States following the Wall Street Crash in 1929 as well as the Great Depression in 1932. President Roosevelt introduced the Reorganization Bill to deal with discrepancies in court rulings that existed in the US Supreme Court (Epstein & Thomas 451).

## **Case 1**

In the analysis of court decisions made by the Supreme Court before 1937, a case that stands out is the Panama Refining Co.

Vs Ryan which took place in 1935. The major contention in this case was the National Industrial Recovery Act where the US Congress gave authority to the President of the United States to prohibit the transportation of petroleum within and outside the country in the event the petrol was produced from storage and also to regulate the oil industry within the United States.

However Panama Refining and Amazon Petroleum filed a law suit that was

meant to stop the enforcement of the National Industrial Recovery Act after it was passed by the US Congress granting the president the overall authority in the oil industry (Findlaw par. 1). The case was taken to the Supreme Court who ruled in favour of Amazon Petroleum and Panama Refining.

The court based its ruling on the fact that the US Congress had delegated a lot of authority and power to the President without providing any clear guidelines or statements as to how they reached their decision. Congress also failed to provide clearly established standards that would be used to empower the President under the NIRA act. This court ruling was seen to be a major blow to President Roosevelt's New Deal initiative and he contested the Supreme Court's decision by stating that the ruling had been made based on the narrowness of the court's opinion as it did not deny Congress the authority to regulate the oil industry (Findlaw par. 5).

## **Case 2**

In the case of Employers Reinsurance Corporation vs. Bryant-1937, a citizen of Texas had sued a corporate citizen in Missouri for the recovery of a sum of \$3,000 that was meant for workmen's compensation insurance. The defendant of the case caused the suit to be removed because of the diverse citizenship of the various parties involved in law suit.

The process was issued out of the Gregg County court and served upon an agent of the defendant on the Western District of Texas. The defendant challenged this move by stating that it was outside of the court's territorial jurisdiction to move the law suit to another state. The plaintiff moved that

the law suit should be remanded to the state court as the federal court was unable to obtain the personal jurisdiction of the defendant (Justia par.

11). The defendant of the case petitioned the Supreme Court begging them to vacate the order of the state court for the case to remain there. The Supreme Court took in the petition by ordering the state judge to show just cause why the requested writs of the case could not be issued. After an analysis of the various facts of the case, the ruling of the Supreme Court was to deny the defendant a petition based on the grounds that the service of process against the defendant to remove cause to the federal court was invalid as the defendant declined to appear voluntarily before the court. The court also based its ruling on the fact that the defendant did not have an agent on which service could have been had with the Western Texas District where the law suit was pending (Justia par. 17).

### **Comparison of the Supreme Court's Decision**

The ruling of the Supreme Court in the Employer's Reinsurance Corporation vs Bryant demonstrates that the Supreme Court expanded its judicial reviews of court cases when compared to the first case.

The court rejected the defendant's appeal because the order made by the state court was done with the proper exercise of lawful authority which was suitable for the situation in which the decision was made. This court ruling demonstrated that the Supreme Court exercised its rulings based on the various circumstances that existed in the court case. In the first case, the court's ruling was based on US Congress acts and legislation which stipulated that the US Congress had supreme authority over the interstate oil

commerce in the United States and the President therefore did not have the authority to regulate the oil industry.

While this ruling was made in accordance with Congress legislation, it affected the new Deal initiative established by President Roosevelt to spur economic growth in the country (Brown 1942). The courts power based on the two cases has expanded as the US Congress continued to grant the Supreme Court more powers and authority that would ensure appropriate rulings in both the state and federal courts. The general view that has been held by the Supreme Court is in ensuring that there is an equitable distribution of justice and management of the country's legal system through the three branches of government that include the President, the US Congress and judicial bodies which include the state and federal courts. The implementation of justice within the court is based on set out legislation and laws that are meant to govern the justice and legal system in the United States (Brown 1942).

## **Works Cited**

Brown, Claude H. Some problems concerning motions under federal rule 12(b). *Minnesota Law Review*, 27(5), 1942-1943, 1943. Epstein, Lee, and Thomas, Walker.

*Constitutional Law for a Changing America: Institutional Powers and Constraints* (6th Ed.). Washington, D.

C.: CQ Press, 2007. Print. Findlaw. US Supreme Court: Panama Refining Co. Vs Ryan, 293 U. S.

388 (135). N. d. Web 27 January 2011

pl? court= us&vol= 293&invol= 388> Justia. Employers reinsurance corporation vs. Bryant, 299, US 374(1937).

N. d. Web 27 January 2011 < [http://supreme.justia.com/us/299/374/case.](http://supreme.justia.com/us/299/374/case.html)

html> McKenna, Marian. Franklin Roosevelt and the Great Constitutional War: The Court-packing Crisis of 1937. New York: Fordham University Press, 2002. Print.