



The Valley's Voice for Choice
National Organization for Women
San Fernando Valley/ Northeast Los Angeles Chapter
P.O. Box 7141 Van Nuys CA 91409-7141 (818) 769-2035
info@sfnnow.org www.sfnnow.org

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: November 12, 2005

FOR INFORMATION: Jan B. Tucker

DEMONSTRATION AGAINST SUPREME COURT NOMINEE

SAMUEL ALITO

Where: Corner of Ventura Blvd/Van Nuys Blvd., Sherman Oaks

When: November 16, 2005, 5:00 p.m. -6:30 p.m.

The San Fernando Valley/Northeast Los Angeles Chapter of the National Organization for Women (SFV/NELA NOW) has called a demonstration at the corner of Ventura Blvd and Van Nuys Blvd in Sherman Oaks for November 16, 2005 beginning at 5:00 p.m. to protest the nomination of Judge Samuel Alito to the United States Supreme Court. Demonstrators will seek signatures on petitions and urge passing motorists to get involved in the campaign to keep Alito off the U.S. Supreme Court.

Background on Alito

Going farther than any other judge on his circuit, Judge Alito argued in 1991 that, under his interpretation of the Constitution, a state can require women to notify their husbands before they are allowed to have an abortion. Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey, Alito dissent.

Judge Alito's opinions consistently demonstrate that he would make it easier for judges to dismiss discrimination cases before they ever get to a jury, and would erect procedural hurdles for plaintiffs seeking justice in employment cases. Sheridan v. E. I. DuPont de Nemours and Co. (dissent, sex discrimination) Bray v. Marriott Hotels (dissent, race discrimination).

Judge Alito wrote the Court of Appeals decision that Congress did not have the power to require state governments to comply with the provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act. Three years later, in an opinion written by William Rehnquist, the Supreme Court took the opposite position, upholding the right of Congress to require state and local governments to follow FMLA. Chittister v Department of Community and Economic Development, Alito opinion.

Judge Alito argued to uphold a police strip search of a woman and her ten year old daughter who were at home when the police executed a search warrant, even though the warrant specified a search of the premises and one named person, a male. Alito said that a reasonable police officer could have reasonably assumed that the warrant gave them the right to search other people. Doe v. Groody, dissent.

Judge Alito joined in a circuit court decision that women students who were sexually abused by fellow students do not have a civil rights action for deprivation of their civil rights (42 U.S.C 1983) because the state did not have a special duty to care for them. In criticizing the majority opinion, one dissenter said, "we owe immature school children attending public school who are seriously injured as a result of a policy of deliberate indifference to their danger no less a remedy than we are willing to provide to incarcerated criminals." D.R. v. Middle Bucks Area Vocational Technical School.