

7-6-1983

## 07-06-1983 Per Curiam

Unknown Justice  
*US Supreme Court*

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



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Per Curiam, Arizona Governing Comm. V. Norris, 463 U.S. 1073 (1983). 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 Arizona Governing Comm. v. Norris, 463 U.S. 1073 (1983) by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact [ISUREd@ilstu.edu](mailto:ISUREd@ilstu.edu).

(Slip Opinion)

**FILE COPY**

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the preliminary print of the United States Reports. Readers are requested to notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D. C. 20543, of any typographical or other formal errors, in order that corrections may be made before the preliminary print goes to press.

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

No. 82-52

ARIZONA GOVERNING COMMITTEE FOR TAX DEFERRED ANNUITY AND DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLANS, ETC., ET AL., PETITIONERS  
*v.* NATHALIE NORRIS ETC.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

[July 6, 1983]

PER CURIAM.

Petitioners in this case administer a deferred compensation plan for employees of the State of Arizona. The respondent class consists of all female employees who are enrolled in the plan or will enroll in the plan in the future. Certiorari was granted to decide whether Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U. S. C. § 2000e *et seq.*, prohibits an employer from offering its employees the option of receiving retirement benefits from one of several companies selected by the employer, all of which pay a woman lower monthly retirement benefits than a man who has made the same contributions; and whether, if so, the relief awarded by the District Court was proper. The Court holds that this practice does constitute discrimination on the basis of sex in violation of Title VII, and that all retirement benefits derived from contributions made after the decision today must be calculated without regard to the sex of the beneficiary. This position is expressed in Parts I, II, and III of the opinion of JUSTICE MARSHALL, *post*, p. —, which are joined by JUSTICE BRENNAN, JUSTICE WHITE, JUSTICE STEVENS, and JUSTICE O'CONNOR. The Court further holds that benefits derived from contributions made prior to this decision may be calcu-

lated as provided by the existing terms of the Arizona plan. This position is expressed in Part III of the opinion of JUSTICE POWELL, *post*, p. —, which is joined by THE CHIEF JUSTICE, JUSTICE BLACKMUN, JUSTICE REHNQUIST, and JUSTICE O'CONNOR. Accordingly, the judgment of the Court of Appeals is affirmed in part, reversed in part, and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. The Clerk is directed to issue the judgment August 1, 1983.

*It is so ordered.*