

6-27-1986

06-27-1986 Justice Brennan, Dissenting

William J. Brennan
US Supreme Court Justice

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/bazemorevfriday>



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brennan, W.J. Justice Brennan, Dissenting, Bazemore V. Friday, 478 U.S. 385 (1986). Box 367, Harry A. Blackmun Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

This Opinion is brought to you for free and open access by the U.S. Supreme Court papers, Justice Blackmun at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bazemore v. Friday, 478 U.S. 385 (1986) by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURed@ilstu.edu.

To: The Chief Justice
Justice White
Justice Marshall
Justice Blackmun
Justice Powell
Justice Rehnquist
Justice Stevens
Justice O'Connor

HAB

STYLISTIC CHANGES THROUGHOUT.
SEE PAGES: 1, 2, 5-8, 10-13

From: Justice Brennan

Circulated: _____

Recirculated: JUN 27 1986

2nd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Nos. 85-93 AND 85-428

85-93 P. E. BAZEMORE, ET AL., PETITIONERS
v.
WILLIAM C. FRIDAY ET AL.

85-428 UNITED STATES, ET AL., PETITIONERS
v.
WILLIAM C. FRIDAY ET AL.

ON WRITS OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF
APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

[June —, 1986]

JUSTICE BRENNAN, with whom JUSTICE MARSHALL, JUSTICE BLACKMUN, and JUSTICE STEVENS join, dissenting in part.

I

The Court rejects private petitioners' claim that the Extension Service had a duty under the Fourteenth Amendment and the regulations promulgated under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to desegregate the 4-H and Extension Homemaker Clubs in North Carolina. The Court concludes that the "Constitution require[s no] more than what the District Court and the Court of Appeals found the service has done in this case to disestablish segregation in its clubs," *ante*, at —, although the Court does not identify precisely what it is that has been done. The Court of Appeals determined that the respondents' constitutional duty has been satisfied if a plaintiff cannot point to a minority individual who has been discriminated against with respect to membership in a 4-H or Extension Homemaker Club. In upholding the Court of Appeals in this respect, the Court joins the Extension Service in winking at the Constitution's requirement