

The case of Collins v. Caldwell, 29 Fed. (2d) 329, does not involve a holding company. This case involves a suit to enforce stockholders' double liability on stock of a national bank. The contention, among others, was made that certain stockholders were not owners of the stock of the bank and the facts involved in such contention are set out concisely in the opinion of the court holding that such stockholders were subject to the double liability, as follows:

"The contention is made as to Mrs. Lovejoy and Mrs. Mitchell that they do not appear on the books of the bank as owners of the stock. The 100 shares of which Mrs. Lovejoy is alleged to be the owner stand in the name of her deceased husband. While there is no proof as to the manner of her acquisition, her ownership is not seriously disputed, and there appears in the record a letter from her to the Comptroller, in which she states herself to be the owner. There is nothing to offset this, and it is conclusive. The proof is conclusive that Mrs. Mitchell became the owner of the stock alleged to be hers under the last will of her deceased husband."

It is apparent, from the facts stated, that the stockholders were owners of the stock of the national bank and there is nothing in this case which has a bearing on the question whether the holder of stock of a holding company is subject to the double liability of the stock of a bank held by the holding company.