

The Burger Court Opinion Writing Database

Parham v. Hughes

441 U.S. 347 (1979)

Paul J. Wahlbeck, George Washington University
James F. Spriggs, II, Washington University in St. Louis
Forrest Maltzman, George Washington University



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

CHAMBERS OF
THE CHIEF JUSTICE

✓

January 18, 1978

Re: 78-3 - Parham v. Hughes

Dear Potter:

My vote sheet shows you as "Pass" on 78-3.

If your "present" vote to affirm remains, you
make a fifth vote to affirm.

Regards,
WB

Mr. Justice Stewart

Copies to the Conference

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

CHAMBERS OF
THE CHIEF JUSTICE

March 15, 1979

Dear Potter:

Re: 78-3 Curtis Parham v. Ellis Franklin Hughes

I join your latest draft.

Regards,



Mr. Justice Stewart

cc: The Conference

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WM. J. BRENNAN, JR.

February 27, 1979

RE: No. 78-3 Parham v. Hughes

Dear Byron:

Please join me.

Sincerely,



Mr. Justice White

cc: The Conference

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE Wm. J. BRENNAN, JR.

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marsha
Mr. Justice Black
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist
Mr. Justice Stevens

27 February 1979
From: Mr. Justice Brennan

No. 78-3, Parham v. Hughes

Circulated: 27 FEB 1979

Recirculated: _____

MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN, dissenting.

I join my Brother White's opinion dissenting from the judgment of the Court. I write separately only to express my concern at the somewhat loose language of the Court:

"Unlike the personal rights and liberties created by other provisions of the Constitution, notably the Bill of Rights, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment confers no substantive rights and creates no substantive liberties. The function of the Equal Protection Clause, rather, is simply to measure the validity of classifications created by state laws." Maj. op. at 10.

If the Court means by this passage only what is necessary in the context of its opinion -- that in the absence of a suspect classification or of a fundamental interest, a reasonable statutory classification does not become irrational and therefore impermissible under the Equal Protection Clause merely because in some circumstances it is overbroad-- the passage is of course unobjectionable. But if the Court means by this passage that statutes or regulations cannot, while acceptable on

*Circulated
1-2 2-28-79*

1st DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 78-3

Curtis Parham, Appellant,
v.
Ellis Franklin Hughes. } On Appeal from the Supreme
Court of Georgia.

[March —, 1979]

MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN, dissenting.

I join my Brother WHITE's opinion dissenting from the judgment of the Court. I write separately only to express my concern at the somewhat loose language of the Court:

"Unlike the personal rights and liberties created by other provisions of the Constitution, notably the Bill of Rights, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment confers no substantive rights and creates no substantive liberties. The function of the Equal Protection Clause, rather, is simply to measure the validity of classifications created by state laws." Maj. op., at 10.

If the Court means by this passage only what is necessary in the context of its opinion—that in the absence of a suspect classification or of a fundamental interest, a reasonable statutory classification does not become irrational and therefore impermissible under the Equal Protection Clause merely because in some circumstances it is overbroad—the passage is of course unobjectionable. But if the Court means by this passage that statutes or regulations cannot, while acceptable on their face, be found impermissible as applied under the Equal Protection Clause, then the Court violates the common understanding of the Clause dating back at least as far as *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U. S. 356, 373 (1886).* And surely

* For the cases present the ordinances in actual operation, and the facts shown establish an administration directed so exclusively against a

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist
Mr. Justice Stevens

1-2
From: Mr. Justice Brennan

Circulated: _____

Recirculated: 5 MAR 1

2nd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 78-3

Curtis Parham, Appellant,
v.
Ellis Franklin Hughes. } On Appeal from the Supreme
Court of Georgia.

[March —, 1979]

MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN, with whom MR. JUSTICE MARSHALL joins, dissenting.

I join my Brother WHITE's opinion dissenting from the judgment of the Court. I write separately only to express my concern at the somewhat loose language of the Court:

"Unlike the personal rights and liberties created by other provisions of the Constitution, notably the Bill of Rights, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment confers no substantive rights and creates no substantive liberties. The function of the Equal Protection Clause, rather, is simply to measure the validity of classifications created by state laws." Maj. op., at 10.

