FERRELL V. DALLAS I.S.D. pdf

1: Ferrell V. Dallas I.S.D.: Hairstyles in Schools (L | eBay

1. Appellants, Phillip Ferrell, Stephen Webb and Paul Jarvis, all minors, were denied enrollment at the W. W. Samuell High School of Dallas, Texas, because of their 'Beatle' type haircuts.

The photos displayed within our listings are Stock Photos provided by eBay and the publisher as a visual aid. They are not actual photos of the physical item for sale and should not be relied upon as a basis for edition or condition. Payment within in 3 days is required via Paypal. At this time, we only accept payment via Pay Pal. Free standard shipping in the US. Deliveries are made to your local post office by way of DHL Worldwide. DHL tracking information is typically visible on your eBay dashboard within business days and can be tracked at: This tracking information tracks packages from our fulfillment center to your local post office. Once tendered to USPS, delivery time is determined by your local post office. USPS does not guarantee a specified delivery time for Media Mail and deliveries may receive deferred service. All of our orders are shipped out within 2 business days M-F of receiving cleared payment. Please confirm your shipping address via Paypal as we cannot guarantee a change of address once your order has been received. Returns are accepted up to 30 days after the sale. Re-stocking fees may apply. Please contact us via email to receive return authorization. Please contact us via eBay messages if you have any questions or concerns regarding your order. Our customer service department is available M-F from 8: Our response time for email inquiries is 24 to 48 hours or 2 business days M-F. Should you submit an email inquiry on a Friday after 3: Feedback is left for buyers after purchase has been completed. Should our services meet your satisfaction, your feedback would be greatly appreciated. Should you have an issue or problem with your order, we request the opportunity to make amends or resolve the issue before feedback is left. Your satisfaction is our highest priority!

FERRELL V. DALLAS I.S.D. pdf

2: FERRELL v. DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT | Citing Cases

F. Supp. () L. W. FERRELL and Jo Ferrell, Next Friends of Phillip Ferrell, June Webb, Next Friend of Stephen Webb, and V. R. Jarvis and Margaret Jarvis, Next Friends of Paul Jarvis, Plaintiffs.

Dallas Independent School District F. March 29, , Rehearing Denied April 30, Spafford, Warren Whitham, Dallas, Tex. Wessell, New Orleans, La. Suit was brought on September 12, , in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas by their natural parents as next friends against the Dallas Independent School District for injunctive relief. Before we resolve these several contentions, we feel that a detailed statement of the facts of this case is necessary. Each has what is commonly known as a Beatle type haircut. In fact, one of them, Paul Jarvis, had cut his hair so as to attend summer school during the summer of Samuell High School for the school year was scheduled for September 7. On the evening of September 6, the business manager or booking agent of Sounds Unlimited, Mr. Lanham, at his home to discuss the matter of enrollment. However, he was told that the principal would talk only to the boys and their parents. Alexander then stated that he would bring the radio and television media to the school. Contrary to this usual procedure of enrollment, the appellants accompanied by the mothers of two of them and Mr. The principal informed the parties that pursuant to authority delegated to him as principal by the Dallas Independent School District he had established rules and regulations concerning the appearance of students at the school. Appellants advised the principal that they would not cut their hair. Accordingly, Stephen Webb and Phillip Ferrell were thereupon denied admission to the school. Paul Jarvis, whose hair had not yet attained the length of the other two, having been previously trimmed for summer school, was not refused admission until later at which time his hair had apparently grown to a point where in the opinion of the principal it would be a disturbing influence in the school. Alexander had called newspapers, radio stations and television stations to be present at the school on September 7. Alexander held a press interview, and pictures, motion pictures and sound tapes were made. For several days thereafter it was played numerous times on several radio stations. Efforts were made by or on behalf of the appellants to present their problem to higher school authorities. A conversation on September 7 between the three boys and the Assistant Superintendent of Administration was held on the steps of the school administration building. Appellants went to the office of the Superintendent tendent of Schools but the Superintendent was not there at the time. Later their attorney discussed the matter by telephone with the Superintendent. The President of the Board of Education made a public statement over television that the Superintendent would be backed by the Dallas School Board and that he approved the action of the principal. On September 8 and 9 the boys inquired into the possibility of transferring schools. They were informed by the principal that since the next period for acceptance of applications for transfer did not begin until September 21, he could not take an application for a transfer at that time. The boys also went to seven different schools on September 8 seeking to be admitted, but were unsuccessful. This fact was said to be especially true in the case of youthful entertainers, particularly rock and roll musicians. The object of such testimony was to demonstrate that long hair was no longer a rare or unusual feature among teenagers and that it had become well accepted by the younger generation. Lanham had a different story to tell about long hair. He recited several examples of the problems caused by boys wearing the Beatle type hair style in school. Lanham stated that boys with long hair were subjected to substantial harassment. Obscene language had been used by some students in reference to others with long hair and girls had come to his office complaining about the language being used. The long hair boys had also been challenged to a fight by other boys who did not like long hair. He referred to other incidents where the boys would eat in the lunch-room only with the girls and never eat with the boys. Some testified that they had encountered no problems with regard to their hair. However, some of these boys stated that remarks had been made to them by other boys about their hair. Lanham stated on numerous occasions that his decision to refuse appellants admission to school was based solely on the length and style of their hair and was not influenced by other considerations. Alexander in calling his home on the evening of September 6 and in alerting the press the next day and the fact that appellants had recorded a protest song about the matter. Lanham did state that he felt that Mr. Alexander by calling him at his home the evening before enrollment had

challenged him. Lanham stated that he viewed the recording made by appellants as directed towards him personally rather than just a general protest song about hair, and that the recording held him up to ridicule, and that he did not particularly appreciate it. He related the fact that other people had commented on the record and had observed that it did refer to him. We do not agree. The legislature also, again pursuant to the constitutional mandate, authorized the authorities of the various public schools so established to adopt such rules and regulations as they deemed proper in order to effectively manage and govern the schools. The Legislature could not possibly foresee all problems and situations that would arise in the administration of the schools. But, necessarily, school boards are given a wide discretion in such matters. Board of Trustees of University of Mississippi, U. Lanham as to the various problems which arise in the school due to the wearing of long hair by members of the student body and the testimony of certain students that their hair style had indeed created some problems during school hours, we cannot say that the requirement that appellants trim their hair as a prerequisite to enrollment is arbitrary, unreasonable or an abuse of discretion. Therefore, the school regulation as promulgated by the principal, banning long hair, is not violative of the state constitution or statutes. We conclude, after careful and thoughtful study, that the action complained of does not violate the fourteenth amendment. We shall assume, though we do not decide, for the purpose of this opinion that a hair style is a constitutionally protected mode of expression. Consequently we are confronted with the question whether a state can prohibit this type of expression in the circumstances here present without running afoul of the fourteenth amendment. Constitutional issues which arise under the Bill of Rights have been before the courts many times. The decided cases clearly demonstrate that each case must be decided in its own particular setting and factual background and within the context of the entire record before the court in determining whether the rule or the action about which complaint is made is arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable or discriminatory. This approach to the problem is clearly demonstrated by the authorities hereinafter cited as well as the following: State of Alabama, U. United States, U. People of the State of California, U. The interest of the state in maintaining an effective and efficient school system is of paramount importance. That which so interferes or hinders the state in providing the best education possible for its people, must be eliminated or circumscribed as needed. This is true even when that which is condemned is the exercise of a constitutionally protected right. Issaquena County Board of Ed. Unquestionably those wearing the buttons were exercising their protected rights of free speech and free communication of ideas. In each the students were denied admission ot or suspended from school until they acquired an acceptable haircut. These contentions were rejected by the courts in Leonard v. School Committee of Attleboro, Mass. However, the district court in Zachry v. No suggestion was made that such haircut had any effect upon the health, discipline, or decorum of the institution. Thus Zachry is essentially different from this case. Their right to follow this chosen business or occupation free from unreasonable governmental interference comes within the liberty and property concepts of the Fifth Amendment. It is common knowledge that many performers are required to use special attire and makeup, including wigs or hairpieces, for their public appearances. We find no violation of the civil rights statutes. The parties were afforded ample opportunity to present their evidence and the facts were fully developed. The parties clearly presented the controlling legal authorities to the court. Thereafter, the court rendered a full opinion in which there were findings of fact and conclusions of law, denying the motion of the appellants for a temporary injunction. We are unable to find an abuse of discretion. But in addition we call upon the schools to give our children driver training, vocational skills, public speaking, music instruction, and sex education, and to maintain their physical fitness, to carry on everbroadening athletic programs, engage in fund raising, and plan, produce and chaperone social events. Whether it should or should not do so, the American community calls upon its schools to, in substance, stand in loco parentis to its children for many hours of each school week. At the same time we expect that the requirements of order, and of protection and implementation of the educational program of the school, will be met by limited enforcement means-- the force of the school establishment itself and the school-related disciplines of reprimand, suspension, and expulsion-- recognizing that the schoolroom is an inappropriate place for the policeman to be either called or needed. Free expression is itself a vital part of the educational process. But in measuring the appropriateness and reasonableness of school regulations against the constitutional protections of the First and Fourteenth

