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FAIR EMPLOYMENT
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See Civil Rights—Employment Discrimination
See Civil Rights—Sex Discrimination
The Class Action and Title VII—An Overview—comment, 325-38
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Rule 23(b) and back pay, 334-38
Conclusion, 338
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   Conclusion, 353-54
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   Subjective evaluation and wage determination by supervisors, 225-26
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   Pregnancy, 233-36
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   Fringe benefits, 238
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Bona fide seniority and employee benefit plans, 245-46
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Recruitment, 260-61
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Aggrieved employees or applicants, 290
Class action, 290-94
Proving the case, 294-302
Discovery, 295-96
Intervention, 296-97
Joinder, 297-98
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Res judicata and collateral estoppel, 299
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   The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 302-03
   The Office of Federal Contract Compliance and the General Services Admin-
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State fair employment agencies, 306
The courts—federal and state, 307
The administrator, 308-09
The National Labor Relations Board, 309-12
Arbitration, 312-14
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      The expert who plays two rules, 718-19
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      Introduction, 557
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Lee: The "Elaborate Interweaving of Jurisdiction:" Labor and Tax Administration and Enforcement of ERISA and Beyond, 463-509
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ERISA: Administration, 471-81
Jurisdiction: Overview, 471
Initial stage jurisdiction, 471-74
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TORTS

Interspousal Immunity
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Virginia defines scope of local power to impose dedication and land use requirements upon individual landowners—recent decision, 440-47