This publication supplements Senate Document 103–6, The Constitution of the United States of America: Analysis and Interpretation—it should be inserted in the pocket on the inside back cover of that volume

104TH CONGRESS, *2d Session* — SENATE — DOCUMENT No. 104–14

THE CONSTITUTION

OF THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

1996 SUPPLEMENT

ANALYSIS OF CASES DECIDED BY THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES TO JULY 1, 1996

PREPARED BY THE
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

JOHNNY H. KILLIAN
GEORGE A. COSTELLO
KENNETH R. THOMAS
EDITORS

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
22–725 CC WASHINGTON : 1997

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

ARTICLE I

Delegation

[P. 78, add to text following n.79:]

The infirm state of the nondelegation doctrine was demonstrated further in *Loving v. United States*.[1] Article 118 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)[2] provides for the death penalty for premedicated murder and felony murder for persons subject to the Act, but the statute does not comport with the Court's capital punishment jurisprudence, which requires the death sentence to be cabined by standards so that the sentencing authority is constrained to narrow the class of convicted persons to be so sentenced and to justify the individual imposition of the sentence.[3] However, the President in 1984 had promulgated standards that purported to supply the constitutional validity the UCMJ needed.[4]

The Court held that Congress could delegate to the President the authority to prescribe standards for the imposition of the death penalty—Congress' power under Article I, § 8, cl. 14, is not exclusive—and that Congress had done so in the UCMJ by providing that the punishment imposed by a court-martial may not exceed "such limits as the President may prescribe."[5] Acknowledging that a delegation must contain some "intelligible principle" to guide the recipient of the delegation, the Court nonetheless held this not to be true when the delegation was made to the President in his role as Commander-in-Chief. "The same limitations on delegation do not apply" if the entity authorized to exercise delegated authority itself possesses independent authority over the subject matter. The President's responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief require him to superintend the military, including the courts-martial, and thus the delegated duty is interlinked with duties already assigned the President by the Constitution.[6]

In the course of the opinion, the Court distinguished between its usual separation-of-powers doctrine—emphasizing arrogation of power by a branch and impairment of another branch's ability to carry out its functions—and the delegation doctrine, "another

---

[1] 116 S. Ct. 1737 (1996). The decision was unanimous in result, but there were several concurrences reflecting some differences among the Justices.

[2] 10 U.S.C. §§ 918(1), (4).

[3] The Court assumed the applicability of Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972), and its progeny, to the military, 116 S. Ct. at 1742, a point on which Justice Thomas disagreed, id. at 1753.

[4] Rule for Courts-Martial; see 116 S. Ct. at 1740, 1741–42.

[5] 10 U.S.C. §§ 818, 836(a), 856.

[6] 116 S. Ct. at 1750–51.

branch of our separation of powers jurisdiction," which is informed not by the arrogation and impairment analyses but solely by the provision of standards,[7] thus confirming what has long been evident that the delegation doctrine is unmoored to separation-of-powers principles altogether.

Qualifications of Members of Congress

[P. 111, add to n.297:]

Powell's continuing validity was affirmed in U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton, 514 U.S. 779 (1995), both by the Court in its holding that the qualifications set out in the Constitution are exclusive and may not be added to by either Congress or the States, id. at 787–98, and by the dissent, who would hold that Congress, for different reasons, could not add to qualifications, although the States could. Id. at 875–76.

[P. 114, add to text following n.312:]

The long-debated issue whether the States could add to the qualifications that the Constitution prescribed for Senators and Representations was finally resolved, by a surprisingly close vote, in *U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*.[8] Arkansas, along with twenty-two other States, all but two by citizen initiatives, had imposed maximum numbers of terms that Members of Congress could serve. In this case, the Court held that the Constitution's qualifications clauses[9] establish exclusive qualifications for Members that may not be added to either by Congress or the States. The four-Justice dissent argued that while Congress had no power to increase qualifications, the States did.

Richly embellished with disputatious arguments about the text of the Constitution, the history of its drafting and ratification, and the practices of Congress and the States in the early years of the United States, the actual determination of the Court as controverted by the dissent was much more over founding principles than more ordinary constitutional interpretation.[10]

Thus, the Court and the dissent drew different conclusions from the text of the qualifications clauses and the other clauses re-

---

[7] Id. at 1743–44.

[8] 514 U.S. 779 (1995). The majority was composed of Justice Stevens (writing the opinion of the Court) and Justices Kennedy, Souter, Ginsburg, and Breyer. Dissenting were Justice Thomas (writing the opinion) and Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justices O'Connor and Scalia. Id. at 845.

[9] Article I, § 2, cl. 2, provides that a person may qualify as a Representative if she is at least 25 years old, has been a United States citizen for at least 7 years, and is an inhabitant, at the time of the election, of the State in which she is chosen. The qualifications established for Senators, Article I, § 3, cl. 3, are an age of 30 years, nine years citizenship, and an inhabitant of the State.

[10] See Sullivan, *Dueling Sovereignties: U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 109 HARV. L. REV. 78 (1995).

specting the elections of Members of Congress; the Court and the dissent reached different conclusions after a minute examination of the records of the Convention respecting the drafting of these clauses and the ratification debates; and the Court and the dissent were far apart on the meaning of the practices in the States in legislating qualifications and election laws and in Congress in deciding election contests based on qualifications disputes.

A default principle relied on by both Court and dissent, given the arguments drawn from text, creation, and practice, had to do with the fundamental principle at the foundation of the Constitution's founding. In the dissent's view, the Constitution was the result of the resolution of the peoples of the separate States to create the National Government. The conclusion to be drawn from this was that the peoples in the States agreed to surrender powers expressly forbidden them and to surrender those limited powers that they had delegated to the Federal Government expressly or by necessary implication. They retained all other powers and still retained them. Thus, "where the Constitution is silent about the exercise of a particular power—that is, where the Constitution does not speak either expressly or by necessary implication—the Federal Government lacks that power and the States enjoy it." [11] The constitution's silence about the States being limited meant that the States could legislate additional qualifications.

Radically different were the views of the majority of the Court. After the adoption of the Constitution, the States had two kinds of powers: powers that they had before the founding and that were reserved to them. The States could have no reserved powers with respect to the Federal Government. "As Justice Story recognized, 'the states can exercise no powers whatsoever, which exclusively spring out of the existence of the national government, which the constitution does not delegate to them. . . . No state can say, that it has reserved, what it never possessed.'" [12] The States could not before the founding have possessed powers to legislate respecting the Federal Government, and since the Constitution did not delegate to the States the power to prescribe qualifications for Members of Congress, the States did not have it. [13]

Evidently, the opinions in this case reflect more than a decision on this particular dispute. They rather represent conflicting philosophies within the Court respecting the scope of national power in the context of the States, an issue at the core of many controversies today.

[11] 514 U.S. at 848 (Justice Thomas dissenting). *See generally* id. at 846–65.
[12] Id. at 802.
[13] Id. at 798–805. *And see* id. at 838–45 (Justice Kennedy concurring).

[P. 115, add to n.317:]

Another census controversy was resolved in Wisconsin v. City of New York, 116 S. Ct. 1091 (1996), in which the Court held that the decision of the Secretary of Commerce not to conduct a post-enumeration survey and statistical adjustment for an undercount in the 1990 Census was reasonable and within the bounds of discretion conferred by the Constitution and statute.

Commerce Clause

[P. 207, add to text following n.820:]

For the first time in almost sixty years,[14] the Court invalidated a federal law as exceeding Congress' authority under the commerce clause.[15] The statute was a provision making it a federal offense to possess a firearm within 1,000 feet of a school.[16] The Court reviewed the doctrinal development of the commerce clause, especially the effects and aggregation tests, and reaffirmed that it is the Court's responsibility to decide whether a rational basis exists for concluding that a regulated activity sufficiently affects interstate commerce when a law is challenged.[17] The Court identified three broad categories of activity that Congress may regulate under its commerce power. "First, Congress may regulate the use of the channels of interstate commerce. . . . Second, Congress is empowered to regulate and protect the instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or persons or things in interstate commerce, even though the threat may come only from intrastate activities. . . . Finally, Congress' commerce authority includes the power to regulate those activities having a substantial relation to interstate commerce, . . . i.e., those activities that substantially affect interstate commerce."[18]

Clearly, said the Court, the criminalized activity did not implicate the first two categories.[19] As for the third, the Court found an insufficient connection. First, a wide variety of regulations of "intrastate economic activity" has been sustained where an activity substantially affects interstate commerce. But the statute being challenged, the Court continued, was a criminal law that had nothing to do with "commerce" or with "any sort of economic enter-

[14] Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936).

[15] United States v. Lopez, 514 U.S. 549 (1995). The Court was divided 5-to–4, with Chief Justice Rehnquist writing the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, and Thomas, with dissents by Justices Stevens, Souter, Breyer, and Ginsburg.

[16] 18 U.S.C. § 922(q)(1)(A). Congress subsequently amended the section to make the offense jurisdictionally turn on possession of "a firearm that has moved in or that otherwise affects interstate or foreign commerce." Pub. L. 104–208, 110 Stat. 3009–370.

[17] 514 U.S. at 556–57, 559.

[18] Id. at 558–59.

[19] Id. at 559.

prise." Therefore, it could not be sustained under precedents "upholding regulations of activities that arise out of or are connected with a commercial transaction, which viewed in the aggregate, substantially affects interstate commerce."[20] The provision did not contain a "jurisdictional element which would ensure, through case-by-case inquiry, that the firearm possession in question affects interstate commerce."[21] The existence of such a section, the Court implied, would have saved the constitutionality of the provision by requiring a showing of some connection to commerce in each particular case. Finally, the Court rejected the arguments of the Government and of the dissent that there existed a sufficient connection between the offense and interstate commerce.[22] At base, the Court's concern was that accepting the attenuated connection arguments presented would result in the evisceration of federalism. "Under the theories that the Government presents . . . it is difficult to perceive any limitation on federal power, even in areas such as criminal law enforcement or education where States historically have been sovereign. Thus, if we were to accept the Government's arguments, we are hard pressed to posit any activity by an individual that Congress is without power to regulate."[23]

Whether this decision bespeaks a Court determination to police more closely Congress' exercise of its commerce power, so that it would be a noteworthy case,[24] or whether it is rather a "warning shot" across the bow of Congress, urging more restraint in the exercise of power or more care in the drafting of laws is unclear. Obviously, Justice Thomas would undo much of modern commerce-clause jurisprudence. He writes that the substantial-effects test in conjunction with the aggregation principle betrays the intent of the Framers and confers a "police power" on Congress that it should not, indeed, does not, have. He argues that the Court in a future case should undo what it has done.[25] On the other hand, Justice Kennedy, with whom Justice O'Connor joined, argued that the Court should generally not upset the stability of commerce-clause jurisprudence and should not erode the "essential principles now in place respecting the congressional power to regulate transactions of a commercial nature." But, when a congressional enactment upsets the federal balance by extending federal power into areas "to which

[20] Id. at 559–61.
[21] Id. at 561.
[22] Id. at 563–68.
[23] Id. at 564.
[24] "Not every epochal case has come in epochal trappings." Id. at 615 (Justice Souter dissenting) (wondering whether the case is only a misapplication of established standards or is a veering in a new direction).
[25] Id. at 584–602 (Justice Thomas concurring).

