

FILED

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE MAY 28 1993

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, NORTHERN DIVISION

CLERK
U. S. DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DIST. OF ALA.

CAK

JOHN DILLARD, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CRENSHAW COUNTY, ALABAMA, et al.,

Defendants.

- CV 87-T-1154-N, City of ASHLAND
- CV 87-T-1161-N, BIBB County Board of Education
- CV 87-T-1162-N, BIBB County Commission
- CV 87-T-1175-N, City of CENTREVILLE
- CV 87-T-1176-N, Town of CHEROKEE
- CV 87-T-1182-N, Town of CLIO
- CV 87-T-1183-N, COFFEE County Board of Education
- CV 87-T-1187-N, Town of COLLINSVILLE
- CV 87-T-1190-N, Town of COTTONWOOD
- CV 87-T-1191-N, Town of COURTLAND
- CV 87-T-1197-N, City of DECATUR
- CV 87-T-1198-N, Town of DETROIT
- CV 87-T-1207-N, FAYETTE County Board of Education
- CV 87-T-1208-N, FAYETTE County Commission
- CV 87-T-1212-N, City of FLORENCE
- CV 87-T-1213-N, City of FOLEY
- CV 87-T-1218-N, Town of GEORGIANA
- CV 87-T-1219-N, Town of GLENWOOD
- CV 87-T-1220-N, City of GORDO
- CV 87-T-1230-N, Town of HAYNEVILLE
- CV 87-T-1233-N, City of HEFLIN
- CV 87-T-1234-N, HOUSTON County Board of Education
- CV 87-T-1237-N, Town of JEMISON
- CV 87-T-1243-N, City of LINDEN
- CV 87-T-1244-N, City of LINEVILLE
- CV 87-T-1245-N, City of LIPSCOMB
- CV 87-T-1247-N, City of LIVINGSTON
- CV 87-T-1254-N, Town of MAPLESVILLE
- CV 87-T-1260-N, City of MOULTON
- CV 87-T-1267-N, Town of NORTH JOHNS
- CV 87-T-1268-N, Town of NOTASULGA
- CV 87-T-1269-N, City of OPP
- CV 87-T-1271-N, Town of PARRISH
- CV 87-T-1276-N, City of PIEDMONT
- CV 87-T-1278-N, Town of PINCKARD
- CV 87-T-1283-N, RANDOLPH County Board of Education
- CV 87-T-1286-N, Town of RIVERSIDE

34

CV 87-T-1288-N, City of RUSSELLVILLE
CV 87-T-1290-N, City of SHEFFIELD
CV 87-T-1294-N, City of SULLIGENT
CV 87-T-1301-N, Town of TOWN CREEK
CV 87-T-1303-N, TUSCALOOSA County Board of Education
CV 87-T-1305-N, Town of VINCENT
CV 87-T-1308-N, City of WARRIOR
CV 87-T-1312-N, Town of WEDOWEE

ORDER

By agreement of the parties, it is ORDERED:

(1) That the motion for further relief, filed by plaintiffs on January 27, 1992, is denied without prejudice and with leave to renew at a later time;

(2) That, if renewed, the motion shall relate back to the original motion of January 27, 1992, and shall be subject to all orders, pleadings, agreements, etc., entered into by the parties since January 27, 1992; and

(3) That the court retains jurisdiction in all of the above cases.

It is the intent of this order that, should the motion be renewed in a case, neither the plaintiffs nor the defendants shall be prejudiced in any way by the denial of the motion this date.

DONE, this the 28th day of May, 1993.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE