

12-1930

## Handbook of the Law of Code Pleading, by Charles E. Clark

Bernard C. Gavit

*Indiana University School of Law*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj>



Part of the [Legal Writing and Research Commons](#), and the [Legislation Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Gavit, Bernard C. (1930) "Handbook of the Law of Code Pleading, by Charles E. Clark," *Indiana Law Journal*: Vol. 6 : Iss. 3 , Article 13.

Available at: <https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj/vol6/iss3/13>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School Journals at Digital Repository @ Maurer Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Indiana Law Journal by an authorized editor of Digital Repository @ Maurer Law. For more information, please contact [rvaughan@indiana.edu](mailto:rvaughan@indiana.edu).



**JEROME HALL LAW LIBRARY**

INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
Maurer School of Law  
Bloomington

*Handbook of the Law of Code Pleading.* By Charles E. Clark.  
West Publishing Company, 1928.

That this is the most valuable text on the subject of Code Pleading is obvious. The book deserves higher praise than that, in fact, because previous efforts along the same line have been quite perfunctory. Dean Clark has made a distinct contribution on the subject, and at the same time has produced a most usable book. Although the book is small in its proportions, it covers the ground thoroughly, and Indiana Lawyers will find a large number of Indiana cases cited. It is the reviewer's opinion, based both on experience with use of the book in practice and teaching, that a lawyer in a Code state who is actively engaged in the trial of cases can not afford to be without its assistance. There is an informed, mature, intelligent and scholarly discussion of the principles of Code Pleading, and the cases decided under the Code. That is altogether too rare an attribute of most legal textbooks. Too often the legal text book is just another digest in disguise.

The reviewer is far from convinced that all of Dean Clark's theories are sound and workable. Primarily it is doubted if his definition of the Code "cause of action" can be sustained as a proper interpretation of the Code. certainly however it is an arguable point, and it will be found that the argument is stimulating, and has not influenced the discussion and statements as to what the cases decide. It is recommended most highly to the bench and bar of the state.

BERNARD C. GAVIT,

*Indiana University School of Law.*