States lay claim by right of history and expertise," he would have the Court intervene.[26]

Thus, it seems unlikely that the Court, as now constituted, will retreat from much of the existing law in this area, but it may well be that, outside the area of economic regulation,[27] the Court will exert a restraining hand to legislation such as that federalizing much state criminal law enforcement.

Dormant Commerce Clause—State Regulation and Taxation

[Pp. 215–16, add to n.864:]

Itel Containers Int'l Corp. v. Huddleston, 507 U.S. 60, 78 (1993) (Justice Scalia concurring) (reiterating view); Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Jefferson Lines, Inc., 514 U.S. 175, 200–01 (1995) (Justice Scalia, with Justice Thomas joining) (same).

[P. 223, add to n.907:]

Notice the Court's distinguishing of *Central Greyhound* in Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Jefferson Lines, Inc., 514 U.S. 175, 188–91 (1995).

[P. 227, add to n.928:]

And see C & A Carbone, Inc. v. Town of Clarkstown, 511 U.S. 383, 391 (1994) (discrimination against interstate commerce not preserved because local businesses also suffer).

[P. 227, add to n.930:]

For the most recent case in this saga, *see* West Lynn Creamery, Inc. v. Healy, 512 U.S. 186 (1994).

[P. 229, add to n.941:]

A recent application of the four-part *Complete Auto Transit* test is Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Jefferson Lines, Inc., 514 U.S. 175 (1995).

[P. 232, add to text following n.959:]

A deference to state taxing authority was evident in a case in which the Court sustained a state sales tax on the price of a bus ticket for travel that originated in the State but terminated in another State. The tax was unapportioned to reflect the intrastate travel and the interstate travel.[28] The tax in this case was different, the Court held. The previous tax constituted a levy on gross receipts, payable by the seller, whereas the present tax was a sales

[26] Id. at 568–83 (Justice Kennedy concurring).

[27] For a striking example, in the same Term as *Lopez*, see Allied-Bruce Terminix Cos. v. Dobson, 513 U.S. 265 (1995).

[28] Indeed, there seemed to be a precedent squarely on point. Central Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Mealey, 334 U.S. 653 (1948). Struck down in that case was a state statute that failed to apportion its taxation of interstate bus ticket sales to reflect the distance traveled within the State.

tax, also assessed on gross receipts, but payable by the buyer. The Oklahoma tax, the Court continued, was internally consistent, since if every State imposed a tax on ticket sales within the State for travel originating there, no sale would be subject to more than one tax. The tax was also externally consistent, the Court held, because it was a tax on the sale of a service that took place in the State, not a tax on the travel.[29]

However, the Court found discriminatory and thus invalid a state intangibles tax on a fraction of the value of corporate stock owned by state residents inversely proportional to the corporation's exposure to the state income tax.[30]

[P. 232, add to n.961:]

And see Oregon Waste Systems v. Department of Envtl. Quality, 511 U.S. 93 (1994) (surcharge on in-state disposal of solid wastes that discriminates against companies disposing of waste generated in other States invalid).

[P. 236, add to n.978:]

In West Lynn Creamery, Inc. v. Healy, 512 U.S. 186 (1994), the Court held invalidly discriminatory against interstate commerce a state milk pricing order, which imposed an assessment on all milk sold by dealers to in-state retailers, the entire assessment being distributed to in-state dairy farmers despite the fact that about two-thirds of the assessed milk was produced out of State. The avowed purpose and undisputed effect of the provision was to enable higher-cost in-state dairy farmers to compete with lower-cost dairy farmers in other States.

[P. 236, add to text following n.980:]

Further extending the limitation of the clause on waste disposal,[31] the Court invalidated as a discrimination against interstate commerce a local "flow control" law, which required all solid waste within the town to be processed at a designated transfer station before leaving the municipality.[32] The town's reason for the restriction was its decision to have built a solid waste transfer station by a private contractor, rather than with public funds by the town. To make the arrangement appetizing to the contractor, the town guaranteed it a minimum waste flow, for which it could charge a fee significantly higher than market rates. The guarantee

[29] Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Jefferson Lines, Inc., 514 U.S. 175 (1995). Indeed, the Court analogized the tax to that in Goldberg v. Sweet, 488 U.S. 252 (1989), a tax on interstate telephone services that originated in or terminated in the State and that were billed to an in-state address.

[30] Fulton Corp. v. Faulkner, 116 S. Ct. 848 (1996). The State had defended on the basis that the tax was a "compensatory" one designed to make interstate commerce bear a burden already borne by intrastate commerce. The Court recognized the legitimacy of the defense, but it found the tax to meet none of the three criteria for classification as a valid compensatory tax. Id. at 855–60.

[31] *See also* Oregon Waste Systems, Inc. v. Department of Envtl. Quality, 511 U.S. 93 (1994) (discriminatory tax).

[32] C & A Carbone, Inc. v. Town of Clarkstown, 511 U.S. 383 (1994).

was policed by the requirement that all solid waste generated within the town be processed at the contractor's station and that any person disposing of solid waste in any other location would be penalized.

The Court analogized the constraint as a form of economic protectionism, which bars out-of-state processors from the business of treating the localities solid waste, by hoarding a local resource for the benefit of local businesses that perform the service. The town's goal of revenue generation was not a local interest that could justify the discrimination. Moreover, the town had other means to accomplish this goal, such as subsidization of the local facility through general taxes or municipal bonds. The Court did not deal with, indeed, did not notice, the fact that the local law conferred a governmentally-granted monopoly, an exclusive franchise, indistinguishable from a host of local monopolies at the state and local level. [33]

[P. 241, add to n.1001:]

See also Itel Containers Int'l Corp. v. Huddleston, 507 U.S. 60 (1993) (sustaining state sales tax as applied to lease of containers delivered within the State and used in foreign commerce).

[P. 242, add to text following n.1004:]

Extending *Container Corp.*, the Court in *Barclays Bank v. Franchise Tax Bd. of California*, [34] upheld the State's worldwide-combined reporting method of determining the corporate franchise tax owed by unitary multinational corporations, as applied to a foreign corporation. The Court determined that the tax easily satisfied three of the four-part *Complete Auto* test—nexus, apportionment, and relation to State's services—and concluded that the nondiscrimination principle—perhaps violated by the letter of the law—could be met by the discretion accorded state officials. As for the two additional factors, as outlined in *Japan Lines*, the Court pronounced itself satisfied. Multiple taxation was not the inevitable result of the tax, and that risk would not be avoided by the use of any reasonable alternative. The tax, it was found, did not impair federal uniformity nor prevent the Federal Government from speaking with one voice in international trade. The result of the case is that foreign corporations have less protection under the neg-

[33] See *The Supreme Court, Leading Cases, 1993 Term*, 108 HARV. L. REV. 139, 149–59 (1994). Weight was given to this consideration by Justice O'Connor, 511 U.S. at 401 (concurring) (local law an excessive burden on interstate commerce), and by Justice Souter, id. at 410 (dissenting).

[34] 512 U.S. 298 (1994).

ative commerce clause, perhaps intentionally for a variety of reasons.[35]

Preemption

[P. 247, add to n.1026, immediately preceding *City of New York v. FCC*:]

Smiley v. Citibank, 116 S. Ct. 1730 (1996).

[P. 247, add to n.1027:]

And see Department of Treasury v. Fabe, 508 U.S. 491 (1993).

[P. 247, add to n.1029:]

See also American Airlines v. Wolens, 513 U.S. 219 (1995).

[P. 248, add to n.1032:]

District of Columbia v. Greater Washington Bd. of Trade, 506 U.S. 125 (1992) (law requiring employers to provide health insurance coverage, equivalent to existing coverage, for workers receiving workers' compensation benefits); John Hancock Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Harris Trust and Savings Bank, 510 U.S. 86 (1993) (ERISA's fiduciary standards, not conflicting state insurance laws, apply to insurance company's handling of general account assets derived from participating group annuity contract); New York State Conf. of Blue Cross & Blue Shield Plans v. Travelers Ins. Co., 514 U.S. 645 (1995) (no preemption of statute that required hospitals to collect surcharges from patients covered by a commercial insurer but not from patients covered by Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan).

[P. 249, add to text following n.1035:]

No clarification of the confusing *Cipollone* decision and opinions resulted in *Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr*.[36] The Medical Device Amendments (MDA) of 1976 prohibits States from adopting or continuing in effect "with respect to a [medical] device" any "requirement" that is "different from, or in addition to" the applicable federal requirement and that relates to the safety or effectiveness of the device.[37] The issue, then, was whether a common-law tort obligation imposed a "requirement" that was different from or in addition to any federal requirement. The device, a pacemaker lead, had come on the market not pursuant to the rigorous FDA test but rather as determined by the FDA to be "substantially equivalent"

[35] *The Supreme Court, Leading Cases, 1993 Term*, 108 HARV. L. REV. 139, 139–49 (1993).

[36] 116 S. Ct. 2240 (1996). *See also* CSX Transportation, Inc. v. Easterwood, 507 U.S. 658 (1993) (under Federal Railroad Safety Act, a state common-law claim alleging negligence for operating a train at excessive speed is preempted, but a second claim alleging negligence for failure to maintain adequate warning devices at a grade crossing is not preempted).

[37] 21 U.S.C. § 350k(a).

to a device previously on the market, a situation of some import to at least some of the Justices.

