

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....ii

INTEREST OF THE *AMICUS CURIAE*.....1

INTRODUCTION.....2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....3

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....6

ARGUMENT.....7

I. RESPONDENTS’ RACE-BASED REFUSAL TO PROMOTE PETITIONERS IS SUBJECT TO STRICT SCRUTINY ANALYSIS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE.....7

II. RESPONDENTS’ RACE-BASED DECISION TO DISREGARD THE EXAM RESULTS AND NOT PROMOTE PETITIONERS FAILS STRICT SCRUTINY.....9

A. Respondents have not articulated any compelling interest that would justify their racially motivated denial of Petitioners’ earned promotions.9

B. Respondents’ action was not narrowly tailored. .10

III. ALLOWING THE RESPONDENTS’ ACTION TO PASS OR EVADE STRICT SCRUTINY WILL UNDERMINE PUBLIC POLICY AND ENCOURAGE RACE-BASED HIRING PRACTICES.....11

CONCLUSION.....13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200
(1995).....*passim*

Hunter v. Erickson, 393 U.S. 385
(1969).....7

*People Who Care v. Rockford Board of Educ.,
Sch. Dist. No. 205*, 111 F.3d 528 (CA7 1997)....10, 12

Washington v. Davis, 426 U.S. 229 (1976).....7, 10

CONSTITUTION

U.S. Const. Amdt. XIV, §1*passim*