

United States Supreme Court,  
Washington – D.C.  
Justice Jackson:

Monroeville, Ohio  
11-17-1942.

Dear Sir:

As a participant in the triple A, I am asking you to give your view on my claim for reimbursement of penalty paid for excess wheat.

As we have read the following statement made by you, it is up to you to hold your word good or admit prevarications. Quote: Thus the penalty was contingent upon an act which appellee committed, not before, but after the enactment of the statute, and had he chosen to cut his excess and cure it as feed it as hay, or reap and feed it with the head and straw together, no penalty would have been demanded. Such manner of consumption is not uncommon.

“Only” when he threshed and thereby made it a part of the bulk of wheat overhanging the market did he become subject to penalty.” Unquote.

Now as I can prove that I made special trip to our county seat, namely Norwalk, Ohio to contact county chairman, to offer to reap my excess wheat, which I only had in excess to re-arrange my fields to clover hay, and not combine it at all for grain, he refused to allow me to mow it down and feed it straw and heads together, or to even destroy it, saying as long as it had ripened, I must assume full cost of penalty.

Thereby as you will note, it was in direct contract to ruling handed down by you as justice of Supreme Court and I ask that you make it possible for me to regain penalty price I was forced to pay against the law.