I interpret the Court to mean by this passage only what is necessary in the context of its opinion: In the absence of a suspect classification or of a fundamental interest, a reasonable statutory classification does not become irrational and therefore impermissible under the Equal Protection Clause merely because in some circumstances it is overbroad. For if the Court meant by this passage that statutes or regulations cannot, while acceptable on their face, be found impermissible as applied under the Equal Protection Clause, the Court would violate the common understanding of the Clause dating back at least as far as *Nick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U. S. 356, 373 (1886).* And surely the Court could not be implying by its

* "For the cases present the ordinances in actual operation, and the facts shown establish an administration directed so exclusively against a

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WM. J. BRENNAN, JR.

March 15, 1979

RE: No. 78-3 Parham v. Hughes

Dear Potter:

I have joined Byron's dissent in the above and
am withdrawing my separate dissent which Thurgood had
joined.

Sincerely,



Mr. Justice Stewart

cc: The Conference

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist
Mr. Justice Stevens

From: Mr. Justice Stewart
9 FEB 1979
Circulated: _____

Recirculated: _____

1st DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 78-3

Curtis Parham, Appellant,
v.
Ellis Franklin Hughes.] On Appeal from the Supreme
Court of Georgia.

[February —, 1979]

MR. JUSTICE STEWART delivered the opinion of the Court.

Under § 105-1307 of the Georgia Code (hereinafter the "Georgia statute"),¹ the mother of an illegitimate child can sue for the wrongful death of that child. A father who has legitimated a child can also sue for the wrongful death of the child if there is no mother. A father who has not legitimated a child, however, is precluded from maintaining a wrongful death action. The question presented in this case is whether this statutory scheme violates the Equal Protection or Due Process Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment by denying the father of an illegitimate child who has not legitimated the child the right to sue for the child's wrongful death.

I

The appellant was the biological father of Leineul Parham, a minor child who was killed in an automobile collision. The child's mother, Cassandra Moreen, was killed in the same collision. The appellant and Moreen were never married to each other, and the appellant did not legitimate the child as

¹Section 105-1307 provides:

"A mother, or, if no mother, a father may recover for the homicide of a child, minor or *sui juris*, unless said child shall leave a wife, husband or child. The mother or father shall be entitled to recover the full value of the life of such child. *In suits by the mother the illegitimacy of the child shall be no bar to a recovery.*" (Emphasis added.)

Supreme Court of the United States

Memorandum

February 14, 1929

Lewis - 78-3

I hope that the changes
made in this circulation will
satisfy your concern.

As you will note, I have

- ① deleted the quotation, and some
the citation, of McGowan v. Maryland.
- ② deleted the reference to "Indigency"
in a classification. P.S.

314

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist
Mr. Justice Stevens

From: Mr. Justice Stewart

Circulated:

14 FEB 1979

Recirculated:

2nd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 78-3

Curtis Parham, Appellant,
v.
Ellis Franklin Hughes. } On Appeal from the Supreme
Court of Georgia.

[February —, 1979]

MR. JUSTICE STEWART delivered the opinion of the Court.

Under § 105-1307 of the Georgia Code (hereinafter the "Georgia statute"),¹ the mother of an illegitimate child can sue for the wrongful death of that child. A father who has legitimated a child can also sue for the wrongful death of the child if there is no mother. A father who has not legitimated a child, however, is precluded from maintaining a wrongful death action. The question presented in this case is whether this statutory scheme violates the Equal Protection or Due Process Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment by denying the father of an illegitimate child who has not legitimated the child the right to sue for the child's wrongful death.

I

The appellant was the biological father of Lemeul Parham, a minor child who was killed in an automobile collision. The child's mother, Cassandria Moreen, was killed in the same collision. The appellant and Moreen were never married to each other, and the appellant did not legitimate the child as

¹ Section 105-1307 provides:

"A mother, or, if no mother, a father may recover for the homicide of a child, minor or *sui juris*, unless said child shall leave a wife, husband or child. The mother or father shall be entitled to recover the full value of the life of such child. *In suits by the mother the illegitimacy of the child shall be no bar to a recovery.*" (Emphasis added.)

TS
7/26/79
7/26/79

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist
Mr. Justice Stevens

From: Mr. Justice Stewart

Circulated: _____

Recirculated: 15 FEB 1979

3rd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 78-3

Curtis Parham, Appellant,
v.
Ellis Franklin Hughes. } On Appeal from the Supreme
Court of Georgia.

