

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION 1954-2004



“In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.”

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) (USSC+)

Publications Committee

Robyn Beilin
Yoginee Braslaw
Charlotte Butt
Mike Cappelli
Donna Hecht
James Heiting
Aurora Hughes

Gary Ilmanen
Rick Lantz
Richard Reed
Michael Trenholm
Allen Turner
Lisa Yang

Co-Editors Michael Bazzo
Jacqueline Carey-Wilson

Design and Production PIP Printing Riverside

Cover Design PIP Printing Riverside

Officers of the Bar Association

President

Mary Ellen Daniels
tel: (909) 684-4444
email: med-atty@pacbell.net

President Elect

Michelle Ouellette
tel: (909) 686-1450
email: mouellette@bbklaw.com

Vice President

Theresa Han Savage
tel: (909) 248-0328
email: theresa.savage@jud.ca.gov

Chief Financial Officer

David T. Bristow
tel: (909) 682-1771
email: dbristow@rhlaw.com

Secretary

Daniel Hantman
tel: (909) 784-4400
email: dh4mjg@earthlink.net

Past President

Brian C. Pearcy
tel: (909) 686-1584
email: bpearcy@bpearcylaw.com

Director-at-Large

E. Aurora Hughes
tel: (909) 980-1148
email: ahugheslaw@aol.com

Jay E. Orr
tel: (909) 955-5516
email: jayorr@aol.com

Janet A. Nakada
tel: (909) 779-1362
email: jan@nakada-silva.com

Michael Trenholm
tel: (909) 781-9231
email: mtrenholm@kmob.com

Executive Director

Charlotte Butt, charlotte@riversidecountybar.com

Officers of the Barristers Association

President

Wendy M. Seto

Treasurer

Danielle G. Sakai

Vice President

Jeremy K. Hanson

Secretary

Robyn A. Beilin

Members-at-Large

Charles P. Boylston

John D. Higginbotham

Riverside County Lawyer is published 11 times per year by the Riverside County Bar Association (RCBA) and is distributed to RCBA members, Riverside County judges and administrative officers of the court, community leaders and others interested in the advancement of law and justice. Advertising and announcements are due by the 6th day of the month preceding publications (e.g., October 6 for the November issue). Articles are due no later than 45 days preceding publication. All articles are subject to editing. RCBA members receive a subscription automatically. Annual subscriptions are \$25.00 and single copies are \$3.50.

Submission of articles and photographs to Riverside County Lawyer will be deemed to be authorization and license by the author to publish the material in Riverside County Lawyer.

The material printed in Riverside County Lawyer does not necessarily reflect the opinions of the RCBA, the editorial staff, the Publication Committee, or other columnists. Legal issues are not discussed for the purpose of answering specific questions. Independent research of all issues is strongly encouraged.

Riverside County Bar Association
4129 Main Street, Suite 100
Riverside, California 92501

Telephone
909-682-1015

Facsimile
909-682-0106

Internet
www.riversidecountybar.com

E-mail
rcba@riversidecountybar.com

Riverside
County

LAWYER

C O N T E N T S

Columns:

3 **President's Message** by *Mary Ellen Daniels*

21 **Current Affairs** by *Richard Brent Reed*

COVER STORIES:

11 .. ***Brown v. Board of Education* Timeline**

12 **Has *Brown v. Board of Education* Achieved The Results Stated in the Decision?**
Irma Poole Asberry

Features:

5 **In Memoriam: Kathy Gonzales**
Carolyn Confer

8 **Judicial Profile: Commissioner Dale Wells**
Rick Lantz

18 **2004-2005 Nominees for the RCBA Board of Directors**

Departments:

Bar Briefs 22

Classified Ads 24

Calendar 2

Membership 24

MISSION STATEMENT

Established in 1894

The Riverside County Bar Association, established in 1894 to foster social interaction between the bench and bar, is a professional organization that provides continuing education and offers an arena to resolve various problems that face the justice system and attorneys practicing in Riverside County.

RCBA Mission Statement

The mission of the Riverside County Bar Association is to:

Serve its members, and indirectly their clients, by implementing programs that will enhance the professional capabilities and satisfaction of each of its members.

Serve its community by implementing programs that will provide opportunities for its members to contribute their unique talents to enhance the quality of life in the community.

Serve the legal system by implementing programs that will improve access to legal services and the judicial system, and will promote the fair and efficient administration of justice.

Membership Benefits

Involvement in a variety of legal entities: Lawyer Referral Service (LRS), Public Service Law Corporation (PSLC), Tel-Law, Fee Arbitration, Client Relations, Dispute Resolution Service (DRS), Barristers, Leo A. Deegan Inn of Court, Inland Empire Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, Mock Trial, State Bar Conference of Delegates, and Bridging the Gap.

Membership meetings monthly (except July and August) with keynote speakers, and participation in the many committees and sections.

Eleven issues of Riverside County Lawyer published each year to update you on State Bar matters, ABA issues, local court rules, open forum for communication and timely business matters.

Social gatherings throughout the year: Installation of RCBA and Barristers Officers dinner, Annual Joint Barristers and Riverside Legal Secretaries dinner, Law Day activities, Good Citizenship Award ceremony for Riverside County high schools, and other special activities.

Continuing Legal Education brown bag lunches and section workshops. RCBA is a certified provider for MCLE programs.

MBNA Platinum Plus MasterCard, and optional insurance programs.

Discounted personal disability income and business overhead protection for the attorney and long-term care coverage for the attorney and his or her family.



CALENDAR

May

14 General Membership Meeting
RCBA 3rd Floor – Noon
(MCLE)

18 Family Section
RCBA, 3rd Floor – Noon

RCBA Board
RCBA – 5:00 p.m.

19 CLE Committee
RCBA, 3rd Floor – Noon
(MCLE)

20 Business Law Section
RCBA, 3rd Floor – Noon
(MCLE)

26 EPPTL Section
RCBA 3rd Floor – Noon
(MCLE)

27 CLE Brown Bag
RCBA, 3rd Floor – Noon
MCLE

31 HOLIDAY

June

2 Bar Publications Committee
RCBA – Noon

Past President's Dinner
Victoria Club – 5:30 p.m.

10 CLE Brown Bag
RCBA, 3rd Floor – Noon
(MCLE)

11 Judicial Forum
FL Ct., 3rd Floor – 11:00 a.m.





President's Message

by *Mary Ellen Daniels*

This month has not been an easy one for the attorneys who knew Kathy Gonzales. We have been faced with the fact that all of us must die at some point. I fear that I will pass without ever having lived or enjoyed life. I fear that I will pass and not have had the opportunity to sit back and reflect on my accomplishments (or lack thereof). I fear that I will lose yet another friend before the year is out and become so fearful of death myself that it will cause me to live as if I were preparing my husband to be left alone, or preparing for another woman to take my place. I wonder if all women feel that way. I wonder if all attorneys feel that way because of the stress that we put ourselves under and because we take care of ourselves last.

