

IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
MONROE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
PLAINTIFF,

versus

CIVIL ACTION NO. 8366

MAE LUCKY, REGISTRAR OF
VOTERS OF OUACHITA PARISH,
LOUISIANA, AND THE STATE
OF LOUISIANA, ET AL.,

DEFENDANTS.

PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED FINDINGS
OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,
AND DECREE

EDWARD SHAHEEN
United States Attorney

BURKE MARSHALL
Assistant Attorney General
JOHN DOAR
DAVID NORMAN
FRANK DUNBAUGH
ALEXANDER ROSS
Attorneys
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
MONROE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) CIVIL ACTION NO. 8366
)
) PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED
 MAE LUCKY, REGISTRAR OF) FINDINGS OF FACT,
 VOTERS OF OUACHITA PARISH,) CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,
 LOUISIANA, AND THE STATE) AND DECREE
 OF LOUISIANA, ET AL.,)
)
 Defendants.)
 _____)

Proposed Findings of Fact

1. This suit was filed on July 11, 1961, by the Attorney General of the United States under the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as amended (42 U.S.C. 1971). The Complaint alleges that the defendants have engaged in acts and practices which have deprived citizens of the right to register and to vote in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, without distinction of race or color.

2. The defendants in this case are Mae Lucky, Registrar of Voters of Ouachita Parish, the State of Louisiana, the Citizens' Council of Ouachita Parish,

Louisiana, and seventeen individuals who conducted a purge of the voter registration rolls in the spring of 1956.

- (a) Mae Lucky has been the Registrar of Voters of Ouachita Parish since January 2, 1953. As registrar of voters her function is to receive applications for registration from prospective electors and to determine whether or not they are qualified to register to vote. It is also her function to see to it that qualified voters remain on the registration rolls and are not unjustifiably removed therefrom. Mrs. Lucky resides in and maintains her office at Monroe, Louisiana, in Ouachita Parish.
- (b) The defendant Citizens' Council of Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, is a corporation which was incorporated under the laws of the State of Louisiana at Monroe, Louisiana, on March 2, 1956. One of the objections and purposes of the Citizens' Council is to maintain white political supremacy and racial segregation in Louisiana. One of the immediate reasons for organizing the Citizens' Council of Ouachita Parish was the dissatisfaction of its organizers with the patterns of Negro voting in Monroe, Louisiana.

(c) Defendants John J. Feeback, James O. Dorris and L. Allen West were the incorporators and first Board of Directors of the defendant Citizens' Council. Defendant Dr. D. L. Anderson was Chairman of the Board of Directors of the defendant Citizens' Council in April and May 1956. The other officers of the defendant Citizens' Council at that time were: defendants Billye L. Adams, President; Walter B. Reed, Vice President; and Vaughn L. Phelps, Secretary. Defendants Rev. H. L. Driskell and Aguilla Greer Rivers, Jr., were members and defendant Felix Edward Brossett was an employee of the defendant Citizens' Council during the spring of 1956. The other individual defendants, Wesley D. Burdine, Antham Bevel Johnston, Lawrence H. Fox, Algernon Clark Ransom, Wirt H. Dean, James C. Ussery and Don L. Williams, all acted under the direction and supervision of the officers of the defendant Citizens' Council while engaged in the challenging of Negro voters in the spring of 1956.

3. In 1960 there were 40,185 white persons and 16,377 Negroes of voting age in Ouachita Parish.

4. In 1953 Ouachita Parish adopted the permanent registration system by which all persons who have registered to vote since January 1, 1949, have not had to re-register unless their names were stricken from the voting rolls.

5. As of the time of the Democratic Party primary election for State officers in January 1956 there were 21,274 white voters and 4,518 Negro voters permanently registered to vote in Ouachita Parish. As of December 7, 1963, the date of the last Democratic Party primary election for State officers there were 28,532 white persons and 1,142 Negroes on the registration rolls.

