

1 JOEL E. OGLE, COUNTY COUNSEL
2 By George F. Holden, Deputy
3 318 Hall of Records
4 Santa Ana, California

FILED

MAY 5 - 1945

EDMUND I. SMITH, Clerk
By *[Signature]*
Deputy Clerk

7 IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
8 FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 CENTRAL DIVISION

10 GONZALO MENDEZ, et al, :
11 :
12 vs Petitioners, : No. 4292-M
13 WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT : ANSWER OF EL MODENO SCHOOL DISTRICT,
14 OF ORANGE COUNTY, et al, :
15 Respondents. : et al.

16 COMES NOW Respondent, El Modeno School District and Henry Camp-
17 bell, Theodore Hower, Clarence Johnson, as Trustees, and Harold Hammar-
18 sten, Superintendent, and severing from their co-respondents herein,
19 in answer to the Petition herein admit, deny and allege as follows:

20 FIRST DEFENSE

21 That Petition fails to state a claim against these respondents
22 or any of them upon which relief can be granted.

23 SECOND DEFENSE

24 That the Court lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter in
25 that:

- 26 (a) It appears upon the face of said Petition that
27 there is no substantial Federal question involved.
28 (b) It appears that this is not a suit at law or in
29 equity authorized by law to be brought by any
30 person to redress the deprivation, under color
31 of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, cus-
32 tom, or usage, of any State, of any right, privi-
lege or immunity secured by the Constitution of
the United States, or any right secured by any
law of the United States providing for equal
rights of citizens of the United States, or of
all persons within the jurisdiction of the United
States.

D✓

1 (c) That it does not appear from said Petition that
2 the action or regulations complained of are
3 sanctioned or are pursuant to any law, rule or
4 regulation of the State of California.

5 THIRD DEFENSE

6 These Respondents admit the allegations contained in Paragraphs
7 I, II, III, IV, V, VI and XVII of the Petition.

8 These Respondents deny generally and specifically all of the
9 allegations contained in Paragraphs VII, VIII, XV, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXII,
10 XXIII and XXV of the Petition.

11 These Respondents have no information sufficient to form a
12 belief as to the matters set forth in Paragraphs IX, X, XI, XII and XIV
13 of the Petition.

14 In answer to Paragraph XIII of said Petition, Respondents admit
15 that Lorenzo Ramirez is the father and next of friend of Ignacio, Sil-
16 verio and Jose Ramirez, who live and reside in the El Modeno School
17 District, but deny generally and specifically all other allegations
18 contained therein.

19 In answer to Paragraph XVI of said Petition, Respondents admit
20 that Petitioners are entitled to the equal enjoyment of school privi-
21 leges and facilities maintained by the El Modeno School District insofar
22 as Petitioner Lorenzo Ramirez is concerned, but deny generally and
23 specifically each and every other allegation contained in said paragraph.

24 In answer to Paragraph XXI of said Petition, Respondents admit
25 that Petitioners are entitled to such equal accomodations, advantages
26 and privileges and to equal rights and accomodations, advantages and
27 privileges, and to equal rights and treatment with other persons as
28 citizens of the United States in the use and enjoyment of the facilities
29 of said schools and to equal treatment with other persons and to equal
30 protection of the laws in their use and enjoyment of said privileges, but
31 deny generally and specifically each and every other allegation contained
32 in said paragraph.

FOURTH DEFENSE

In further defense to said Petition, Respondents allege that the

1 El Modeno School District maintains two school buildings upon one cam-
2 pus in said district;

3 That there are admitted to one of the school buildings in said
4 district approximately two hundred sixty pupils of Mexican descent;

5 That said pupils come from families of Mexican descent living
6 together in communities in said district;

7 That said persons speak the Spanish language among themselves
8 in their homes and that a large number of children from said families
9 who reach the age for compulsory school attendance are unfamiliar with
10 and unable to speak the English language;

11 That for the efficient instruction of pupils from said families,
12 El Modeno School District has found it desirable to separate said pupils
13 from English speaking pupils residing in said district;

