UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA LAFAYETTE-OPELOUSAS DIVISION

: DOCKET NO. 65-10912 MARILYN MARIE MONTEILH,

Plaintiff, :

: December 19, 2008 VS.

SCHOOL BOARD OF ST. LANDRY PARISH, :

Defendant. : Lafayette, Louisiana

REPORTER'S OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE TUCKER L. MELANCON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

REPORTED BY:

LARAE BOUKQUE, NIN, United States Court Reporter

Stroot Ste. 3103 800 Lafayette Street, Ste. 3103 Lafayette, Louisiana 70501

APPEARANCES

MARION OVERTON WHITE
Law Office of Marion Overton White
511 E. Landry St.
Opelousas, LA 70570

NORMAN J. CHACHKIN (Via Telephone) 36 Cedar Dr. Accord, NY 12404-6002

LISA M. TAYLOR (Via Telephone)
U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division
601 D St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20580

DONALD W. WASHINGTON
United States Attorney
Western District of Louisiana
800 Lafayette St., Ste. 2200
Lafayette, LA 70501

KATHERINE W. VINCENT Assistant U.S. Attorney 800 Lafayette St., Ste. 2200 Lafayette, LA 70501

> ADAM GERARD CASWELL Attorney at Law P.O. Box 1600 Eunice, LA 70535

PROCEEDINGS

2 (Call to order of the court.)

THE COURT: All right. The first matter before the Court today is Civil Action Number 65-10912, Marilyn Marie Monteilh and others vs. the St. Landry Parish School Board.

The matter before the Court is the hearing that was fixed on this date in regards to the motion filed by the St.

Landry Parish School Board on September 26th asking this Court to adopt one of three proposed school reorganization plans based on the instructions of this Court and bringing it to the school board's attention after numerous meetings over the last almost eight years with the school board members in this courtroom on the record, most, some not, and even more numerous conferences with the attorneys for the parties. The United States — the motion of the school board that I made reference to is Record Document Number 209 of this proceeding.

The United States and the original plaintiff each filed objections to the school board proposed plans. The United States' objection was Record Document Number 215. The original plaintiff's objections are Record Document 216.

This matter was originally set for hearing to present their position relating to the plan and that hearing date was set for December the 17th -- or excuse me. The previous date was set for -- Mr. Caswell, if you could help me right quick, when were we set for, or anybody?

1 MR. CASWELL: It was originally set for the 18th, I think.

THE COURT: I apologize. No. The first time before that.

THE CLERK: Judge, it was November 17th.

THE COURT: November 17th.

And because of this Court's -- this judge being the presiding judge in Criminal Action Number 06-60006, United States of America vs. Mehmood M. Patel, which originally started with the initial jury selection on August 25th which had to be set aside, our work, because of Hurricane Ike, and the second selection process -- that was Hurricane Gustav that set that aside. Then the second hurricane, Hurricane Ike, delayed us and we started on September 17th and that jury now is deliberating. So that's the reason for the delay in getting you all here.

Now, the Court, through its law clerk, was notified that the parties had indicated they had reached an agreement on the reorganization plan, and so what I perceive it to be, when this matter was set and rescheduled as a contradicting hearing, it may be that — if my information is correct and I have every reason to believe it is — that we will — the parties will just describe what they've done.

The Court has indicated previously to the lawyers in conversations during the course of the last several weeks that if they -- I was very familiar with all three plans. The plan that,

in my view, came closest to constitutional muster as presented to the Court was Plan Number 2, and there were some modifications, I believe, that needed to be made from the government and the original plaintiff's perspective.

And, again, I hadn't made that determination and I would have heard evidence as to all three plans, but —— and I don't want to make light of a very serious matter, but most of this stuff as it comes to school desegregation cases is very old law, very established law. After all, Brown vs. the Board was decided over 54 years ago and most of the case law implementing Brown occurred in this circuit. The United States Court of Appeal for the Fifth Circuit is the leading court as far as implementing what the Supreme Court mandated. So it seemed clear to me at that juncture, without going into the minutiae of it, which obviously the government and the original plaintiffs did.

And with that brief introduction of how it is we got here, I would like for the attorneys, starting with the attorney for the original plaintiff and then the government, to identify themselves for the record.

And I will say it is my belief, based on what I was told before I came in here, that we have attorneys that are participating for the United States and the original plaintiffs by telephone.