[February —, 1979]

MR. JUSTICE STEWART delivered the opinion of the Court.

Under § 105-1307 of the Georgia Code (hereinafter the "Georgia statute"),¹ the mother of an illegitimate child can sue for the wrongful death of that child. A father who has legitimated a child can also sue for the wrongful death of the child if there is no mother. A father who has not legitimated a child, however, is precluded from maintaining a wrongful death action. The question presented in this case is whether this statutory scheme violates the Equal Protection or Due Process Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment by denying the father of an illegitimate child who has not legitimated the child the right to sue for the child's wrongful death.

I

The appellant was the biological father of Lemeul Parham, a minor child who was killed in an automobile collision. The child's mother, Cassandra Moreen, was killed in the same collision. The appellant and Moreen were never married to each other, and the appellant did not legitimate the child as

¹ Section 105-1307 provides:

"A mother, or, if no mother, a father may recover for the homicide of a child, minor or *sui juris*, unless said child shall leave a wife, husband or child. The mother or father shall be entitled to recover the full value of the life of such child. *In suits by the mother the illegitimacy of the child shall be no bar to a recovery*" (Emphasis added.)

10
The Chief
Mr. Justice Bre
Mr. Justice Whit
Mr. Justice Marsh
Mr. Justice Blaet
Mr. Justice Powel
Mr. Justice Reinaui
Mr. Justice Stevens

From: Mr. Justice Stewart
Circulated: 14 MAR 197
Recirculated: _____

4th DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 78-3

Curtis Parham, Appellant, } On Appeal from the Supreme
v. } Court of Georgia.
Ellis Franklin Hughes.

[February —, 1979]

MR. JUSTICE STEWART delivered the opinion of the Court.

Under § 105-1307 of the Georgia Code (hereinafter the "Georgia statute"),¹ the mother of an illegitimate child can sue for the wrongful death of that child. A father who has legitimated a child can also sue for the wrongful death of the child if there is no mother. A father who has not legitimated a child, however, is precluded from maintaining a wrongful death action. The question presented in this case is whether this statutory scheme violates the Equal Protection or Due Process Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment by denying the father of an illegitimate child who has not legitimated the child the right to sue for the child's wrongful death.

I

The appellant was the biological father of Lemeul Parham, a minor child who was killed in an automobile collision. The child's mother, Cassandria Moreen, was killed in the same collision. The appellant and Moreen were never married to each other, and the appellant did not legitimate the child as

¹ Section 105-1307 provides:

"A mother, or, if no mother, a father may recover for the homicide of a child, minor or *suu juris*, unless said child shall leave a wife, husband or child. The mother or father shall be entitled to recover the full value of the life of such child. *In suits by the mother the illegitimacy of the child shall be no bar to a recovery.*" (Emphasis added.)

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE POTTER STEWART

April 26, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE CONFERENCE

Case held for 78-3, Parham v. Hughes.

The only hold is 78-5441, Robinson v. Kolstad.

This is the only case that has been held for Parham. However, it probably should have been held for 77-1115, Lalli v. Lalli instead. The issue in Kolstad is under what circumstances an illegitimate child can sue for the wrongful death of his father. The Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld a Wisconsin statute that denied an unacknowledged illegitimate child the right to sue for the wrongful death of his father. The statute provided that an illegitimate child could be acknowledged by a father's admission in open court, an adjudication in paternity proceedings, a subsequent marriage of the parents, or a signed document by the father. The Kolstad case is thus similar to Lalli (that case dealt with when an illegitimate child can inherit from his father).

The issue in Parham, by contrast, was whether a father of an illegitimate child can be denied the right to sue for the wrongful death of his child. We specifically stated in Parham that the case did not present the same issues as the Court's illegitimacy cases where the rights of an illegitimate child were at stake. I would vacate and remand for reconsideration in light of Lalli v. Lalli.

PS
1
PS

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE BYRON R. WHITE

February 10, 1979

Re: No. 78-3 - Parham v. Hughes

Dear Potter,

In due course I shall circulate a
dissent in this case.

Sincerely yours,

Byron

Mr. Justice Stewart
Copies to the Conference
cmc

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
 Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist
Mr. Justice Stevens

From: Mr. Justice White

Circulated: 26 FEB 1973

1st DRAFT

Recirculated: _____

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 78-3

Curtis Parham, Appellant,
v.
Ellis Franklin Hughes. } On Appeal from the Supreme
Court of Georgia.

[March —, 1979]

MR. JUSTICE WHITE, dissenting.

Petitioner is the father, rather than the mother, of a *deceased* illegitimate child. It is conceded that for this reason alone he may not bring an action for the wrongful death of his child. Yet the Court concludes that petitioner is not discriminated against "simply" because of his sex, *ante*, at 7, because Georgia provides a means by which fathers can legitimate their children. The dispositive point for the Court is that only a father may avail himself of this process. Therefore, we are told, "[t]he fact is that mothers and fathers of illegitimate children are not similarly situated," *ibid.*

There is a startling circularity in this argument. The issue before the Court is whether Georgia may require unmarried fathers, but not unmarried mothers, to have pursued the statutory legitimization procedure in order to bring suit for the wrongful death of their children. Seemingly, it is irrelevant that as a matter of state law mothers may not legitimate their children,¹ for they are not required to do so in order to maintain a wrongful death action. That only fathers *may* resort to the legitimization process cannot dissolve the sex discrimination in *requiring* them to.² Under the Court's boot-

¹ Although Ga. Code § 74-103 (1973) provides that a father may petition, with notice to the mother, to legitimate his child, mothers are not given a similar right. At least one State provides that either parent, or both, may legitimate a child. La. Civ. Code Ann. Art. 203 (West 1976).

² The Court not only fails to examine whether required resort by fathers to the legitimization procedure bears more than a rational rela-

Brennan
Rehnquist

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blaumun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist
Mr. Justice Stevens

From: Mr. Justice White

Circulated: _____

Recirculated: 28 FEB 1973

STYLISTIC CHANGES THROUGHOUT.
SEE PAGES: |

2nd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 78-3

Curtis Parham, Appellant,
v.
Ellis Franklin Hughes. | On Appeal from the Supreme
Court of Georgia.

[March —, 1979]

MR. JUSTICE WHITE, with whom MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN |
joins, dissenting.

Appellant is the father, rather than the mother, of a deceased illegitimate child. It is conceded that for this reason alone he may not bring an action for the wrongful death of his child. Yet the Court concludes that appellant is not discriminated against "simply" because of his sex, *ante*, at 7, because Georgia provides a means by which fathers can legitimate their children. The dispositive point for the Court is that only a father may avail himself of this process. Therefore, we are told, "[t]he fact is that mothers and fathers of illegitimate children are not similarly situated," *ibid.*

There is a startling circularity in this argument. The issue before the Court is whether Georgia may require unmarried fathers, but not unmarried mothers, to have pursued the statutory legitimization procedure in order to bring suit for the wrongful death of their children. Seemingly, it is irrelevant that as a matter of state law mothers may not legitimate their children,¹ for they are not required to do so in order to maintain a wrongful death action. That only fathers *may* resort to the legitimization process cannot dissolve the sex discrimination in *requiring* them to.² Under the Court's boot-

¹ Although Ga. Code § 74-103 (1973) provides that a father may petition, with notice to the mother, to legitimate his child, mothers are not given a similar right. At least one State provides that either parent, or both, may legitimate a child. La. Civ. Code Ann. Art. 203 (West 1976).

