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In this issue the St. John's Law Review continues its annual tradition of focusing upon some of the more significant cases decided by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. These cases were selected from those decided by this important tribunal during the September 1976 Term.

The Review is honored to have as the author of this year's Foreword Circuit Judge Wilfred Feinberg. Judge Feinberg has examined some of the problems of judicial administration and posed many questions on that subject which are in need of further examination.

While space and time considerations necessarily limit the number of cases we can treat, it is believed that our selection will advance the dual purpose of this issue. The intent is to provide a synopsis of the significant cases decided during the 1976 Term and to serve as a basic research tool for the practitioner. Accordingly, the cases examined herein include Abrahamson v. Fleshner (recognition of an implied private right of action under the Investment Advisors Act), Brook v. Flagg Brothers, Inc. (private enforcement of warehouseman's lien as state action), Mitchell v. National Broadcasting Co. (state administrative determination reviewed by state court afforded res judicata effect in a subsequent federal Civil Rights suit), and United States v. Robinson (propriety of giving second Allen charge to a deadlocked jury). We trust that our analysis of the issues confronting one of the country's premier courts will continue to meet with the approval of the attorneys, professors, and judges of the Second Circuit whose assistance has contributed to the success of the Second Circuit Note.
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