

NAME	ADDRESS	DATE	AMOUNT	REMARKS	INITIALS
Bryan, J. J.					
Brown, J.					
Brown, J.					
White, J.					
Marshall, J.					
Blackman, J.					
Powell, J.					
Bishop, J.					
Green, J.					



The Chief Justice held below that where there was deprivation of <sup>Constitutional</sup> rights, qualified immunity applies

Stewart, J. thought only issue was what immunity if any City has. said used to be complete immunity, as governmental but not as proprietary. That distinction has been discredited. Here conduct was governmental but I'd think immunity was contrary to <sup>the</sup> ~~new~~ <sup>rule</sup>. But I'd affirm <sup>to</sup> ~~part~~ City Wood & Stuchland immunity

White, J. moral makes common law immunity as unacceptable as sovereign immunity. I wouldn't get into whether there was policy - I'd not overturn City of Ap.

Some make this argument but see no reason to dislodge City of Ap.

Marshall, J. Agree with 314 would decide only immunity interest hitting it of app dead everything else



Blackmun, J. Theory at 9th  
Can right the first time  
There is no prop interest  
falls before us. I  
could not to intervene  
with ERW + UHS  
-

Powell, J. If court were more  
free, I'd disagree there was  
any deprivation of liberty  
I'd find qualified  
immunity if we  
reach it & would  
affirm

Rehnquist, J. Agree with C

STEVENS, J. Part claim on the  
merits but if you put it  
all together there's  
stigma in connection  
with discharge. If  
there was official con-  
firmation

Immunity, various  
don't apply to  
municipality itself  
which was to protect  
employees. We say by  
on old cases (MS) &  
say no immunity  
I didn't agree there was  
any emp liability