Errata for Volume 70, Issue 3

Kentucky Law Journal

ERRATA

Readers should note the following footnote corrections in Volume 70:

pages 569-70:

[13] An advantage of commercial paper during the antebellum period was that it was less costly than metallic money to transfer or store. *See* Kilbourne, *Securing Commercial Transactions in the Antebellum Legal System of Louisiana*, 70 KY. L.J. 609 (1981-82) . . . .

page 580:

[54] For a discussion of judicial attitudes toward the negotiability of accommodation paper, see Freyer, *Antebellum Commercial Law: Common Law Approaches to Secured Transactions*, 70 KY. L.J. 593 (1981-82).

page 734:

[15] Since the Court later referred to the correct theory, both by name and statutory section, *id.* at 2188, it is clear that the Court understood the nature of the issue before it.

[16] *Id.* at 2185 n.5.

[17] *Id.* at 2185 n.4.

[18] *Id.* at 2185.

page 737:

[29] (second paragraph) The Supreme Court's express determination that the trial court's factual findings had not been "clearly erroneous" drew a critical comment from Justice Rehnquist, who apparently felt that the question of whether the district judge's findings were "clearly erroneous" should have been remanded to the appellate court for consideration under the correct standard. *Id.* at 2193 (Rehnquist, J., concurring). More interestingly, Justice White criticized the Court's opinion on the ground that the "clearly erroneous" rule had not been presented as a basis for certiorari—except on the issue of "functionality"—and thus should not have been considered by the Court. *Id.* at 2191 & n.1 (White, J., concurring). He also opined that "it is doubtful in my mind [whether] this fact-bound issue would have warranted certiorari." *Id.* at 2191. . . .

page 738:

[32] *Id.* at 2191 . . . .

[34] 102 S. Ct. at 2188 n.13.

page 741:

[47] Inwood Laboratories, Inc. v. Ives Laboratories, Inc., 102 S. Ct. at 2190 (emphasis added). *Accord id.* at 2193-94 . . . .

page 743:

[55] "As the Court of Appeals noted [in the first appeal], § 43(a) 'goes beyond § 32 in making certain types of unfair competition federal statutory torts' . . . ." *Id.* at 2193 . . . .