MINUTES OF PROCEEDING ROBERT G. JAMES U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE June 19, 2012

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

## MONROE DIVISION

JIMMY ANDREWS, ET AL.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 65-11297** 

**VERSUS** 

JUDGE ROBERT G. JAMES

CITY OF MONROE, ET AL.

MAG. JUDGE KAREN L. HAYES

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

A status conference was held in the above-referenced matter on June 18, 2012, beginning at 10:00 A.M. Attending in person were Doug Lawrence, counsel for the Monroe City School Board ("School Board"); Charles Kincade, counsel for Plaintiffs Benya F. Marshall and Annie F. Harris; Debbie Dickerson, Courtroom Deputy; and Kayla Dye May, Law Clerk. Attending by telephone was Franz Marshall, United States Department of Justice ("DOJ").

The Court raised the issue of the pending March 30, 2010 Consent Decree. Under that Decree, a unitary status review is set to take place after June 30, 2014. However, it is the intent of the Court that the parties take affirmative steps to address any issues that would prevent a unitary status finding in 2014. As issues arise, the Court expects the parties to attempt to reach an amicable resolution or to contact the Court for a hearing to resolve the issues, rather than waiting to conduct a review in 2014. In the upcoming June 30, 2012 status report, the Court expects the School Board to identify and address any unresolved issues.

DOJ's counsel raised concerns about the effect recent education legislation in Louisiana might have on desegregation cases. All parties agreed that they were concerned about the

potential effects, but the Court and the parties agreed that it is unclear what those effects may be at this time. The Court's intent is to continue to move forward and to address problems as they arise.

The Court and the parties also addressed the pending Motion for Partial Relief filed by the School Board. The DOJ does not oppose the motion. Both Plaintiffs' counsel and the School Board's counsel stated that they would not call any witnesses or make further arguments, but would stand on their written briefs to the Court. The Court indicated that it would issue a ruling very shortly.

The conference concluded at 10:25 A.M.

RGJ