6. Prior to 1956, persons in Ouachita Parish were able to become registered voters if they possessed the qualifications of age, citizenship and residence, and were not disqualified by reason of convictions. Applicants for registration to vote were not required to read or to interpret any part of the state or federal constitutions or to take any test of literacy, intelligence or knowledge. Applicants were given whatever assistance they needed in order to fill out their applications sufficiently to provide the registrar with the information she needed to register the applicants. The application card was used for informational purposes and not as a test. The registrar did not grade application cards for errors or omissions. The registrar filled out application cards for applicants and permitted other persons to fill out cards for applicants.

7. In the spring of 1956 the defendant Citizens' Council and the individual defendants initiated a purge of the voter registration rolls by challenging the registration status of approximately 4,000 Negro voters and a token number of white voters. On the basis of these challenges the defendant registrar issued Citations of Notice to Erase to each of the challenged voters and removed from the voter registration rolls all those challenged voters who did not satisfy her retention procedures. Under the retention procedures established by the defendant registrar it was impossible for the registrar's office to process, within the allotted time, all challenged voters who sought to be retained on the rolls. In order to be retained on the rolls challenged voters were required to produce three voters to make affidavits in their behalf. The registrar placed unreasonable limitations on the use of such affidavits. Only 917 of the challenged Negro voters were able to retain their registration status by filing affidavits.

8. During the period June 1956 through August 1957 the registrar conducted a purge of the voter registration rolls of Ouachita Parish. She examined the application cards of persons then registered to vote and challenged the registration status of voters on the ground that their applications contained alleged omissions and errors. In selecting the applications

for challenge she applied more stringent standards to Negroes than she applied to white persons. Negroes, but not white persons, were challenged for age computation errors and for omissions in the blanks calling for "other" and "last" registration. Persons who were challenged by the registrar during this period were required to re-register in order to remain on the registration rolls. From June 1956 through August 1957, the registrar challenged 5,383 of the 24,361 white persons and 1,448 of the 1,616 Negroes then registered to vote. Among those challenged by the registrar were 845 of the 917 Negroes who had been challenged by the Citizens' Council and retained by Affidavit of Retention. At least ninety-two Negro school teachers were challenged by the registrar in 1956.

9. In conducting the re-registration of voters purged from the rolls in 1956 and 1957 the registrar applied more stringent procedures, tests and standards to Negroes than she applied to white persons. During June 1956, only 132 of 334 applications of Negroes were accepted while all but two of the 1,365 applications of white persons were accepted. During the entire period June 1956 through August 1957 the registrar accepted 3,896 of the 3,971 applications of white persons and only 579 of the 1,186 applications of Negroes.

10. One of the discriminatory devices used by the registrar to prevent the purged Negroes from becoming re-registered was the constitutional interpretation test.

This test was adopted by the registrar in the spring of 1956 at the request of the Citizens' Council. It was used from 1956 through August 1961. During this period 12,459 white persons became registered to vote and only sixty-five applications of white persons were rejected on the basis of the interpretation test. During the same period 1,139 Negroes became registered and 517 applications of Negroes were rejected for registration on the ground that the applicant failed to interpret a constitutional section to the satisfaction of the registrar. According to the registrar, 293 of these rejected Negroes filled out correct application cards. At least eleven Negro school teachers were rejected for registration for failure to interpret to the registrar's satisfaction.

11. Also in the spring of 1956, concurrently with the Citizens' Council purge, the registrar commenced using the application form as a strict test for Negroes, but not for white persons. The application card had never previously been used as a test for any applicants. During the eight years, 1956 through 1963, over 26% of the Negro applicants were rejected solely on the ground that their applications contained alleged errors or omissions. Less than 3% of the white applicants were rejected on similar grounds. At least twenty-six Negro school teachers have been denied registration to vote on the grounds that they failed the application card test.

Negro applicants have been rejected for such technical reasons as one day age miscomputations and striking out the wrong "have" in the character statements so that the statement reads, "I have (~~have~~ not) been convicted . . .". White applicants on the other hand have been accepted for registration although their applications contained alleged errors and omissions. The registrar has also assisted white applicants in filling out the application form usually by pointing out their errors to them and permitting them to make corrections.