Amendments the courts must give full credence to the role and purposes of the schools and of the tools with which it is expected that they deal with their problems, and careful recognition to the differences between what are reasonable restraints in the classroom and what are reasonable restraints on the street corner. It does seem as though this issue is something of a tempest in a teapot. However, we are faced with the problem of three teenage school children in Dallas, Texas, being denied a high school education because the length of their hair did not suit the school authorities. This of course, if true, is violative of the Fourteenth Amendment. Issaquena County Board of Education, F. It seems to me it cannot be said too often that the constitutional rights of an individual cannot be denied him because his exercise of them produces violent reaction by those who would deprive him of the very rights he seeks to assert. City of Chicago, U. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger. Speech is often provocative and challenging. It may strike at prejudices and preconceptions and have profound unsettling effects as it presses for acceptance of an idea. That is why freedom of speech, though not absolute, Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire, supra, U. It permitted conviction of petitioner if his speech stirred people to anger, invited public dispute, or brought about a condition of unrest. A conviction resting on any of those grounds may not stand. They were barred because it was anticipated, by reason of previous experiences, that their fellow students in some instances would do things that would disrupt the serenity or calm of the school. It is these acts that should be prohibited, not the expressions of individuality by the suspended students.

FERRELL V. DALLAS I.S.D. pdf

3: Ferrell v. Dallas Independent School District, F. Supp. (N.D. Tex.) :: Justia

Discusses the case in which three students in the Dallas Independent School District were suspended from school in because of their hairstyles. Edition Notes Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

