

April 1967

## Masthead Volume 69, Issue 3

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr>

---

### Recommended Citation

*Masthead Volume 69, Issue 3*, 69 W. Va. L. Rev. (1967).

Available at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr/vol69/iss3/1>

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the WVU College of Law at The Research Repository @ WVU. It has been accepted for inclusion in West Virginia Law Review by an authorized editor of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact [ian.harmon@mail.wvu.edu](mailto:ian.harmon@mail.wvu.edu).

# West Virginia Law Review

---

Published by the College of Law of West Virginia University. Official  
publication of The West Virginia Bar Association.

---

## STUDENT BOARD OF EDITORS

### *Editor-in-Chief*

John Welton Fisher, II

### *Associate Editors*

Raymond Albert Hinerman  
Menis Elbert Ketchum, II

Forest Hansbury Roles  
Ellen Fairfax Warder

### *Assistant Editors*

James Truman Cooper

Hazel Armenta Staub

Ronald Ralph Brown  
K. Paul Davis

Edward Perry Johnson  
Robert Bruce King

Jack William DeBolt

George Lawson Partain

Fred L. Fox, II

Paul Robert Rice

William Douglass Goodwin

Jacob Michael Robinson

Judith Ann Herndon

Louis Sweetland Southworth, II

Jerry David Hogg

Robert Brand Stone

---

### *Faculty Advisors*

Charles Phillip Bubany

J. Timothy Philipps

### *Business Manager*

Agnes A. Furman

---

## STUDENT NOTE

### Habeas Corpus in West Virginia

A survey of recent appellate proceedings, both at the state and federal levels, reveals a tremendous upsurge in litigation concerning the ancient writ of habeas corpus. This is due mainly to opinions handed down by the United States Supreme Court, opinions destined to have a substantial impact on the states' administration of criminal justice.<sup>1</sup> Such opinions have made the American public more aware of the breadth of their constitutional rights, in turn causing an expansion in the use of the habeas corpus concept of relief. There remains a high degree of confusion and uncertainty in regard to the writ. Since it is both a federal and a state remedy,

---

<sup>1</sup> Miller v. Boles, 248 F.Supp 49 (N.D. W. Va. 1965).