

Nos. 79-1404, 79-1408,  
79-1414, 79-1415 and 79-1489

Supreme Court, U. S.,  
**FILED**

**OCT 23 1980**

MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE  
**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

October Term, 1979

PENNHURST STATE SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL, *et al.*,  
*Petitioners*

*v.*

TERRI LEE HALDERMAN, *et al.*,  
PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CITIZENS,  
*et al.*,  
and

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Respondents*

ON PETITIONS FOR WRITS OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

**BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS**  
**TERRI LEE HALDERMAN, *et al.*,**

David Ferleger

37 South 20th Street, Suite 601  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103  
(215) 567-2828

Penelope A. Boyd

37 South 20th Street, Suite 603  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103  
(215) 567-2828

Counsel for Respondents  
Terri Lee Halderman, *et al.*

October 20, 1980

THE LEGAL INTELLIGENCER, 66 NORTH JUNIPER STREET, PHILA., PA. 19107 (215) 561-4050

Pennhurst v. Halderman



MR-PA-0002-0002

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	2
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	7
ARGUMENT	
I. Certiorari should be dismissed as improvidently granted because of changes and proposed changes in the law, recent decisions of this Court, the dispositive nature of the state law ground, and the factual nature of the case. ....	20
A. Developmental disabilities program — proposed regulations .....	20
B. Enactment of the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act, P.L. 96-247, 94 Stat. 349 .....	21
C. Recent decisions of this Court resolve several important issues in this case ...	22
D. State law fully supports all aspects of the judgment below .....	23
E. The dispositive facts are undisputed and the issues are factual in nature .....	23
II. The District Court and the Court of Appeals <i>en banc</i> reasonably and correctly interpreted dispositive Pennsylvania statutory and case law providing an enforceable right to habilitation provided in an individually determined least restrictive setting, thereby rendering unnecessary any further decision by the Court .....	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS — (Continued)

	Page
A. Where the lower courts reasonably interpreted state law, any further decision by this Court is unnecessary . . . . .	24
B. The lower court decisions are based on independent dispositive determinations of a state law right to habilitation, individually determined and provided in an appropriate least restrictive setting . . . . .	26
C. State law requires affirmance of the judgment below . . . . .	30
III. In the Developmentally Disabled Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, Congress established rights, including the right to individually determined habilitation in the appropriate least restrictive setting . . . . .	34
A. The plain meaning of the Act supports the judgment below . . . . .	35
B. The statutory predecessors of the current statute . . . . .	37
C. Procedural history of the Bill of Rights . . . . .	39
D. Congressional intent to create enforceable rights is manifest in the legislative history of the Bill of Rights . . . . .	40
IV. A judicial remedy is provided to developmentally disabled people for official deprivation of rights under the Developmentally Disabled Assistance and Bill of Rights Act . . . . .	49
A. Remedy under 42 U.S.C. §1983 . . . . .	49
B. Private right of action . . . . .	53

TABLE OF CONTENTS — (Continued)

	Page
V. Where petitioner government officials adamantly refuse to remedy their violations of respondents' rights and where protection of state and federal statutory rights would otherwise be impossible, individual determinations of need and appointment of a special master with circumscribed supervisory duties does not violate principles of federalism and is not an abuse of discretion . . . . .	57
A. Equitable discretion permits choice among acceptable alternative structures for relief . . . . .	58
B. The relief granted is fully within appropriate discretionary limits . . . . .	60
1. Individual determinations . . . . .	61
2. Appointment of a master . . . . .	63
3. Implications for other states of nature of relief in Pennsylvania . . . . .	66
CONCLUSION . . . . .	68
TABLE — All states' statutory provisions regarding rights to habilitation and treatment for the mentally disabled . . . . .	70
APPENDIX — Narrative Summary of Record . . . .	A1