So when it gets to their opportunity, after the attorneys who are here and present in court, to identify

1 themselves, I would like the attorney who's on the phone for the 2 original plaintiffs to identify himself immediately after 3 Mr. White. 4 So, Mr. White, if you would identify yourself for the 5 record. 6 MR. WHITE: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning. 7 Overton White for the original plaintiff, Monteilh. 8 MR. CHACHKIN: Your Honor, this is Norman Chachkin. 9 I'm an attorney for the original plaintiffs participating by 10 telephone. I appreciate the Court allowing us to do that. 11 THE COURT: How's the weather up there, Mr. Chachkin? MR. CHACHKIN: We're waiting for the snow to start. 12 13 They're predicting 15 inches. 14 THE COURT: Well, good luck and God bless you. 15 MR. CHACHKIN: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, this is Lisa Taylor 17 representing the United States with offices in Washington, D.C. 18 We're also participating by phone. 19 MS. VINCENT: Katherine Vincent for the United States 20 for the United States Attorney's Office. 21 MR. WASHINGTON: Don Washington, United States 22 Attorney, Western Louisiana. 23 MR. CASWELL: Good morning, Your Honor. Gerard Caswell

THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Caswell, let me just

24

25

representing the school board.

cut to the chase on this. Is my information from the school board's perspective accurate?

I've read the media accounts, and I have to say that our friends in the media, I know they do the best they can to relay what actually transpires, but sometimes in proceedings that I'm involved in, I was there and I read what happens to have been said about what happened there, it's not exactly the way I saw it, but, at any rate, I know everybody does the best they can all the time.

Are we in a position that I've been led to believe that there's an agreement, that in the paper that I read, it reported that there was a ten to two vote, with the president not voting as the presiding officer, in favor of a plan that you must have represented to your members that met the muster of the original plaintiffs and the government and that you had discussed with the Court and the other attorneys had discussed with the Court if this is done? Is that accurate?

MR. CASWELL: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

As you indicated earlier, Plan 2 as originally filed by the school board by agreement and hopefully today by joint motion will be presented in a slightly revised fashion. That revision of that plan was approved by the school board Wednesday evening of this week by a vote, as you've said, of ten to two allowing that to be submitted as an agreed to resolution of this matter.

Prior to its presentation to the board, it was agreed

to in writing by the original plaintiffs through their counsel and by the United States through their counsel and, of course, by myself dependent upon the board approving same.

It has been approved. We do have a joint motion signed by all parties. The two counsel participating by telephone did sign it and then PDF'd their signatures over here, and we have that on a document along with the original signatures of myself, Ms. Vincent and Mr. White.

And I do have the board's demographer present with copies of the exhibits of the actual modifications that took place to Plan 2 as filed. And what we did is we redid the mapping such that the exhibits show the entirety of Plan 2 now as amended, not just the amendments, and we'll make that the exhibits to this motion. It will be various maps as well as the plan summary detailing what the plan does, and we would -- we'll get copies of that shortly from Mr. Hefner for the Court's filing if that is what the Court wishes us to do.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Caswell.

Mr. White, from the original plaintiff's perspective, has Mr. Caswell accurately reflected where it is that the original plaintiffs maintain we are?

MR. WHITE: That is correct, Your Honor, and we agreed to that plan as per our slight modification.

THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Chachkin, is that your view up in the cold north waiting on the snow?

MR. CHACHKIN: Yes, it is, Your Honor. That's why I

PDF'd my signature to Mr. Caswell for presentation to the Court.

THE COURT: And, Ms. Taylor, is that your appreciation of the situation where we are at this juncture?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Ms. Vincent?

MS. VINCENT: Same here, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let me say then I'm certainly going to approve this plan that's been agreed to by the parties. I don't want to be accused of hyperbole, and when people use certain terms, most of the time it is hyperbole, and the term I'm speaking of is historic, but within the context of this case, what the St. Landry Parish School Board did by a ten to two vote evening before last is certainly historic.

Those members of the school board, as well as the lawyers in this case and the superintendent and the superintendent's predecessor, have known almost since the very first day that I became actively involved in this case that the facilities issue along with student assignment was, to use the metaphor, the 800-pound gorilla in this case, and with the school board's action under the guidance of its very able counsel, they got rid of the 800-pound gorilla two nights ago or night before last.

