

Summer 1997

Errata Covering Volume 46, Number 6 and Volume 48, Number 2

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/sclr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Errata Covering Volume 46, Number 6 and Volume 48, Number 2, 48 S. C. L. Rev. 930 (1997).

This Note is brought to you by the Law Reviews and Journals at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in South Carolina Law Review by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

ERRATA

Please take note of the following change to Volume 46, Number 6:

1. Jack F. Williams, *The Federal Tax Consequences of Individual Debtor Chapter 11 Cases*, 46 S.C. L. REV. 1203, 1229 (1995). The third sentence of the penultimate paragraph should read as follows:

If one can show that the postpetition earnings were not derived from services performed by an individual debtor but from services performed by primary employees of the individual debtor in the particular enterprise who directly generate income, then those future earnings comprise property of the estate.

Please take note of the following changes to Volume 48, Number 2:

1. Peter Nichols, *The Panhandler's First Amendment Right: A Critique of Loper v. New York City Police Department and Related Academic Commentary*, 48 S.C. L. REV. 267, 276 (1997). The third sentence of the first full paragraph should read as follows:

This is not intended to suggest that the speech or publication protected by the First Amendment should, on the basis of its historical antecedents, be confined to prose tracts or arguments on the subject of politics.

2. *Id.* at 282. The second sentence of the first full paragraph should read as follows:

This argument would appear to be based upon the misinterpretation of a 1948 Supreme Court opinion, *Winters v. New York*,⁷² overturning the conviction of a book dealer for selling a crime magazine.

3. *Id.* at 289. The fifth sentence of the first full paragraph should read as follows:

In fact, the law denies panhandlers only the liberty to hustle money on the public streets, not the right to practice advocacy in general.