

*O'Callahan v. Parker*, 395 U.S. 258 (1969), overruled in *Solorio v. United States*, 483 U.S. 435 (1987).

Concurring: Douglas, Black, Brennan, Fortas, Marshall, Warren, C.J.

Dissenting: Harlan, Stewart, White

100. Act of August 10, 1956 (70A Stat. 35, § 772(f))

Proviso of statute permitting the wearing of United States military apparel in theatrical productions only if the portrayal does not tend to discredit the armed forces imposes an unconstitutional restraint upon First Amendment freedoms and precludes a prosecution under 18 U.S.C. § 702 for unauthorized wearing of uniform in a street skit disrespectful of the military.

*Schacht v. United States*, 398 U.S. 58 (1970).

101. Act of September 2, 1958 (§ 5601(b)(1), 72 Stat. 1399)

Provision of Internal Revenue Code creating a presumption that one's presence at the site of an unregistered still shall be sufficient for conviction under a statute punishing possession, custody, or control of an unregistered still unless defendant otherwise explained his presence at the site to the jury held unconstitutional because the presumption is not a legitimate, rational, or reasonable inference that defendant was engaged in one of the specialized functions proscribed by the statute.

*United States v. Romano*, 382 U.S. 136 (1965).

102. Act of September 2, 1958 (Pub. L. 85-921, § 1, 72 Stat. 1771, 18 U.S.C. § 504(1))

Exemptions from ban on photographic reproduction of currency "for philatelic, numismatic, educational, historical, or newsworthy purposes" violates the First Amendment because it discriminates on the basis of the content of a publication.

*Regan v. Time, Inc.*, 468 U.S. 641 (1984).

Justices concurring: White, Brennan, Blackmun, Marshall, Powell, Rehnquist, O'Connor, Burger, C.J.

Justice dissenting: Stevens

103. Act of September 2, 1958 (§ 1(25)(B), 72 Stat. 1446), and Act of September 7, 1962 (§ 401, 76 Stat. 469)

Federal statutes providing that spouses of female members of the Armed Forces must be dependent in fact in order to qualify for certain dependent's benefits, whereas spouses of male members are statutorily deemed dependent and automatically qualified for allowances, whatever their actual status, held an invalid sex classification under the equal protection principles of the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause.