

333. *Cline v. Frink Dairy Co.*, 274 U.S. 445 (1927).

Because of the exception it contained, under which its prohibitions were not to apply to conduct engaged in by participants whenever necessary to obtain a reasonable profit from products traded in, the Colorado Antitrust Law was void for want of a fixed standard for determining guilt and a violation of due process.

334. *Power Mfg. Co. v. Saunders*, 274 U.S. 490 (1927).

As applied to a foreign corporation having a fixed place of business and an agent in one county, but no property, debts or anything also in the county in which it was sued, Arkansas law that authorized actions to be brought against a foreign corporation in any county in the state, while restricting actions against domestic corporations to the county where it had a place of business or where its chief officer resided, deprived the foreign corporation of equal protection of the laws.

Justices concurring: Van Devanter, McReynolds, Sutherland, Stone, Sanford, Butler, Taft, C.J.

Justices dissenting: Holmes, Brandeis

335. *Northwestern Ins. Co. v. Wisconsin*, 275 U.S. 136 (1927).

A Wisconsin law levying a tax on the gross income of domestic insurance companies was void where the income was derived in part as interest on United States bonds.

336. *Wuchter v. Pizzutti*, 276 U.S. 13 (1928).

A New Jersey statute that provided that in suits by residents against nonresidents for injuries resulting from operation of motor vehicles by the latter, service might be made on the Secretary of State as their agent, but that failed to provide any assurance that notice of such service would be communicated to the nonresidents, violated due process.

Justices concurring: Taft, C.J., Van Devanter, Butler, Sutherland, Sanford, McReynolds

Justices dissenting: Brandeis, Holmes, Stone

337. *Accord: Consolidated Flour Mills Co. v. Muegge*, 278 U.S. 559 (1928), voiding similar service as authorized by an Oklahoma law.

338. *Missouri ex rel. Robertson v. Miller*, 276 U.S. 174 (1928).

A Mississippi statute that terminated the right of a retired revenue agent to prosecute suits for unpaid taxes in the name of his successor by requiring that the successor approve and join in such suits, and that stipulated that the successor share equally in the commissions that had accrued solely to the retired agent, was held to impair the latter's rights under the Contract Clause insofar as it