

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
For the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 95-30994  
Summary Calendar

---

LOUISIANA DEBATING AND LITERARY ASSOCIATION,  
doing business as The Louisiana Club,  
for itself and on behalf of its members,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

VERSUS

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, ET AL,

Defendants,

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS,

Defendant-Appellant.

\*\*\*\*\*

STRATFORD CLUB, for itself and  
on behalf of its members,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

VERSUS

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, ET AL,

Defendants,

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS,

Defendant-Appellant.

\*\*\*\*\*

BOSTON CLUB OF NEW ORLEANS,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

VERSUS

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, ET AL,

Defendants,

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS,

Defendant-Appellant.

\*\*\*\*\*

PICKWICK CLUB, for itself and  
on behalf of its members,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

VERSUS

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, ET AL,

Defendants,

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
For the Eastern District of Louisiana

---

June 12, 1996

Before DAVIS, BARKSDALE, and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

---

\* Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.

The Louisiana Debating and Literary Association d/b/a The Louisiana Club, Pickwick Club, Boston Club and Stratford Club (hereinafter "the Clubs") filed consolidated suits against the City of New Orleans ("the City") seeking to enjoin the Human Relations Committee of the City from investigating complaints of discrimination made against the Clubs pursuant to the City's anti-discrimination ordinance (Chapter 40C of the Municipal Code). The district court rendered summary judgment in favor of the Clubs. Thereafter, the Clubs filed motions for awards of attorneys' fees but action on these motions were deferred pending appeal by the City to the Fifth Circuit and application by the City for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court. The Fifth Circuit affirmed the district court's judgment in favor of the Clubs and the Supreme Court denied writ of certiorari. The motions for attorneys' fees pending before the district court were renewed and the district court awarded attorneys' fees to each of the Clubs.

We have carefully reviewed the briefs, the record excerpts and relevant portions of the record itself. For the reasons stated by the district court in its memorandum filed August 24, 1995, we are satisfied that the district court did not abuse the discretion vested in it pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1998(b) to allow the prevailing party a reasonable attorneys' fee. The amended judgment entered under date of August 29, 1995, is

**AFFIRMED.**