14 That for the purpose and for the benefit of said pupils, and to
15 give them instruction in the aforesaid subject separate and apart from
16 the English speaking pupils, the Board of Trustees of said district
17 have determined that it is for the best interests of said pupils of
18 Mexican descent and for the best interests of the English speaking pup-
19 ils that said groups be educated separately;

20 That to carry out said policy, the Board of Trustees established
21 a rule requiring that persons of Mexican descent who were unfamiliar
22 with the English language be required to attend one of the schools set
23 apart by said Board for said purpose;

24 That the school established by said Board of Trustees for the
25 instruction of said pupils of Mexican descent furnishes all of the
26 facilities and all the instruction that is furnished to pupils in the
27 other school of said district;

28 That the teachers employed to instruct the pupils in the Mexican
29 school have the same qualifications and are paid the same salary and
30 are as efficient as are the teachers provided for the other school main-
31 tained by said School District;

32 That at the aforesaid school maintained for pupils of Mexican

1 descent who are unfamiliar with the English language, said district
2 employs eight teachers;

3 That in the other school maintained for the English speaking
4 pupils of said district, the enrollment of pupils is one hundred seven-
5 teen and in said school four teachers are employed;

6 That in the school building maintained for the instruction of
7 English speaking pupils there are enrolled approximately twenty-two
8 pupils of Mexican descent;

9 That these respondents do not have and never have had a rule,
10 regulation or custom that would deny the admission of any pupil to a
11 school within said district solely for the reason that said pupil was
12 of Mexican or Latin descent.

13 WHEREFORE, these Respondents pray that this action be dismissed
14 and that these Respondents have judgment for their costs herein incur-
15 red.

16 JOEL E. OGLE, COUNTY COUNSEL

17 By George F. Holden
18 Deputy County Counsel
19 Attorney for Respondents

20 DATED: May 3rd 1945
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ss

2 COUNTY OF ORANGE

3 Henry S Campbell, being first duly sworn, deposes
4 and says: That he is one of the Respondents in the above-entitled
5 action; that he has read the foregoing Answer and knows the contents
6 thereof; and that the same is true of his own knowledge, except as to
7 the matters which are therein stated upon his information or belief,
8 and as to those matters that he believes it to be true.

Henry S Campbell

11 SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to
12 before me this 1st
13 day of May,
14 1945.

My Commission Expires Jan. 4, 1948

16 Ella Fenton
17 Notary Public in and for said
18 County and State.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

JOEL E. OGLE, COUNTY COUNSEL
By George F. Holden, Deputy
318 Hall of Records
Santa Ana, California

FILED

MAY 5 - 1945

EDMUND L. SMITH, Clerk

By *Edmund L. Smith*
Deputy Clerk

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CENTRAL DIVISION

GONZALO MENDEZ, et al

Petitioners,

vs

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
OF ORANGE COUNTY, et al,

Respondents.

No. 4292-M

ANSWER OF GARDEN GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DISTRICT OF ORANGE COUNTY, et al

COMES NOW Respondent, Garden Grove Elementary School District of Orange County and William C. Noble, Robert B. Smith and Paul Applebury and James L. Kent, Superintendent, as Trustees of said school district, and severing from their co-respondents herein, in answer to the Petition herein admit, deny and allege as follows:

FIRST DEFENSE

That Petition fails to state a claim against these respondents or any of them upon which relief can be granted.

SECOND DEFENSE

That the Court lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter in that:

- (a) It appears upon the face of said Petition that there is no substantial Federal question involved.
- (b) It appears that this is not a suit at law or in equity authorized by law to be brought by any person to redress the deprivation, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State, of any right, privilege, or immunity secured by the Constitution of the United States, or any right secured by any law of the United States providing for equal rights of citizens of the United States, or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

D ✓

1 (c) That it does not appear from said Petition that
2 the action or regulations complained of are
3 sanctioned or are pursuant to any law, rule or
4 regulation of the State of California.

5 THIRD DEFENSE

6 These respondents admit the allegations contained in Paragraphs
7 I, II, III, IV, V, VI and XVII of the Petition.

8 These respondents deny generally and specifically all of the
9 allegations contained in Paragraphs VII, VIII, XV, XVI, XVIII, XIX,
10 XX, XXII, XXIII and XXV of the Petition.

