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CASES NOTED

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW—POLICE DEPARTMENT
TRIALS—QUESTION OF RES JUDICATA

Defendant police officers, in a departmental hearing, were acquitted of charges of accepting bribes when the principal witness refused to testify. At a second hearing, four months later, petitioners were found guilty as charged on the basis of that witness' testimony. As a result of the later decision, defendants were removed from the police force. On appeal defendants allege that the first decision was res judicata. Held, no strictly binding legal rule of estoppel should apply to administrative decisions, particularly where such application would preclude a decision on the merits. Evans v. Monaghan, 282 App. Div. 382, 123 N.Y.S.2d 662 (1st Dep't 1953).

It is a general rule that the decision of an administrative board or officer acting in a judicial or quasi-judicial capacity under the proper empowering statute has the same binding effect as the judgment of a properly-constituted court. The courts agree that the ministerial or administrative decisions of a board or officer have no strict judicial finality. The principal difficulty arises when the courts attempt to characterize the functions of a particular board or officer as administrative or judicial for the purposes of res judicata. This tenuous classification often has most confusing results.

The application of res judicata in administrative law is further

1. Before a deputy appointed by the police commissioner, as authorized by N. Y. City Charter § 434; Adm. Code § 434a-14.0.
2. 2 Freeman on Judgements § 633 (5th ed. 1925) and cases there cited.
5. Compare three of Mr. Justice Holmes' decisions: In re Janvrin, 174 Mass. 514, 55 N.E. 381 (1899) (rate-making is a judicial function); Prentis v. Atlantic Coast Line R.R., 211 U.S. 210 (1908) (railroad rate-making predominantly legislative); Springer v. Gov't of the Philippine Islands, 277 U.S. 189, 210 (1928) (His dissenting opinion says: "... The Interstate Commerce Commission does legislative, judicial, and executive acts, softened only by a quasi... we do not and cannot carry out the distinction... with mathematical precision... ".) (Citations arranged chronologically to show the policy development.)
complicated by the doctrine's traditional judicial problems of jurisdiction,^{9} 
privity,^{7} and the necessity for a final^{8} decision on the merits.^{9} No detailed 
discussion of the complexities of the situation can be attempted here.^{10} 
It must suffice to say that interpretation of the empowering statute^{11} 
and protection of the public interest^{12} are generally the best guides to 
the probable res judicata effect of an administrative decision. 

More specifically, the removal of members of a police force is generally 
regarded as judicial or quasi-judicial if removal is for cause or is exercised 
after a hearing.^{13} However, where the pertinent statute or charter permits 
summary discharge, the action may be considered administrative.^{14} 
There are cases which suggest that hearings concerning the dismissal of 
public employees have res judicata effect^{15} but "... the vein of authority 
runs very thin."^{16} Indeed, what appears the most logical approach to 
this particular problem is found in Handlon v. Town of Belleville^{17} which held that the civil service commission could re-examine its dismissal of a court clerk.^{18} 

---

7. Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co. v. Adkins, 310 U.S. 381 (1940) (decision by Bituminous Coal Commission binding on coal company in later case between company and Commissioner of Internal Revenue).
8. Hastings Mfg. Co. v. FTC, 153 F.2d 253 (6th Cir.), cert. denied, 328 U.S. 853 (1946) (dismissal "without prejudice" not final decision); C.G. Conn., Ltd. v. NLRB, 108 F.2d 390 (7th Cir. 1940) (dismissal with reservation of jurisdiction has no finality).
12. Churchill Tabernacle v. FCC, 160 F.2d 244 (D.C. Cir. 1947) (F.C.C. should re-examine each application for renewal of an old license and grant or refuse it in the public interest).
14. Barron v. Bailies, 157 Fla. 492, 26 So.2d 449 (1946); Simms v. Owen, 87 Fla. 485, 100 So. 734 (1924); City of Jackson v. McLeod, 199 Miss. 676, 24 So.2d 319 (1946).
18. In analogy to the authority of courts of general jurisdiction at common law, administrative tribunals possess the inherent power of reconsideration.
The dissenting opinion in the instant case relies heavily on the decision in *Stowell v. Santoro* which prevented village trustees from convicting the petitioner (police chief) of a bribery charge after a previous acquittal on the same specification. The dissenters are fearful that a grant of retrial power to the police department could result in endless vexation for members of the force. The majority of the court makes a weak attempt to distinguish the facts of the *Stowell* case but is primarily concerned with the necessity for a decision on the merits. Since *whatever evidence was offered* at the first hearing was directed to the guilt or innocence of the accused, it is difficult to support this emphasis.

However, since a court of law will relax the res judicata doctrine to further the ends of justice, administrative agencies, with their greater flexibility, should have the same power. Even in a criminal case, the refusal of a witness to testify may result in a mistrial so that the defendant can be retried. Removal proceedings are not criminal actions, although they are penal in nature, and it appears illogical to extend to defendants in a departmental trial greater protection from jeopardy than a criminal proceeding might afford them. It is further suggested that "... in proceedings for the removal or discharge of a policeman the protection of the public is a matter of paramount importance, exceeding perhaps the individual interests of the policeman concerned."
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**CONFLICT OF LAWS— IN PERSONAM JURISDICTION OVER NON-RESIDENT INDIVIDUALS— DOING BUSINESS TEST**

Defendants, out of state owners of a Florida orange grove, listed the grove for sale with a real estate broker in Florida. In a suit for the broker's

---

of their judicial acts, except as qualified by statute. This function arises by necessary implication to serve the statutory policy. The denial to such tribunals of the authority to correct error and injustice and to revise its judgments for good and sufficient cause would run counter to the public interest. The power of correction and revision, the better to serve the statutory policy, is of the very nature of such governmental agencies.

(1) see note 10 supra.


