

Copyright 2006 SHEPARD'S(R) - 40 Citing references

Prince George's County v. Collington Crossroads, Inc., 275 Md. 171, 339 A.2d 278, 1975 Md. LEXIS 954 (1975)

SHEPARD'S Signal: *Positive treatment is indicated*

Restrictions: *Unrestricted*

FOCUS(TM) Terms: *No FOCUS terms*

Print Format: *FULL*

Citing Ref. Signal: *Hidden*

SHEPARD'S SUMMARY

Unrestricted Shepard's Summary

No subsequent appellate history. Prior history available.

Citing References:

Positive Analyses: **Followed (1)**

Other Sources: Law Reviews (13), Statutes (1), Treatises (7), American Law Rpts/Lawyers' Edition Annos (1)

LexisNexis Headnotes: HN1 (3), HN2 (3), HN4 (3), HN5 (4), HN6 (3), HN7 (4), HN8 (3), HN9 (2), HN10 (2), HN11 (4), HN12 (3), HN13 (4)

PRIOR HISTORY (1 citing reference)

1. *Prince George's County v. Collington Crossroads, Inc.*, 268 Md. 69, 299 A.2d 792, 1973 Md. LEXIS 1087 (1973)

Appeal after remand at (CITATION YOU ENTERED):

Prince George's County v. Collington Crossroads, Inc., 275 Md. 171, 339 A.2d 278, 1975 Md. LEXIS 954 (1975)

CITING DECISIONS (17 citing decisions)

MARYLAND COURT OF APPEALS

2. **Cited by:**
Green v. High Ridge Ass'n, 346 Md. 65, 695 A.2d 125, 1997 Md. LEXIS 69 (1997) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN5, HN7**

346 Md. 65 p.73
695 A.2d 125 p.128
3. **Cited by:**
Williams v. Anne Arundel County, 334 Md. 109, 638 A.2d 74, 1994 Md. LEXIS 60 (1994) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN8**

334 Md. 109 p.120
334 Md. 109 p.121
638 A.2d 74 p.79
638 A.2d 74 p.80

4. **Cited by:**
Anne Arundel County v. Burnopp, 300 Md. 343, 478 A.2d 315, 1984 Md. LEXIS 323 (1984) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN7**

300 Md. 343 p.350
478 A.2d 315 p.319
5. **Cited by:**
Snowden v. Anne Arundel County, 295 Md. 429, 456 A.2d 380, 1983 Md. LEXIS 211 (1983) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN1, HN4, HN11**

295 Md. 429 p.434
456 A.2d 380 p.383
6. **Cited by:**
Baltimore v. Chertkof, 293 Md. 32, 441 A.2d 1044, 1982 Md. LEXIS 225 (1982) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN1, HN4, HN5, HN6, HN8, HN10, HN11, HN13**

293 Md. 32 p.43
293 Md. 32 p.46
293 Md. 32 p.48
441 A.2d 1044 p.1051
441 A.2d 1044 p.1053
7. **Cited by:**
Reyes v. Prince George's County, 281 Md. 279, 380 A.2d 12, 1977 Md. LEXIS 594 (1977) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN12**

281 Md. 279 p.307
380 A.2d 12 p.27

MARYLAND COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS

8. **Cited by:**
High Ridge Ass'n v. County Comm'rs, 105 Md. App. 423, 660 A.2d 951, 1995 Md. App. LEXIS 122 (1995) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN1, HN4, HN5, HN6, HN8, HN9, HN10, HN11**

105 Md. App. 423 p.433
660 A.2d 951 p.956
9. **Cited by:**
Baltimore v. State Dep't of Health & Mental Hygiene, 38 Md. App. 570, 381 A.2d 1188, 1978 Md. App. LEXIS 329 (1978) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN6, HN7, HN9, HN11, HN13**

38 Md. App. 570 p.575
381 A.2d 1188 p.1191

MARYLAND

10. **Cited by:**

74 Md. Op. Att'y Gen. 221

74 Md. Op. Att'y Gen. 221 p.227

11. **Cited by:**
65 Md. Op. Att'y Gen. 209, 65 Md. Op. Att'y Gen. 209

65 Md. Op. Att'y Gen. 209 p.223

CONNECTICUT SUPREME COURT

12. **Followed by:**
Kelo v. City of New London, 268 Conn. 1, 843 A.2d 500, 2004 Conn. LEXIS 54 (2004) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN13**

268 Conn. 1 p.41

843 A.2d 500 p.528

OTHER CONNECTICUT DECISIONS

13. **Cited by:**
AvalonBay Cmty's., Inc. v. Town of Orange, 2000 Conn. Super. LEXIS 372 (Conn. Super. Ct. Feb. 9, 2000) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN2**

ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT

14. **Cited by:**
People ex rel. Urbana v. Paley, 68 Ill. 2d 62, 368 N.E.2d 915, 1977 Ill. LEXIS 359, 11 Ill. Dec. 307 (1977) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN12**

