

1984

Front Matter

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.smu.edu/jalc>

Recommended Citation

Front Matter, 49 J. AIR L. & COM. i (1984)
<https://scholar.smu.edu/jalc/vol49/iss3/1>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at SMU Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Air Law and Commerce by an authorized administrator of SMU Scholar. For more information, please visit <http://digitalrepository.smu.edu>.

The Journal of Air Law and Commerce

VOLUME 49

1984

NUMBER 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COPING WITH DEREGULATION: REDUCTION OF LABOR COSTS IN THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY.....	<i>John V. Jansonius</i> <i>Kenneth E. Broughton</i>	501
A LEGAL ANALYSIS OF THE SHOOTING OF KOREAN AIRLINES FLIGHT 007 BY THE SOVIET UNION.....	<i>Dr. Farooq Hassan</i>	555
COMMENTS		
FAA REGULATION OF ULTRALIGHT VEHICLES.....	<i>Thompson</i>	591
CASENOTES AND STATUTE NOTES		
FEDERAL AVIATION ACT—RECORDATION OF AIR- CRAFT CONVEYANCES—Transfers of Aircraft Interests Must Be Evidenced by Writings, and Such Instru- ments Must Be Recorded with the Federal Aviation Administration before Innocent Third Parties Can Be Affected. <i>Philko Aviation, Inc. v. Shacket</i> , 103 S. Ct. 2476 (1983).....		623

TORTS—MISREPRESENTATION EXCEPTION IN FTCA
ACTIONS INVOLVING GOVERNMENT INSPECTION AND
CERTIFICATION—The exception to liability under the
Federal Tort Claims Act for claims arising out of mis-
representation does not bar suits where a party seeks
recovery for government negligence in inspection and
supervision of construction. *Block v. Neal*, 103 S. Ct.
1098 (1983) 647

TORTS—GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR DEFENSE TO
STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY—A supplier of military
equipment is not subject to strict products liability for
a design defect where: (1) the United States is
immune from liability; (2) the supplier proves that the
United States established or approved reasonably pre-
cise specifications for the allegedly defective military
equipment; (3) the equipment conformed to those
specifications; and (4) the supplier warned the United
States about patent errors in the government’s specifi-
cations or about dangers involved in the use of the
equipment that were known to the supplier but not to
the United States. *McKay v. Rockwell Int’l Corp.*, 704
F.2d 444 (9th Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 104 S. Ct. 711
(1984) 671