11 These respondents have no information sufficient to form a belief
12 as to the matters set forth in Paragraphs IX, X, XI, XIII and XIV of
13 the Petition.

14 In answer to Paragraph XII of said Petition, these respondents
15 deny that Arthur and Sally Palomino live or reside in the Garden Grove
16 Elementary School District, and these respondents have no information
17 or belief as to the other allegations in said paragraph.

18 In answer to Paragraph XXI, these respondents admit that Peti-
19 tioners are entitled to such equal accomodations, advantages and privi-
20 leges and to equal rights and accomodations, advantages and privileges,
21 and to equal rights and treatment with other persons as citizens of the
22 United States in the use and enjoyment of the facilities of said schools
23 and to equal treatment with other persons and to equal protection of
24 the laws in their use and enjoyment of said privileges, but deny gener-
25 ally and specifically each and every other allegation contained in
26 Paragraph XXI.

27 FOURTH DEFENSE

28 In further defense to said Petition, these respondents allege
29 that the Garden Grove Elementary School District of Orange County main-
30 tains four elementary school buildings;

31 That there are residing in said district approximately two hun-
32 dred families of Mexican descent;

That a large percentage of said families live in communities in
said district wherein reside persons of Mexican or Latin descent;

1 That said persons speak the Spanish language among themselves
2 in their homes and that a large number of children from said families
3 who reach the age for compulsory school attendance are unfamiliar with
4 and unable to speak the English language, and

5 That a large percentage of said persons residing in said communi-
6 ties have not been instructed in or are familiar with the proper rules
7 of personal hygiene.

8 That for the efficient instruction of pupils from said families,
9 the Garden Grove Elementary School District has found it desirable to
10 instruct said pupils at different locations than are provided for the
11 instruction of pupils who are familiar with the English language and
12 who are more advanced according to the American standards in personal
13 hygiene.

14 That for the purpose and for the benefit of said pupils, and to
15 give them instruction in the aforesaid subjects separate and apart from
16 the English speaking pupils, the Board of Trustees of said district
17 have determined that it is for the best interests of said pupils of
18 Mexican descent and for the best interests of the English speaking
19 pupils, that said groups be educated separately during the period that
20 they are in the lower grades.

21 That to carry out said policy, the Board of Trustees established
22 a rule requiring that persons of Mexican descent who were unfamiliar
23 with the English language be required to attend one of the schools set
24 apart by said board for said purpose, and

25 That such pupils should attend said schools until they acquired
26 some efficiency in the English language or until they had completed the
27 fifth grade.

28 That the school established by said Board of Trustees for the
29 instruction of said pupils of Mexican descent furnishes all of the
30 facilities and all the instruction that is furnished to pupils in the
31 other schools of said district;

32 That the teachers employed to instruct the pupils in the Mexican

1 schools have the same qualifications and are paid the same salary and
2 are as efficient as are the teachers provided for the other schools
3 maintained by said school district;

4 That, these respondents do not have and never have had a rule,
5 regulation or custom that would deny the admission of any pupil to a
6 school within said district solely for the reason that said pupil was
7 of Mexican or Latin descent.

8 WHEREFORE, these respondents pray that this action be dismissed
9 and that these respondents have judgment for their costs herein incur-
10 red.

11 JOEL E. OGLE, COUNTY COUNSEL

12 By George J. Holder
13 Deputy County Counsel
14 Attorney for Respondents

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
DATED: May 3rd 1896

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ss

COUNTY OF ORANGE

James L. Kent, being first duly sworn, deposes and says: That he is one of the Respondents in the above-entitled action; that he has read the foregoing Answer and knows the contents thereof; and that the same is true of his own knowledge, except as to the matters which are therein stated upon his information or belief, and as to those matters that he believes it to be true.

James L. Kent
Dist. Supt.

SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to before me this 2nd day of May, 1945.

Estelita Calen
Notary Public in and for said County and State.