Unanimously, the Court determined that a defective design claim was not preempted and that the MDA did not prevent States from providing a damages remedy for violation of common-law duties that paralleled federal requirements. But the Justices split 4–1–4 with respect to preemption of various claims relating to manufacturing and labeling. FDA regulations, which a majority deferred to, limited preemption to situations in which a particular state requirement threatens to interfere with a specific federal interest. Moreover, the common-law standards were not specifically developed to govern medical devices and their generality removed them from the category of requirements "with respect to" specific devices. However, five Justices did agree that common-law requirements could be, just as statutory provisions, "requirements" that were preempted, though they did not agree on the application of that view. [38]

[P. 252, add to n.1050 before *Free v. Brand*:]

Allied-Bruce Terminix Cos., v. Dobson, 513 U.S. 265 (1995) (federal arbitration law preempts state law invalidating predispute arbitration agreements that were not entered into in contemplation of substantial interstate activity); Doctor's Associates, Inc. v. Casarotto, 116 S. Ct. 1652 (1996) (federal arbitration law preempts state statute that conditioned enforceability of arbitration clause on compliance with special notice requirement).

[P. 252, add to n.1054:]

See also Barnett Bank of Marion County v. Nelson, 116 S. Ct. 1103 (1996) (federal law empowering national banks in small towns to sell insurance preempts state law prohibiting banks from dealing in insurance; despite explicit preemption provision, state law stands as an obstacle to accomplishment of federal purpose).

[P. 255, add to n.1069, immediately following *Bethlehem Steel*:]

See also Livadas v. Bradshaw, 512 U.S. 107 (1994) (finding preempted because it stood as an obstacle to the achievement of the purposes of NLRA a practice of a state labor commissioner).

[P. 263, add to n.1114:]

For recent tax controversies, see Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Sac & Fox Nation, 508 U.S. 114 (1993); Department of Taxation & Finance v. Milhelm Attea & Bros., 512 U.S. 61 (1994); Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Chickasaw Nation, 115 S. Ct. 2214 (1995).

---

[38] The dissent, by Justice O'Connor and three others, would have held preempted the latter claims, 116 S. Ct. at 2262, whereas Justice Breyer thought that common-law claims would sometimes be preempted, but not here. Id. at 2259 (concurring).

[P. 263, add to n.1117, immediately following *Brendale* discussion:]

And see Hagen v. Utah, 510 U.S. 399 (1994).

[P. 264, add to n.1119:]

See South Dakota v. Bourland, 508 U.S. 679 (1993) (abrogation of Indian treaty rights and reduction of sovereignty).

Aliens

[P. 276, add to n.1199:]

See Sale v. Haitian Centers Council, 509 U.S. 155 (1993) (construing statutes and treaty provisions restrictively to affirm presidential power to interdict and seize fleeing aliens on high seas to prevent them from entering U.S. waters).

[P. 281, add to n.1232:]

In Reno v. Flores, 507 U.S. 292 (1993), the Court upheld an INS regulation providing for the ongoing detention of juveniles apprehended on suspicion of being deportable, unless parents, close relatives, or legal guardians were available to accept release, as against a substantive due process attack.

Copyrights and Patents

[P. 297, add to n.1353:]

In Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 116 S. Ct. 1384 (1996), the Court held that the interpretation of terms in a patent claim is a matter of law reserved entirely for the court. The Seventh Amendment does not require that such issues be tried to a jury.

[P. 298, add to n.1359:]

For fair use in the context of a song parody, see Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc., 510 U.S. 569 (1994).

The War Power

[P. 316, add to n.1465:]

See Loving v. United States, 116 S. Ct. 1737 (1996) (in context of the death penalty under the UCMJ).

Taxes on Exports

[P. 356, add to text following n.1775:]

In *United States v. IBM Corp.*,[39] the Court declined the Government's argument that it should refine its export-tax-clause jurisprudence. Rather than read the clause as a bar on any tax that applies to a good in the export stream, the Government contended that the Court should bring this clause in line with the import-export clause[40] and with dormant-commerce-clause doctrine. In that

[39] 116 S. Ct. 1793 (1996).
[40] Article I, § 10, cl. 2, applying to the States.

view, the Court should distinguish between discriminatory and nondiscriminatory taxes on exports. But the Court held that sufficient differences existed between the export clause and the other two clauses, so that its bar should continue to apply to any and all taxes on goods in the course of exportation.

[P. 356, add to n.1778:]

In United States v. IBM Corp., 116 S. Ct. 1793 (1996), the Court adhered to *Thames & Mercy*, and held unconstitutional a federal excise tax upon insurance policies issued by foreign countries as applied to coverage for exported products. The Court admitted that one could question the earlier case's conflating of a tax on the insurance of exported goods as the same as a tax on the goods themselves, but it observed that the Government had chosen not to present that argument. Principles of *stare decisis* thus cautioned observance of the earlier case. Id. at 1800–01. The dissenters argued that the issue had been presented and should be decided by overruling the earlier case. Id. at 1804 (Justices Kennedy and Ginsburg dissenting).

Ex Post Facto Laws

[P. 364, add to n.1829:]

But see California Dep't of Corrections v. Morales, 514 U.S. 499 (1995) (a law amending parole procedures to decrease frequency of parole-suitability hearings is not *ex post facto* as applied to prisoners who committed offenses before enactment). The opinion modifies previous opinions that had held impermissible some laws because they operated to the disadvantage of covered offenders. Henceforth, "the focus of *ex post facto* inquiry is . . . whether any such change alters the definition of criminal conduct or increases the penalty by which a crime is punishable." Id. at 506 n.3.

Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports

[P. 400, add to n.2020:]

See also Itel Containers Int'l Corp. v. Huddleston, 507 U.S. 60, 76–8 (1993). And see id. at 81–2 (Justice Scalia concurring).

ARTICLE II

Executive Power

[P. 420, add to n.34:]

In Loving v. United States, 116 S. Ct. 1737 (1996), the Court recurred to the original setting of *Curtiss-Wright*, a delegation to the President without standards. Congress, the Court found, had delegated to the President authority to structure the death penalty provisions of military law so as to bring the procedures, relating to aggravating and mitigating factors, into line with constitutional requirements, but Congress had provided no standards to guide the presidential exercise of the authority. Standards were not required, held the Court, because his role as Commander-in-Chief gave him responsibility to superintend the military establishment and Congress and the President had interlinked authorities with respect to the military. Where the entity exercising the delegated authority itself possesses independent authority over the subject matter, the familiar limitations on delegation do not apply. Id. at 1750–51.

Separation of Powers

[P. 422, add to text following n.45:]

Significant change in the position of the Executive Branch respecting its position on separation of powers may be discerned in two briefs of the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel, which may spell some measure of judicial modification of the formalist doctrine of separation and adoption of the functionalist approach to the doctrine.[1] The two opinions withdraw from the contention of the Department of Justice, following *Buckley v. Valeo*, that the execution of the laws is an executive function that may be carried out only by persons appointed pursuant to the appointments clause, thus precluding delegations to state and local officers and to private parties (as in *qui tam* actions), as well as to glosses on the take care clause and other provisions of the Constitution. Whether these memoranda signal long-term change depends on several factors, importantly on whether they are adhered to by subsequent administrations.

---

[1] Memorandum for John Schmidt, Associate Attorney General, from Assistant Attorney General Walter Dellinger, Constitutional Limitations on Federal Government Participation in Binding Arbitration (Sept. 7, 1995); Memorandum for the General Counsels of the Federal Government, from Assistant Attorney General Walter Dellinger, The Constitutional Separation of Powers Between the President and Congress (May 7, 1996). The principles laid down in the memoranda depart significantly from previous positions of the Department of Justice. For conflicting versions of the two approaches, see *Constitutional Implications of the Chemical Weapons Convention*, Hearings Before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights, 104th Cong., 2d Sess. (1996), 11–26, 107–10 (Professor John C. Woo), 80–106 (Deputy Assistant Attorney General Richard L. Shiffrin).

[P. 425, in text following n.61, add:]

In the course of deciding that the President's action in approving the closure of a military base, pursuant to statutory authority, was not subject to judicial review, the Court enunciated a principle that may mean a great deal, constitutionally speaking, or that may not mean much of anything.[2] The lower court had held that, while review of presidential decisions on statutory grounds might be precluded, his decisions were reviewable for constitutionality; in that court's view, whenever the President acts in excess of his statutory authority, he also violates the constitutional separation-of-powers doctrine. The Supreme Court found this analysis flawed. "Our cases do not support the proposition that every action by the President, or by another executive official, in excess of his statutory authority is *ipso facto* in violation of the Constitution. On the contrary, we have often distinguished between claims of constitutional violations and claims that an official has acted in excess of his statutory authority."[3] Thus, the Court drew a distinction between executive action undertaken without even the purported warrant of statutory authorization and executive action in excess of statutory authority. The former may violate separation of powers, while the latter will not.[4]

Doctrinally, the distinction is important and subject to unfortunate application.[5] Whether the brief, unilluminating discussion in *Dalton* will bear fruit in constitutional jurisprudence, however, is problematic.

Appointment of Officers

[P. 512, add to n.461:]

The designation or appointment of military judges, who are "officers of the United States," does not violate the appointments clause. The judges are selected by the Judge Advocate General of their respective branch of the Armed Forces. These military judges, however, were already commissioned officers who had been appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, so that their designa-

---

[2] Dalton v. Specter, 511 U.S. 462 (1994).

[3] Id. at 472.

[4] See *The Supreme Court, Leading Cases, 1993 Term*, 108 HARV. L. REV. 139, 300–10 (1994).

[5] "As a matter of constitutional logic, the executive branch must have some warrant, either statutory or constitutional, for its actions. The source of all federal governmental authority is the Constitution and, because the Constitution contemplates that Congress may delegate a measure of its power to officials in the executive branch, statutes. The principle of separation of powers is a direct consequence of this scheme. Absent statutory authorization, it is unlawful for the President to exercise the powers of the other branches because the Constitution does not vest those powers in the President. The absence of statutory authorization is not merely a statutory defect; it is a constitutional defect as well." Id. at 305–06 (footnote citations omitted).

tion simply and permissibly was an assignment to them of additional duties that did not need a second formal appointment. Weiss v. United States, 510 U.S. 163 (1994). However, the appointment of civilian judges to the Coast Guard Court of Military Review was impermissible and their actions were not salvageable under the *de facto* officer doctrine. Ryder v. United States, 515 U.S. 177 (1995).

[P. 519, add to n.498:]

The Supreme Court held this provision unconstitutional in United States v. NTEU, 513 U.S. 454 (1995).

Presidential Immunity From Judicial Direction

[P. 579, add to n.723:]

See also, following *Franklin*, Dalton v. Specter, 511 U.S. 462 (1994).

[P. 582, add to n.743:]

Following the *Westfall* decision, Congress enacted the Federal Employees Liability Reform and Tort Compensation Act of 1988 (the Westfall Act), which authorized the Attorney General to certify that an employee was acting within the scope of his office or employment at the time of the incident out of which a suit arose; upon certification, the employee is dismissed from the action, and the United States is substituted, the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) then governing the action, which means that sometimes the action must be dismissed against the Government because the FTCA has not waived sovereign immunity. Cognizant of the temptation set before the Government to immunize both itself and its employee, the Court in Gutierrez de Martinez v. Lamagno, 115 S. Ct. 2227 (1995), held that the Attorney General's certification is subject to judicial review.