And there has been a lot of -- well, acrimony is a good word, but a lot of misunderstanding among not only the general

public, but among some school board employees as well about where this case was, the role of this court or any court within the context of a school desegregation case, but I would submit that the heavy lifting that the school board accomplished night before last, if it weren't so heavy, would have been done a long time ago and this case would have been over with a long time ago.

St. Landry Parish with its history is not dissimilar to most of our parishes in our state, particularly the more rural parishes, and I don't know what the number is now, but as of about four years ago we still had 40 of our 64 districts under school desegregation orders, some 50 years at that time after Brown vs. the Board of Education.

And much of it as I have written and said is the fault of the judiciary and the good men at that time because we had — unfortunately, until only relatively recently, women weren't judges, but the good men of the day, if it wasn't brought to them, didn't go out and try to conclude the business because this is — this is terrible work for any judge. You're affecting people's children which are literally their most prized possessions. So this is truly, within the context of this case, historic.

The St. Landry Parish School Board as a group -- and I understand the practical and political consequences of the members who could not support this plan, I do, but they ought to be congratulated. They have followed their oath and have

complied -- their oath of office and complied with the laws and constitution of the United States.

And I am going to also say that the new superintendent
-- and he's not really new anymore, but he's new to this case
relative to the Court's involvement, direct involvement in this
case.

Mr. Nassif, Superintendent Nassif, deserves great credit and he has gone through some very, very adverse times. He followed in the wake of in my view -- and I am prejudiced toward the memory of Lanny Moreau because I worked with that man for well over five years before he passed away.

And I told Mr. Nassif, Superintendent Nassif, the first time I met him, I said, Lanny Moreau never told me one thing that he didn't absolutely follow through on and that's how he earned the Court's respect, and I will say that Superintendent Nassif has done just the same. So I thank him very much.

I also want to thank my friend, Mr. Hefner, for the fine work that he did yet again in another case. I believe it to be true that without his assistance to the St. Landry Parish School Board in this case and his reputation in the legal community based on the work he's done in other cases, school desegregation cases and others, the board would not have been able to come together. He put them in a position where this could have happened night before last.

And, lastly, from the school board's position, Gerard

Caswell, I've already called him able counsel. He has — and I don't say that with any disrespect to any of the individual school board members at all. They are elected to represent their constituents' interests. It's very difficult sometimes to do what is good for the system systemwide, particularly when it's contrary to the — what many of one's constituents think is in that district's interests.

So what Mr. Caswell had many times to do was kind of like herding cats. And, again, another lawyer with less skill, integrity and respect from that board as well as the other lawyers in this case based on the history, because, he too, does what he says he's going to do, we might not have been here. So I thank all of you individually.

There have been a number of lawyers involved in this case over a number of years, but to my best belief Mr. White was here from day one. Mr. Chachkin was here from almost day one, if not day one, and had to come out of retirement or semi-retirement or whatever he's in to re-enroll and be part of this process to make sure that he didn't let one of his cases that had the opportunity to resolve itself resolve itself. So I thank both of them.

And certainly Ms. Taylor in Washington is the latest of I don't know how many. I know I am the fifth life-tenured Article III United States District Judge that has presided over this 44-year-old or almost 44-year-old case, wherever we are, and

I don't know where Ms. Taylor is, but there have been a bunch of her predecessors that were there.

Another person in the United States Department of
Justice who I have the greatest admiration and respect for is
Mr. Franz Marshall who apparently is not on this call today, but,
Ms. Taylor, if you would just for posterity sake, if for nothing
else, what is Mr. Marshall's title again -- I ought to know that
-- with the United States Department of Justice Educational
Division?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. He is the Deputy Chief of the Educational Opportunities Section which is a section within the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice.

THE COURT: And he has, to my recollection, supervision of over half or at least half of the school desegregation cases in the country, and the last time I heard a number, it was -- I think there were 300 or so out there, but, at any rate, he has been here, if not from the beginning, almost from the beginning.

And, now, Ms. Vincent who has been steering the government's ship for the last number of years, she is the latest in a long line of her predecessors. I recall Ms. Janice Hebert before Ms. Vincent. I don't go further back in history than that I don't believe, but, at any rate, I thank her for her great work.