² The Court not only fails to examine whether required resort by

COLLECTIONS
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
20100
20101
20102
20103
20104
20105
20106
20107
20108
20109
20110
20111
20112
20113
20114
20115
20116
20117
20118
20119
20120
20121
20122
20123
20124
20125
20126
20127
20128
20129
20130
20131
20132
20133
20134
20135
20136
20137
20138
20139
20140
20141
20142
20143
20144
20145
20146
20147
20148
20149
20150
20151
20152
20153
20154
20155
20156
20157
20158
20159
20160
20161
20162
20163
20164
20165
20166
20167
20168
20169
20170
20171
20172
20173
20174
20175
20176
20177
20178
20179
20180
20181
20182
20183
20184
20185
20186
20187
20188
20189
20190
20191
20192
20193
20194
20195
20196
20197
20198
20199
20200
20201
20202
20203
20204
20205
20206
20207
20208
20209
20210
20211
20212
20213
20214
20215
20216
20217
20218
20219
20220
20221
20222
20223
20224
20225
20226
20227
20228
20229
20230
20231
20232
20233
20234
20235
20236
20237
20238
20239
20240
20241
20242
20243
20244
20245
20246
20247
20248
20249
20250
20251
20252
20253
20254
20255
20256
20257
20258
20259
20260
20261
20262
20263
20264
20265
20266
20267
20268
20269
20270
20271
20272
20273
20274
20275
20276
20277
20278
20279
20280
20281
20282
20283
20284
20285
20286
20287
20288
20289
20290
20291
20292
20293
20294
20295
20296
20297
20298
20299
202000
202001
202002
202003
202004
202005
202006
202007
202008
202009
202010
202011
202012
202013
202014
202015
202016
202017
202018
202019
202020
202021
202022
202023
202024
202025
202026
202027
202028
202029
202030
202031
202032
202033
202034
202035
202036
202037
202038
202039
202040
202041
202042
202043
202044
202045
202046
202047
202048
202049
202050
202051
202052
202053
202054
202055
202056
202057
202058
202059
202060
202061
202062
202063
202064
202065
202066
202067
202068
202069
202070
202071
202072
202073
202074
202075
202076
202077
202078
202079
202080
202081
202082
202083
202084
202085
202086
202087
202088
202089
202090
202091
202092
202093
202094
202095
202096
202097
202098
202099
2020100
2020101
2020102
2020103
2020104
2020105
2020106
2020107
2020108
2020109
2020110
2020111
2020112
2020113
2020114
2020115
2020116
2020117
2020118
2020119
2020120
2020121
2020122
2020123
2020124
2020125
2020126
2020127
2020128
2020129
2020130
2020131
2020132
2020133
2020134
2020135
2020136
2020137
2020138
2020139
2020140
2020141
2020142
2020143
2020144
2020145
2020146
2020147
2020148
2020149
2020150
2020151
2020152
2020153
2020154
2020155
2020156
2020157
2020158
2020159
2020160
2020161
2020162
2020163
2020164
2020165
2020166
2020167
2020168
2020169
2020170
2020171
2020172
2020173
2020174
2020175
2020176
2020177
2020178
2020179
2020180
2020181
2020182
2020183
2020184
2020185
2020186
2020187
2020188
2020189
2020190
2020191
2020192
2020193
2020194
2020195
2020196
2020197
2020198
2020199
2020200
2020201
2020202
2020203
2020204
2020205
2020206
2020207
2020208
2020209
2020210
2020211
2020212
2020213
2020214
2020215
2020216
2020217
2020218
2020219
2020220
2020221
2020222
2020223
2020224
2020225
2020226
2020227
2020228
2020229
2020230
2020231
2020232
2020233
2020234
2020235
2020236
2020237
2020238
2020239
2020240
2020241
2020242
2020243
2020244
2020245
2020246
2020247
2020248
2020249
2020250
2020251
2020252
2020253
2020254
2020255
2020256
2020257
2020258
2020259
2020260
2020261
2020262
2020263
2020264
2020265
2020266
2020267
2020268
2020269
2020270
2020271
2020272
2020273
2020274
2020275
2020276
2020277
2020278
2020279
2020280
2020281
2020282
2020283
2020284
2020285
2020286
2020287
2020288
2020289
2020290
2020291
2020292
2020293
2020294
2020295
2020296
2020297
2020298
2020299
2020300
2020301
2020302
2020303
2020304
2020305
2020306
2020307
2020308
2020309
2020310
2020311
2020312
2020313
2020314
2020315
2020316
2020317
2020318
2020319
2020320
2020321
2020322
2020323
2020324
2020325
2020326
2020327
2020328
2020329
2020330
2020331
2020332
2020333
2020334
2020335
2020336
2020337
2020338
2020339
2020340
2020341
2020342
2020343
2020344
2020345
2020346
2020347
2020348
2020349
2020350
2020351
2020352
2020353
2020354
2020355
2020356
2020357
2020358
2020359
2020360
2020361
2020362
2020363
2020364
2020365
2020366
2020367
2020368
2020369
2020370
2020371
2020372
2020373
2020374
2020375
2020376
2020377
2020378
2020379