Impeachment

[P. 591, in text following n.784, add:]

Upon at last reaching the question, the Court has held that a claim to judicial review of an issue arising in an impeachment trial in the Senate presents a nonjusticiable question, a "political question."[6] Specifically, the Could held that a claim that the Senate had not followed the proper meaning of the word "try" in the impeachment clause, a special committee being appointed to take testimony and to make a report to the full Senate, complete with a full transcript, on which the Senate acted, could not be reviewed. But the analysis of the Court applies to all impeachment clause questions, thus seemingly putting off-limits to judicial review the whole process.

[6] Nixon v. United States, 506 U.S. 224 (1993). Nixon at the time of his conviction and removal from office was a federal district judge in Mississippi.

ARTICLE III

Judicial Power

[P. 618, add to text following n.126:]

Judicial power confers on federal courts the power to decide a case, to render a judgment conclusively resolving a case. Judicial power is the authority to render dispositive judgments, and Congress violates the separation of powers when it purports to alter *final* judgments of Article III courts.[1] In this controversy, the Court had unexpectedly fixed on a shorter statute of limitations to file certain securities actions than that believed to be the time in many jurisdictions. Resultantly, several suits that had been filed later than the determined limitations had been dismissed and had become final because they were not appealed. Congress enacted a statute, which, while not changing the limitations period prospectively, retroactively extended the time for suits dismissed and provided for the reopening of the final judgments rendered in the dismissals of suits.

Holding the congressional act invalid, the Court held it impermissible for Congress to disturb a final judgment. "Having achieved finality, . . . a judicial decision becomes the last word of the judicial department with regard to a particular case or controversy, and Congress may not declare by retroactive legislation that the law applicable *to that very case* was something other than what the courts said it was."[2]

[P. 620, add to n.140:]

Notice the Court's discussion in Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc., 514 U.S. 211, 218, 225–26 (1995).

---

[1] Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc., 514 U.S. 211, 218–19 (1995). The Court was careful to delineate the difference between attempting to alter a final judgment, one rendered by a court and either not appealed or affirmed on appeal, and legislatively amending a statute so as to change the law as it existed at the time a court issued a decision that was on appeal or otherwise still alive at the time a federal court reviewed the determination below. A court must apply the law as revised when it considers the prior interpretation. Id. at 226–27.

Article III creates or authorizes Congress to create not a collection of unconnected courts, but a judicial *department* composed of "inferior courts" and "one Supreme Court." "Within that hierarchy, the decision of an inferior court is not (unless the time for appeal has expired) the final word of the department as a whole." Id. at 227.

[2] Id. at 227 (emphasis by Court).

Contempt Power

[P. 622, add to text following n.154:]

In *International Union, UMW v. Bagwell,* [3] the Court formulated a new test for drawing the distinction between civil and criminal contempts, which has important consequences for the procedural rights to be accorded those cited. Henceforth, the imposition of non-compensatory contempt fines for the violation of any complex injunction will require criminal proceedings. This case, as have so many, involved the imposition of large fines (here, $52 million) upon a union in a strike situation for violations of an elaborate court injunction restraining union activity during the strike. The Court was vague with regard to the standards for determining when a court order is "complex" and thus requires the protection of criminal proceedings. [4] Much prior doctrine, however, as in the distinction between remedial sanctions, which are civil, and punitive, which are criminal, and between in-court and out-of-court contempts remain.

[P. 631, add to n.195:]

See also International Union, UMW v. Bagwell, 512 U.S. 821 (1994) (refining the test for when contempt citations are criminal and thus require jury trials).

[P. 631, add to n.196:]

In International Union, UMW v. Bagwell, 512 U.S. 821, 837 n.5 (1994), the Court continued to reserve the question of the distinction between petty and serious contempt fines, because of the size of the fine in that case.

[P. 634, add to n.206:]

See also International Union, UMW v. Bagwell, 512 U.S. 821 (1994).

Congressional Control Over Habeas

[P. 639, add to text following n.238:]

In *Felker v. Turpin,* [5] the Court again passed up the opportunity to delineate Congress' permissive authority over *habeas*, finding that of the provisions of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act [6] none did raise questions of constitutional import.

---

[3] 512 U.S. 821 (1994).

[4] Id. at 832–38. Relevant is the fact that the alleged contempts did not occur in the presence of the court and that determinations of violations require elaborate and reliable factfinding. See esp. id. at 837–38.

[5] 116 S. Ct. 2333 (1996).

[6] P. L. 104–132, §§ 101–08, 110 Stat. 1214, 1217–26, amending, *inter alia*, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2244, 2253, 2254, 2255, and Fed. R. App. P. 22.

Congressional Control Over the Injunctive Process

[P. 642, add to text following n.264:]

Perhaps pressing its powers further than prior legislation, Congress has enacted the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996.[7] Essentially, the law imposes a series of restrictions on judicial remedies in prison-conditions cases. Thus, courts may not issue prospective relief that extends beyond that necessary to correct the violation of a federal right that they have found, that is narrowly drawn, is the least intrusive, and that does not give attention to the adverse impact on public safety. Preliminary injunctive relief is limited by the same standards. Consent decrees may not be approved unless they are subject to the same conditions, meaning that the court must conduct a trial and find violations, thus cutting off consent decrees. If a decree was previously issued without regard to the standards now imposed, the defendant or intervenor is entitled to move to vacate it. No prospective relief is to last longer than two years if any party or intervenor so moves. A number of constitutional challenges can be expected respecting Congress' power to limit federal judicial authority to remedy constitutional violations.

Standing

[P. 661, add to text following n.357:]

In a case permitting a plaintiff contractors' association to challenge an affirmative-action, set-aside program, the Court seemed to depart from several restrictive standing decisions in which it had held that the claims of attempted litigants were too "speculative" or too "contingent."[8] The association had sued, alleging that many of its members "regularly bid on and perform construction work" for the city and that they would have bid on the set-aside contracts but for the restrictions. The Court found the association had standing, because certain prior cases under the equal protection clause established a relevant proposition. "When the government erects a barrier that makes it more difficult for members of one group to obtain a benefit than it is for members of another group, a member of the former group seeking to challenge the barrier need not allege that he would have obtained the benefit but for the barrier in order

[7] The statute was part of an Omnibus Appropriations Act signed by the President on April 26, 1996. P. L. 104–134, §§ 801–10, 110 Stat. 1321–66–77, amending 18 U.S.C. § 3626. *See* Benjamin v. Jacobson, 935 F. Supp. 332 (S.D.N.Y. 1996).

[8] Thus, it appears that had the Court applied its standard in the current case, the results would have been different in such cases as Linda R. S. v. Richard D., 410 U.S. 614 (1973); Warth v. Seldin, 422 U.S. 490 (1975); Simon v. Eastern Kentucky Welfare Rights Org., 426 U.S. 26 (1976); and Allen v. Wright, 468 U.S. 737 (1984).

to establish standing. The 'injury in fact' in an equal protection case of this variety is the denial of equal treatment resulting from the imposition of the barrier, not the ultimate inability to obtain the benefit."[9] The association, therefore, established standing by alleging that its members was able and ready to bid on contracts but that a discriminatory policy prevented them from doing so on an equal basis.[10]

Declaratory Judgments

[P. 674, add to n.436:]

See also Wilton v. Seven Falls Co., 515 U.S. 277 (1995).

Ripeness

[P. 678, add to n.457:]

In the context of the ripeness to challenge of agency regulations, as to which there is a presumption of available judicial remedies, the Court has long insisted that federal courts should be reluctant to review such regulations unless the effects of administrative action challenged have been felt in a concrete way by the challenging parties, i.e., unless the controversy is "ripe." See, of the older cases, Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner, 387 U.S. 136 (1967); Toilet Goods Ass'n, Inc. v. Gardner, 387 U.S. 158 (1967); Gardner v. Toilet Goods Ass'n, Inc., 387 U.S. 167 (1967). More recent cases include Reno v. Catholic Social Services, Inc., 509 U.S. 43 (1993); Lujan v. National Wildlife Federation, 497 U.S. 871, 891 (1990).

Mootness

[P. 679, add to n.462:]

Munsingwear had long stood for the proposition that the appropriate practice of the Court in a civil case that had become moot while on the way to the Court or after *certiorari* had been granted was to vacate or reverse and remand with directions to dismiss. But, in U. S. Bancorp Mortgage Co. v. Bonner Mall Partnership, 513 U.S. 18 (1994), the Court held that when mootness occurs because the parties have reached a settlement, vacatur of the judgment below is ordinarily not the best practice; instead, equitable principles should be applied so as to preserve a presumptively correct and valuable precedent, unless a court concludes that the public interest would be served by vacatur.

[PP. 679–80, add to n.463:]

Consider the impact of Cardinal Chemical Co. v. Morton Int'l, Inc., 508 U.S. 83 (1993).

---

[9] Northeastern Fla. Ch. of the Associated Gen. Contractors v. City of Jacksonville, 508 U.S. 656, 666 (1993). The Court derived the proposition from another set of cases. Turner v. Fouche, 396 U.S. 346 (1970); Clements v. Fashing, 457 U.S. 957 (1982); Regents of the Univ. of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265, 281 n.14 (1978).

[10] 508 U.S. at 666. But see, in the context of ripeness, Reno v. Catholic Social Services, Inc., 509 U.S. 43 (1993), in which the Court, over the dissent's reliance on *Jacksonville*, id. at 81–2, denied the relevance of its distinction between entitlement to a benefit and equal treatment. Id. at 58 n.19.

[P. 680, add to n.466:]

Following *Aladdin's Castle*, the Court in Northeastern Fla. Ch. of the Associated Gen. Contractors v. City of Jacksonville, 508 U.S. 656, 660–63 (1993), held that when a municipal ordinance is repealed but replaced by one sufficiently similar so that the challenged action in effect continues, the case is not moot. But see id. at 669 (Justice O'Connor dissenting) (modification of ordinance more significant and case is mooted).