My commission expires May 27, 1946

JOEL E. OGLE, COUNTY COUNSEL
By George F. Holden, Deputy
318 Hall of Records
Santa Ana, California

FILED

MAY 5 - 1945

EDMUND L. SMITH, Clerk

By *E. L. Smith*
Deputy Clerk

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CENTRAL DIVISION

GONZALO MENDEZ, et al, :

Petitioners, :

No. 4292-M

vs :

ANSWER OF SANTA ANA CITY SCHOOLS, et al

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
OF ORANGE COUNTY, et al, :

Respondents. :

COMES NOW Respondent, Santa Ana City Schools and George R. Wells,
Hiram M. Currey, James K. Givens, Daniel W. Stover and George J. Bus-
dieker, its Board of Education; and Frank A. Henderson and Harold Yost,
its Superintendent and Secretary, and severing from their co-respondents
herein, in answer to the Petition herein admit, deny and allege as
follows:

FIRST DEFENSE

That Petition fails to state a claim against these respondents
or any of them upon which relief can be granted.

SECOND DEFENSE

That the Court lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter in
that:

- (a) It appears upon the face of said Petition that there is no substantial Federal question involved.
- (b) It appears that this is not a suit at law or in equity authorized by law to be brought by any person to redress the deprivation, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State, of any right, privilege, or immunity secured by the Constitution of

D✓

1 the United States, or any right secured by
2 any law of the United States providing for
3 equal rights of citizens of the United States,
4 or of all persons within the jurisdiction of
5 the United States.

6 (c) That it does not appear from said Petition
7 that the action or regulations complained of
8 are sanctioned or are pursuant to any law,
9 rule or regulation of the State of California.

10 THIRD DEFENSE

11 These respondents admit the allegations contained in Paragraphs
12 I, II, III, IV, V, VI and XVII of the Petition.

13 These respondents deny generally and specifically all of the
14 allegations contained in Paragraphs VII, VIII, XV, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXII,
15 XIII and XIV of the Petition.

16 These respondents have no information sufficient to form a be-
17 lief as to the allegations contained in Paragraphs IX, X, XII, XIII and
18 XIV of the Petition.

19 In answer to Paragraph XI of said Petition, respondents admit
20 that William Guzman is the father and next of friend of Billy Guzman,
21 who lives and resides within the Santa Ana school system, but deny each
22 and every other allegation therein contained.

23 In answer to Paragraph XVI of said Petition, respondents admit
24 that Petitioners are entitled to the equal enjoyment of school privi-
25 leges and facilities maintained by the Santa Ana City Schools insofar
26 as Petitioner William Guzman is concerned, but deny generally and
27 specifically each and every other allegation contained in said paragraph.

28 In answer to Paragraph XXI of said Petition, respondents admit
29 that Petitioners are entitled to such equal accommodations, advantages
30 and privileges and to equal rights and accommodations, advantages and
31 privileges, and to equal rights and treatment with other persons as
32 citizens of the United States in the use and enjoyment of the facilities
of said schools, and to equal treatment with other persons and to equal
protection of the laws in their use and enjoyment of said privileges, but
deny generally and specifically each and every other allegation con-
tained in Paragraph XXI.

1 In the zone served by the Roosevelt School, 25% of the persons
2 residing in said zone are of Mexican descent and the percentage of Mexi-
3 can pupils attending said school is 25% of the attendance.

4 In the zone served by the Muir School, 45% of the persons resid-
5 ing in said zone are of Mexican descent and the percentage of Mexican
6 pupils attending said school is 45% of the attendance.

7 In the zone served by the Lincoln School, 10% of the persons
8 residing in said zone are of Mexican descent and the percentage of Mexi-
9 can pupils attending said school is 10% of the attendance.

10 That these respondents do not have and never have had a rule,
11 regulation or custom that would deny the admission of any pupil to a
12 school within said district solely for the reason that said pupil was
13 of Mexican or Latin descent.

14 That all of the schools established and maintained by said Board
15 of Education in said Santa Ana School District, whether attended by
16 Mexicans or others, are maintained upon an equal basis;

17 That equal facilities are furnished to each of the schools and
18 that equal instruction and courses of study are provided in all of said
19 schools maintained by said district.

20 WHEREFORE, these respondents pray that this action be dismissed
21 and that these respondents have judgment for their costs herein incurred.