Kathy Gonzales was a friend of mine. Kathy was a friend to everyone I know. She dedicated her life to others and always made sure that everything she did resulted in somehow bettering life for those who have now been left behind. I remember yesterday when I went to the Catholic church with Dan Hantman at 8:30 a.m. Were we both so stressed out that we did not understand that the proceedings did not begin until 10:00 – or did we both just desire to be there for her? What remained of her was not there yet, but we both knew that she had left long before we arrived.

I recall meeting Kathy Gonzales some years ago. She was a strong-willed woman who did not bite her tongue. She told me that I had to be strong because we both had to lead our people in our different struggles and that at some point I would look behind me and no one would be following. Kathy was strong, and whenever I needed any advice on anything she always seemed to have the answer.

I remember Dan showing me his tie, which he had received from Kathy two weeks before she passed. He said that she had had it for him for quite some time and just had not found the time to give it to him. That tie meant so much to Dan. I knew, after talking to Dan, that his relationship with Kathy was one of the most important ones he had established during his long career as an attorney. They were really close, and his eyes filled with tears as he recalled their relationship.

Kathy, our own Kathy, always made sure she was on the Board of the Bar Association, fighting for those who could not afford legal representation to receive it, even though sometimes they refused to fight for themselves. Kathy, the woman who always gave me a big hug, is gone. I cry for Kathy because she went so quickly and left behind so much. We will all miss Kathy.

Judicial Forum

As most of you are aware, Judge Doug Miller and his staff of volunteers are putting together a Judicial Forum for the purpose of bringing the bar and the judiciary closer together. It is tentatively scheduled for June 11, 2004. We look forward to the Bar Association and the judiciary putting together an event that will result in a better understanding and relationship between the bench and the bar.

Mary Ellen Daniels is president of the RCBA and is a sole practitioner in Riverside.

From The Desk of Judge Sichel

Merger Trend Continues

Reflecting the nationwide trend of legal mergers, two eminent Riverside attorneys merged on April 4, 2004. Sandra Leer and Edward Mackey celebrated their merger with a beautiful family wedding at their home in Riverside. Ms. Leer has frequently commented that Mr. Mackey offers new opportunities to expand her horizons. In addition, she now has the ability to walk on air. Mr. Mackey, who devotes part of his practice to eminent domain law, in an abrupt turnabout refused to condemn anything or anyone related to Ms. Leer. We extend our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to both!



IN MEMORIAM: KATHLEEN M. GONZALES

by Carolyn Confer



Kathleen M. Gonzales was a force of nature. She was my colleague and my friend.

Kathy's commitment to her family, to the community and to her profession was awesome. She was an alumna of the University of California at Riverside and the Law School at the University of California at Davis.

She was recognized for her accomplishments in many ways. In 1996, Kathy was a YWCA Woman of the Year and in 2003, she was given the City of Riverside Distinguished Public Service Award. Kathy served on the boards of directors of the Community Foundation, Inland Counties Legal Services, and the Casa Blanca Home of Neighborly Services.

Brian Percy, immediate Past President of the Riverside County Bar Association, had this to say of Kathy:

"Every once in a while you meet a person who reflects all the best aspects of what you aspire to achieve as a human being. Someone known professionally as one of the best in the business. Someone who is committed to their community and the improvement thereof. Someone whom others seek out for wisdom, counsel and advice. Someone who understands and puts into practice the concept that family does come first. Ideally, you want to be like Kathy. A balanced individual who, as a Latina woman, wife, mother, lawyer, friend and active member of the community she lived in, was a role model for many. I am fortunate to have crossed paths with Kathy. I am fortunate to have experienced her friendship and counsel. I am fortunate to have witnessed her laughter, which I can still hear in my mind. While I am saddened by the loss of her physical presence, I am heartened by the fact that she will live on in our hearts and minds as an inspiration as to what you can achieve as a human being."

Kathy was an Assistant City Attorney at the time of her death, and her career of 20 years with that office was marked by challenges met and excellence in lawyering. Ron Loveridge, Kathy's professor at UCR and Mayor of the City of Riverside, observed:

"Kathy Gonzales was more than an Assistant City Attorney. She was an attorney for the City – loyal, conscientious, highly skilled, unflappable, with a striking ability to bring together the best of law with the public interest."

She litigated a number of complicated planning cases and succeeded in maintaining the integrity of the City's planning laws. Retired Superior Court Judge Victor Miceli says of Kathy:

"Kathy was a lawyer that judges were pleased to have appear before them. Although soft-spoken, Kathy was prepared, reasonable but resolute. Above all, she was always a lady. Her passing is a great loss to our community. I am honored to have called her my friend."

Her advice to the Planning Commission and the City Council over the years was conservative, based in the law and remarkably on point. City Attorney Greg Priamos commented:

"Kathy was a dear friend, valued colleague, and role model to all of us in the City Attorney's Office. Her dedication, commitment, and loyalty to the City of Riverside were unparalleled.

"After she was diagnosed with cancer, it came as no surprise to us that so many members of the Riverside legal community immediately expressed concern and sought to help Kathy and her family in any way possible. She touched so many people's lives throughout her professional career.

"What I will miss most is her deep devotion and passion for the law. She taught us that it was our responsibility as the City's lawyers always to do the right thing for the right reasons and to try and make people's lives a little bit better."

In many respects, Kathy had the reputation of being an aggressive and assertive advocate – but

continued on next page

In Memoriam: Kathleen M. Gonzales *(continued)*

always with respect and concern for the outcome of the case before the City. Ken Gutierrez, City of Riverside Planning Director, recalls his work with Kathy:

“As with so many people in Riverside, the staff of the Planning and Building Department is devastated by the tragic death of Kathleen Gonzales. Over the past 18 years, Kathy gently – and when we needed it, forcefully – guided the City of Riverside on a variety of land use issues. As Planning Director, I always felt most comfortable when Kathy was by my side. As a land use attorney, she was among the best in the state. As a friend, a mentor and an advisor, she was among the best – period. Even under the most difficult situations, I could count on Kathy’s wisdom and guidance; be put at ease by her calm demeanor; and be disarmed by her sense of humor. My life has been blessed by knowing such a genuine, caring person such as Kathleen Gonzales . . . and I am proud to have been able to call her ‘friend.’”

