

1955

# Donald Buckner v. Main Realty and Insurance Company and Robert Stevenson : Brief of Respondent

Utah Supreme Court

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu\\_sc1](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc1)



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Original Brief submitted to the Utah Supreme Court; funding for digitization provided by the Institute of Museum and Library Services through the Library Services and Technology Act, administered by the Utah State Library, and sponsored by the S.J. Quinney Law Library; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors.

D. H. Oliver; Attorney for Respondent;

---

## Recommended Citation

Brief of Respondent, *Buckner v. Main Realty and Insurance Co.*, No. 8345 (Utah Supreme Court, 1955).

[https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu\\_sc1/2367](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc1/2367)

This Brief of Respondent is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Supreme Court Briefs (pre-1965) by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu](mailto:hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu).

IN THE SUPREME COURT RECEIVED  
of the  
STATE OF UTAH

MAR 27

LAW LIBRARY  
U. of U.

DONALD BUCKNER,

*Respondent,*

vs.

MAIN REALTY AND INSURANCE  
COMPANY, a Corporation, and ROB-  
ERT STEVENSON,

*Appellants.*

---

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF

---

D. H. OLIVER,

*Attorney for Respondent,*

309 Frick Building,

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
STATEMENT .....	1
POINTS .....	1
PROPOSITIONS OF LAW.....	2

### CASES CITED

Bryden vs. Board, 51 P2nd 177.....	2
Gietz vs. Webster, 50 P2nd 573.....	2
Irr. Co. vs. Stock Co., 173 P 265 .....	2
McGeal vs. Phelps, 128 N.W. 1041.....	2
Peo vs. Henning, 103 N.E. 530.....	2
State vs. Gates, 206 P 863.....	2

### STATUTES CITED

#### UTAH CODE 1953 :

Rule 1(a) .....	3
Rule 5(o) .....	3
Rule 77(d) .....	3
Rule 81(c) .....	3
Rule 77(h) .....	4

IN THE SUPREME COURT  
of the  
STATE OF UTAH

---

DONALD BUCKNER,

*Respondent,*

vs.

MAIN REALTY AND INSURANCE  
COMPANY, a Corporation, and ROB-  
ERT STEVENSON,

*Appellants.*

} Case No. 8345

---

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF

---

STATEMENT

Appellants' statement of facts is substantially correct.

POINTS

The lower court did not error in dismissing appellants appeal to the District from the City Court.

To sustain the judgment of the lower court, Respondent relies on the following

## PROPOSITION OF LAW

### I.

STATUTES SHOULD BE INTERPRETED ACCORDING TO THE LEGISLATIVE INTENT, TO BE ASCERTAINED FROM THE WHOLE STATUTE AND A CONSIDERATION OF THE MISCHIEF WHICH IT WAS DESIGNED TO REMEDY.

*Irr. Co. vs. Stock Co.*, 173 P 265  
*State vs. Gates*, 206 P 863  
*Dryden vs. Board*, 51 P2nd 177  
*Gietz vs. Webster*, 50 P2nd 573  
*McGeal vs. Phelps*, 128 NW 1041  
*Peo. vs. Henning*, 103 NE 530

### ARGUMENT

In *State vs. Gates*, supra, at page 867 the Oregon Supreme Court said,

“Statutes should be interpreted according to the Legislative intent, to be ascertained from the whole statute and a consideration of the mischief which it was designed to remedy.”

In *Irr. Co. vs. Stock Co.*, the same court said, at page 266

“In order to discern the legislative intent which is the main object, we should look at the whole statute and section.”

These decisions have been cited with approval and followed in all of the cases cited above, and many more.

This court can take judicial notice that the New Rules were approved by this court and incorporated in

the 1953 Statutes as the Code of Civil Procedure by the legislature.

The purpose of this Code is expressed by the legislature in Rule 1 (a) as follows

“These rules shall govern the procedure in the District Courts of this State, and such *other Courts* as may *hereafter be determined*, in all actions, suits and proceedings of a civil nature, whether cognizable at law or equity. . . . They shall be liberally construed to secure the *just, speedy, and inexpensive* determination of every action.”

Rule 5(a) provides for the filing and service of pleadings and other papers in civil actions, and expressly provides

“No service need be made on parties in default for failure to appear, etc.”

Rule 77(d) provides the manner of service and by whom notice of judgment should be made, and specifically excepts from its operation parties in default, and then provides

“Lack of notice of the entry of judgment by the clerk does not affect the time for appeal or relieve or otherwise authorize the court to relieve a party for failure to appeal within the time allowed.”

Rule 81(c) provides

“These rules shall apply to civil actions commenced in the City or Justice Courts except in so far as such rules are by their nature inapplicable to such courts or proceedings therein.”

This court is familiar with the evil existing in the courts of this state prior to the adoption of the new rules and the mischief perpetrated upon society by prolonged, expensive and oft times dilatory tactics of neglectful and careless litigants.

Viewing Rule 73 (h) in the light of all the rules of civil procedure and the evil intended to be remedied thereby, the conclusion is unescapable that the notice provided for therein was not meant for parties in default, and in this we respectfully submit that the judgment of the District Court should be affirmed with costs to Respondent.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**D. H. OLIVER,**  
*Attorney for Respondent,*

**309 Frick Building,  
Salt Lake City, Utah**