Retroactivity of Judicial Decisions

[P. 687, add to text following n.509:]

Apparently, the Court now has resolved this dispute, although the principal decision is a close five-to-four result. In *Harper v. Virginia Dep't of Taxation*,[11] the Court adopted the principle of the *Griffith* decision in criminal cases and disregarded the *Chevron Oil* approach in civil cases. Henceforth, in civil cases, the rule is: "When this Court applies a rule of federal law to the parties before it, that rule is the controlling interpretation of federal law and must be given full retroactive effect in all cases open on direct review and as to all events, regardless of whether such events predate or postdate our announcement of the rule."[12] Four Justices continued to adhere to *Chevron Oil*, however,[13] so that with one Justice each retired from the different sides one may not regard the issue as definitively settled.[14]

[11] 509 U.S. 86 (1993).

[12] Id. at 97. While the conditional language in this passage might suggest that the Court was leaving open the possibility that in some cases it might rule purely prospectively, not even applying its decision to the parties before it, other language belies that possibility. "This rule extends *Griffith*'s ban against "'selective application of new rules.'" [Citing 479 U.S. at 323]. Inasmuch as *Griffith* rested in part on the principle that "the nature of judicial review requires that [the Court] adjudicate specific cases," *Griffith*, 479 U.S. at 322, deriving from Article III's case or controversy requirement for federal courts and forbidding federal courts from acting legislatively, the "Court has no more constitutional authority in civil cases than in criminal cases to disregard current law or to treat similarly situated litigants differently." 509 U.S. at 97 (quoting *American Trucking*, 496 U.S. at 214 (Justice Stevens dissenting)). The point is made more clearly in Justice Scalia's concurrence, in which he denounces all forms of nonretroactivity as "the handmaid of judicial activism." Id. at 105.

[13] Id. at 110 (Justice Kennedy, with Justice White, concurring); 113 (Justice O'Connor, with Chief Justice Rehnquist, dissenting). However, these Justices disagreed in this case about the proper application of *Chevron Oil*.

[14] *But see* Reynoldsville Casket Co. v. Hyde, 514 U.S. 749 (1995) (setting aside a state court refusal to give retroactive effect to a U. S. Supreme Court invalidation of that State's statute of limitations in certain suits, in an opinion by Justice Breyer, Justice Blackmun's successor); Ryder v. United States, 515 U.S. 177, 184–85 (1995) ("whatever the continuing validity of *Chevron Oil* after" *Harper* and *Reynoldsville Casket*).

Political Questions

[P. 696, add to text following n.569:]

A challenge to the Senate's interpretation of and exercise of its impeachment powers was held to be nonjusticiable; there was a textually demonstrable commitment of the issue to the Senate, and there was a lack of judicially discoverable and manageable standards for resolving the issue.[15]

Judicial Review—Stare Decisis

[P. 712, add to n.639:]

Recent discussions of and both applications of and refusals to apply *stare decisis* may be found in United States v. IBM Corp., 116 S. Ct. 1793, 1800–01 (1996) (noting principles of following precedent and declining to consider overturning an old precedent when parties have not advanced arguments on the point), with which compare id. at 1804 (Justice Kennedy dissenting) (arguing that the United States had presented the point and that the old case ought to be overturned); Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200, 231–35 (1996) (plurality opinion) (discussing *stare decisis*, citing past instances of overrulings, and overruling 1990 decision), with which compare the dissents, id. at 242, 264, 271; Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida, 116 S. Ct. 1114, 1127–32 (1996) (discussing policy of *stare decisis*, why it should not be followed with respect to a 1989 decision, and overruling that precedent), with which compare the dissents, id. at 1133, 1145. Justices Scalia and Thomas have argued for various departures from precedent. E.g., Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Jefferson Lines, Inc., 514 U.S. 175, 200–01 (1995) (Justice Scalia concurring) (negative commerce jurisprudence); Colorado Republican Campaign Comm. v. FEC, 116 S. Ct. 2309, 2323 (1996) (Justice Thomas concurring in part and dissenting in part) (rejecting framework of *Buckley v. Valeo* and calling for overruling of part of case). Compare id. at 2321 (Court notes those issues not raised or argued).

Federal Question Jurisdiction

P. 721, add to n.702:]

See also Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co., 511 U.S. 375 (1994); Peacock v. Thomas, 116 S. Ct. 862 (1996) (both cases using the new vernacular of "ancillary jurisdiction").

Admiralty

[P. 734, add to n.780:]

And see Grubart v. Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., 513 U.S. 527 (1995), a tort claim arising out of damages allegedly caused by negligently driving piles from a barge into the riverbed, which weakened a freight tunnel that allowed flooding of the tunnel and the basements of numerous buildings along the Chicago River, the Court found that admiralty jurisdiction could be invoked. The location test was satisfied, because the barge, even though fastened to the river bottom, was a "vessel" for admiralty tort purposes; the two-part connection test was also satisfied, inasmuch as the incident had a potential to disrupt maritime commerce and the conduct

[15] Nixon v. United States, 506 U.S. 224 (1993). The Court pronounced its decision as perfectly consonant with *Powell v. McCormack*. Id. at 236–38.

giving rise to the incident had a substantial relationship to traditional maritime activity.

United States as a Party

[P. 743, add to n.842:]

But, in Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Calhoun, 116 S. Ct. 619 (1996), a case involving a death in territorial waters from a jet ski accident, the Court held that *Moragne* does not provide the exclusive remedy in cases involving the death in territorial waters of a "nonseafarer" - a person who is neither a seaman covered by the Jones Act nor a longshore worker covered by the LHWCA.

[P. 747, add to n.863:]

See FDIC v. Meyer, 510 U.S. 471 (1994) (FSLIC's "sue-and-be-sued" clause waives sovereign immunity; but a *Bivens* implied cause of action for constitutional torts cannot be used directly against FSLIC).

Suits Between States

[P. 755, add to n.909:]

But in Mississippi v. Louisiana, 506 U.S. 73 (1992), the Court's reluctance to exercise original jurisdiction ran afoul of the "uncompromising language" of 28 U.S.C. § 1251(a) giving the Court "original and *exclusive* jurisdiction" of these kinds of suits.

Diversity of Citizenship

[P. 772, add to text following n.1013:]

Some confusion has been injected into consideration of which law to apply—state or federal—in the absence of a federal statute or a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure.[16] In an action for damages, the federal courts were faced with the issue of the application either of a state statute, which gave the appellate division of the state courts the authority to determine if an award is excessive or inadequate if it *deviates materially* from what would be reasonable compensation, or of a federal judicially-created practice of review of awards as so exorbitant that it shocked the conscience of the court. The Court determined that the state statute was both substantive and procedural, which would result in substantial variations between state and federal damage awards depending whether the state or the federal approach was applied; it then followed the mode of analysis exemplified by those cases emphasizing the importance of federal courts reaching the same outcome as would the state courts,[17] rather than what had been the prevailing standard,

[16] Gasperini v. Center for Humanities, Inc., 116 S. Ct. 2211 (1996). The decision was five-to-four, so that the precedent may or may not be stable for future application.

[17] E.g., Guaranty Trust Co. v. York, 326 U.S. 99 (1945).

in which the Court balanced state and federal interests to determine which law to apply.[18] Emphasis upon either approach to considerations of applying state or federal law reflects a continuing difficulty of accommodating "the constitutional power of the states to regulate the relations among their citizens . . . [and] the constitutional power of the federal government to determine how its courts are to be operated."[19] Additional decisions will be required to determine which approach, if either, prevails.

[P. 773, add to n.1016:]

But see O'Melveny & Myers v. FDIC, 512 U.S. 79 (1994).

Power of Congress to Control the Federal Courts

[P. 788, add to n.1105:]

A restrained reading of *McCardle* is strongly suggested by Felker v. Turpin, 116 S. Ct. 2333 (1996). A 1996 congressional statute giving to federal courts of appeal a "gate-keeping" function over the filing of second or successive *habeas* petitions limited further review, including denying the Supreme Court appellate review of circuit court denials of motions to file second or successive *habeas* petitions. Pub. L. 104–132, § 106, 110 Stat. 1214, 1220, amending 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b). Upholding the limitation, which was nearly identical to the congressional action at issue in *McCardle* and *Yerger*, the Court held that its jurisdiction to hear appellate cases had been denied, but just as in *Yerger* the statute did not annul the Court's jurisdiction to hear *habeas* petitions filed as original matters in the Supreme Court. No constitutional issue was thus presented.

Federal-State Court Relations

[Pp. 798–99, add to n.1161:]

But in Quackenbush v. Allstate Ins. Co., 116 S. Ct. 1712 (1996), an exercise in *Burford* abstention, the Court held that federal courts have power to dismiss or remand cases based on abstention principles only where relief being sought is equitable or otherwise discretionary but may not do so in common-law actions for damages.

Habeas Corpus

[P. 818, add to text following n.1270:]

The Court continues, with some modest exceptions, to construe *habeas* jurisdiction quite restrictively, but it has now been joined by new congressional legislation that is also restrictive. In *Herrera v. Collins*,[20] the Court appeared, though ambiguously, to take the position that, while it requires a showing of actual innocence to permit a claimant to bring a successive or abusive petition, a claim

[18] E.g., Byrd v. Blue Ridge Rural Elec. Coop., 356 U.S. 525 (1958).

[19] 19 C. Wright, A. Miller & E. Cooper, Federal Practice and Procedure (2d ed. 1996), § 4511, at 311.

[20] 506 U.S. 390 (1993).

of innocence is not alone sufficient to enable a claimant to obtain review of his conviction on *habeas*. Petitioners are entitled in federal *habeas* courts to show that they are imprisoned in violation of the Constitution, not to seek to correct errors of fact. But a claim of innocence does not bear on the constitutionality of one's conviction or detention, and the execution of one claiming actual innocence would not itself violate the Constitution.[21]

But, in *Schlup v. Delo*,[22] the Court adopted the plurality opinion of *Kuhlmann v. Wilson* and held that, absent a sufficient showing of "cause and prejudice," a claimant filing a successive or abusive petition must, as an initial matter, make a showing of "actual innocence" so as to fall within the narrow class of cases implicating a fundamental miscarriage of justice. The Court divided, however, with respect to the showing a claimant must make. One standard, found in some of the cases, was championed by the dissenters; "to show 'actual innocence' one must show by clear and convincing evidence that but for a constitutional error, no reasonable juror would have found the petitioner eligible for the death penalty."[23] The Court adopted a second standard, under which the petitioner must demonstrate that "a constitutional violation has probably resulted in the conviction of one who is actually innocent." To meet this burden, a claimant "must show that it is more likely than not that no reasonable juror would have convicted him in the light of the new evidence."[24]

In the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996,[25] Congress imposed tight new restrictions on successive or abusive petitions, including making the circuit courts "gate keepers" in permitting or denying the filing of such petitions, with bars to appellate review of these decisions, provisions that in part were

---

[21] Id. at 398–417. However, in a subsequent part of the opinion, the Court purports to reserve the question whether "a truly persuasive demonstration of 'actual innocence' made after trial would render the execution of a defendant unconstitutional," and it imposed a high standard for making this showing. Id. at 417–19. Justices Scalia and Thomas would have unequivocally held that "[t]here is no basis in text, tradition, or even in contemporary practice . . . for finding in the Constitution a right to demand judicial consideration of newly discovered evidence of innocence brought forward after conviction." Id. at 427–28 (Concurring). However, it is not at all clear that all the Justices joining the Court believe innocence to be nondispositive on *habeas*. Id. at 419 (Justices O'Connor and Kennedy concurring), 429 (Justice White concurring).