12. During the eight years, 1956 through 1963, 17,022 applications of white persons have been accepted and 668 (or 3.8%) of the applications of white persons have been rejected for registration. During the same period 1,512 applications of Negroes have been accepted, while 1,435 (or 48.8%) of the applications of Negroes have been rejected for registration.

13. The registrar has deprived Negroes but not white persons of the opportunity to apply for registration to vote by imposing arbitrary and unreasonable requirements for proof of identity and proof of length of residence.

(a) From at least 1959 until July 1961 Negroes were required, as a prerequisite to making application, to produce two registered voters from their ward and precinct to identify them by affidavit. The registrar placed arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions

on the number of times a voter could identify applicants. These restrictions further minimized the opportunity of Negro citizens in Ouachita Parish to become registered to vote. White persons were not required to have identifying vouchers.

- (b) Since July 1961 the registrar has imposed as a condition prerequisite to making application that prospective applicants establish that they have resided in Ouachita Parish for six months or more by producing three documents. Each of the three documents must bear the applicant's name and must be dated to show that it is more than six months old but no older than two years. Each document must show an address in Ouachita Parish. One must have the present address of the applicant. At the time this requirement was adopted only about 5% of the adult Negro population of Ouachita Parish was registered, while a substantial majority of white persons of voting age were on the voter rolls.

14. The registrar conducted periodic examinations of the application cards of registered Negro voters during the years 1958 through 1960. In each of these years she went entirely through the file of Negroes registered in Monroe comparing the addresses given by

the registrant with the listings in the city directory and telephone book. Once during these three years she conducted such an examination in the file of Negro voters for West Monroe and the rural wards. On the basis of these "address checks" she challenged the registration status of every Negro voter for whom she found any discrepancies no matter how slight. She only conducted one address check in the file of white voters in Monroe and then did not challenge white voters for minor discrepancies. She never conducted such an examination in the file of white voters in West Monroe or the rural wards. As a result of her "address checks" the registrar challenged over half of the Negroes then registered to vote and only about 3% of the white voters. Many qualified Negro voters were unjustifiably challenged and removed from the rolls. The challenged Negro voters were often not given adequate notice of the challenge lodged against their registration status. On at least one occasion the registrar sent a challenge letter to Negro voters residing in a rural ward telling them to come to the registrar's office "if there is any change in your address or name". Negro voters who did not respond to this letter were removed from the registration rolls even though there had been no change in their addresses or names. The registrar sent challenge letters to the residence address rather than the mailing address of challenged Negro voters even when she knew that they would not receive mail there. She also sent

such letters to the old address of Negro voters who had moved, although she knew their new address.

15. In 1959 the registrar examined the application card of each Negro then registered to vote in Ouachita Parish and recomputed the age in years, months and days. She challenged the registration status of each Negro voter whose age computation she determined to be incorrect. All Negro voters so challenged who sought reinstatement were required to re-register by taking all of the registration tests. If they failed any of these tests they were denied registration. As a result of these challenges for age miscomputations 153 or nearly 20% of the Negro voters of Ouachita Parish were challenged. No white voters were challenged for age miscomputation, although about 5,000 of the applications of white persons registered at that time contained such errors.

16. The acts and practices found in Findings 8 through 15 hereof constitute deprivations of the right of Negro citizens to register to vote without distinction of race. These deprivations have been and are pursuant to a pattern and practice of discrimination.

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This Court has jurisdiction of this action under 42 U.S.C. 1971(d) and under 28 U.S.C. 1345.

2. The Attorney General is authorized to institute this action on behalf of the United States under 42 U.S.C. 1971(c) to obtain relief against acts and practices by the defendants which would deprive other persons of rights and privileges secured by 42 U.S.C. 1971(a).

3. The State of Louisiana is properly joined as a party defendant pursuant to Section 601(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1960, 42 U.S.C. 1971(c).

4. Acts and practices of the defendant registrar which violate 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) are also the acts and practices of the defendant State. (Civil Rights Act of 1960, Sec. 601(b)).

