

58 Am. Jur. 2d Occupations, Trades, and Professions § 52

American Jurisprudence, Second Edition  
Database updated February 2015  
Occupations, Trades, and Professions

George L. Blum, J.D.

III. Regulation of Other Particular Occupations, Trades, and Professions

E. **Secondhand** and Junk **Dealers**

[Topic Summary](#) [Correlation Table](#) [References](#)

§ 52. **Records** and reporting requirements

**West's Key Number Digest**

**West's Key Number Digest, Licenses** 🔑16(11)

**A.L.R. Library**

**Regulation of junk **dealers**, 45 A.L.R.2d 1391**

Frequently, the persons engaged in the **secondhand** or junk business are required to keep **records** of purchases made<sup>1</sup> and in some instances to furnish statements thereof to the police.<sup>2</sup> Ordinances that simply require the reporting of certain **secondhand** goods transactions have been upheld.<sup>3</sup>

Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> [Diversified Numismatics, Inc. v. City of Orlando, FL., 949 F.2d 382 \(11th Cir. 1991\) \(applying Florida law\).](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Block v. Board of Police Com'rs of City of Los Angeles, 110 Cal. App. 2d 67, 242 P.2d 68 \(2d Dist. 1952\).](#)

Provisions of a city ordinance requiring **secondhand** merchants to report transactions to local law enforcement within 48 hours of the transaction and pay a \$2 fee for each transaction was not preempted by provision of **secondhand** and junk-**dealers** act, requiring **secondhand** merchants to report transactions on a weekly basis only and not imposing transaction fees. [USA Cash £1, Inc. v. City of Saginaw, 285 Mich. App. 262, 776 N.W.2d 346 \(2009\).](#)

<sup>3</sup> [Diversified Numismatics, Inc. v. City of Orlando, FL., 949 F.2d 382 \(11th Cir. 1991\).](#)

A statute requiring **secondhand dealers** who know or reasonably should know that certain items ordinarily used by or ordinarily belonging to an entity engaged in furnishing public utility service to exercise due diligence to ascertain that the person selling or delivering the items has a legal right to do so was not unconstitutionally vague. [People v. Cramblit, 84 Cal. App. 3d 437, 148 Cal. Rptr. 440 \(3d Dist. 1978\).](#)