[22] 513 U.S. 298 (1995).

[23] Id. at 334 (Chief Justice Rehnquist dissenting, with Justices Kennedy and Thomas), 342 (Justice Scalia dissenting, with Justice Thomas). This standard was drawn from Sawyer v. Whitney, 505 U.S. 333 (1995).

[24] 513 U.S. at 327. This standard was drawn from Murray v. Carrier, 477 U.S. 478 (1986).

[25] P. L. 104–132, Title I, 110 Stat. 1217–21, amending 28 U.S.C. §§ 2244, 2253, 2254, and Rule 22 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

upheld in *Felker v. Turpin.*[26] An important new restriction on the authority of federal *habeas* courts is that found in the new law, which provides that a *habeas* court shall not grant a writ to any person in custody pursuant to a judgment of a state court "with respect to any claim that was adjudicated on the merits in State court proceedings unless the adjudication of the claim - (1) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, *clearly established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme court of the United States*[.]"[27]

[26] 116 S. Ct. 2333 (1996).

[27] The amended 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) (emphasis supplied). On the constitutionality of this provision, see the various opinions in Lindh v. Murphy, 96 F.3d 856 (7th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

FIRST AMENDMENT

RELIGION

An Overview

—Court Tests Applied to Legislation Affecting Religion

[Pp. 973–74, change text following n.25 to read:]

and with increasing frequency have not been applied at all by the Court.

[P. 974, add to n.26 following *Lee v. Weisman* citation:]

Zobrest v. Catalina Foothills School Dist., 509 U.S. 1 (1993) (upholding provision of sign-language interpreter to deaf student attending parochial school); Board of Educ. of Kiryas Joel Village v. Grumet, 114 S. Ct. 2481 (1994) (invalidating law creating special school district for village composed exclusively of members of one religious sect).

[P. 974, add to text following n.29:]

Justice O'Connor has suggested that it is inappropriate to try to shoehorn all Establishment cases into one test, and has called instead for recognition that different contexts may call for different approaches.[1] For example, the Justice proposes that cases involving government "speech" on religious topics be judged by an endorsement test that would invalidate government actions only if a reasonable observer would perceive the action as an endorsement or disapproval of religious belief.[2]

ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION

[P. 977, add to text following n.41:]

"[The] Court has long held that the First Amendment reaches more than classic, 18th century establishments."[3]

Financial Assistance to Church-Related Institutions

[P. 984, add to text following n.74:]

On the other hand, public payment of a sign-language interpreter for a deaf student attending parochial school created no such

[1] Board of Educ. of Kiryas Joel Village v. Grumet, 114 S. Ct. 2481, 2498–99 (1994).

[2] Lynch v. Donnelly, 465 U.S. 668, 688 (1984) (concurring); Allegheny County v. Greater Pittsburgh ACLU, 492 U.S. 573, 625 (1989) (concurring); Board of Educ. of Kiryas Joel Village v. Grumet, 114 S. Ct. 2481, 2500 (1994) (concurring).

[3] Board of Educ. of Kiryas Joel Village v. Grumet, 114 S. Ct. 2481, 2494 (1994) (citing Torcaso v. Watkins, 367 U.S. 488, 492–95 (1961)).

effects or entanglement problems, the Court ruled in a later case, since this was not an expense that the parochial school would otherwise have borne, and since the interpreter had no role in selecting or editing the content of the educational and religious lessons.[4] *Aguilar* and *Grand Rapids* are now tenuous at best, five Justices having recently expressed the opinion that the cases should be overruled or at least reconsidered.[5]

[P. 988, add to n.92:]

Similar reasoning led the Court to rule that provision of a sign-language interpreter to a deaf student attending a parochial school is permissible as part of a neutral program offering such services to all students regardless of what school they attend. Zobrest v. Catalina Foothills School Dist., 509 U.S. 1 (1993). The interpreter, the Court noted additionally, merely transmits whatever material is presented, and neither adds to nor subtracts from the school's sectarian environment. Id. at 13.

[P. 997, change heading to:]

Access of Religious Groups to Public Property

[P. 997, add to text following n.130:]

Similarly, public schools may not rely on the Establishment Clause as grounds to discriminate against religious groups in after-hours use of school property otherwise available for non-religious social, civic, and recreational purposes;[6] public colleges may not exclude student religious organizations from benefits otherwise provided to a full spectrum of student "news, information, opinion, entertainment, or academic communications media groups;"[7] and a state that creates a traditional public forum for citizen speeches and unattended displays on a plaza at its state capitol cannot, on Establishment Clause grounds, deny access for a religious display.[8] These cases make clear that the Establishment Clause does not

---

[4] Zobrest v. Catalina Foothills School Dist., 509 U.S. 1 (1993).

[5] *See* Board of Educ. of Kiryas Joel Village v. Grumet, 114 S. Ct. 2481 (1994). Four Justices advocated outright overruling: Justice O'Connor, id. at 2498 (*Aguilar* erroneously requires "disfavoring" of religion and should be reconsidered) (concurring opinion); and Justice Scalia, joined by Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justice Thomas, Id. at 2514–15 (dissenting opinion). Justice Kennedy stated that the cases "may have been erroneous," and advocated reconsideration. Id. at 2505 (concurring opinion).

[6] Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches School Dist., 508 U.S. 384 (1993). The Court explained that there was "no realistic danger that the community would think that the District was endorsing religion," and that the three-part *Lemon* test would not have been violated. Id. at 395. Concurring opinions by Justice Scalia, joined by Justice Thomas, and by Justice Kennedy, criticized the Court's reference to *Lemon*. "Like some ghoul in a late-night horror movie that repeatedly sits up in its grave and shuffles abroad, after being repeatedly killed and buried, *Lemon* stalks our Establishment Clause jurisprudence once again," Justice Scalia lamented. Id. at 398.

[7] Rosenberger v. University of Virginia, 115 S. Ct. 2510 (1995).

[8] Capitol Square Review Bd. v. Pinette, 115 S. Ct. 2440 (1995).

necessarily trump the First Amendment's protection of freedom of speech; in regulating private speech in a public forum, government may not justify discrimination against religious viewpoints as necessary to avoid creating an "establishment" of religion.

[P. 1002, add new heading following n.163:]

Religious Displays on Government Property

[P. 1004, add new paragraph at end of section:]

In *Capitol Square Review Bd. v. Pinette*,[9] the Court distinguished privately sponsored from governmentally sponsored religious displays on public property. There the Court ruled that Ohio violated free speech rights by refusing to allow the Ku Klux Klan to display an unattended cross in a publicly owned plaza outside the Ohio Statehouse. Because the plaza was a public forum in which the State had allowed a broad range of speakers and a variety of unattended displays, the State could regulate the expressive content of such speeches and displays only if the restriction was necessary, and narrowly drawn, to serve a compelling state interest. The Court recognized that compliance with the Establishment Clause can be a sufficiently compelling reason to justify content-based restrictions on speech, but saw no need to apply this principle when permission to display a religious symbol is granted through the same procedures, and on the same terms, required of other private groups seeking to convey non-religious messages.

Miscellaneous

[P. 1005, add to text at end of section:]

Using somewhat similar reasoning, the Court in *Board of Education of Kiryas Joel Village v. Grumet*,[10] invalidated a New York law creating a special school district for an incorporated village

[9] 115 S. Ct. 2440 (1995). The Court was divided 7–2 on the merits of *Pinette*, a vote that obscured continuing disagreement over analytical approach. The portions of Justice Scalia's opinion that formed the opinion of the Court were joined by Chief Justice Rehnquist and by Justices O'Connor, Kennedy, Souter, Thomas, and Breyer. A separate part of Justice Scalia's opinion, joined only by the Chief Justice and by Justices Kennedy and Thomas, disputed the assertions of Justices O'Connor, Souter, and Breyer that the "endorsement" test should be applied. Dissenting Justice Stevens thought that allowing the display on the Capitol grounds did carry "a clear image of endorsement" (id. at 2471), and Justice Ginsburg's brief opinion seemingly agreed with that conclusion.

[10] 114 S. Ct. 2481 (1994). Only four Justices (Souter, Blackmun, Stevens, and Ginsburg) thought that the *Grendel's Den* principle applied; in their view the distinction that the delegation was to a village electorate rather than to a religious body "lack[ed] constitutional significance" under the peculiar circumstances of the case. 114 S. Ct. at 2488.

composed exclusively of members of one small religious sect. The statute failed "the test of neutrality," the Court concluded, since it delegated power to an electorate defined by common religious belief and practice, in a manner that fails to foreclose religious favoritism." It was the "anomalously case-specific nature of the legislature's exercise of authority" that left the Court "without any direct way to review such state action" for conformity with the neutrality principle. Because the village did not receive its governmental authority simply as one of many communities eligible under a general law, the Court explained, there was no way of knowing whether the legislature would grant similar benefits on an equal basis to other religious and nonreligious groups.

FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION

[P. 1007, add to n.188:]

Board of Educ. of Kiryas Joel Village v. Grumet, 114 S. Ct. 2481, 2492–93 (1994) ("accommodation is not a principle without limits;" one limitation is that "neutrality as among religions must be honored").

Free Exercise Exemption From General Governmental Requirements

[P. 1018, add new paragraph following n.253:]

The political processes were soon utilized in an attempt to provide additional protection for religious exercise. In the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993,[11] Congress sought to supersede *Smith* and substitute a statutory rule of decision. The Act provides that laws of general applicability—federal, state, and local—may substantially burden free exercise of religion only if they further a compelling governmental interest and constitute the least restrictive means of doing so. The purpose, Congress declared in the Act itself, was "to restore the compelling interest test as set forth in Sherbert v. Verner and Wisconsin v. Yoder and to guarantee its application in all cases where free exercise of religion is substantially burdened."[12] Enactment of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act does not, however, close the book on *Smith*. Issues concerning the RFRA's constitutionality ensure continuing litigation over the appropriate constitutional test.[13]

---

[11] Pub. L. 103–141, 107 Stat. 1488 (1993); 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000bb to 2000bb–4.

