

8. *Leloup v. Port of Mobile*, 127 U.S. 640 (1888).

A Mobile, Alabama, ordinance that levied an occupational license tax on a telegraph company doing an interstate business was void.

9. *McCall v. California*, 136 U.S. 104 (1890).

A San Francisco ordinance that imposed a license tax on a soliciting agent for a foreign corporation was void as levying a tax on interstate commerce.

Justices concurring: Lamar, Miller, Field, Bradley, Harlan, Blatchford

Justices dissenting: Fuller, C.J., Gray, Brewer

10. *Brennan v. City of Titusville*, 153 U.S. 289 (1894).

An ordinance of a Pennsylvania city requiring a license tax of a soliciting agent for a manufacturer in another state was held invalid as imposing a tax upon interstate commerce.

11. *City of Walla Walla v. Walla Walla Water Co.*, 172 U.S. 1 (1898).

A Washington city ordinance that authorized construction of a municipal water works impaired the obligation of a contract previously negotiated with a private utility providing the same service.

12. *City of Los Angeles v. Los Angeles City Water Co.*, 177 U.S. 558 (1900).

Ordinance expanding city limits beyond those to be served by a utility leasing a municipality's water works and effecting diminution of the rates stipulated in the original agreement without any equivalent compensation impaired the obligation of contract between the utility and the city.

13. *City of Detroit v. Detroit Citizens' St. Ry.*, 184 U.S. 368 (1902).

City ordinances that adjusted the rate of fare stipulated in agreements made with a street railway company held to impair the obligation of contract.

14. *Caldwell v. North Carolina*, 187 U.S. 622 (1903).

Greensboro ordinance imposing a license on photographic business, as applied to an agent of an out-of-state corporation, was held an invalid regulation of commerce.

15. *Postal Telegraph-Cable Co. v. Borough of Taylor*, 192 U.S. 64 (1904).

Ordinance of Taylor, Pennsylvania authorizing an inspection fee on telegraph companies doing an interstate business held to be an unreasonable and invalid regulation of commerce.

Justices concurring: Peckham, Fuller, C.J., Brown, White, McKenna, Holmes, Day