Before she came to the Office of the City Attorney, she worked for Inland Counties Legal Services and as a managing attorney with the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles County. Dan Hantman, her close friend, recalled working with her there:

“I first met Kathy and her family in 1977, when she was hired by Ron Taylor, the Executive Director of Riverside Legal Services (now Inland Counties Legal Services). I had come to Riverside from Los Angeles in 1976, when Ron hired me as the Senior Citizen Attorney. I worked there along with such wonderful attorneys and friends as Irene Morales, Greg Espinoza, Gil Gutierrez, Rene Pimental, and Jesse Valenzuela, to name but a few that Kathy blessed. When Governor Jerry Brown appointed Ron a Riverside County judge, Irene became, as she continues to be, the Executive Director of ICLS. We were all like ‘family.’

“Kathy was wonderful to work with. She contributed so much to us all in her spirit, her energy, her expertise and her compassion. As you may have known or read, she was later hired to work for the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles as a managing attorney. She and her family continued to live in Riverside during these years and we were so fortunate when

she was hired to work for the Riverside City Attorney’s Office in 1984.”

Her work with these organizations spoke of her commitment to people who needed help to protect their interests. She was also a founding member of the Inland Empire Latino Lawyers Association.

She was a willing and effective mentor to young Latinas in the Puente Program at Riverside Community College and in her career. There was no one in the City Attorney’s Office who was more willing and able to take a student intern. She was a mentor to new employees in the City Attorney’s Office and she often helped new lawyers work their way into the system.

She was an active member of the Riverside County Bar Association and she served on many committees and as a scoring attorney for Mock Trial. Dan Hantman remembers Kathy’s work with the Bar Association:

“Kathy was such a contributor to our Riverside County Bar Association (RCBA). She had been a member since December 1978. She was a member of our Board of Directors, chairperson of many of our committees (most recently our Continuing Legal Education Committee), scoring attorney for Riverside County Mock Trial competition every year, and always available to the Executive Directors and staff of the RCBA.”

As part of her devotion to her sons, Alex and Martin, she was active in school affairs. She and her husband Dana also took interesting vacations that would provide the boys with a variety of experiences and educational opportunities. They would camp out one year and stay at nice hotels in interesting cities on other occasions. Several years ago, while in Washington, D.C., she made arrangements for a meeting with Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O’Connor and took Alex and Martin along so they could meet this gracious woman whose appointment made history.

Certainly, she learned to be concerned and committed to the needs of others by her parents’ example. Dolores and Ruben Gonzales have been lifelong educators and set a great example for Kathy.

Dan Hantman sums up our loss:

“How does one say goodbye to a friend and colleague who has done so much for her family, friends, work and community? Throughout the years, Kathy was such a dynamic person, who would rope you into helping her with her many community activities. Her passion to help oth-

ers, whether they were clients, friends, or community groups, was infectious. It seemed she knew everybody and she could accomplish things no one thought possible. ‘Dan/Marcia/Greg, so-and-so just needs this or that.’ And off we would go to do those things for her and for the individual(s) or group she was assisting.

“Kathy was such an inclusive person. She would share her expertise, her home, and her wonderful family with all of us. How many times have we joined her in doing by-laws for newly forming nonprofit organizations, doing fundraisers, moving furniture, transporting needy clients, and on and on. Being part of Kathy’s family included being Uncle Dan to Martin and Alex and participating in family events, including the annual tamale making on Christmas Eve. Kathy included me in her family and I will miss my sister more than words can say.”

Our sympathy and concern go out to Dana, Martin, Alex, Kathy’s parents, her sister and brothers, and their children. We will not soon see one like Kathy again.

Memorial contributions may be made to the Puente Project.

The check should be made payable to:

RCC Auxiliary Business,

with the subject line Puente Program Trust Fund,

Kathy M. Gonzales Book Fund,

and mailed to:

RCC Auxiliary Business Services,

4800 Magnolia Avenue, Riverside, CA 92506.



JUDICIAL PROFILE: COMMISSIONER DALE WELLS

by Rick Lantz



Commissioner Dale Wells, 51, went to California Southern Law School in Riverside. After being in private practice for about five years, he was the Family Law Facilitator for Riverside County for seven years, then took the bench in

November 2003. Prior to law school, Commissioner Wells was a minister in central Texas for 20 years. Now for the inner Dale Wells.

L: What is your idea of perfect happiness?

W: Being content in whatever circumstance I find myself, rooted in my sense of who I am.

L: What is the trait you most dislike in yourself?

W: I tend to take on too many things. When people ask me to do them, I generally have difficulty saying no. And that's the thing that bothers me most about myself.

L: What is the trait you most dislike in others?

W: Lack of consideration. They don't have to bend or yield or they don't have to compromise, just a general sense of too much self-importance.

L: What is your greatest extravagance?

W: Probably my car. I bought a new 4-Runner last year and I just love it, it's loaded to the gills.

L: What is your greatest fear?

W: A debilitating illness.

L: What is your most treasured possession or person?

W: My wife.

L: How long have you been married?

W: Two and a half years.

L: What is your favorite avocation?

W: Religious studies. I used to teach in the seminary, I taught Greek and I taught a number of Old Testament and New Testament books. And I just love studying and writing on basic biblical religious things. In fact, I'm halfway through writing a book on the Book of Revelation.

L: What is the quality you most admire in a woman?

W: I don't know that I have a quality in a woman that I would find more desirable than as a quality of a man. And I would say for both, a basic goodness.

L: Who are your favorite writers?

W: James Patterson, Jeffery Deaver, Scott Turow, Tom Clancy.

L: Who are your favorite heroes, fact or fiction?

W: There's a guy that's always fascinated me. Wyatt Earp. Always fascinated me. In fact, I would just say the Earps. Not just Wyatt, but his brothers too, but in particular Wyatt. And when I say that, it's because the reality of his life was so different than what people perceive him. He was very much a multi-colored character, usually depicted as some hard-nosed feudalist guy that's going to clean up the town and shoot everybody in the process, even if nobody lives anymore. We're going to have a clean town.

L: If there is one place in the world that you would like to go to, where you have not been before, where would that be?

W: I'd say the Bible lands. I'm talking about Israel, Rome, I'm talking about what was called Asia Minor, which is now Turkey.

L: Would that include Mecca?

W: I've never had the desire to go to Mecca. But if it were convenient to do so, I would go there as a matter of historical interest.

L: I like the way you say convenient. In other words, if it's safe.

W: Right.

L: If not a commissioner, what would you like to be?

W: My first vocation in life was as a minister. I was a preacher for 20 years before I became a lawyer, and I would say if I had my choice of things to do, teaching the Bible would be my first choice. In the legal realm, if I were not a commissioner, some day I would like to be a judge. I don't have any other forces.

L: Why the switch from preacher to lawyer?

W: Bad divorce.