5. 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) forbids any distinctions in the voting process, including registration for voting, based upon race or color.

6. The defendant Citizens' Council and the individual defendants, in challenging the registration status of Negro voters in Ouachita Parish in the spring of 1956 engaged in acts and practices under color of law which were racially discriminatory in purpose and effect in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The challenges having been unlawful were null,

void and ineffective for any purpose and the Negro voters taken off the registration rolls as a result of these challenges were accordingly illegally removed therefrom.

7. The participation by the defendant registrar in the discriminatory purge of Negro voters conducted by the defendant Citizens' Council was in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The defendant registrar removed the names of nearly all of the challenged Negro voters from the voter rolls, knowing that it was a purge of Negroes and not of white voters. These acts of the defendant registrar are attributable also to the defendant State. See 42 U.S.C. 1971(c).

8. The purge of voters in Ouachita Parish conducted by the defendant registrar during the period June 1956 through August 1957 was racially discriminatory and was in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

9. The use by the defendant registrar of more stringent procedures, tests and standards for Negro applicants than for white applicants in conducting the re-registration of voters who had been purged from the rolls in 1956 and 1957 was racially discriminatory and in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

10. The use by the defendant registrar of the interpretation test between 1956 and 1961 as a pre-requisite to registration to vote discriminated against Negro applicants for registration in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

11. The purge of Negro voters in 1959 by the defendant on the ground that these voters had miscomputed their ages when they registered was discriminatory and arbitrary and in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

12. The fact that the defendant registrar has over an eight-year period, 1956-1963, rejected 48% of the applications of Negroes and has accepted 96% of the applications of white persons creates the presumption that Negro citizens have been deprived of the right to vote without distinction of race or color; and in the absence of proof by the defendants that the rejected Negroes were not qualified under the standards and requirements applied to the accepted white persons, discrimination must be found.

13. The use by the defendant registrar of the application form as a strict test for Negro applicants but not for white applicants is in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

14. The practice of denying registration to Negro applicants in Ouachita Parish on the ground that they make errors or omissions on their application forms while giving assistance to white applicants in filling out their application forms so as to avoid such errors and omissions is in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

15. The practice of denying registration to Negro applicants in Ouachita Parish on account of errors or omissions on their application forms where, despite these errors and omissions, their applications show them to possess all of the substantive qualifications and none of the disqualifications to vote under Louisiana law, is wholly unreasonable and arbitrary and in violation of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

16. The practice of denying to Negroes in Ouachita Parish the opportunity to apply for registration on the ground that they did not produce two registered voters from their respective ward and precinct to identify them is unreasonable and arbitrary and in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. This violation was aggravated by the practice of the defendant registrar of restricting the number of times a voter could identify applicants.

17. The adoption and use by the defendant registrar in 1961 of the requirement that applicants for registration must establish proof of six months residence in Ouachita Parish by producing three satisfactory documents are in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. This requirement is arbitrary and unreasonable and places a heavier burden upon Negroes, who constitute the unregistered class, than upon white persons, the majority of whom were already registered when the requirement was invoked.

18. The practice of the defendant registrar of periodically combing through the registration records of Negro voters, comparing their addresses with those listed in current directories, and removing from the voter rolls those Negro voters as to whom discrepancies are found and who did not respond to letters of challenge based on such discrepancies is discriminatory and arbitrary and in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

19. The progressive raising of registration standards and requirements in Ouachita Parish at a time when a majority of the white persons of voting age were already permanently registered but only a token percentage of the Negroes of voting age were registered is in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

20. Negro citizens of Ouachita Parish are "otherwise qualified by law to vote" within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) if they possess all of the qualifications and none of the disqualifications under Louisiana law, as those qualifications and disqualifications are actually applied by the Registrar of Voters of Ouachita Parish in registering other persons.

PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED DECREE

Pursuant to the Findings of Fact and the Conclusions of Law entered this date:

1. This Court finds specifically that the defendants have engaged in acts and practices which have deprived Negro citizens in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, of the right secured by 42 U.S.C. 1971(a), and that the deprivations of this right have been and are pursuant to a pattern and practice of racial discrimination.