368 N.E.2d 915 p.921

MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT

15. **Cited by:**
Poletown Neighborhood Council v. Detroit, 410 Mich. 616, 304 N.W.2d 455, 1981 Mich. LEXIS 250, 19 Env't Rep. Cas. (BNA) 1972, 11 Env'tl. L. Rep. 20778 (1981) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN13**

304 N.W.2d 455 p.463

MINNESOTA SUPREME COURT

16. **Cited by:**
Duluth v. State, 390 N.W.2d 757, 1986 Minn. LEXIS 850 (Minn. 1986) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN12**

390 N.W.2d 757 p.763

OHIO SUPREME COURT

17. **Cited by:**
City of Norwood v. Horney, 2006 Ohio 3799, 2006 Ohio LEXIS 2170 (Ohio July 26, 2006) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN5**

2006 Ohio 3799

OHIO COURT OF APPEALS

18. **Cited by:**
Dayton v. Kuntz, 1988 Ohio App. LEXIS 747 (Ohio Ct. App., Montgomery County Mar. 3, 1988) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN7**

ANNOTATED STATUTES (1 Citing Statute)

19. *Md. Const. art. III, @ 40*

LAW REVIEWS AND PERIODICALS (13 Citing References)

20. *NOTE: From Direct "Public Use" to Indirect "Public Benefit": Kelo v. New London's Bridge from Rational Basis to Heightened Scrutiny for Eminent Domain Takings*, 2005 BYU L. Rev. 1669 (2005)
 2005 BYU L. Rev. 1669 p.1669
21. *COMMENT: Keeping the Home Team at Home.*, 74 Cal. L. Rev. 1329 (1986)
22. *COMMENT: ABSOLUTE DEFERENCE LEADS TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE: THE NEED FOR A NEW PUBLIC USE RULE*, 54 Cath. U.L. Rev. 1001 (2005)
 54 Cath. U.L. Rev. 1001 p.1001
23. *NOTE: CONTAINING THE EFFECT OF HAWAII HOUSING AUTHORITY V. MIDKIFF ON TAKINGS FOR PRIVATE INDUSTRY.*, 71 Cornell L. Rev. 428 (1986)
24. *COMMENT: TAKING THE OAKLAND RAIDERS: A THEORETICAL RECONSIDERATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF PUBLIC USE AND JUST COMPENSATION*, 32 Emory L.J. 857 (1983)
25. *NOTE: BREAKING NEW GROUND: USING EMINENT DOMAIN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT*, 73 Fordham L. Rev. 1837 (2005)
 73 Fordham L. Rev. 1837 p.1837
26. *SYMPOSIUM: THE DEATH OF POLETOWN: THE FUTURE OF EMINENT DOMAIN AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AFTER COUNTY OF WAYNE V. HATHCOCK: OVERCOMING POLETOWN: COUNTY OF WAYNE V. HATHCOCK, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS, AND THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC USE*, 2004 Mich. St. L. Rev. 1005 (2004)
 2004 Mich. St. L. Rev. 1005 p.1005
27. *NOTE: PUBLIC USE, PRIVATE USE, AND JUDICIAL REVIEW IN EMINENT DOMAIN.*, 58 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 409 (1983)

28. *NOTE: TRUMPING EMINENT DOMAIN LAW: AN ARGUMENT FOR STRICT SCRUTINY ANALYSIS UNDER THE PUBLIC USE REQUIREMENT OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT*, 50 Syracuse L. Rev. 285 (2000)
50 Syracuse L. Rev. 285 p.285
29. 7 U. Balt. L. Rev. 299
7 U. Balt. L. Rev. 299 p.309
30. *CASENOTE: Eminent Domain and the Commerce Clause Defense: City of Oakland v. Oakland Raiders*, 41 U. Miami L. Rev. 1185 (1987)
31. *ARTICLE: PROPERTY AS ENTRANCE*, 91 Va. L. Rev. 1889 (2005)
91 Va. L. Rev. 1889 p.1889
32. *NOTE: Waking a Sleeping Giant: Revisiting the Public Use Debate Twenty-Five Years After Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff*, 44 Washburn L.J. 355 (2005)
44 Washburn L.J. 355 p.355

ALR ANNOTATIONS (1 Citing Annotation)

33. *Eminent domain: industrial park or similar development as public use justifying condemnation of private property*, 62 A.L.R.4th 1183, sec. 3

TREATISE CITATIONS (7 Citing Sources)

34. 1-24 Antieau on Local Government Law, Second Edition @ 24.12
35. 4-60 Antieau on Local Government Law, Second Edition @ 60.02
36. 4-60 Antieau on Local Government Law, Second Edition @ 60.06
37. 3A(2)-22 Condemnation Procedures & Techniques - Forms @ 22.01
38. 3A(2)-22 Condemnation Procedures & Techniques - Forms @ 22.04
39. 8A-22 Nichols on Eminent Domain @ 22.01
40. 8A-22 Nichols on Eminent Domain @ 22.04