

6

No. 89-1290

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

NOV 29 1990

JOSEPH F. SPANOL, JR.  
CLERK

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1990

ROBERT R. FREEMAN, *et al.*,  
*Petitioners,*

v.

WILLIE EUGENE PITTS, *et al.*,  
*Respondents.*

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Eleventh Circuit

**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF PETITIONERS**

REX E. LEE \*  
CARTER G. PHILLIPS  
MARK D. HOPSON  
SIDLEY & AUSTIN  
1722 Eye Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 429-4000

GARY M. SAMS  
CHARLES L. WEATHERLY  
J. STANLEY HAWKINS  
WEEKES & CANDLER  
One Decatur Town Center  
150 East Ponce de Leon Avenue  
Suite 300  
Decatur, Georgia 30031  
(404) 378-4300

*Counsel for Petitioners,*  
*Robert R. Freeman, et al.*

November 29, 1990

\* Counsel of Record

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1990

---

No. 89-1290

---

ROBERT R. FREEMAN, *et al.*,  
*Petitioners,*

v.

WILLIE EUGENE PITTS, *et al.*,  
*Respondents.*

---

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Eleventh Circuit**

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF PETITIONERS**

---

The recent Fifth Circuit decision in *Flax v. Potts*, 915 F.2d 155 (1990) bears directly upon and further enhances the importance of the questions presented in the petition in this case, which is being held pending the disposition on the merits of *Board of Educ. of Oklahoma City v. Dowell*, No. 89-1080. The Fifth Circuit in *Flax* confronted the same two issues presented in the petition: first, whether a school district under a desegregation order can be “barred from obtaining a finding of unitariness” on the ground that “a school system cannot achieve unitary status *incrementally*” (Pet. i; 915 F.2d at 158 (emphasis added)); and, second, whether a school district that has “achieved effective desegregation . . . is nevertheless obligated to remedy the segregative effects of massive demographic changes . . . completely beyond the school district’s control.” Pet. i; see 915 F.2d at 161-62.

Like the First and Tenth Circuits, the Fifth Circuit answered both questions in the negative. In doing so, the court specifically recognized and rejected the Eleventh Circuit's contrary holdings in this case. Thus, after the Court disposes of *Dowell*, it should grant this petition in order to resolve the growing conflict on the discrete issues relating to the scope of federal remedial authority in a desegregation action which are presented by the decision below.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and those stated in the petition and in the petitioner's reply brief, the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

REX E. LEE \*  
 CARTER G. PHILLIPS  
 MARK D. HOPSON  
 SIDLEY & AUSTIN  
 1722 Eye Street, N.W.  
 Washington, D.C. 20006  
 (202) 429-4000

GARY M. SAMS  
 CHARLES L. WEATHERLY  
 J. STANLEY HAWKINS  
 WEEKES & CANDLER  
 One Decatur Town Center  
 150 East Ponce de Leon Avenue  
 Suite 300  
 Decatur, Georgia 30031  
 (404) 378-4300

*Counsel for Petitioners,*  
*Robert R. Freeman, et al.*

November 29, 1990

\* Counsel of Record