2. The Citizens' Council of Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, and the individual defendants, to wit: Billye L. Adams; Dr. D. L. Anderson; Felix Edward Brossett; Wirt H. Dean; James O. Dorris; Rev. H. L. Driskell; John J. Feedback; Vaughn L. Phelps; Walter B. Reed; Aguilla Greer Rivers, Jr.; James C. Ussery; L. Allen West; Wesley D. Burdine; Lawrence H. Fox; Antham Bevel Johnston; Algernon Clark Ransom; Don L. Williams, individually and as members or agents of the Citizens' Council, and all persons acting in concert with them, are hereby enjoined from causing or initiating challenges or filing any affidavits of challenge which have as their purpose or effect discrimination based upon race or color against the registrants of Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, and from engaging in any other acts or practices which would interfere with the rights of any citizens of the United States to vote in any election.

3. Mae Lucky, Registrar of Voters of Ouachita Parish, and the State of Louisiana, their deputies, agents and successors, are hereby enjoined from:

(a) Giving any legal effect whatsoever to the challenges filed in the office of the Registrar of Voters of Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, against Negro registrants of that Parish since 1955.

(b) Permitting the names of any of the Negro voters thus challenged to remain off the permanent and current rolls of qualified voters of Ouachita Parish, Louisiana.

The purpose of this subparagraph is to require the Registrar of Voters of Ouachita Parish to do whatever is necessary to be done to reinstate within a reasonable time from the date of this Decree upon the permanent rolls of qualified voters in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, the names of all the Negroes who were challenged and removed from the voter rolls since 1955 and who have not subsequently become registered or become disqualified by reason of death, conviction, or removal from the Parish.

(c) Acting upon or giving any effect to any challenges of registrants in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, which may hereafter be filed which

have as their purpose or effect discrimination against Negroes on account of their race or color.

- (d) Challenging registrants in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, for technical errors, omissions, age miscomputations, or for any reason which has as its purpose or effect discrimination against Negroes on account of their race or color.
- (e) Challenging or removing from the voter registration rolls registrants in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, for discrepancies between their application card addresses and the addresses listed for them in the city directory, telephone book or any other source, without substantial proof such registrant does not possess the residence required to be a registered voter in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana.

4. It is further ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the defendant State of Louisiana and the defendant Mae Lucky, Registrar of Voters of Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, their agents, officers, employees, successors in office and all persons in active concert with them be and each hereby is enjoined

from engaging in any act or practice which involves or results in distinctions of race or color in the registration of voters in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana. Specifically, each of said defendants and persons is enjoined from:

- (a) Applying different and more stringent registration qualifications, requirements, procedures or standards to Negro applicants for registration than those which have been applied to white applicants since January 1949 in determining whether or not such applicants were or are qualified to register to vote in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana.
- (b) Failing to register applicants who meet the following qualifications:
 - (1) He is a citizen of not less than 21 years of age;
 - (2) He has resided in the State, Parish and precinct the required period;
 - (3) He is not disqualified by reason of bad character or conviction of a disqualifying crime; and
 - (4) He is literate and is able to demonstrate his ability to read and write by copying a portion of the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States.

- (c) Using the application form (LR-1) in any manner or for any purpose different from and more stringent than that for which it has been used in registering white persons in Ouachita Parish since January 1949. Specifically, the application form is to be used to obtain and record essential information from which it can be determined whether applicants possess the qualifications set forth in sub-paragraphs (b)(1)-(3) above. The application form is not to be used as an examination or test. No applicant for registration whose application form shows that he meets the substantive qualifications prerequisite to voting under Louisiana law shall be denied registration because of errors or omissions on his application form.
- (d) Requiring applicants for registration to prove their residence by documentary evidence or by any other method other than by their statements under oath.
- (e) Requiring applicants for registration to prove their identity by producing registered voters to identify them or by requiring any other unreasonable means of identification.

