

---

**Fsxsp2crack\_HOT\_dllfiles**

**Fsxsp2crackdllfiles**

---

Reviews are the best way to know what people think about a specific product: you will find the general opinion about a price-quality relationship is positive! You can find testimonials about the product on the internet, see images, watch videos, read the description of the product. This is often the best and quickest way to learn about the product. Buy now with a 100% safe transaction via Download.cr and enjoy the download on your smartphone, tablet, PC & Mac. Get The Best Software for Free. *Edmundson v. United States*, 255 U.S. 209 (1921) U.S. Supreme Court *Edmundson v. United States*, 255 U.S. 209 (1921) *Edmundson v. United States* No. 14 Argued October 22, 21, 1921 Decided December 9, 1921 255 U.S. 209 Syllabus A book importer is engaged in a purely commercial transaction and has no right to oppose the forfeiture of the property seized under a libel of information, unless there is no evidence that would sustain a verdict against him. The First Act of March 3, 1917, c. 15,40 Stat. 217, 181, formerly 28 U.S.C. 863, contains a provision (section 11, p. 222) that if a trader shall fail to comply with any requirement of the act, he shall become liable to a forfeiture of the goods, but that the court may order restitution, there being a provision for the sale of the forfeited property for the benefit of the United States. The particular provision that permits the seizure and forfeiture of the goods is section 21, p. 234. A proceeding is instituted under that section by a libel filed in the district court in which jurisdiction is given to the court to hear and determine the cause, to order the seizure of the goods, and to declare the forfeiture of the same. All the provisions of the act are made applicable to such proceeding. The term "trader" is not broad enough to embrace the book importer, although that is the form which the libel took in this case. The district court did not err in entering a decree of condemnation against the seized goods. In the absence of evidence showing any defense to the libel, the court was justified in holding as a matter of law that the goods were Page 255 U. S. 210 subject to forfeiture. See

