JOEL E. OGLE
COUNTY COUNSEL
and
GEORGE F. HOLDEN
DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL

318 Hall of Records Santa Ana, California



APR 5 1946



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

CENTRAL DIVISION

GONZALO MENDEZ, et al.

Petitioners,

vs.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT OF ORANGE COUNTY, et al.

Respondents.

No. 4292 M

RESPONDENTS STATEMENT OF POINTS ON WHICH THEY INTEND TO RELY ON APPEAL

THE RESPONDENTS AND APPELLANTS intend to rely upon the following contentions on the Appeal:

I

That the District Court lacked jurisdiction over the subject matter:

- (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.

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

II

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

## III

That the District Court erred in denying the Motion of Respondents to Dismiss Action.

IV

That the Conclusions of Law are not supported by the Findings of Fact.

That Conclusions of Law No. IV is not supported by the Findings of Fact and that said Conclusion of Law is contrary to law.

VI

That the District Court's Conclusions of Law No. V, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII and XIII are not supported by the Findings of Fact and are erroneous as not being supported by law.

VII

That the District Court erred in over-ruling Defendants objections to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

## VIII

The Findings of Fact show that the District Court lacked jurisdiction over the subject matter:

- (a) It appears from the Findings of Fact that no substantial Federal question is involved.
- (b) It appears from the Findings of Fact that the action of regulations complained of are not sanctioned or made pursuant to any law, rule or regulation of the State of California.

DATED: This # day of April, 1946.

JOHL E. OGLE, COUNTY COUNSEL and

GEORGE F. HOLDEN, DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSE

Attorneys for Respondents.

-3-

0

## INDBX

	ra en
Answer of El Modeno School District, et al.,	14
Answer of Gerden Grove Blementery School District of Grange County, et al	24
Answer of Sente Ana City Schools, et al.,	19
Answer of Westminster School District of Orange County, et al	29
Appeals	
Bond on	72
Designation of Record on	80
Notice of	71
Statement of Points on	75
Bond on Appeal	72
Compleint (Petition)	2
Conclusions of the Court	34
Designation of Record on Appeal	80
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	53
Judgment and Injunction	69
Minute Order Entered April 16, 1945,	13
Names and Addresses of Attorneys	1
Notice of Appeal	71
Notice of Motion to Dismiss Petition	11
Petition	2
Respondents' Objections to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	
Ruling on Respondents' Objections to Findings of Feet	
and Conclusions of Law	68
Statement of Doints on inner!	72