[12] Pub. L. 103–141, § 2(b)(1) (citations omitted). Congress also avowed a purpose of providing "a claim or defense to persons whose religious exercise is substantially burdened by government." § 2(b)(2).

[13] *See, e.g.*, Flores v. City of Boerne, 877 F. Supp. 355 (W.D. Tex. 1995) (holding the RFRA unconstitutional); and Canedy v. Boardman, 16 F.3d 183, 186 n.2 (7th Cir. 1994) (dictum that the constitutionality of the RFRA—not before the court—"raises a number of questions involving the extent of Congress's powers under Sec-

[P. 1018, add new note following comma after word "treatment" in third sentence of paragraph beginning after n.253:]

This much was made clear by *Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520 (1993), striking down a city ordinance that prohibited ritual animal sacrifice but that allowed other forms of animal slaughter.

[P. 1018, add to text at end of third sentence of same paragraph:]

That the Court views the principle as a general one, not limited to criminal laws, seems evident from its restatement in *Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah*: "our cases establish the general proposition that a law that is neutral and of general application need not be justified by a compelling governmental interest even if the law has the incidental effect of burdening a particular religious practice."[14]

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION—SPEECH AND PRESS

Adoption and Common Law Background

[P. 1025, add to text at end of section:]

The First Amendment by its terms applies only to laws enacted by Congress, and not to the actions of private persons.[15] This leads to a "state action" (or "governmental action") limitation similar to that applicable to the Fourteenth Amendment.[16] The limitation has seldom been litigated in the First Amendment context, but there is no obvious reason why analysis should differ markedly from Fourteenth Amendment state action analysis. Both contexts require "cautious analysis of the quality and degree of Government relationship to the particular acts in question."[17] In holding that the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) is a governmental entity for purposes of the First Amendment, the Court declared that "[t]he Constitution constrains governmental action 'by whatever instruments or in whatever modes that action may be taken.'. . . [a]nd under whatever congressional label."[18] The rela-

---

tion 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment"). For an overview of these issues, see Scott C. Idleman, *The Religious Freedom Restoration Act: Pushing the Limits of Legislative Power*, 73 TEX. L. REV. 247 (1994). For arguments pro and con, *compare* Douglas Laycock, *The Religious Freedom Restoration Act*, 1993 B.Y.U. L. REV. 221 *with* Christopher L. Eisgruber and Lawrence G. Sager, *Why the Religious Freedom Restoration Act is Unconstitutional*, 69 N.Y.U. L. REV. 437 (1994).

[14] 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993).

[15] Through interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment, the prohibition extends to the States as well. *See* discussion on incorporation, main text, pp. 957–64.

[16] *See* discussion on state action, main text, pp. 1786–1802.

[17] CBS v. Democratic Nat'l Comm., 412 U.S. 94, 115 (1973) (opinion of Chief Justice Burger).

[18] Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., 115 S. Ct. 961, 971 (1995) (quoting Ex parte Virginia, 100 U.S. 339, 346–47 (1880)). The Court refused to be bound by

tionship of the government to broadcast licensees affords other opportunities to explore the breadth of "governmental action."[19]

The Doctrine of Prior Restraint

—Obscenity and Prior Restraint

P. 1033, add to n.69:]

But cf. Alexander v. United States, 509 U.S. 544 (1993) (RICO forfeiture of the entire adult entertainment book and film business of an individual convicted of obscenity and racketeering offenses, based on the predicate acts of selling four magazines and three videotapes, does not constitute a prior restraint and is not invalid as "chilling" protected expression that is not obscene).

Freedom of Belief

—Imposition of Consequences for Holding Certain Beliefs

[P. 1054, add to n.181 following cite to *Barclay v. Florida*:]

Wisconsin v. Mitchell, 508 U.S. 476 (1993) (criminal sentence may be enhanced because the defendant intentionally selected his victim on account of the victim's race),

Right of Association

[P. 1061, add to text at end of section:]

When application of a public accommodations law was viewed as impinging on an organization's ability to present its message, the Court found a First Amendment violation. Massachusetts could not require the private organizers of Boston's St. Patrick's Day parade to allow a group of gays and lesbians to march as a unit proclaiming its members' gay and lesbian identity, the Court held in *Hurley v. Irish-American Gay Group*.[20] To do so would require parade organizers to promote a message they did not wish to promote. The *Roberts* and *New York City* cases were distinguished as

---

the statement in Amtrak's authorizing statute that the corporation is "not . . . an agency or establishment of the United States Government." This assertion can be effective "only for purposes of matters that are within Congress' control," the Court explained. "It is not for Congress to make the final determination of Amtrak's status as a governmental entity for purposes of determining the constitutional rights of citizens affected by its actions." 115 S. Ct. at 971.

[19] In CBS v. Democratic Nat'l Comm., 412 U.S. 94 (1973), the Court held that a broadcast licensee could refuse to carry a paid editorial advertisement. Chief Justice Burger, joined only by Justices Stewart and Rehnquist in that portion of his opinion, reasoned that a licensee's refusal to accept such an ad did not constitute "governmental action" for purposes of the First Amendment. "The First Amendment does not reach acts of private parties in every instance where the Congress or the [Federal Communications] Commission has merely permitted or failed to prohibit such acts." Id. at 119.

[20] 115 S. Ct. 2338 (1995).

not involving "a trespass on the organization's message itself."[21] Those cases stood for the proposition that the state could require equal access for individuals to what was considered the public benefit of organization membership. But even if individual access to the parade might similarly be mandated, the Court reasoned, the gay group "could nonetheless be refused admission as an expressive contingent with its own message just as readily as a private club could exclude an applicant whose manifest views were at odds with a position taken by the club's existing members."[22]

—Political Association

[P. 1063, add to text before first full paragraph on page:]

In 1996 the Court extended *Branti* and *Finkel* to protect independent government contractors.[23]

Particular Governmental Regulations That Restrict Expression

[P. 1081, change subheading to:]

—Government as Employer: Political and Other Outside Activities

[P. 1084, add new paragraph to end of section:]

The Hatch Act cases were distinguished in *United States v. National Treasury Employees Union*,[24] in which the Court struck down an honoraria ban as applied to lower level employees of the Federal Government. The honoraria ban suppressed employees' right to free expression while the Hatch Act sought to protect that right, and also there was no evidence of improprieties in acceptance of honoraria by members of the plaintiff class of federal employees.[25] The Court emphasized further difficulties with the "crudely crafted" honoraria ban: it was limited to expressive activities and had no application to other sources of outside income, it applied

[21] Id. at 2351.

[22] Id.

[23] O'Hare Truck Serv., Inc. v. City of Northlake, 116 S. Ct. 2353 (1996) (allegation that city removed petitioner's company from list of those offered towing business on a rotating basis, in retaliation for petitioner's refusal to contribute to mayor's campaign, and for his support of mayor's opponent, states a cause of action under the First Amendment). *See also* Board of County Comm'rs v. Umbehr, 116 S. Ct. 2342 (1996) (termination or non-renewal of a public contract in retaliation for the contractor's speech on a matter of public concern can violate the First Amendment).

[24] 115 S. Ct. 1003 (1995).

[25] The plaintiff class consisted of all Executive Branch employees below grade GS–16. Also covered by the ban were senior executives, Members of Congress, and other federal officers, but the possibility of improprieties by these groups did not justify application of the ban to "the vast rank and file of federal employees below grade GS–16."

when neither the subjects of speeches and articles nor the persons or groups paying for them bore any connection to the employee's job responsibilities, and it exempted a "series" of speeches or articles without also exempting individual articles and speeches. These "anomalies" led the Court to conclude that the "speculative benefits" of the ban were insufficient to justify the burdens it imposed on expressive activities.[26]

—Government as Employer: Free Expression Generally

[P. 1089, add to text following n.113:]

The protections applicable to government employees have been extended to independent government contractors, the Court announcing that "the *Pickering* balancing test, adjusted to weigh the government's interests as contractor rather than as employer, determines the extent of their protection."[27]

[P. 1089, add to n.116:]

In Waters v. Churchill, 114 S. Ct. 1878 (1994), the Court grappled with what procedural protections may be required by the First Amendment when public employees are dismissed on speech-related grounds, but reached no consensus.

—Government as Regulator of the Electoral Process: Elections

[P. 1097, add to n.150:]

See also Colorado Republican Campaign Comm. v. FEC, 116 S. Ct. 2309 (1996) (the First Amendment bars application of the Party Expenditure Provision of the Federal Election Campaign Act, 2 U.S.C. § 441a(d)(3), to expenditures that the political party makes independently, without coordination with the candidate).

Governmental Regulation of Communications Industries

—Commercial Speech

[P. 1116, add to n.12:]

Shapero was distinguished in Florida Bar v. Went For It, Inc., 115 S. Ct. 2371 (1995), a 5–4 decision upholding a prohibition on targeted direct-mail solicitations to victims and their relatives for a 30-day period following an accident or disaster. The ban struck down in *Shapero* was far broader, both in scope and in duration, the Court explained, and was not supported, as Florida's was, by findings describing the harms to be prevented by the ban. Dissenting Justice Kennedy disagreed that there was a valid distinction, pointing out the Court's previous reliance on the mode of communication (in-person solicitation versus mailings) as "mak[ing] all the difference." 115 S. Ct. at 2382 (quoting *Shapero*, 486 U.S. at 475).

[26] 115 S. Ct. at 1018.
[27] Board of County Comm'rs v. Umbehr, 116 S. Ct. 2342, 2346 (1996).

[P. 1116, add to text following n.13:]

, or prohibit a certified public accountant from holding herself out as a certified financial planner.[28]

[P. 1116, add to text following n.14:]

The Court later refused, however, to extend this principle to in-person solicitation by certified public accountants, explaining that CPAs, unlike attorneys, are not professionally "trained in the art of persuasion," and that the typical business executive client of a CPA is "far less susceptible to manipulation" than was the accident victim in *Ohralik*.[29] To allow enforcement of such a broad prophylactic rule absent identification of a serious problem such as ambulance chasing, the Court explained, would dilute commercial speech protection "almost to nothing."[30]

[P. 1117, delete last two sentences of paragraph continued from p. 1116, and substitute the following:]

The Court has developed a four-pronged test to measure the validity of restraints upon commercial expression.