5. It is further ORDERED that said defendants in applying the above qualifications shall comply with the following standards and procedures:

- (a) Applicants who possess these qualifications must be registered, and it is the duty of the Registrar to determine whether the applicants possess these qualifications.
- (b) If from the information contained on the application form the Registrar is unable to determine whether the applicant possesses the qualifications of citizenship, age, residence, or if the Registrar is unable to determine whether the applicant is disqualified by reason of bad character or conviction of a disqualifying crime, then the Registrar should obtain the necessary information either by pointing out the deficiency to the applicant and permitting him to supply the necessary information on his application form, or by questioning the applicant and noting the necessary information on his form. If the information supplied by the applicant on his application form would disqualify him from registration if true, the registrar shall call this fact to his attention to insure that the information is correct and

if it is incorrect permit the applicant to correct his answers if he so desires. It is the duty of the registrar to determine whether the applicant is qualified for registration to vote and the registrar cannot justify the rejection of any applicant on the ground that the registrar does not have sufficient information about the applicant from which to determine whether the applicant is qualified, unless the applicant refuses to furnish the necessary information after the insufficiency has been called to his attention.

6. It is further ORDERED that the defendant Registrar shall notify each rejected applicant for registration of the specific reason for his rejection.

7. It is further ORDERED that the said defendants, within a reasonable time, place upon the current and permanent registration rolls of Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, the names of the Negro citizens who since 1955 have applied for and been denied registration to vote in Ouachita Parish and whose application forms show them to possess the substantive qualifications set forth in paragraph 4(b) of this Decree; unless, however, within a reasonable time the defendants by affidavit show to the Court that any such person should not be placed upon the rolls by reason of death, removal from the Parish, conviction of a disqualifying crime, or subsequent registration. As the determination is

made as to each such person that he is among those to be placed upon the current and permanent registration rolls of Ouachita Parish, he shall be notified that his name has been placed on the permanent voter registration rolls. The defendants shall file with the Clerk of this Court on or before the fifteenth day of each month commencing the second month following the date of this Decree a written report reflecting their progress during the preceding month in complying with this paragraph.

8. It is further ORDERED that the defendant registrar submit to the Clerk of this Court in writing and a copy thereof to the plaintiff on or before the fifteenth day of each month commencing the second month following the date of this Decree and until further orders of this Court, a report which shall include:

- (1) The date and places applications were received during the preceding report period and the hours during which the registrar was available to receive applications.
- (2) The action taken by the registrar on each application for registration during the preceding report period which, with respect to accepted applications, will

state the name and race of the applicant and date of application, and with respect to rejected applications, the name and race of the rejected applicant, the date of application, and the specific reason for his rejection.

- (3) The action taken by the registrar in removing registrants from the rolls during the preceding report period, which, with respect to each removed registrant, will state the name and race of the registrant, the date of original registration, the date removed from the rolls, and the specific reason for removal. If the reason for removal is something other than the death of the registrant or the registrant's failure to vote in the immediately preceding four years, the report shall state how the reason for removal came to the attention of the registrar and shall contain a sworn statement from the registrar describing in detail any examination of the voter rolls that took place for the purpose of determining whether

persons currently registered were to be challenged and removed. If such examination of the rolls does not cover every ward and precinct of the parish, the sworn statement shall state what wards and precincts, or parts of wards and precincts were covered, and the reason or reasons for not including all the others.

9. It is further ORDERED that defendant registrar make available at the office of the registrar all registration records of Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, for inspection and photographing by agents of the United States at any and all reasonable times.

The costs incurred in this proceeding to date are hereby taxed against the defendants.

Done this day of , 1964.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I served the foregoing Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decree, together with the Plaintiff's Brief and Appendix in support thereof, upon Honorable Jack P. F. Gremillion, Attorney General for the State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Honorable Harry J. Kron, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Albin P. Lassiter, District Attorney for the Fourth Judicial District, Monroe, Louisiana, and William Shaw, Attorney, Homer, Louisiana, attorneys for the defendants, by mailing copies thereof to them at said addresses by United States Air Mail, postage prepaid, on this 25th day of September, 1964.

ALEXANDER C. ROSS