

# Washington Law Review

---

Volume 41 | Number 4

---

8-1-1966

## Errata

anon

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr>

---

### Recommended Citation

anon, Errata, *Errata*, 41 Wash. L. Rev. xiii (1966).

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol41/iss4/2>

This Errata is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at UW Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington Law Review by an authorized editor of UW Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [cnyberg@uw.edu](mailto:cnyberg@uw.edu).

# ERRATA

The title at 41 Wash. L. Rev. 157 should read:

## **HUSBAND'S IMMUNITY FROM SUIT FOR PERSONAL TORT**

The following should be added to the list in footnote 2 on page 207:

8. New Act § 37 adds to Model Act § 33 the following sentence: "The powers and duties of the board of directors may be prescribed by the bylaws."

In footnotes 4 and 5 on page 208, the citations to 1 MODEL ACT ANN. should read:

1 MODEL ACT ANN. § 1, ¶ 4.02

Line one of footnote 66 on page 219 should read:

As was implicit in the text discussion at note 57 *supra* (concerning when non-voting

Lines ten and eleven of footnote 302 on page 258, beginning with "It seems clear, however," should read:

It seems clear, however, that the court must have believed that the constitution did not grant creditors a direct right against shareholders, or it would have been forced to reach a different conclusion on the statutory interpretation question.

The title-page masthead of issue beginning at page 383 should read:

VOL. 41, No. 3

JUNE 1966

On pages 563-64 at text line 29 it was stated that the 1965 Probate Code increased the awards "in lieu of homestead" and "in addition to homestead" to ten thousand dollars. The amount of the awards was increased in 1963 by WASH. REV. CODE §§ 11.52.010, .022, and the 1965 Probate Code re-enacted these amounts.

Line thirteen of the text of the casenote beginning on page 621 should read:

was not enforceable because unconscionable.<sup>4</sup> The District of Columbia