L: Bad divorce? All that praying didn't help?

W: That's right. When the preacher's wife decided she didn't want to be a preacher's wife anymore, it became untenable for me to continue as a full-time minister. Because I came from a group where divorce was just not an option. I was in law school, not because I ever intended to be a lawyer, just because I was always studying or teaching something. So while I was in law school, my wife left, and I literally came home and found my house cleaned out. So I decided, well, maybe I'd better get serious about studying law. So I finished law school, passed the bar, and hung out my shingle, and that led to where I am now.

L: Between Elvis, the Beatles and Tony Bennett, who would you listen to?

W: Well, it depends on what time, you know, what time frame you would be talking about. I would say late Elvis or early Beatles.

L: For you, I was going to lean toward Elvis because you said you were from Waco.

W: Right, exactly.

L: What talent would you most like to have?

W: I find myself being content with the talents I do have.

L: Well, you might want to be a terrific guitar player or you might want to write that great American novel.

W: You know, I think the talent would be writing; writing something that people would really want to read.

L: Where do you see yourself 10 years from now?

W: Probably in Department 3M.

L: Hopefully as a judge?

W: Hopefully, right.

L: Is there a camaraderie among the judiciary here?

W: Yes. I would say especially here in the desert. The judiciary has a lot of good interrelation with each other, probably to a greater extent than anyplace else I'm aware of. I go with the entire group to lunch about once a week, and then I go with Commissioner McCoy another time of the week.

L: Which historical figure do you most identify with?

W: David.

L: If you could come back as a person or a thing, what or who do you think it would be? Let me ask you a different question. Under current 21st Century circumstances, would you like to come back as Jesus?

W: My inclination is to say yes, but I would not want to presume that I would have such ability. If I could come back as a 21st Century personage like Paul or John, yes.

L: There are those who say that if you looked at the Bible, there are really only two things you have to remember: Believe in God, and do unto others as you would have then do unto you. Everything else is commentary.

W: That's right. As a matter of fact, do you know who said that first? Rabbi

continued on next page

Judicial Profile: Comm. Dale Wells *(cont.)*

Shammai and Rabbi Hillel. They were two great Rabbis, basically the two leaders among the Pharisees in the 1st Century. Shammai was very conservative, dot the i's, cross the t's. Do everything precisely.

L: Probably an annoying man.

W: Very much. And Hillel was what they would think of as the liberal, more gregarious, more outgoing. Hillel said, "What you find hurtful to yourself, do not do to others. That's law, the rest is commentary." Jesus took the statement a little further. Instead of saying what you find hurtful to yourself do not do unto others, he added the positive, "As you would that others do to you, do so to them."

L: As they say in our profession, that's the bottom line.

W: That's right.

Rick Lantz is a member of the Bar Publications Committee.



BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION TIMELINE

1849-Roberts v. City of Boston

The first documented school case, Roberts vs. City of Boston, was introduced by Benjamin Roberts after his daughter Sarah Roberts, was prohibited from attending the local primary school because she was black. This case denied African American parents from enrolling their children in certain Boston public schools.

1896-Plessy v. Ferguson

The case upheld segregated railroad car seating in Louisiana on the grounds that “separate but equal” seating did not violate the black passengers’ right to equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution.

1938-Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the University of Missouri’s grant of an out-of-state scholarship to keep a black student out of its law school denied the student equal protection under the law.

1940’s and 1950’s

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People brought a series of cases designed to show that separate facilities did not meet the equality criterion.

1950-McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents

U.S. Supreme Court strikes down the University of Oklahoma’s rules that had permitted a black man to attend classes.

1951-Brown v. Board of Education (Kansas)

Plaintiffs set out to organize a legal challenge to an 1879 State law that permitted racially segregated elementary schools in certain cities based on population.

1951-Bolling v. Sharpe (Washington, DC)

This case was filed against C. Melvin Sharpe, president of the District of Columbia Board of Education because of unequal schooling. The lead plaintiff in the case, Spottswood Thomas Bolling, Jr., was a twelve year-old-student that was turned away from John Phillip Sousa, a brand new, modern school for whites

and had to attend Shaw Junior High, a run down forty-eight-year-old school for blacks. The ruling confirmed that racial discrimination in the public school system of Washington, D.C. denied blacks due process of law as protected by the Fifth Amendment.

1951-Brown v. Board of Education

The NAACP coordinates the filing of lawsuits challenging the “separate but equal” doctrine as applied to the South Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, the District of Columbia, and Kansas cases.

1952-Brown Oral Arguments

On December 9, the U.S. Supreme Court heard oral arguments on all five of the cases on the Brown docket but postponed its ruling and requested a rehearing.

1954-Chief Justice Earl Warren Issues Brown v. Board Opinion

On May 17, 1954 at 12:52 p.m., Chief Justice Earl Warren’s historic Brown opinion overruled the previous “separate but equal” standard and announced that education is “a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.”

1955-Brown v. Board of Education (II)

The Supreme Court holds that states must implement the court’s 1954 segregation mandate, “with all deliberate speed.” This was viewed as a concession for southern segregationist who wanted a gradual implementation approach.



HAS *BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION* ACHIEVED

by Irma Poole Asberry

May 17th of this year will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954). Every lawyer recalls from his or her "Con Law" class that *Brown v. Board of Education* overturned the "separate but equal" doctrine established in the 1896 decision of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537. Under that doctrine, the court had decided, there is no violation of Fourteenth Amendment rights when the races are provided substantially equal facilities, even though use of each facility is restricted to a specific race. In the *Brown* case, the court ruled that "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment." Page 495.

The plaintiffs in *Brown* were seeking the aid of the court to obtain admission to the public schools of their communities on a nonsegregated basis. Chief Justice Warren, in delivering the opinion of the court, stated that: "Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms." Page 493.

Therefore, the result of the *Brown* decision was to desegregate public schools – to make admission to all public schools open to all persons regardless of race.

The answer to the question posed by the title of the article is, "Yes." *Brown* resulted in allowing any student admission to the public school in his/her geographic area. The lead story of the April, 2004 issue of the *California Bar Journal*, entitled "Honoring a Landmark Decision," states the opinions of some of the top lawyers in our state as to the positive impact *Brown* had on their educational experiences. I encourage you to read that article. The last paragraph of that article notes as follows: "Brown v. Board of Education . . . 'was a monumental decision in that it validated what so many of us had felt for so very long – that separate wasn't equal. It validated our sense of injustice It was a landmark decision, but it didn't solve the problems It was the beginning of change." Page 4.

