

No. 78-1779

yes.
11/11
I think the city must have the same Wood v Strickland immunity that its officers have--a city, after all, can act only through its agents. This result, I think, is consistent with Monell: Monell said a municipality could not be made liable under §1983 on a respondeat superior theory, thus suggesting that cities were not to be made "deep pockets." In any event, I see no need to reach the immunity issue here: petr, I believe, quite clearly had no liberty interest under Paul v Davis, and thus was not entitled to a due process hearing. Since the city didn't violate petr's due process rights, therefore, petr has no cause of action under §1983.

Even if the immunity issue were properly presented, I would not grant in the absence of a CA conflict.

Deny 7/9/79 AGL

9 no if we have lobby
interviewed
Judge Van was about right?