December 9, L. Lanham, Defendants The opinion of the court was delivered by: Plaintiffs brought this action for an alleged violation of the right of the minor plaintiffs, Phillip Ferrell, Stephen Webb, and Paul Jarvis, to attend W. Lanham, Principal of W. Samuell High School, discriminated against the minor plaintiffs and that such action was arbitrary, discriminatory, and violated the constitutional right of plaintiffs to equal opportunity for a public education. Because of the recognized importance of an education and the importance of classroom work at the commencement of school, a temporary order requiring admission of the minor plaintiffs was granted pending hearing and was made returnable to the Court on September 22, Lanham, Principal of the W. Samuell High School, answered and among other things questioned the jurisdiction of this Court on the ground that no question arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States was before this Court. The Defendants also claimed that the alleged Federal questions were frivolous and unsubstantial, and also that the Court had no jurisdiction for the reason that plaintiffs had failed to exhaust their administrative remedies by submitting or presenting to the Board of Education of the Dallas Independent School District, State Commissioner of Education, and the State Board of Education, the alleged claim. These legal defenses were taken under advisement and the Court proceeded to hear the testimony offered by plaintiffs and Defendants. It appears from the testimony that on the morning of September 7, , the opening day of school, instead of reporting to their home rooms, as was the usual procedure, the Plaintiff Stephen Webb, accompanied by his mother, the Plaintiff Phillip Ferrell, accompanied by his mother, and Plaintiff Paul Jarvis, accompanied and represented by Kent Alexander, the booking agent of the minor plaintiffs, went to the office of Mr. Lanham, the Principal of W. The purpose of this visit was to confer with Mr. Lanham, it being understood that admission to the high school would be denied by Mr. Lanham because of the hair style of the boys. Lanham refused to admit the boys to school and advised them to get their hair cut or trimmed before coming back to enroll. The minor plaintiffs are members of a musical group or "combo" known as Sounds Unlimited, and insisted to Mr. Lanham that they were under contract with Mr. Alexander to maintain their dress and personal appearance, including the so-called "Beatle" type hair style. There seems to be little question, however, under Texas law, that this contract is unenforceable insofar as the minors are concerned. It is not over his collar, but is over his forehead and down to his eyebrows. The hair extends down to the ear lobe on the side and to the collar in the back. This hair style adopted by these plaintiffs is in conformity with the so-called "Beatle" type hair style. There are numerous pictures admitted in evidence in the record, not only of plaintiffs, but also of other musical combos, more accurately showing this Beatle type hair style. Among other things, the boys testified that they had attended W. Samuell High School the year before and that their hair during that school year had been as long as it was on September 7, After being refused admission to W. They were advised by Mr. Lanham that it was too late to make application for transfer to another high school. Within a short time the boys went to the Administration Building of the Dallas Independent School District to see the Superintendent, and according to the testimony of Paul Jarvis, were met on the steps by a Mr. Allen, whom he understood to be the Assistant Superintendent. It also appears that Mr. Lanham first told Paul Jarvis that he would be admitted, but would have to have his hair trimmed in a couple of days. However, when Jarvis went to school the next day he was advised by Mr. Lanham that the matter had been reconsidered and that he would not be admitted until he did have his hair trimmed. Plaintiffs called to the witness stand some seven young boys, ages 17 and 18, who had the Beatle type hair style, three of whom attended W. From their testimony it appeared that this type hair style had been in vogue about three to three and a half years and that some problems had developed in the beginning, but that this type of hair style was now generally accepted by other students and occasioned no difficulties at this time. One of the Mesquite High School students testified that he thought that the coaches, athletes and teachers created whatever problems developed in regard to the long hair. There was some testimony to the effect that some of the athletes at a nearby high school were now wearing the Mohawk

style haircut. Plaintiffs called Principal Lanham to the stand, and on this examination it appears that in his administration of the W. It also developed from Mr. Lanham further testified that the boys in question should have gone to their home room to get their schedules and then to later enroll, in which event he would not have seen them for possibly two or three weeks; that the Alexander phone call and the appearance of the boys at his office on the opening day of school constituted a challenge to his authority and his responsibility to maintain good order and discipline in the school. Lanham also said that there was a correlation between discipline and dress or attire. Plaintiffs also called to the stand Dr. Among other things, these administrative policies and procedures provide, Page 83, as follows:

FERRELL V. DALLAS I.S.D. pdf

4: FERRELL V. DALLAS I.S.D.: Hairstyles in Schools by Karen L. Trespacz | Kirkus Reviews

Hairstyles in School Ferrell v. Dallas I.S.D. In , Phil, Paul & Steve seniors at W.W Samuell High School were in a rock band called "Sounds Unlimited" Teachers & Parents say the issue still stands today of Hairstyles in school & School Uniforms Today The seniors hired an agent named Kent.