There was a time even at the Court's instruction that Ms. Vincent sat through every St. Landry Parish School Board

meeting just to make sure that I understood what was going on and the record would reflect, so when she got to court, if I had a question, she could answer. She did that at much, I'm sure, discomfort to her family and to her own personal life because the school board, I guess, at that time was meeting when it meets now, Thursdays, at sometime later in the afternoon.

And, lastly, I want to thank the United States Attorney for this district, the Honorable Donald Washington. He has been as involved in this case and in the Evangeline Parish school desegregation case as I'm sure any United States Attorney in the United States of America has been involved in these kind of cases, I mean as far as personal involvement, being here when he could, and he's got a lot of other fish to fry, and there were times with what he said, which is in the record of this proceeding, that made a significant difference and I say that without fear of contradiction.

So, Mr. Washington, I thank you for your direct involvement. It's unusual, but it's very appreciated.

Now, I am going to instruct -- and I want to make sure everybody understands. I am going to instruct the government -- and, of course, the original plaintiffs are invited to do that, too.

I want to have a memorandum, and it will be very brief, on, under the case law, the requirements of once a *Green* factor has been satisfied structurally, if you would, how long does the

jurisprudence mandate that we make sure that plan that has been put into place actually works.

I want it to be very concise and I want to know the whole parameter from the slowest amount of time or the least amount of time, rather, that a district court has approved going in until the longest amount of time with very brief information, just a sentence or two about why, from what they read in the case, the Court did what the Court did.

Also, guidance would be the circuit courts. If there's Supreme Court jurisprudence on it, I want to know that, and the reason I want to know that is because — and I don't need to rehash history, but the school board lost the good faith that it had with this Court because of various actions that it took over the last several years up until frankly, I guess, some point in the year — the end of 2007 and certainly through this year.

And, again, using the football metaphor saying we were in the red zone, we were on the -- at one point we were on the one yard line. I said, don't fumble the ball, and from the Court's perspective, the school board fumbled the ball.

Well, with what they did the other night to get this 800-pound gorilla off of our back -- and I say "our" because whether anybody understands, believe it or not, this case, along with the other school desegregation case I have, are the most problematic from a judicial and personal perspective for this judge.

And I used to say -- he's no longer here, but there won't -- I used to say that nobody would be happier when I sign that final order of unitary status achieved and case dismissed than Lanny Moreau. The only one after that would be Tucker Melancon. Well, I can't say that exactly now, but there's not going to be anybody -- I will say there's not going to be anybody happier when I can sign that.

And with what the school board did the other night, they have restored that element of good faith in the view of the presiding judge, and it is my intention to move this case forward, to go back to the term I've used, not in this case I don't think, but in others, the old Star Trek term, at warp speed, consistent with my obligation as a United States Judge under the case law. I want to sign off on this factor as soon as I can.

And I'm going to also instruct the lawyers — I would like to have that memorandum. I know we're going into the holidays, but I would certainly like to have that by January the 20th. I haven't thought about it until I just said it, but that happens to be the day we inaugurate our new President. So I would like to have it by then, and, again, that would be from the original plaintiffs and the government.

The other thing I want and I would like to have by the same day is I want the lawyers, during the course of the new year, to go ahead and consult with each other and lay out for

this Court what it is that remains.

We've got I think -- and my memory isn't what it used to be and I've had other fish to fry, too, in the last several months. This hasn't been as big a focus as it normally might have been, but I think there are two *Green* factors and a partial *Green* factor that remain, and if that's correct, it's correct, but I want it to be laid out. This will be a joint memorandum saying -- or a statement by the original plaintiffs and the government or either one of the two concurred to by the school board saying we agree this is it.

Then I want to have a conference with the lawyers, a telephone conference, shortly after January the 20th, which will be the date for me to receive this statement saying what remains. I want to devise a plan so we can attack those remaining *Green* factors because we can't get this case dismissed and take the federal yoke from around the St. Landry Parish School Board and the school system's neck until all the *Green* factors have been complied with and signed off by the Court. So I want the plan.

And I have every reason to believe, Superintendent Nassif, that really strong vote the other night and with the able leadership and legal talent of Mr. Caswell, that whatever it is need be done can be done yet again at warp speed.

