

6-30-1986

## 06-30-1986 Justice Brennan, Per Curiam

William J. Brennan  
*US Supreme Court Justice*

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



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Brennan, W.J. Justice Brennan, Per Curiam, 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](mailto:ISURed@ilstu.edu).

HAB

STYLISTIC CHANGES THROUGHOUT.  
SEE PAGES: 12

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

From: Justice Brennan

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.

Circulated: \_\_\_\_\_  
Recirculated: \_\_\_\_\_  
JUN 30 1986

**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

[July 1, 1986]

PER CURIAM.

These cases present several issues arising out of petitioners' action against respondents for alleged racial discrimination in employment and provision of services by the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service (Extension Service). The District Court declined to certify various proposed classes and, after a lengthy trial, entered judgment for respondents in all respects, finding that petitioners had not carried their burden of demonstrating that respondents had engaged in a pattern or practice of racial discrimination. The District Court also ruled against each of the individual plaintiff's discrimination claims. The Court of Appeals affirmed. 751 F. 2d 662 (CA4 1984). We hold, for the reasons stated in the opinion of JUSTICE BRENNAN, that the Court of Appeals erred in holding that under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, the Extension Service had no duty to eradicate salary disparities between white and black workers that had their origin prior to the date. Title VII was made

6