



**LexEmetica  
Clerk**

## **Brown v. Board of Education (1954)**

### **– CASE BRIEF –**

Citation: 347 U.S. 483

Docket No.: —

Date Filed: 1954-05-17



# Brown v. Board of Education (1954) – Case Brief

---

**Case Name:**

Brown v. Board of Education

**Citation:**

347 U.S. 483

**Date Filed:**

1954-05-17

**Docket Number:**

—

**Court:**

Unknown Court

**Source URL:**

<https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/105221/brown-v-board-of-education/>

**Judges:**

Warren

**Procedural History:****Attorneys:**

Robert L. Carter argued the cause for appellants in No. 1 on the original argument and on the reargument. Thurgood Marshall argued the cause for appellants in No. 2 on the original argument and Spottswood W. Robinson, III, for appellants in No. 4 on the original argument, and both argued the causes for appellants in Nos. 2 and 4 on the reargument. Louis L. Redding and Jack Green-berg argued the cause for respondents in No. 10 on the original argument and Jack Greenberg and Thurgood Marshall on the reargument., On the briefs were Robert L. Carter, Thurgood Marshall, Spottswood W. Robinson, III, Louis L. Redding, Jack Greenberg, George E. C. Hayes, William R. Ming, Jr., Constance Baker Motley, James M. Nabrit, Jr., Charles S. Scott, Frank D. Reeves, Harold R. Boulware and Oliver W. Hill for appellants in Nos. 1, 2 and 4 and respondents in No. 10; George M. Johnson for appellants in Nos. 1, 2 and 4; and Loren Miller for appellants in Nos. 2 and 4. Arthur D. Shores and A. T. Walden were on the Statement as to Jurisdiction and a brief opposing a Motion to Dismiss or Affirm in No. 2., Paul E. Wilson, Assistant Attorney General of Kansas, argued the cause for appellees in No. 1 on the original argument and on the reargument. With him on the briefs was Harold R. Fatzer, Attorney General., John W. Davis argued the cause for appellees in No. 2 on the original argument and for

appellees in Nos. 2 and 4 on the reargument. With him on the briefs in No. 2 were T. C. Callison, Attorney General of South Carolina, Robert McC. Figg, Jr., S. E. Rogers, William R. Meagher and Taggart Whipple., J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Attorney General of Virginia, and T. Justin Moore argued the cause for appellees in No. 4 on the original argument and for appellees in Nos. 2 and 4 on the reargument. On the briefs in No. 4 were J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Attorney General, and Henry T. Wickham, Special Assistant Attorney General, for the State of Virginia, and T. Justin Moore, Archibald O. Robertson, John W. Riely and T. Justin Moore, Jr. for the Prince Edward County School Authorities, appellees., H. Albert Young, Attorney General of Delaware, argued the cause for petitioners in No. 10 on the original argument and on the reargument. With him on the briefs was Louis J. Finger, Special Deputy Attorney General., By special leave of Court, Assistant Attorney General Rankin argued the cause for the United States on the reargument, as amicus curiae, urging reversal in Nos. 1, 2 and 4 and affirmance in No. 10. With him on the brief were Attorney General Brownell, Philip Elman, Leon Ulman, William J. Lamont and M. Magdalena Schoch. James P. McGranery, then Attorney General, and Philip Elman filed a brief for the United States on the original argument, as amicus curiae, urging reversal in Nos. 1, 2 and 4 and affirmance in No. 10., Briefs of amici curiae supporting appellants in No. 1 were filed by Shad Polier, Will Maslow and Joseph B. Robison for the American Jewish Congress; by Edwin J. Lukas, Arnold Forster, Arthur Garfield Hays, Frank E. Karelson, Leonard Haas, Saburo Kido and Theodore Leskes for the American Civil Liberties Union et al.; and by John Lichtenberg and Selma M. Borchardt for the American Federation of Teachers. Briefs of amici curiae supporting appellants in No. 1 and respondents in No. 10 were filed by Arthur J. Goldberg and Thomas E. Harris for the Congress of Industrial Organizations and by Phineas Indritz for the American Veterans Committee, Inc.

### **Facts:**

This case is actually a consolidation of four cases from different states: *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, *Briggs v. Elliot*, *Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County*, and *Gebhart v. Belton*. The plaintiffs are African-American students who were denied admission to public schools because of their race (Page 484-485).

### **Issue:**

Whether segregation in public schools deprives minority children of equal educational opportunities, thereby violating the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Page 486).

### **Rule of Law:**

Segregation in public schools is 'inherently unequal' and violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Page 493, 495).

### **Holding & Reasoning:**

The Court held that segregation in public education has a detrimental effect on African-American children because it generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community. The doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place in the field of public education since separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Thus, such state-imposed segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment (Page 493-495).

### **Disposition:**

The Supreme Court reversed the decisions of the lower courts and remanded the cases for further proceedings (Page 495).

### **Dissent:**

Three justices, Reed, McReynolds, and Clark, dissented without writing an opinion (Page 496). Justice Stanley F. Reed filed a dissenting opinion stating that the Constitution does not prohibit segregation in public schools. He argued that the decision of this Court should be left to local authorities and that the Constitution does not establish the courts as a board of education (Page 495, 498).

*Generated using LexEmetica Clerk on April 28, 2025 at 02:21 AM (UTC)*

#### **Disclosure:**

*This brief was generated with the assistance of an AI system trained to summarize legal opinions based on the provided court text. While efforts have been made to ensure accuracy, this document may contain errors, omissions, or hallucinated content.*

*Users must not rely solely on this brief for legal decision-making, academic work, or court preparation. Always cross-check information against the original court opinion and consult with a licensed attorney if applicable.*

*Use of this tool is at your own risk. No liability is assumed by the developer or contributors for any inaccuracies.*

*© 2025 LexEmetica Clerk. All rights reserved.*

*Unauthorized copying, reproduction, or distribution of this material, in whole or in part, without the prior written consent of LexEmetica Clerk is strictly prohibited.*