Now, I don't want anybody to misconstrue what I say here. I don't know what we have to -- what amount of time has to pass to make sure the plan that the school board adopted, which

this Court is about to sign off on, how long it must be in place before I can, under the case law from the higher courts, sign the order saying unitary status, case dismissed. That's why I say I want the shortest amount of time to the longest and the particulars for each case.

I will always to the extent of my ability, to the extent of my ability follow the constitution and laws of the United States and the guidance or the mandates of the higher courts telling me what they mean and what I'm supposed to do and how I'm supposed to interpret it, but, again, I want the point to be made here. Because of the good faith of the school board and the fine work of all of these lawyers consistent with that obligation, this case is going to be over and that factor is going to be off the table as quickly as the law allows me to do it.

Now, I suspect this would be the time to make a tender — or let me ask you, first of all, do any of the lawyers for any of the parties, starting with the original plaintiffs, then the government and then the school board, have any question about what I've asked them to provide me with by January 20th?

MR. CHACHKIN: Your Honor, this is Norman Chachkin for the original plaintiffs. We understand what the Court wants and we will work with the government to produce a joint document.

THE COURT: I take it, Ms. Taylor --

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. We also understand.

1 We're very clear about what the expected deadlines are. 2 THE COURT: Okay. And then Mr. Caswell. MR. CASWELL: Yes, sir, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: And I suspect this is the time for whatever 4 5 tender is going to be made in the form of a joint motion so this 6 Court can sign it. 7 MR. CASWELL: Yes, sir. I just need one minute to get 8 some exhibits. 9 THE COURT: You have got it. 10 (OFF THE RECORD) 11 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Caswell. 12 MR. CASWELL: Yes, sir, Your Honor. We have the joint 13 motion signed off by all the parties and the exhibits referenced 14 in it now to make a tender. 15 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Jordan, if you would present that to me. 16 MS. VINCENT: Your Honor, if I could just say something 17 18 right now. 19 THE COURT: Yes. I didn't mean to cut anybody off. If anybody wants to say anything else, I've got the motion, so go 20 21 ahead. 22 MS. VINCENT: Okay. Apparently we did receive the 23 maps, but apparently the only difference in the maps that you 24 have and the maps that were provided to us earlier, apparently 25 there were some spelling corrections.

```
2
                MS. VINCENT: And Mr. Caswell is going to get us
3
      copies.
 4
                MR. CASWELL:
                             There were a couple of school names that
 5
      actually were an oversight, some misspelling, and Mr. Hefner
 6
      corrected it and we printed the maps and brought them today.
7
      That's why I had to get them from him. I will supply everybody
8
      with the correct map. There's no substantive change whatsoever.
9
                MS. VINCENT: I haven't had an opportunity to review,
10
      but assuming that's the case, then -- and we proceed from that
11
      today, no problem.
12
                THE COURT: I have every reason to believe that's
13
      exactly the case as does the government, but with that caveat,
14
      okay, fine.
15
                MS. TAYLOR: And, Your Honor, just because we are
     participating by phone, I would like to request an identification
16
17
      of each of the titles of exhibits so that we're all on the same
18
     page.
19
               MR. CASWELL: I need to get them back.
20
                THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Jordan, if you'll hand them back
21
      to Mr. Caswell.
22
                MR. CASWELL: I'm happy to put them on the record.
23
                THE COURT: Okay. They were attached -- I'm sorry. I
24
      see what we're saying. Let me just say that when everybody is
25
      trying to move as quickly as they can even with the great
```

MR. CASWELL: Correct.

1

technology, stuff happens, so this is understandable.

MR. CASWELL: Yes, sir.

The exhibits that we are presenting are as follows:

The first map is entitled St. Landry Parish Elementary Plan 2

Revised, High School Plan 1a Revised Effective 09/10 School Year.

One second, Your Honor. I believe that's a combined map. Let me make a clarification for especially those not present, Your Honor.

Previously we had distributed the individual school zone maps to everyone so that they could see in great detail how each change was made. Mr. Hefner has since combined all of that into one map, which is the map I just identified as the St. Landry Parish Elementary Plan 2 Revised, High School Plan 1a Revised, all of the zones being on that one map.

The other PDF that goes with that is the Summary of School Attendance Plan HS1a and Elementary Plan 2 Revised as Adopted by the School Board December 17, 2008.