Over the fifty years since *Brown*, vast changes have occurred in access to public education – any student can attend the public school in his/her geographic area. Chief Justice Warren use of the words "today" and "in these times" in the court's decision shows that the court was obviously limited to the circumstances that existed as of the 1950's. Research shows that for approximately thirty years following *Brown*, vast improvements were achieved. But since the late 1980's, resegregation of schools has been on a steady increase.

- In a study released by the Civil Rights Project at Harvard University, it was found that in the past decade there has been a backward movement for desegregation in U.S. schools, especially for Latino and African-American students, and especially in the South. The report also found that Asian students are the most integrated and most successful students by far. "New Report Looks Closely at Resegregation of Schools," *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 2/12/04, Vol. 20, Issue 26, page 12.

- In the cover story of the March 22, 2004, issue of U.S. News & World Report, "Special Report, 50 Years After Brown", in an article titled "Unequal Education," the authors noted the flight of whites from inner cities for suburbia has resulted in a negative impact on the public school system. The author stated, "This, then is the tragedy of American education. Fifty years after *Brown*, the nation still has not figured out how to educate all of its children. African-Americans, on average, start kindergarten behind whites academically, and the gap grows during elementary school. The ripple effect carries into high school – and beyond. Although blacks and whites enter college at similar rates, 36 percent of whites graduate with four-year degrees, compared with only 18 percent of blacks. Black job-

ED THE RESULTS STATED IN THE DECISION?

less rates are higher than whites', and black income is lower. The achievement gap between whites and blacks remains an affront to the national creed . . . that all are created equal. What caused this racial chasm, and why does it linger? More important, what can schools do to close the gap? . . .

"Too often, especially in big cities, white flight and resegregation accelerated. Still throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, black scores rose on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the respected federal test known as 'the nation's report card.' And yet by 1988, African-Americans and Hispanics (the latter unmentioned in *Brown* but now becoming the nation's largest minority group) have stopped catching up to their white and Asian-American contemporaries.

". . . Surprising as it may seem in 2004, Chief Justice Earl Warren's opinion in *Brown* made little reference to scholastic achievement. Instead, it focused on the psychological damage of segregation and asserted that as long as education is separate, true equality of opportunity cannot exist. But now, as the racially charged fights over desegregation recede into the past, a new national debate over how to close the minority achievement gap has emerged. Not only is integration hard to achieve, but it is no longer universally assumed to be the key to excellence. If anything, the argument has been reversed: To have any hope of luring whites into majority-black schools, educators must first raise academic achievement in those classrooms. The 2001 No Child Left Behind Act is the most prominent example of this intellectual shift. The law does not concern itself with how integrated a school is. It simply demands achievement from every student, in every school.

"To reach that goal, schools must find ways to prevent disorder and indifference from overwhelming education."

As time has gone on, it appears that access to public school by itself is not the factor that determines whether a student receives a quality education. Among the most pertinent factors cited in the *U.S. News & World Report* article that are not indicative of the success of public education are these:

- The amount of money expended by the school district did not make a difference.
- Anti-intellectual attitudes prevailed in all youth cultures, black and white, and they were not a major factor in determining achievement in school.

The article noted the following factors as determinative in the success of a child in public school:

- Positive parenting and involvement of the parent in the child's academic experiences.
- The level of family income.
- The quality of teachers.

Brown v. Board of Education concluded that "because of the wide applicability of this decision, and because of the great variety of local conditions, the formulation of decrees in these cases presents problems of considerable complexity. . . . [T]he consideration of appropriate relief was necessarily subordinated to the primary question – the constitutionality of segregation in public education. We have now announced that such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws. In order that we may have the full assistance of the parties in formulating decrees, the cases will be restored to the docket, and the parties are requested to present further argument" Page 496.

It is clear that the court intended the local schools and communities to fashion resolutions that afforded equal protection of the law to all students. The court used the words "today" and "in these times" as an indication of the perspective that must be used in crafting such resolutions. It is incumbent on us, the lawyers, judicial officers, legislators, educators, parents and students, to continue to fashion resolutions to make education (which Chief Justice Warren called "perhaps the most important function of state and local governments") meet the needs of today's students.

Irma Poole Asberry, an attorney in Riverside, was the RCBA President in 1997-98.

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) (USSC+)

**Argued December 9, 1952, Reargued December 8, 1953,
Decided May 17, 1954**

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN delivered the opinion of the Court.

These cases come to us from the States of Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware. They are premised on different facts and different local conditions, but a common legal question justifies their consideration together in this consolidated opinion.

In each of the cases, minors of *continued on next page*

Brown v. Board of Education . . . Decision *(continued)*

the Negro race, through their legal representatives, seek the aid of the courts in obtaining admission to the public schools of their community on a nonsegregated basis. In each instance, they had been denied admission to schools attended by white children under laws requiring or permitting segregation according to race. This segregation was alleged to deprive the plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment. In each of the cases other than the Delaware case, a three-judge federal district court denied relief to the plaintiffs on the so-called "separate but equal" doctrine announced by this Court in **Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537**. Under that doctrine, equality of treatment is accorded when the races are provided substantially equal facilities, even though these facilities be separate. In the Delaware case, the Supreme Court of Delaware adhered to that doctrine, but ordered that the plaintiffs be admitted to the white schools because of their superiority to the Negro schools.

The plaintiffs contend that segregated public schools are not "equal" and cannot be made "equal," and that hence they are deprived of the equal protection of the laws. Because of the obvious importance of the question presented, the Court took jurisdiction. Argument was heard in the 1952 Term, and reargument was heard this Term on certain questions propounded by the Court.

Reargument was largely devoted to the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868. It covered exhaustively consideration of the Amendment in Congress, ratification by the states, then-existing practices in racial segregation, and the views of proponents and opponents of the Amendment. This discussion and our own investigation convince us that, although these sources cast some light, it is not enough to resolve the problem with which we are faced. At best, they are inconclusive. The most avid proponents of the post-War Amendments undoubtedly intended them to remove all legal distinctions among "all persons born or naturalized in the United States." Their opponents, just as certainly, were antagonistic to both the letter and the spirit of the Amendments and wished them to have the most limited effect. What others in Congress and the state legislatures had in mind cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

An additional reason for the inconclusive nature of the Amendment's history with respect to segregated schools is the status of public education at that time. In the South, the movement toward free common schools, supported by general taxation, had not yet taken hold. Education of white children was largely in the hands of private groups. Education of Negroes was almost nonexistent, and practically all of the race were illiterate. In fact, any education of Negroes was forbidden by law in some states. Today, in contrast, many Negroes have achieved outstanding success in the arts and sciences, as well as in the business and professional world. It is true that public school education at the time of the Amendment had advanced further in the North, but the effect of the Amendment on Northern States was generally ignored in the congressional debates. Even in the North, the conditions of public education did not approximate those existing today. The curriculum was usually rudimentary; ungraded schools were common in rural areas; the school

term was but three months a year in many states, and compulsory school attendance was virtually unknown. As a consequence, it is not surprising that there should be so little in the history of the Fourteenth Amendment relating to its intended effect on public education.

In the first cases in this Court construing the Fourteenth Amendment, decided shortly after its adoption, the Court interpreted it as proscribing all state-imposed discriminations against the Negro race. The doctrine of “separate but equal” did not make its appearance in this Court until 1896 in the case of **Plessy v. Ferguson**, supra, involving not education but transportation. American courts have since labored with the doctrine for over half a century. In this Court, there have been six cases involving the “separate but equal” doctrine in the field of public education. In **Cumming v. County Board of Education**, 175 U.S. 528, and **Gong Lum v. Rice**, 275 U.S. 78, the validity of the doctrine itself was not challenged. In more recent cases, all on the graduate school level, inequality was found in that specific benefits enjoyed by white students were denied to Negro students of the same educational qualifications. **Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada**, 305 U.S. 337; **Sipuel v. Oklahoma**, 332 U.S. 631; **Sweatt v. Painter**, 339 U.S. 629; **McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents**, 339 U.S. 637. In none of these cases was it necessary to reexamine the doctrine to grant relief to the Negro plaintiff. And in **Sweatt v. Painter**, supra, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question whether **Plessy v. Ferguson** should be held inapplicable to public education.

In the instant cases, that question is directly presented. Here, unlike **Sweatt v. Painter**, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other “tangible” factors. Our decision, therefore, cannot turn on merely a comparison of these tangible factors in the Negro and white schools involved in each of the cases. We must look instead to the effect of segregation itself on public education.

continued on next page

Brown v. Board of Education . . . Decision *(continued)*

In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868, when the Amendment was adopted, or even to 1896, when *Plessy v. Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws.

Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other “tangible” factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does.

In *Sweatt v. Painter*, supra, in finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide them equal educational opportunities, this Court relied in large part on “those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school.” In *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents*, supra, the Court, in requiring that a Negro admitted to a white graduate school be treated like all other students, again resorted to intangible considerations: “. . . his ability to study, to engage in discussions and exchange views with other students, and, in general, to learn his profession.” Such considerations apply with added force to children in grade and high schools. To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs:

Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system.

Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in *Plessy v. Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected.

We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of “separate but equal” has no place. Separate educational facilities are

inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion whether such segregation also violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Because these are class actions, because of the wide applicability of this decision, and because of the great variety of local conditions, the formulation of decrees in these cases presents problems of considerable complexity. On reargument, the consideration of appropriate relief was necessarily subordinated to the primary question -- the constitutionality of segregation in public education. We have now announced that such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws. In order that we may have the full assistance of the parties in formulating decrees, the cases will be restored to the docket, and the parties are requested to present further argument on Questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court for the reargument this Term. The Attorney General of the United States is again invited to participate. The Attorneys General of the states requiring or permitting segregation in public education will also be permitted to appear as amici curiae upon request to do so by September 15, 1954, and submission of briefs by October 1, 1954.

It is so ordered.



2004-2005 NOMINEES FOR THE RCBA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The RCBA Nominating Committee has nominated the following members to run for the RCBA offices indicated, beginning September 1, 2004. (See below for their positions and biographies.) Watch your mail for ballots. Election results will be announced at the RCBA General Membership meeting on Friday, June 25.



Michelle Ouellette,
President-Elect 2003-2004,
will automatically assume the office of President for September 1, 2004, through August 31, 2005.

Theresa Han Savage *President-Elect*

Theresa Han Savage is a research attorney for the California Court of Appeal in Riverside. Ms. Savage received her undergraduate degree in public policy from Occidental College and her law degree from UCLA.

Ms. Savage has been active in the Riverside County Bar Association since 1993. She has served as the RCBA's Secretary, Chief Financial Officer and Director-at-Large for two years. Most recently, Ms. Savage served as Vice-President. Moreover, she was president of Barristers in 1998-1999. In the past, Ms. Savage has served as the co-chairperson of the Women's Law Section, and has been a member of the Civil Litigation Committee, the Judicial Liaison Committee, the Mock Trial Steering Committee, and the Diversity Law Section. For two years, Ms. Savage was an associate member of the Leo A. Deegan Inn of Court.

Ms. Savage was Vice-Chairperson of the Board of Directors for Goodwill Industries of the Inland Empire, and served on that board for over four years. She currently serves on the Board of Directors for the United Way of the Inland Valleys.

Ms. Savage is married to Phil Savage, and they have three children, Andrew, Katherine and James.



David T. Bristow *Vice President*

David Bristow is an attorney with Reid & Hellyer in Riverside, where he specializes in business and commercial litigation. Mr. Bristow has been a member of the board for four years, and currently holds the position of Chief Financial Officer. He is

the chair of the RCBA Public Bar Relations Committee, and is responsible for coordinating Law Day activities for the RCBA, including the presentation of the bar's Good Citizenship Award. He is also a member of the Riverside County Judicial-Community Committee. He is also on the boards of Riverside Hospice, the Riverside Municipal Museum, and the Riverside County Library Foundation.

Mr. Bristow is a 1993 graduate of McGeorge School of Law and an alumnus of California State University, San Bernardino.

Daniel Hantman *Chief Financial Officer*

Daniel Hantman has been in the Riverside community since 1976. He came to Riverside to serve as the Senior Citizen Attorney at the predecessor of Inland Counties Legal Services (ICLS). In 1984, Dan went into private practice.

Prior to coming to Riverside, he obtained his education from UCLA, UC Berkeley and the University of San Fernando Valley, College of Law. He spent almost eight years in Thailand, as a Peace Corps volunteer for two years and later supervising the establishment of English language schools throughout that country. There he learned to speak Thai fluently.

Dan has been active in RCBA committees and sections since his days at ICLS. These include the Lawyer Referral Service, the Juvenile Law Section, the Estate Planning, Probate and Trust Section, the Continuing



Legal Education Committee, and the Women's Law Section. He has sat as judge pro tem for the Riverside Small Claims Court and the Riverside County Juvenile Court. He was co-chair of the Mock Trial Blue Ribbon Committee and has been an attorney scorer for years. He has helped organize Bridging the Gap programs and MCLE Brown Bag seminars.

Dan also has been active in the Riverside Chamber of Commerce for many years. He has been President of the Downtown Division and is presently a board member of the Downtown Division and the Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce (GRCC). He participated in the GRCC Leadership Riverside program and has been active in the UCR Citizens University Committee and numerous other community organizations.

Dan Hantman is currently the Secretary on the RCBA Board.



E. Aurora Hughes
Secretary

Thank you for taking the time to read the candidate statements. This is our opportunity to tell you a little about ourselves. It is my desire to continue to serve our membership in the capacity of Secretary of the RCBA. I have had the honor of serving on the board as a Director-at-Large for the past three years. My RCBA involvement has included

serving on the Publications Committee (five years) and the CLE Committee (four years) and as the Legislative Committee Chair (four years). As a member of the Board, I have served on the Personnel Committee and have participated in various projects and programs as requested by the President. I am committed to serving our membership. As House Counsel for CCIC-NC, an out-of-state insurance company, I have the time and support to take on these responsibilities. I am deeply committed to serving our membership and ask for your support.

Richard A. Kennedy
Secretary

I look forward to the opportunity to serve the Riverside County Bar Association as its Secretary. I currently serve as a board member of the RCBA Lawyer Referral Service, Inland Counties Legal Services and as President of the Public Service Law Corporation. I also volunteer as an attorney-client fee arbitrator for the bar and as a temporary judge in Riverside County.



I graduated from UCLA with a Bachelor of Arts in history, then obtained my Juris Doctor degree from Western State University College of Law in Fullerton. I am 49 years old and have been married to Alicia for over 15 years. We have two children, Richard and Ahmicqui.

In closing, I thank you for your considered attention and support. My election to the office of Secretary of the Riverside County Bar Association will allow me to continue my service to our legal community.



John E. Brown
Director-at-Large

John E. Brown joined Best Best & Krieger LLP's Riverside office in 1975 and currently chairs the firm's Municipal & Redevelopment Law Practice Group. John is a public lawyer specializing in municipal law and is

the City Attorney of the cities of Lafayette, Ontario and San Jacinto, California. He also acts as special or general counsel for a variety of other public agencies and presently serves as general counsel to the March Joint Powers Authority, as well as the March Inland Port Airport Authority and March JPA Redevelopment Agency, the local reuse authorities for the former March Air Force Base.

John and his wife, Nancy Johnson, live in downtown Riverside. John is a member of the RCBA and has been active in the Riverside Downtown Partnership, the Riverside Arts Council, the Riverside Public Library Foundation and the Downtown Division of the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce. For the past several years, John has chaired the City of Riverside's Homeless Advisory Committee and he would like to see the RCBA and the local court system implement a "homeless court" program like those successfully operating in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. He is particularly interested in continuing the efforts of the RCBA to improve member services, to enhance existing outreach to current and future RCBA members in order to broaden diversity, and to assist RCBA members in becoming even more involved in civic and quality-of-life issues in the community.

continued on next page

Mr. Brown graduated from Claremont McKenna College, holds an M.A. degree from Occidental College, awarded as part of a Coro Foundation Fellowship in Public Affairs, and received his Juris Doctorate degree from the University of California, Berkeley, School of Law (Boalt Hall).



Harry J. Histen, III
Director-at-Large

I am a sole practitioner and make my office in Riverside, California and have done so since June of 1977. I have a fairly broad general practice, with an emphasis on wills and trusts and general business law. I also do probate and conservatorship matters, family law matters, general civil litigation and real estate matters.

I was born in 1942 and am a “second career” lawyer and a graduate of Western State University Night Law School in Fullerton, California. Prior to becoming a lawyer, I had my major in mathematics and worked as a Computer Programmer/Systems Analyst for Rockwell, International on the Apollo and Space Shuttle Programs.

I was very active in bar activities as a younger lawyer and belonged to several panels as well as serving on the Lawyer Referral Service Committee. I have served on the California State Bar Resolutions Committee. I have trained as a mediator both by experience and by taking mediation courses at the University of California at Riverside. I mediate privately and through the Bar Association Dispute Resolution Service and on a voluntary basis with the Probate Departments and Family Law Bi-Monthly Voluntary Settlement Conferences.

I have not been particularly active formally in recent years.

I believe that what I can offer the Bar is my experience and the diversity of my legal experience. Politically, I am a libertarian; the basic principles of libertarianism are individual freedom and personal responsibility. Thus, my vote as a member of the Board of Directors would reflect those principles.

Michael H. Trenholm
Director-at-Large



I appreciate the opportunity to stand for the Board of Directors. I have been practicing intellectual property law in Riverside since 1994. As a former Director-at-Large and current Chairman of the Business Law Section of the RCBA, I am familiar with the issues that are currently being addressed by the RCBA Board of Directors and would like the opportunity to help address these matters. I believe that the legal community has been greatly strengthened by the activities of the RCBA, including the educational programs and the pro bono work done through the RCBA, and, if elected, I would work to continue to enhance the RCBA's efforts in these areas and to advance the growth of the RCBA.



C. Victor Wear
Director-at-Large

I am a Senior Associate Attorney at the law firm of Graves & King in Riverside. I have been at Graves & King for four years and I have been an attorney for five years. I specialize in the defense of personal injury claims, including automobile accidents, premises liability claims, and government tort claims.

I am a native of the Inland Empire and it has been my great pleasure to practice law here. I have been a member of the Riverside County Bar Association for several years and I have enjoyed meeting my colleagues. I have particularly enjoyed attending the Barristers meetings with my fellow young attorneys.

Thank you for your consideration for the Board of Directors.



by Richard Brent Reed

Son of Chad

The last presidential election was decided by judges and lawyers. In the last Riverside County election for supervisor, Linda Soubirous lost to Bob Buster – or did she? Linda wants a recount. She has hired a law firm to challenge the accuracy of the voting machines. In order to head off a potential lawsuit, assistant county counsel Joe Rank wants Riverside County to hire an outside law firm that specializes in election matters. And, so, a new area of practice develops as a cottage industry: election law. Thank you, Florida.

Some day, election lawsuits may be so common as to require their own venue: the Election Court. Someone with a sardonic sense of humor decided that Riverside probate cases be designated “RIP.” Divorce cases, naturally, get the prefix “RID.” I foresee a court devoted to adjudicating election fraud, with case designation “RIG”; an unlawful detainer court, “RINT”; and, perhaps, a cash-handling court to enforce settlement transfers: “RICH.”



In Memoriam

MARSHALL HOWARD RICH

*December 1952
through
March 2004*

In Memoriam

WALTER E. SCARBOROUGH

*June 1919
through
March 2004*

David Moore – Admitted to American College of Trial Lawyers

David G. Moore has become a Fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers, one of the premier legal associations in America.

The induction ceremony at which David G. Moore became a Fellow took place before an audience of 730 persons during the recent 2004 Spring Meeting of the College in Phoenix, Arizona.

Founded in 1950, the College is composed of the best of the trial bar from the United States and Canada. Fellowship in the College is extended by invitation only, and only after careful investigation, to those experienced trial lawyers who have mastered the art of advocacy and whose professional careers have been marked by the highest standards of ethical conduct, professionalism, civility and collegiality. Lawyers must have a minimum of fifteen years' trial experience before they can be considered for Fellowship.

Membership in the College cannot exceed one per cent of the total lawyer population of any state or province. There are currently approximately 5,400 members in the United States and Canada, including active Fellows, Emeritus Fellows, Judicial Fellows (those who ascended to the bench after their induction) and Honorary Fellows.

The College strives to improve and elevate the standards of trial practice, the administration of justice and the ethics of the trial profession. Qualified lawyers are called to Fellowship in the College from all branches of trial practice. They are carefully selected from among those who customarily represent plaintiffs in civil cases and those who customarily represent defendants, those who prosecute persons accused of crime and those who defend them. The College is thus able to speak with a balanced voice on important issues affecting the legal profession and the administration of justice.

David G. Moore is a partner in the firm of Reid & Hellyer and has been practicing in this city for 39 years. He was President of the Riverside County Bar Association in 1984. The newly inducted Fellow is an alumnus of Hastings College School of Law.

Art Littleworth – Recipient of Annual Frank Miller Civic Achievement Award

The Mission Inn Foundation is hosting the Annual Frank Miller Civic Achievement Award Dinner on the evening of May 27 at the historic Riverside County Court House. This award is presented annually to an individual who has provided outstanding civic leadership, service, and support to the community in the tradition of Frank Miller, founder of the Mission Inn.

This year's recipient is Art Littleworth. Mr. Littleworth is a particularly appropriate choice, as he was the first President of the Mission Inn Foundation's Board of Directors (1976-78) and exemplifies the ideals practiced and championed by Frank Miller.

Art Littleworth, a senior partner at Riverside's premier law firm, Best, Best & Krieger, is highly regarded for his expertise in water allocation policies. He is a frequently sought-after litigator, expert witness, and speaker on the subject of water rights. In 1987, he was appointed as Special Master by the United States Supreme Court to hear a case between the states of Kansas and Colorado involving the Arkansas River. Art Littleworth was President of the Riverside County Bar Association in 1971. He received the RCBA's Krieger Meritorious Service Award in 1984 for outstanding community service and civic achievement in the legal profession.

His leadership has not been limited to state and national issues. During his tenure as Chairman of the RUSD Board of Education, he guided our public schools through the difficult transition to voluntary desegregation. The current Mission Inn Foundation Board President Dr. Daniel Hays observes, "It will come as no surprise to anyone in Riverside that Arthur L. Littleworth has been selected as the recipient of the Frank Miller Annual Civic Achievement Award for 2004. His life could easily be regarded as a template for the ideal recipient!"

Previous recipients of the Frank Miller Civic Achievement Award include Knox Mellon, Tim Hays, Judge Victor Miceli, Peggy Fouke Wertz, Justice John Gabbert and Duane Roberts.



CLASSIFIED ADS

Wanted – Associate Attorney

Palm Desert law firm seeks associate attorney with 0-2 years experience for litigation/transaction position in common interest development law. Strong academic, writing and communications skills required. Applicants should email resume to jrossman@fiorelaw.com.

Firm Seeks Associate Attorney

Growing Southern California consumer bankruptcy firm seeks associate attorney for San Bernardino/Riverside office. Candidate must be hard working, outgoing and self motivated. No bankruptcy experience necessary. Spanish speaking preferred. Fax resume to (626) 332-8644.

Litigation Attorney Wanted

Established AV-rated law firm seeks 2+ years associate for new Temecula office. E-mail resume to mgrace@gbhlaw.com.

Immediate Need for Attorney

Well-known Riverside general, civil, law firm has an immediate need for an additional attorney in Riverside office. Applicants should be a member in good standing of the California Bar Association and have 3-5 years experience, preferable with some knowledge of transactional matters. Salary is negotiable. Firm provides health insurance and has a 401(k) plan available. Those interested should submit resumes to Mr. Eagans or Mr. Matheson at 1950 Market Street, Riverside, CA 92501 or call (909) 684-2520.

Free Skip Tracing

We want to be your Process Serving Company. Our local fees are only \$35.00 per defendant/witness, which includes a FREE basic skip trace (if needed). Call us anytime, at (909) 544-0140, or you may fax your case to us at (909) 653-3202. Judgment Collection and other services available. (License #713)


Office Space for Rent

San Bernardino – Downtown, next to Courthouse. Great location, 500-700 sq ft.; \$1.37 per sq. ft. Full service lease with limited parking. Call (909) 906-9304.

Office Space for Lease

Great location. Half way between Riverside and San Bernardino Courts, 22545 Barton Road, Grand Terrace. 1052 sq. ft., \$900/month; 2 months free rent with 3 year lease. Call (909) 689-9644.

Conference Rooms Available

Conference rooms, small offices and the third floor meeting room at the RCBA building are available for rent on a half-day or full-day basis. Please call for pricing information, and reserve rooms in advance by contacting Charlotte at the RCBA, (909) 682-1015. 

MEMBERSHIP

The following persons have applied for membership in the Riverside County Bar Association. If there are no objections, they will become members effective May 31, 2004.

Alex Boudov –

Disability Law Group, Santa Monica

Dennis Boyer (A) –

Sabbah & MacKoul, Riverside

Garry M. Brown –

Gresham Savage Nolan & Tilden LLP, San Bernardino

Raymond F. Choi –

Elliot Snyder & Reid, Redlands

Leah L. Dixon (S) –

Law Student, Beaumont

Donna Greschner –

Univ. of La Verne College of Law, Ontario

Monica G. Hartman –

Sole Practitioner, Riverside

Kristopher T. Hiraoka –

Sole Practitioner, Riverside

Donna Kay Johnson –

Sole Practitioner, Riverside

Tony M. Lu –

Elliot Snyder & Reid, Redlands

Kimberly Mall (S) –

Law Student, Riverside

Astghik Lucy Mazloumian (S) –

Law Student, Burbank

Yvette J. McKeehan (A) –

Sabbah & MacKoul, Riverside

Margarette M. Mow (S) –

Law Student, Azusa

Meri Naapetyan (S) –

Law Student, Glendale

Michelle R. Penna –

Sole Practitioner, Orange

Raymond C. Prospero (S) –

Law Student, Corona

Douglas L. Raiden –

Lewis Operating Corp., Upland

Darla J. Sanderson (S) –

Law Student, San Diego

Connie L. Younger –

Sabbah & MacKoul, Riverside

(A) Designates Affiliate Member
(S) Designates Student Member