2020380
2020381
2020382
2020383
2020384
2020385
2020386
2020387
2020388
2020389
2020390
2020391
2020392
2020393
2020394
2020395
2020396
2020397
2020398
2020399
2020400
2020401
2020402
2020403
2020404
2020405
2020406
2020407
2020408
2020409
2020410
2020411
2020412
2020413
2020414
2020415
2020416
2020417
2020418
2020419
2020420
2020421
2020422
2020423
2020424
2020425
2020426
2020427
2020428
2020429
2020430
2020431
2020432
2020433
2020434
2020435
2020436
2020437
2020438
2020439
2020440
2020441
2020442
2020443
2020444
2020445
2020446
2020447
2020448
2020449
2020450
2020451
2020452
2020453
2020454
2020455
2020456
2020457
2020458
2020459
2020460
2020461
2020462
2020463
2020464
2020465
2020466
2020467
2020468
2020469
2020470
2020471
2020472
2020473
2020474
2020475
2020476
2020477
2020478
2020479
2020480
2020481
2020482
2020483
2020484
2020485
2020486
2020487
2020488
2020489
2020490
2020491
2020492
2020493
2020494
2020495
2020496
2020497
2020498
2020499
2020500
2020501
2020502
2020503
2020504
2020505
2020506
2020507
2020508
2020509
2020510
2020511
2020512
2020513
2020514
2020515
2020516
2020517
2020518
2020519
2020520
2020521
2020522
2020523
2020524
2020525
2020526
2020527
2020528
2020529
2020530
2020531
2020532
2020533
2020534
2020535
2020536
2020537
2020538
2020539
2020540
2020541
2020542
2020543
2020544
2020545
2020546
2020547
2020548
2020549
2020550
2020551
2020552
2020553
2020554
2020555
2020556
2020557
2020558
2020559
2020560
2020561
2020562
2020563
2020564
2020565
2020566
2020567
2020568
2020569
2020570
2020571
2020572
2020573
2020574
2020575
2020576
2020577
2020578
2020579
2020580
2020581
2020582
2020583
2020584
2020585
2020586
2020587
2020588
2020589
2020590
2020591
2020592
2020593
2020594
2020595
2020596
2020597
2020598
2020599
2020600
2020601
2020602
2020603
2020604
2020605
2020606
2020607
2020608
2020609
2020610
2020611
2020612
2020613
2020614
2020615
2020616
2020617
2020618
2020619
2020620
2020621
2020622
2020623
2020624
2020625
2020626
2020627
2020628
2020629
2020630
2020631
2020632
2020633
2020634
2020635
2020636
2020637
2020638
2020639
2020640
2020641
2020642
2020643
2020644
2020645
2020646
2020647
2020648
2020649
2020650
2020651
2020652
2020653
2020654
2020655
2020656
2020657
2020658
2020659
2020660
2020661
2020662
2020663
2020664
2020665
2020666
2020667
2020668
2020669
2020670
2020671
2020672
2020673
2020674
2020675
2020676
2020677
2020678
2020679
2020680
2020681
2020682
2020683
2020684
2020685
2020686
2020687
2020688
2020689
2020690
2020691
2020692
2020693
2020694
2020695
2020696
2020697
2020698
2020699
2020700
2020701
2020702
2020703
2020704
2020705
2020706
2020707
2020708
2020709
2020710
2020711
2020712
2020713
2020714
2020715
2020716
2020717
2020718
2020719
2020720
2020721
2020722
2020723
2020724
2020725
2020726
2020727
2020728
2020729
2020730
2020731
2020732
2020733
2020734
2020735
2020736
2020737
2020738
2020739
2020740
2020741
2020742
2020743
2020744
2020745
2020746
2020747
2020748
2020749
2020750
2020751
2020752
2020753
2020754
2020755
2020756
2020757
2020758
2020759
2020760
2020761
2020762
2020763
2020764
2020765
2020766
2020767
2020768
2020769
2020770
2020771
2020772
2020773
2020774
2020775
2020776
2020777
2020778
2020779
2020780
2020781
2020782
2020783
2020784
2020785
2020786
2020787
2020788
2020789
2020790
2020791
2020792
2020793
2020794
2020795
2020796
2020797
2020798
2020799
2020800
2020801
2020802
2020803
2020804
2020805
2020806
2020807
2020808
2020809
2020810
2020811
2020812
2020813
2020814
2020815
2020816
2020817
2020818
2020819
2020820
2020821
2020822
2020823
2020824
2020825
2020826
2020827
2020828
2020829
2020830
2020831
2020832
2020833
2020834
2020835
2020836
2020837
2020838
2020839
2020840
2020841
2020842
2020843
2020844
2020845
2020846
2020847
2020848
2020849
2020850
2020851
2020852
2020853
2020854
2020855
2020856
2020857
2020858
2020859
2020860
2020861
2020862
2020863
2020864
2020865
2020866
2020867
2020868
2020869
2020870
2020871
2020872
2020873
2020874
2020875
2020876
2020877
2020878
2020879
2020880
2020881
2020882
2020883
2020884
2020885
2020886
2020887
2020888
2020889
2020890
2020891
2020892
2020893
2020894
2020895
2020896
2020897
2020898
2020899
2020900
2020901
2020902
2020903
2020904
2020905
2020906
2020907
2020908
2020909
2020910
2020911
2020912
2020913<br

BRN
Please give me direct
Mr. Justice Marshall

124

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
 Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist
Mr. Justice Stevens

From: Mr. Justice White

Circulated: _____

Recirculated: 15 MAR 1979

3rd DRAFT

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 78-3

Curtis Parham, Appellant,
v.
Ellis Franklin Hughes. } On Appeal from the Supreme
Court of Georgia.

[March —, 1979]

Mr. Justice Marshall

MR. JUSTICE WHITE, with whom MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN and
MR. JUSTICE BLACKMUN join, dissenting.

Appellant is the father, rather than the mother, of a deceased illegitimate child. It is conceded that for this reason alone he may not bring an action for the wrongful death of his child. Yet four Members of the Court conclude that appellant is not discriminated against "simply" because of his sex, *ante*, at 7, because Georgia provides a means by which fathers can legitimate their children. The dispositive point is that only a father may avail himself of this process. Therefore, we are told, "[t]he fact is that mothers and fathers of illegitimate children are not similarly situated," *ibid.*

There is a startling circularity in this argument. The issue before the Court is whether Georgia may require unmarried fathers, but not unmarried mothers, to have pursued the statutory legitimization procedure in order to bring suit for the wrongful death of their children. Seemingly, it is irrelevant that as a matter of state law mothers may not legitimate their children,¹ for they are not required to do so in order to maintain a wrongful death action. That only fathers *may* resort to the legitimization process cannot dissolve the sex discrimination in *requiring* them to.² Under the plurality's

¹ Although Ga. Code § 74-103 (1973) provides that a father may petition, with notice to the mother, to legitimate his child, mothers are not given a similar right. At least one State provides that either parent, or both, may legitimate a child. La. Civ. Code Ann. Art. 203 (West 1976).

² The plurality not only fails to examine whether required resort by

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE THURGOOD MARSHALL

February 15, 1979

Re: No. 78-3 - Parham v. Hughes

Dear Potter:

I await the dissent.

Sincerely,

JM
T.M.

Mr. Justice Stewart

cc: The Conference

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE THURGOOD MARSHALL

March 15, 1979

Re: 78-3 - Parham v. Hughes

Dear Byron:

Please join me in your dissent.

Sincerely,

JM.

T.M.

Mr. Justice White

cc: The Conference

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE HARRY A. BLACKMUN

February 26, 1979

Re: No. 78-3 - Parham v. Hughes

Dear Potter:

I, too, shall await the dissent in this case.

Sincerely,



Mr. Justice Stewart

cc: The Conference

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE HARRY A. BLACKMUN

March 6, 1979

Re: No. 78-3 - Parham v. Hughes

Dear Byron:

Please join me in your dissent.

Sincerely,

Harry

Mr. Justice White

cc: The Conference

March 9, 1979

No. 78-3 Parham v. Hughes

Dear Potter:

As you will see from the concurring opinion I am today circulating, I concluded that it was best for me to write separately.

I appreciate the changes you made to accommodate my suggestions, but the difficulty is that you and I have not been together in most of the "illegitimate" equal protection cases. I think it best to adhere to the type of analysis I have consistently applied in the past.

In any event, you have a Court and I think our opinions will afford adequate guidance.