Under Title 42, U. Board of Education, Cahoka, Ill. Another ground for dismissal for lack of jurisdiction is that the alleged federal questions are "frivolous and unsubstantial. Board of Education of Topeka, et al. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. Board of Education, U. The Constitution of the State of Texas, Art. The problem that causes this court the most concern is whether or not the actions taken by the school authorities deprive plaintiffs of any rights guaranteed by the Constitution and Laws of the United States. These facts are considered because the determination here becomes more specifically: Were the actions of the school authorities in excluding the plaintiffs from high school unlawful under state law? This was the first part of a two-part test used in Byrd v. The remainder of the test used by the court in that case then became: There, the plaintiffs had to prove the first requirement before this second part of the test would be applied. In that case, the court assumed that state law had been violated, but determined, after consideration of recent segregation cases Brown v. Board of Education, supra, etc. Counsel for plaintiffs contend that Byrd v. Sexton is distinguishable on the grounds that it was a suit for damages and the instant case is one seeking equitable relief. The Supreme Court has made passing references to these sections as providing relief in appropriate situations[3], and has used them as a basis for granting equitable relief[4]. However, where the Court felt that the complaint established a case within the adjudicatory power of the federal courts under the statutes, or assumed that it did, it has been cautious in granting relief where to do so would interfere with state court proceedings or where "the proper balance between the States and the federal government in law enforcement" would be affected. United States, U. Minard, at page of U. These contingencies are perhaps best illustrated by Mr. Hughes, at page 16 of U. Such a problem of federal judicial control must be placed in the historic context of the relationship of the federal courts, with due regard for the natural sensitiveness of the states and for the appropriate responsibility of state courts to correct the action of lower state courts and state officials. This case has received a great deal of publicity and aroused a great deal of feeling in the community. It is felt therefore that we should say more than merely whether or not this Court has jurisdiction to rule on this case. At the outset it should be emphasized that this is a case involving high school students and their administrators; we in no way even propose to consider such a situation arising between college students and their administrators. Here the action of the school authorities was upheld. Having determined now that this court has jurisdiction of this case, what are the questions the court must resolve? There are two ways to approach this problem of authorization. The court could focus on the school administration and attempt to justify the regulation by emphasizing the educational need for an academic atmosphere and the resulting demand that disturbances be kept to a minimum. Or, it can focus more directly on the individual student and evaluate the need for regulation by examining the purpose of public school education in terms of the individual. The regulation must serve both purposes. Since confusion and anarchy have no place in the classroom, school authorities must control the behavior of their students. It puts a strain on the words to prohibit the wearing of clean, combed, long hair in the name of educational efficiency. This is especially true when the issue is long hair. The educational system suffers many minor disruptions every day; the interstudent feud that starts during school hours, and the classes that are cut to manufacture prom decorations. It should not be so finely tuned that it clogs on an extra two

