

5 Rapp no. 10 (1958)

## VIGDOR V. YOUNG

### HEADNOTE

by Ira Brad Matetsky

Source: Papers of Felix Frankfurter, Box 220, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Opinion by: Felix Frankfurter (stated in source).

Opinion date: July 1958.

Citation: *Vigdor v. Young*, 5 Rapp no. 10 (1958) (Frankfurter, J., in chambers), 1 J. In-Chambers Practice 311 (2016).

Additional information: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper. It is undated, but bears a stamp stating “OCT. TERM 1958 U.S. Supreme Court” at the top. It must have been issued sometime between approximately July 25, 1958 – 90 days after the D.C. Circuit issued its denial of rehearing decision in *Vigdor v. Young*, 254 F.2d 333 (D.C. Cir. Mar. 13, 1958), *rehearing denied* (D.C. Cir. Apr. 25, 1958) – and August 4, 1958, a future date mentioned in the opinion. The petitioner’s name at the top of the opinion is cut off in the file copy, but the full name of the case is clear given the D.C. Circuit’s opinion and the Supreme Court’s denial of certiorari in *Vigdor v. Young*, 358 U.S. 854 (Oct. 13, 1958).

### OPINION

[Blossom *Vigdor v.*] Phillip Young, Chairman, et al., Members, U.S. Civil Service Comm., and H.V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

Considering the generous time – ninety days – that Congress has allowed for petitioning for a writ of certiorari in a case like this it seems to me inexcusable to wait till the eve of the very last day before expiration of the ninety days to ask for an extension of time. The petition for certiorari, one cannot too often repeat, does not call for and indeed precludes extended arguments on the issues affording “special and important reasons” for bringing a case here. The fact of the matter is that in the application for

extension of time the essence of the claim on which petitioner seeks a writ to review the judgment of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia is set forth. Accordingly, I shall treat this application for an extension of time as though it were the petition for certiorari, with leave to the applicant to file a formal petition setting forth a brief elaboration of the claim that he makes in his application for extension, provided such formal petition will be filed not later than Monday, August 4.

[signed] Felix Frankfurter  
Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States