Sincerely,

Mr. Justice Stewart

LFP/lab

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Rehnquist
Mr. Justice Stevens

From: Mr. Justice Powell

Circulated: 16 MAR 1979

1st DRAFT

Recirculated: _____

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 78-3

Curtis Parham, Appellant, *v.* Ellis Franklin Hughes. } On Appeal from the Supreme Court of Georgia.

[March —, 1979]

MR. JUSTICE POWELL, concurring in the judgment.

I agree that the gender-based distinction of Georgia Code § 105-1307 does not violate equal protection.* I write separately, however, because I arrive at this conclusion by a route somewhat different from that taken by the ~~Court~~ *mr. Justice Stewart*

To withstand judicial scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause, gender-based distinctions must "serve important governmental objectives and must be substantially related to achievement of those objectives." *Craig v. Boren*, 429 U. S. 190, 197 (1977). See *Stanton v. Stanton*, 421 U. S. 7, 14 (1975); *Reed v. Reed*, 404 U. S. 71 (1971). We have recognized in various contexts the importance of a State's interest in minimizing potential problems in identifying the natural father of an illegitimate child. See, *e. g.*, *Caban v. Mohammed*, — U. S. —, — n. 14 (1979) (adoptions); *Lalli v. Lalli*, — U. S. —, — (1978) (inheritance); *Gomez v. Perez*, 409 U. S. 535, 538 (1973) (child support). Indeed, we have explicitly sought to avoid "impos[ing] on state court systems a greater burden" in determining paternity for purposes of wrongful death actions. *Weber v. Aetna Casualty & Surety Co.*, 406 U. S. 164, 174 (1972).

*I also agree with the Court that the classification of § 105-1307 affects only fathers of illegitimates—not the illegitimates themselves—and therefore that this case differs substantially from those in which we have found classifications based upon illegitimacy to be unconstitutional. See, *e. g.*, *Trimble v. Gordon*, 430 U. S. 762 (1977).

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Johnquist
Mr. Justice Stevens

2nd DRAFT

From: Mr. Justice Powell

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

16 MAR 1979

No. 78-3

Recirculated:

Curtis Parham, Appellant,
v.
Ellis Franklin Hughes. } On Appeal from the Supreme
Court of Georgia.

[March —, 1979]

MR. JUSTICE POWELL, concurring in the judgment.

I agree that the gender-based distinction of Georgia Code § 105-1307 does not violate equal protection.* I write separately, however, because I arrive at this conclusion by a route somewhat different from that taken by MR. JUSTICE STEWART.

To withstand judicial scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause, gender-based distinctions must "serve important governmental objectives and must be substantially related to achievement of those objectives." *Craig v. Boren*, 429 U. S. 190, 197 (1977). See *Orr v. Orr*, — U. S. —, — (1979); *Stanton v. Stanton*, 421 U. S. 7, 14 (1975); *Reed v. Reed*, 404 U. S. 71 (1971). We have recognized in various contexts the importance of a State's interest in minimizing potential problems in identifying the natural father of an illegitimate child. See, e. g., *Caban v. Mohammed*, — U. S. —, — n. 14 (1979) (adoptions); *Lalli v. Lalli*, — U. S. —, — (1978) (inheritance); *Gomez v. Perez*, 409 U. S. 535, 538 (1973) (child support). Indeed, we have sought to avoid "impos[ing] on state court systems a greater burden" in determining paternity for purposes of wrongful death actions. *Weber v. Aetna Casualty & Surety Co.*, 406 U. S. 164, 174 (1972).

*I also agree with Mr. JUSTICE STEWART that the classification of § 105-1307 affects only fathers of illegitimate—*not* the illegitimate themselves—and therefore that this case differs substantially from those in which we have found classifications based upon illegitimacy to be unconstitutional. See, e. g., *Trimble v. Gordon*, 430 U. S. 762 (1977).

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

February 14, 1979

Re: No. 78-3 Parham v. Hughes

Dear Potter:

Please join me.

Sincerely,

Mr. Justice Stewart

Copies to the Conference

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

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE JOHN PAUL STEVENS

February 12, 1979

Re: 78-3 - Parham v. Hughes

Dear Potter:

Please join me.

Respectfully,



Mr. Justice Stewart

Copies to the Conference