

4

86-772

St Louis v Prosser

Architect's demotion & layoff. Is + City lead. See 1968-85 = 15 yrs.

Receipt over 4 yrs was entered. Usually was vindicated in whole or in part see this

Sued Ed Mo vs city & sev supervisors - claimed usual v 7th st

asserted custom or practice

def was to nonnamed had done the job

Special vdt exonerated widows but city lead

CS + 7th cl but -'d DP Is.

city lead this widow Is were in - others put prob in effect

and was dele & the deci by delegate ended + mat

Dis (Ross) R un suff. Pol w/ mayor, aldermen & + Comm.

R u suff w/ 7th st

I → -

A. The factual setting of this case is messy. Justice is a mess

And what is the correct view - turf or layoff?

No objection by city to the masters.

Comm has not yet acted on the layoff.

∴ cd DIG & @ the issues in Little Rock v Williams (by lead)

B. Lead for "official job"

3-25-86

I joined WFB case in Bambam - 1983 lead only on a deliberate choice made

for sev alterns by the official resp for city final job

(B-W-M-X only, as per II-15.)

Thru 12) v WFB requires official's final resp for final gtl policy

This note supports the city here, tho A7L-C10 disavows.

CS was permit ad hoc deci. of final, to → lead

the officers here had n b given policy-making auth

3 Oct 87