

1947 WL 44429 (U.S.) (Appellate Brief)
Supreme Court of the United States.

James M. HURD and Mary I. Hurd, Petitioners,

v.

Frederic E. HODGE, Lena A. Murray Hodge, Pasquale DeRita, Victoria DeRita, Constantino Marchegiani, Mary M. Marchegiani, Balduino Giancola and Margaret Giancola, Respondents;
Raphael G. Urciolo, Robert H. Rowe, Isabelle J. Rowe, Herbert B. Savage, Georgia N. Savage and Pauline B. Stewart, Petitioners,

v.

Frederic E. Hodge, Lena A. Murray Hodge, Pasquale DeRita, Victoria DeRita, Constantino Marchegiani, Mary M. Marchegiani, Balduino Giancola and Margaret Giancola, Respondents.

Nos. 290, 291.

October Term, 1947.

November 18, 1947.

Consolidated Brief for Petitioners

Raphael G. Urciolo, pro se,

Charles H. Houston,

Phineas Indritz,

Spottswood W. Robinson, III,

Attorneys for Petitioners.

***i INDEX**

Consolidated Brief for Petitioners	
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Statement of the Case	2
Questions Presented	5
Specification of Errors to Be Urged	6
The Basic Issue	7
Summary of Argument	8
Argument	10
I.	
A. Judicial enforcement, under the law of the District of Columbia, of a restrictive covenant which, solely on the basis of race, (1) forbids a person from acquiring, occupying and selling land, and (2) forbids an owner of land from selling it to any member of the restricted group, violates the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment	10
(1) This Court has protected the rights of both white sellers and nonwhite buyers against legislative racial restrictions	11
(2) The petitioners here have been deprived of their property without due process by the Government, acting in this instance through its judicial arm	16
(3) Judicial action is subject to the Due Process clause	20
(4) Legislative racial restrictions compared to judicial enforcement of racial restrictive covenants	28
(5) Assumed cases showing unconstitutionality of judicial enforcement of both racial restrictive covenants and racial zoning statute	30
(6) The petitioners have not attempted to contract away their constitutional rights	33
(7) Judicial enforcement of racial restrictive covenants is unconstitutional	35