The individual school zone maps that were distributed to everyone and utilized by Mr. Hefner to make this one overlay that I'm now introducing as an exhibit are certainly all part of the plan. They're just individual maps. It was all put into one map for everyone so that there would be one exhibit as opposed to so many different ones.

Each individual elementary zone map previously sent out forms part of this. It's just not necessary as a separate

exhibit. And I have Mr. Hefner's assurances that they are all combined into this, and if we need Mr. Hefner on the record to do so, I'll be happy to do so.

THE COURT: I think not unless one of the lawyers would say otherwise.

MS. VINCENT: Your Honor, you know, from first blush I would agree. I would like to study it a little longer, but I don't think that will be necessary either.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let me just say this.

And, of course, one of the great things about my job is that
there's hardly anything that I can't undo that I sign with the
mere stroke of a pen.

So if there's a reason for me to do that because we need to yet amend another map for some reason, then we certainly will be able to do that on a joint motion of the lawyers for the parties or on a motion of any party.

And I can't imagine that would be necessary, that we'd have to have any kind of contradictory hearing, but we can handle that. And the point of me rushing you through this is, like I say, I've got issues I need to resolve in my criminal proceeding. So I need to get back to that as quick as I can.

MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, just for clarification, the other document that we assumed was going to be a plan summary document. Is that document being entered into evidence today?

MR. CASWELL: Yes. There were two exhibits. There was

1 the combined map and the other was the plan summary. 2 MS. TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you. 3 THE COURT: Okay. That answers the question, 4 Ms. Taylor? 5 MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. I just wanted to make 6 sure we were all on the same page. 7 THE COURT: Does anybody have any other questions 8 before I sign this? 9 Okay. Now, let me say I want to make -- I think it's 10 clear and it will remain clear again. For those citizens of St. 11 Landry Parish and anybody else that cares to look at what goes on 12 here in this courtroom in this case, I want a transcript of this proceeding to be placed on the school board website and we'll 13 14 continue that throughout the process so, again, the people who 15 can't come here to court who do the best they can to keep up with the entirety of what's said in court and not just through the 16 17 media will have that opportunity if they choose to do so. Again, 18 I want to go ahead and I'll sign this. 19 All right. I'm going to ask the lawyers that are here 20 to make sure that everything that is supposed to be going into 21 the record with this filing, the order which I just signed, is

to make sure that everything that is supposed to be going into the record with this filing, the order which I just signed, is actually here. And I see them unfolding maps. I don't know what happens to those as far as the official record, if they're redacted down and reduced in size and placed in here.

22

23

24

25

MR. CASWELL: That's what you've got in a smaller

1 version.

THE COURT: And the big copy, one of them I assume is for the Court.

MR. CASWELL: I'm sorry?

the big copy, but you can certainly have one.

THE COURT: Are one of those for the Court? I mean, what are y'all doing that for now if it's not for the Court?

MR. CASWELL: I was just sharing with opposing counsel

THE COURT: No. I don't care to have one. I guess what I'm asking you -- I can't hear right now, the way y'all are doing that. Unless you're giving it to me, y'all wait a little bit because, like I say, I've got to move on to the next matter. So I appreciate it.

Okay. Again, I thank all of you very sincerely. I congratulate all of you very sincerely. And I want to say, that I didn't say, thanks to those employees, all of them, not only in the central office, but all up and down the line from the principals and the teachers and the teachers' aides and the people who work in maintenance and at all levels of the school system.

You've been through a bunch in the last few years and you ought to be congratulated, too, and just know the calvary is on the way. It's almost over with. Y'all just hang in there and keep doing the great job to keep these kids educated in your parish. With that, does anybody else have anything to say? I

```
1
      want to go ahead and we'll go on to recess in this proceeding.
      Anybody else got anything to say?
 2
                MR. CASWELL: No, sir.
 3
                THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all very much. We are in
 4
 5
      recess.
                                               (Hearing adjourned.)
 6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA LAFAYETTE-OPELOUSAS DIVISION

MARILYN MARIE MONTEILH

:

VS.

DOCKET NUMBER 65-10912

SCHOOL BOARD OF ST. LANDRY PARISH

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, LaRae E. Bourque, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court, Western District of Louisiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing 25 pages are a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in this matter, as hereabove set forth, and that I have no interest of any nature whatsoever regarding the ultimate disposition of this litigation.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

/s/LaRae E. Bourque

LARAE E. BOURQUE, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter