

The Burger Court Opinion Writing Database

Love v. Pullman Co.

404 U.S. 522 (1972)

Paul J. Wahlbeck, George Washington University

James F. Spriggs, II, Washington University

Forrest Maltzman, George Washington University



24 B

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
THE CHIEF JUSTICE

January 6, 1972

No. 70-37 -- U.S. v. Pullman Company
No. 70-5033- Love v. Pullman Company

Dear Potter:

Please join me in the above.

Regards,

WFB

Mr. Justice Stewart

Copies to the Conference

FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

3
4
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

December 28, 1971

Dear Potter:

Please join me in your Per Curiam
in No. 70-5033 - Love v. Pullman Co. and
No. 70-37 - U. S. v. Pullman Co.

W. O. D.
W.D.

Mr. Justice Stewart

cc: The Conference

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WM. J. BRENNAN, JR. December 29, 1971

RE: No. 70-5033 and 70-37 - Love v. Pullman
Co. & United States v. Pullman Company

Dear Potter:

I agree.

Sincerely,

Bill

Mr. Justice Stewart

cc: The Conference

6

Please file me
M

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice
Mr. Justice
Mr. Justice
Mr. Justice
Mr. Justice
Mr. Justice
Mr. Justice

From: *Stevens, J.*

DEC 17

1st DRAFT

Circulated: _____

Recirculated: _____

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 70-5033 AND 70-37

Earl A. Love, Petitioner.

70-5033 v.

The Pullman Company.

United States et al.,

Petitioners,

70-37 v.

The Pullman Company.

On Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Ap-
peals for the Tenth Circuit.

[January —, 1972]

PER CURIAM.

A person claiming to be aggrieved by a violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964¹ may not maintain a suit for redress in Federal District Court until he has first unsuccessfully pursued certain avenues of potential administrative relief. In this case the petitioner filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, alleging that his employer, the respondent Pullman Company, had engaged in employment practices violative of Title VII. The court dismissed the complaint, holding that the statutory prerequisites to the maintenance of the suit had not been met. The Court of Appeals affirmed, 430 F. 2d 49, and we granted certiorari to consider the question of federal law presented. 401 U. S. 97.

The petitioner was employed by the Pullman Company as a "porter-in-charge." In 1963 and again in 1965, he complained to the Colorado Civil Rights Commission, alleging that the porters-in-charge, most of

¹ §§ 701-716, 42 U. S. C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-15 (1970).

31

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Warren
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Black
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

2nd DRAFT

From: Stewart, J.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 70-5033 AND 70-37

Revised: _____

Recirculated: _____

JAN 11

Earl A. Love, Petitioner,

70-5033 v.

The Pullman Company.

United States et al.,
Petitioners,

70-37 v.

The Pullman Company.

On Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Ap-
peals for the Tenth Circuit.

[January —, 1972]

MR. JUSTICE STEWART delivered the opinion of the Court.

A person claiming to be aggrieved by a violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964¹ may not maintain a suit for redress in Federal District Court until he has first unsuccessfully pursued certain avenues of potential administrative relief. In this case the petitioner filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, alleging that his employer, the respondent Pullman Company, had engaged in employment practices violative of Title VII. The court dismissed the complaint, holding that the statutory prerequisites to the maintenance of the suit had not been met. The Court of Appeals affirmed, 430 F. 2d 49, and we granted certiorari to consider the question of federal law presented. 401 U. S. 907.

The petitioner was employed by the Pullman Company as a "porter-in-charge." In 1963 and again in 1965, he complained to the Colorado Civil Rights Com-

¹ §§ 701-716, 42 U. S. C. §§ 2000e to 2000j-15 (1970).

B M
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE BYRON R. WHITE


January 5, 1972

Re: Nos. 70-5033 & 70-37 - Love
v. The Pullman Co.

Dear Potter:

Please join me in the per
curiam you have prepared in this
case.

Sincerely,



Mr. Justice Stewart

Copies to Conference

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE THURGOOD MARSHALL

December 29, 1971

Re: No. 70-37 and 70-5033 - U. S. v. Pullman Co., et al.

Dear Potter:

Please join me.

Sincerely,


T.M.

Mr. Justice Stewart

cc: The Conference

H B

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE HARRY A. BLACKMUN

January 6, 1972

Re: No. 70-5033 - Love v. Pullman Co.
No. 70-37 - U.S. v. Pullman Co.

Dear Potter:

Please join me.

Sincerely,

HAB

Mr. Justice Stewart

cc: The Conference