FILED

APR 1 3 1984

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

		THOMAS C. CAVER, CLERK
MAGGIE S. BOZEMAN)	BY DEPUTY CLERK
Petitioner)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 83-H-579-N
vs.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 05-M-579-N
EALON M. LAMBERT; et al)	
Respondents)	

JUDGMENT

Pursuant to the attached memorandum opinion, it is hereby

ORDERED that petitioner's motion for summary judgment is granted.

It is the ORDER, JUDGMENT, and DECREE of the Court that the judgment of conviction and the sentence pronounced thereon by the Circuit Court of Pickens County, Alabama, on November 21, 1980, wherein Maggie S. Bozeman was found guilty in state criminal case #CC-78-109 of fraudulent or illegal voting and sentenced to four years' imprisonment, is hereby vacated. It is further ORDERED that respondents release petitioner from all restraints imposed as a result of said conviction not later than April 30, 1984.

It is further ORDERED that the costs of this proceeding be taxed against the State of Alabama.

DONE this 13th day of April, 1984.

Trunian Hotel

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

FILED

APR 1 3 1984

. .

	THOMAS C. CAVER, CLERK
MAGGIE S. BOZEMAN) BY DEPUTY CLERK
Petitioner)
vs.) CIVIL ACTION NO. 83-H-579-N
EALON M. LAMBERT; et al)
Respondents)
JULIA P. WILDER)
Petitioner)
vs.) CIVIL ACTION NO. 83-H-580-N
EALON M. LAMBERT; et al)
Respondents)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This cause is before the Court on petitioners' motions for summary judgment. Although the Court has not consolidated these cases, it will issue a joint opinion, with separate judgments. Bozeman in her motion argues that, under <u>Jackson v. Virginia</u>, 443 U.S. 307 (1979), the evidence was insufficient to support her conviction. She also contends that she was deprived of her constitutional right to notice of the charges against her. Wilder raises only the latter claim in her motion. She raises the <u>Jackson</u> claim in her petition, however, and the Court thus will consider it now. For the reasons stated below, the Court