

Official COURT DECISION

CASE: ASSOCIATED STUDENT BODY, LBSC, VS. LOS ALAMITOS HALL

- CHARGES: 1. Placing unauthorized posters and literature on other campuses without their approval.  
2. Lack of proper supervision at the dance in question.

The evidence adduced to the first was said posters as returned by the respective campus. To this complaint the defendants answered accepting full responsibility for distribution.

The evidenced adduced in the second charge was a letter for the Chairman of the Student Conduct Committee, attesting to the fact that there was excessive amounts of alcoholic beverage containers on the premises adjacent to the place in which that dance was held. It was common knowledge and admitted by the defendants that students other than those possessing Student Body Cards and those escorted by bonified members were in attendance at this dance. The answer to the first part of the charge was that of not guilty as they were unaware that their jurisdiction was such as to ~~XXX~~ cause them to be responsible for the area in question. Los Alamitos Hall had two (2) Reserve Police Officers from The City of Long Beach in attendance, plus the services of three (3) qualified chaperones, plus the services of the Long Beach State College Security Patrol. No attempt by any or both of these Police Units was made to secure the area adjacent to the Student Dining Hall. The chaperones felt it their task to patrol the area within the Dining Hall. Thus no one body secured the area outside ~~XXX~~ and adjacent ~~XXXX~~ to the College Dining Hall. The answer to the second part of the charge was answered by the statement of the Social Chairman, that the College Housing Co-ordinator, Mr. Frank Bowman, gave them his permission to allow non-student members not escorted by members to attend, and stated further he would send the House <sup>M</sup>other, Mrs. Smith, as added chaperone service.

The court cannot find anything to condone the actions of this living group, as they should have been aware that a group such as the Bel Airs would cause a group of undesirables to attend. Likewise the Court can find no place to cause the guilt solely upon this group. The Activities Advisor made no mention, nor is it stated in the Social Chairman's Handbook, on file in the Activities Office for a guide book for Social Chairmen, just what kind and where advertising can be placed but this in itself does not remove the liability of the Students in asking permission from other campuses prior to posting.

THEREFORE, this Court to the first recommends that a letter of apology be forthcoming to the injured schools.

To the second charge, the first part thereof, the Court has search the same Handbook for a statement of the confines to ~~XX~~ be patrolled, and it can find none. If the entire area of the school is to be patrolled then the facilities of the campus area would be beyond the financial reach of any group. If the area be patrolled would remain the same as present then reoccurrence would occur. It is the feeling of this court that the area should be decided upon by those more capable than the Student Court, ie, the Dean of Students, Dean of Activities, and the person in charge of the Campus Security Police. Further the amount of supervision stated in the Handbook is inadequate, as clearly evidenced by the lack of control in the ~~X~~ lobby and lounge areas. It is necessary to have that many police and/or chaperones inside, but what about the outside areas. Further chaperones are as of yet unenlightened as to their tasks as chaperones, therefore the allowance made here need not be made again.

THEREFORE, to the first part of the second charge this Court recommends to the Dean of Students that:

1. The area to be patrolled be clearly indicated and made available to all parties interested in using the facilities of the campus.
2. That the number of police, chaperones, and student guidance be increased.
3. That some arrangements be made with the Long Beach Police Department to allow that we have a choice in who will be the policemen in attendance, thereby causing any negligent action on their part to be definitely assigned, and refusal to rehire will be effected.

To the second part of the second charge, we find that although Mr. Bowman allowed such people to attend this was in lack of sufficient advice from the students requesting such allowances, as the students only concern at the time was for the monetary return that would be ~~forthcoming~~ forthcoming from such allowance, and therefore their citing as to the number was directly proportional to this figure. This could have been averted had adequate supervision been present, and the Court does not feel that one woman, even of Mrs. Smith's stature, could have stopped the mob that was allowed to enter. A portion of the blame must rest with Mr. Bowman, and an equal portion allocated to the Students of Alamitos Hall.

THEREFORE, the Court recommends that a reprimand be forthcoming to both parties.

Chief Justice - Paul R. Steinman  
Justices, Lemley, Burns, and Mattox  
concurring