inches of hair. The testimony here showed that Mr. Lanham, the Principal, acted on the basis of some prior incidents involving students with long hair. Further testimony from high school students revealed that there were no longer any disturbances resulting from long hair on boys because it "had been around three or four years and everyone was used to it. The regulation in question here arises from the generally accepted proposition that the superintendent, principal, and board of trustees may officially exercise whatever powers of control, restraint, and correction over pupils as may be reasonably necessary to "enable teachers to perform their duties and to effect the general purposes of the educational system. Two other cases involving students with long hair, although from other jurisdictions, have influenced the decision in this case. Foremost of these is the case of Marshall et al. George Oliver supra , where the U. If a state has constitutional authority to regulate the appearance of college students, a fortiori, it has the same power over high school students. The other case is Leonard et al. School Committee of Attleboro et al. This court is concerned for the welfare of the individual plaintiffs in this case, but feels that the rights of other students, and the interest of teachers, administrators and the community at large are paramount. It also appears that there is a fairly reasonable indication that this situation could have been deliberately planned by the previously mentioned "agent" for the boys. Plaintiffs contend naturally that their primary interest is to get an education, but it appears that they want this education on their own terms. It is inconceivable that a school administrator could operate his school successfully if required by the courts to follow the dictates of the students as to what their appearance shall be, what they shall wear, what hours they will attend, etc. One of the most important aims of the school should be to educate the individual to live successfully with other people in our democracy. Since the school authorities, by legislative grant, control the public educational system, their regulations play a part in the educational process. It does not appear from the facts of this particular case that there has been any abuse of discretion on the part of the school authorities. On the contrary, it appears that they acted reasonably under the circumstances, taking into consideration these individual students and the need for an academic atmosphere. The school principal felt that his authority was being challenged when the boys did not follow the usual registration procedure, but came instead to his office with the proposition that they were under contract to keep their hair "Beatle Length" and did not intend to cut it. Further, the terms upon which a public free education is granted in the high schools of Texas cannot be fixed or determined by the pupils themselves. Nor is a contract which is unenforceable against the minor plaintiffs in this State to be considered determinative of the right. The temporary restraining order is dissolved and the motion for temporary injunction is denied. This Memorandum Opinion is in lieu of findings of fact and conclusions of law. They were thus designed for a specific purpose. This history and this purpose have been noted and emphasized by the Supreme Court, Hague v. Justice Roberts, dissenting, in Screws v. Sexton, supra, F. State of Ohio, U. Board of Education, supra; United States v.

5: Ferrell v. Dallas I.S.D | Open Library

Are you sure you want to remove Ferrell www.enganchecubano.com I.S.D from your list?

6: Ferrell v. Dallas I.S.D. by Aviva Kern on Prezi

Gr As Phil Ferrell, Paul Jarvis, and Steve Webb were to begin their senior year at W. W. Samuell High School in Dallas, TX, in , the principal prohibited them from attending school because of the way they wore their hair.

7: Ferrell v. Dallas I.S.D. (edition) | Open Library

Ferrell v. Dallas Independent School District Court Decision: The final decision, after much debate, was in favor of Sounds Unlimited. They decided that the Civil.

8: Ferrell v. Dallas I.S.D.: Hairstyles in Schools

FERRELL V. DALLAS I.S.D. pdf

Ferrell v. Dallas I.S.D.: hairstyles in schools. Author: Trespacz, Karen L.

9: Accelerated Reader Bookfinder US - Book Detail

Online access temporarily down for system upgrades.

FERRELL V. DALLAS I.S.D. pdf

Importance of deen in human life On the Eastern Front The Big Book of Color in Design (Big Book (Collins Design)) Fundamentals of cost accounting 5th edition solutions manual The Secret History of Freemasonry Becoming whole again Charles Taylor (Contemporary Philosophy in Focus) Sex, class, and culture The Great Man: Sir Robert Walpole Fairfax, Vienna, Reston, Herndon, Virginia, EasyFinder The quest for efficiency River pigs cayuses Mathematical methods for physics and engineering 3rd How to do profitable business with South Africa Blue rendo for 3 guitars Under the Rattlesnake Flag Serse piano vocal score La duchesse insoumise gratuit Unnatural feelings Anthony Rudd The Louisiana Purchase in American history Transport of animals amendment rules 2001 Fundamentals of kayak navigation Contemporary financial management 12th Forever his bride Glimmer Train Summer 1997 Ursula le guin left hand of darkness American Country Antiques (Wallace-Homestead Price Guide to American Country Antiques) Learn to say no without explaining yourself Your hundred best tunes 400.1 hud handbook Step-by-step pyrography projects for the solid point machine Learning python on russian In the Circle of the Dance Antony and cleopatra shakespeare full text Biochemical engineering blanch clark Expansion of Protestant missions in the nineteenth century The Grand Finale Hotel Long gone lonesome history of country music The collaborative construction of pretend Week nine: find a mentor, be a mentor