

12-4-85

The Chief Justice +

Consent gets a writ ad = a jail  
 For here suggest ad hoc approach  
 Steyer decided latter  
 Steyer v b applied retro

I see no jail here  
 no precept got  
 fact-bound & a single deci

Brennan, J. —

Thornell - RS n suff  
 ? is one v spec sanction  
 ad by a) written rule, b) consent  
 apply, - c) make a deci  
 distinguish the act v + co or v + Sec.  
 ad b by a simple act  
 @ largely  
 as to this county can b held like  
 @ Steyer - no one agrees n + b retro  
 applied  
 do n b + address S retro  
 no objection 1/20

White, J. —

Perjury S  
 n raised B/60 on here  
 at + to no court viol  
 Cin. knuckled under  
 County only + do what sheriff S  
 But n every act sets a jail  
 ad n state co just here  
 sheriff made a mistake  
 n + back steps  
 §. co atty comes + viol co jail?

But no trouble in this case  
 S n retro n our cases for purposes  
 v + Ex Rule  
 unless we get to S, I —.

Marshall, J. +

This agrees = a bench w  
 is OK  
 w - But what v Steyer?  
 chg to —

Powell, J. +

no app of S retro  
to me to unfair  
i. n rec + real job?  
if I do, I +  
this a spin + moment deci  
surely n a policy  
on the basis, and n to jamed  
Monell

Rehnquist, J. +

wrong + app of S retro  
on job issue, +  
no job + break down a door  
to he went to co atty shows  
n a job

Stevens, J. —

I no shw Shaw's concern  
this n dramatic  
after job is made by a ~~few~~  
single person  
resp pub official makes deci in  
approp area

O'Connor, J. — ?

Co atty has no auth + order shuff  
to serge  
but Ch S this ok n this law  
i. —?  
ch join again nearly S + says  
n retro  
we shw ca concerns