22 JOEL E. OGLE, COUNTY COUNSEL

23
24 By George F. Halden
25 Deputy County Counsel
26 Attorney for Respondents

27
28
29
30
31
32
DATED: May 3rd / 1945

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SS

2 COUNTY OF ORANGE

3 F. A. Henderson, being first duly sworn, deposes and
4 says: That he is one of the Respondents in the above-entitled action;
5 that he has read the foregoing Answer and knows the contents thereof;
6 and that the same is true of his own knowledge, except as to the matters
7 which are therein stated upon his information or belief, and as to those
8 matters that he believes it to be true.

9
10
11 Francis A. Henderson

12 SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to
13 before me this 30th
14 day of April,
15 1945.

16
17 Hawkins
18 Notary Public in and for
19 said County and State.
20 My Commission Expires Nov. 24, 1945

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

JOEL E. OGLE, COUNTY COUNSEL
By George F. Holden, Deputy
318 Hall of Records
Santa Ana, California

FILED

MAY 5 - 1945

EDMUND L. SMITH, Clerk
By *[Signature]*
Deputy Clerk

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CENTRAL DIVISION

-----	:	
GONZALO MENDEZ, et al,	:	
	:	
Petitioners,	:	No. 4292-M
vs	:	
	:	ANSWER OF WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT	:	OF ORANGE COUNTY, et al
OF ORANGE COUNTY, et al,	:	
	:	
Respondents.	:	

COMES NOW Respondent, Westminster School District of Orange County and J. A. Houlihan, Lewis Conrady, Ray Schmitt, as Trustees and J. Harris, Superintendent of said school district, and severing from their co-respondents herein, in answer to the Petition herein admit, deny and allege as follows:

FIRST DEFENSE

That Petition fails to state a claim against these respondents or any of them upon which relief can be granted.

SECOND DEFENSE

That the Court lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter in that:

- (a) It appears upon the face of said Petition that there is no substantial Federal question involved.
- (b) It appears that this is not a suit at law or in equity authorized by law to be brought by any person to redress the deprivation, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State, of any right, privilege, or immunity secured by the Constitution of the United States, or any right secured by any law of the United States providing for equal rights of citizens of the United States, or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

D✓

1 (c) That it does not appear from said Petition that
2 the action or regulations complained of are
3 sanctioned or are pursuant to any law, rule or
4 regulation of the State of California.

5 THIRD DEFENSE

6 These respondents admit the allegations contained in Paragraphs
7 I, II, III, IV, V, VI and XVII of the Petition.

8 These respondents deny generally and specifically all of the
9 allegations contained in Paragraphs VII, VIII, XV, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXII,
10 XXIII and XXV of the Petition.

11 These respondents have no information sufficient to form a
12 belief as to the allegations contained in Paragraphs IX, XI, XII and XIII.

13 In answer to Paragraph X of said Petition, these respondents
14 admit that Gonzalo Mendez is the father and next of friend of Sylvia,
15 Gonzalo and Geronimo Mendez, who live and reside in the Westminster
16 School District, but deny each and every other allegation therein con-
17 tained.

18 In answer to Paragraph XIV of said Petition, these respondents
19 admit that Thomas Estrada is the father and next of friend of Clara,
20 Roberto, Francisco, Syria, Daniel and Evelina Estrada, who live and
21 reside in the Westminster School District, but deny each and every other
22 allegation therein contained.

23 In answer to Paragraph XVI of said Petition, these respondents
24 admit that Petitioners are entitled to the equal enjoyment of school
25 privileges and facilities maintained by the Westminster School District
26 insofar as Petitioners Gonzalo Mendez and Thomas Estrada are concerned,
27 but deny generally and specifically each and every other allegation
28 contained in said paragraph.

29 In answer to Paragraph XXI of said Petition, respondents admit
30 that Petitioners are entitled to such equal accommodations, advantages
31 and privileges and to equal rights and accommodations, advantages and
32 privileges, and to equal rights and treatment with other persons as
citizens of the United States in the use and enjoyment of the facilities
of said schools, and to equal treatment with other persons and to equal

1 protection of the laws in their use and enjoyment of said privileges,
2 but deny generally and specifically each and every other allegation
3 contained in Paragraph XXI.

4 FOURTH DEFENSE

5 In further defense to said Petition, respondents allege that
6 the Westminster School District operates and maintains two elementary
7 schools;

8 That there are residing in said district many families of Mexi-
9 can descent;

10 That a large percentage of said families live in communities
11 in said district wherein reside persons of Mexican or Latin descent;

12 That said persons speak the Spanish language among themselves
13 in their homes and that a large number of children from said families
14 who reach the age for compulsory school attendance are unfamiliar with
15 and unable to speak the English language, and

16 That for the efficient instruction of pupils from said families,
17 the Westminster School District has found it desirable to instruct said
18 pupils at different locations than are provided for the instruction of
19 pupils who are familiar with the English language;

20 That for the purpose and for the benefit of said pupils, and
21 to give them instruction in the aforesaid subject separate and apart
22 from the English speaking pupils, the Board of Trustees of said District
23 have determined that it is for the best interests of said pupils of
24 Mexican descent and for the best interests of the English speaking
25 pupils, that said groups be educated separately during the period they
26 are in the lower grades;

27 That to carry out said policy, the Board of Trustees established
28 a rule requiring that persons of Mexican descent who were unfamiliar
29 with the English language be required to attend a school set apart by
30 said Board for said purpose;

31 That such pupils should attend said school until they acquired
32 some efficiency in the English language;

1 That the school established by said Board of Trustees for the
2 instruction of said pupils of Mexican descent furnishes all of the
3 facilities and all the instruction that is furnished to pupils in the
4 other school of said district;

5 That the teachers employed to instruct the pupils in the Mexi-
6 can school have the same qualifications and are paid the same salary
7 and are as efficient as are the teachers provided for the other school
8 maintained by said School District;

9 That these respondents do not have and never have had a rule,
10 regulation or custom that would deny the admission of any pupil to a
11 school within said district solely for the reason that said pupil was
12 of Mexican or Latin descent.

13 WHEREFORE, these Respondents pray that this action be dismissed
14 and that these Respondents have judgment for their costs herein incur-
15 red.

16 JOEL E. OGLE, COUNTY COUNSEL

17 By George F. Holden
18 Deputy County Counsel
19 Attorney for Respondents

20 DATED: May 3rd 1945
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ORANGE

ss

Louis Conroy

being first duly sworn, deposes and says: That he is one of the Respondents in the above-entitled action; that he has read the foregoing Answer and knows the contents thereof; and that the same is true of his own knowledge, except as to the matters which are therein stated upon his information or belief, and as to those matters that he believes it to be true.

Louis Conroy

SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to before me this 30 day of April, 1945.

My Commission expires October 6, 1947

O. A. Thomas

Notary Public in and for said County and State.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, }
County of Los Angeles } ss.


being by me first duly sworn, deposes and says: That _____ he is _____

in the foregoing and above entitled action; that _____ he has _____ read the foregoing _____

and knows the contents thereof; and that the same is true of h_____own knowledge, except as to the matters which are therein
stated upon h_____information or belief, and as to those matters that _____ he believes it to be true _____

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this }
_____ day of _____, 19____. }

Notary Public in and for said County and State.



AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE BY MAIL — 1013A, C. C. P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, }
County of Los Angeles } ss.

_____, being first duly

sworn, says: That affiant is a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County of _____;

that affiant is over the age of eighteen years and is not a party to the within and above entitled action; that affiant's ^{residence} business
address is _____

That on the _____ day of _____, A.D., 19____, affiant served the
within _____

on the _____ in said action, by placing a true copy thereof
in an envelope addressed to _____ ^{residence} at the business

address of said _____, as follows: _____

and by then sealing said envelope and depositing the same, with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States Post Office
at _____ That there is delivery service by United States mail at the place so

addressed _____ there is a regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and the place so addressed.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this }
_____ day of _____, 19____. }

Notary Public in and for said County and State.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CENTRAL DIVISION

No. 4292-M

GONZALO MENDEZ, et al.,

Petitioners,

XXXXXXXX

vs.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
OF ORANGE COUNTY, et al.,

XXXXXXXX
Respondents

Attorney for _____

Received copy of the within _____ this _____ day of _____, 19 _____

Attorney for _____

Received copy of the within _____ this _____ day of _____, 19 _____

Attorney for _____