[P. 1117, add to n.19 following *San Francisco Arts & Athletics* cite:]

Rubin v. Coors Brewing Co., 115 S. Ct. 1585 (1995) (government's interest in curbing strength wars among brewers is substantial, but interest in facilitating state regulation of alcohol is not substantial). *Contrast* United States v. Edge Broadcasting Co., 509 U.S. 418 (1993), finding a substantial federal interest in facilitating state restrictions on lotteries. "Unlike the situation in *Edge Broadcasting*," the *Coors* Court explained, "the policies of some states do not prevent neighboring states from pursuing their own alcohol-related policies within their respective borders." 115 S. Ct. at 1591.

[P. 1118, add to n.20 following *Bolger* cite:]

Rubin v. Coors Brewing Co., 115 S. Ct. 1585 (1995) (prohibition on display of alcohol content on beer labels does not directly and materially advance government's interest in curbing strength wars among brewers, given the inconsistencies and "overall irrationality" of the regulatory scheme); Edenfield v. Fane, 507 U.S. 761 (1993) (Florida's ban on in-person solicitation by certified public accountants does not directly advance its legitimate interests in protecting consumers from fraud, protecting consumer privacy, and maintaining professional independence from clients).

[P. 1118, add to text following n.20:]

Instead, the regulation must "directly advance" the governmental interest. The Court resolves this issue with reference to ag-

[28] Ibanez v. Florida Bd. of Accountancy, 114 S. Ct. 2084 (1994) (also ruling that Accountancy Board could not reprimand the CPA, who was also a licensed attorney, for truthfuly listing her CPA credentials in advertising for her law practice).
[29] Edenfield v. Fane, 507 U.S. 761, 775 (1993).
[30] Id. at 1803.

gregate effects, and does not limit its consideration to effects on the challenging litigant.[31]

[P. 1118, add to n.21 following *Bolger* cite:]

Rubin v. Coors Brewing Co., 115 S. Ct. 1585 (1995) (there are less intrusive alternatives—e.g., direct limitations on alcohol content of beer—to prohibition on display of alcohol content on beer label).

[P. 1118, add to n.22:]

In a 1993 opinion the Court elaborated on the difference between "reasonable fit" and least restrictive alternative. "A regulation need not be 'absolutely the least severe that will achieve the desired end,' but if there are numerous and obvious less-burdensome alternatives to the restriction . . . , that is certainly a relevant consideration in determining whether the 'fit' between ends and means is reasonable." City of Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc., 507 U.S. 410, 417 n.13 (1993).

[P. 1118, delete remainder of section after n.22, and add the following:]

The "reasonable fit" standard has some teeth, the Court made clear in *City of Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc.*,[32] striking down a city's prohibition on distribution of "commercial handbills" through freestanding newsracks located on city property. The city's aesthetic interest in reducing visual clutter was furthered by reducing the total number of newsracks, but the distinction between prohibited "commercial" publications and permitted "newspapers" bore "no relationship *whatsoever*" to this legitimate interest.[33] The city could not, the Court ruled, single out commercial speech to bear the full onus when "all newsracks, regardless of whether they contain commercial or noncommercial publications, are equally at fault."[34] On the other hand, the Court upheld a federal law that prohibited broadcast of lottery advertisements by a broadcaster in a state that prohibits lotteries, while allowing broadcast of such ads by stations in states that sponsor lotteries. There was a "reasonable fit" between the restriction and the asserted federal interest in supporting state anti-gambling policies without unduly interfering with policies of neighboring states that promote lotteries.[35] The prohibition "directly served" the congressional interest, and could be applied to a broadcaster whose principal audience was in

---

[31] United States v. Edge Broadcasting Co., 509 U.S. 418, 427 (1993) ("this question cannot be answered by limiting the inquiry to whether the governmental interest is directly advanced as applied to a single person or entity").

[32] 507 U.S. 410 (1993). *See also* Edenfield v. Fane, 507 U.S. 761 (1993), decided the same Term, relying on the "directly advance" third prong of *Central Hudson* to strike down a ban on in-person solicitation by certified public accountants.

[33] Id. at 1514.

[34] Id. at 1515. The Court also noted the "minute" effect of removing 62 "commercial" newsracks while 1,500 to 2,000 other newsracks remained in place. Id. at 1510.

[35] United States v. Edge Broadcasting Co., 509 U.S. 418 (1993).

an adjoining lottery state, and who sought to run ads for that state's lottery.[36]

In a 1986 decision the Court asserted that "the greater power to completely ban casino gambling necessarily includes the lesser power to ban advertising of casino gambling."[37] Subsequently, however, the Court has eschewed reliance on *Posadas*,[38] and it seems doubtful that the Court would again embrace the broad principle that government may ban all advertising of an activity that it permits but has power to prohibit. Indeed, the Court's very holding in *44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island*,[39] striking down the State's ban on advertisements that provide truthful information about liquor prices, is inconsistent with the general proposition. A Court plurality in *44 Liquormart* squarely rejected *Posadas*, calling it "erroneous," declining to give force to its "highly deferential approach," and proclaiming that a state "does not have the broad discretion to suppress truthful, nonmisleading information for paternalistic purposes that the *Posadas* majority was willing to tolerate."[40] Four other Justices concluded that *Posadas* was inconsistent with the "closer look" that the Court has since required in applying the principles of *Central Hudson*.[41]

The "different degree of protection" accorded commercial speech has a number of consequences. Somewhat broader times, places, and manner regulations are to be tolerated.[42] The rule

---

[36] Id. at 2704.

[37] Posadas de Puerto Rico Assocs. v. Tourism Co. of Puerto Rico, 478 U.S. 328, 345–46 (1986). For discussion of the case, *see* P. Kurland, *Posadas de Puerto Rico v. Tourism Company: "'Twas Strange, 'Twas Passing Strange; 'Twas Pitiful, 'Twas Wondrous Pitiful,"* 1986 SUP. CT. REV. 1.

[38] In *Rubin v. Coors Brewing Co.*, 115 S. Ct. 1585 (1995) (invalidating a federal ban on revealing alcohol content on malt beverage labels), the Court rejected reliance on *Posadas*, pointing out that the statement in *Posadas* had been made only after a determination that the advertising could be upheld under *Central Hudson*. The Court found it unnecessary to consider the greater-includes-lesser argument in *United States v. Edge Broadcasting Co.*, 509 U.S. 418, 427 (1993), upholding through application of *Central Hudson* principles a ban on broadcast of lottery ads.

[39] 116 S. Ct. 1495 (1996).

[40] 116 S. Ct. at 1511–14 (opinion of Stevens, joined by Justices Kennedy, Thomas, and Ginsburg). The Stevens opinion also dismissed the *Posadas* "greater-includes-the-lesser argument" as "inconsistent with both logic and well-settled doctrine," pointing out that the First Amendment "presumes that attempts to regulate speech are more dangerous than attempts to regulate conduct." Id. at 1512.

[41] 116 S. Ct. at 1522 (concurring opinion of O'Connor, joined by Chief Justice Rehnquist and by Justices Souter and Breyer).

[42] Virginia State Bd. of Pharmacy v. Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, 425 U.S. 748, 771 (1976); Bates v. State Bar of Arizona, 433 U.S. 350, 384 (1977). But in Linmark Associates v. Township of Willingboro, 431 U.S. 85, 93–94 (1977), the Court refused to accept a times, places, and manner defense of an ordinance prohibiting "For Sale" signs on residential lawns. First, ample alternative channels of communication were not available, and second, the ban was seen rather as a content limitation.

against prior restraints may be inapplicable,[43] and disseminators of commercial speech are not protected by the overbreadth doctrine.[44]

Different degrees of protection may also be discerned among different categories of commercial speech. The first prong of the *Central Hudson* test means that false, deceptive, or misleading advertisements need not be permitted; government may require that a commercial message appear in such a form, or include such additional information, warnings, and disclaimers, as are necessary to prevent deception.[45] But even truthful, non-misleading commercial speech may be regulated, and the validity of such regulation is tested by application of the remaining prongs of the *Central Hudson* test. The test itself does not make further distinctions based on the content of the commercial message or the nature of the governmental interest (that interest need only be "substantial"). Recent decisions suggest, however, that further distinctions may exist. Measures aimed at preserving "a fair bargaining process" between consumer and advertiser[46] may be more likely to pass the test[47] than regulations designed to implement general health, safety, or moral concerns.[48] As the governmental interest becomes further

[43] Virginia State Bd. of Pharmacy v. Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, 425 U.S. 748, 771–72 n.24 (1976); Central Hudson Gas & Elec. Co. v. Public Serv. Comm'n, 447 U.S. 557, 571 n.13 (1980).

[44] Bates v. State Bar of Arizona, 433 U.S. 350, 379–81 (1977); Central Hudson Gas & Electric Co. v. Public Service Comm'n, 477 U.S. 557, 565 n.8 (1980).

[45] Bates v. State Bar of Arizona, 433 U.S. 350, 383–84 (1977); Ohralik v. Ohio State Bar Ass'n, 436 U.S. 447, 456 (1978). Requirements that advertisers disclose more information than they otherwise choose to are upheld "as long as [they] are reasonably related to the State's interest in preventing deception of consumers," the Court explaining that "[t]he right of a commercial speaker not to divulge accurate information regarding his services is not . . . a fundamental right" requiring strict scrutiny of the disclosure requirement. Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel, 471 U.S. 626, 651 & n.14 (1985) (upholding requirement that attorney's contingent fees ad mention that unsuccessful plaintiffs might still be liable for court costs).

[46] 44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island, 116 S. Ct. 1495, 1507 (1996) (opinion of Justice Stevens, joined by Justices Kennedy and Ginsburg).

[47] See, e.g., Ohralik v. Ohio State Bar Ass'n, 436 U.S. 447, 465 (1978) (upholding ban on in-person solicitation by attorneys due in part to the "potential for overreaching" when a trained advocate "solicits an unsophisticated, injured, or distressed lay person").

[48] *Compare* United States v. Edge Broadcasting Co., 509 U.S. 418 (1993) (upholding federal law supporting state interest in protecting citizens from lottery information) *and* Florida Bar v. Went For It, Inc., 115 S. Ct. 2371, 2379 (1995) (upholding a 30-day ban on targeted, direct-mail solicitation of accident victims by attorneys, not because of any presumed susceptibility to overreaching, but because the ban "forestall[s] the outrage and irritation with the . . . legal profession that the [banned] solicitation . . . has engendered") *with* Rubin v. Coors Brewing Co., 115 S. Ct. 1585 (1995) (striking down federal statute prohibiting display of alcohol content on beer labels) *and* 44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island, 116 S. Ct. 1495 (1996) (striking down state law prohibiting display of retail prices in ads for alcoholic beverages).

removed from protecting a fair bargaining process, it may become more difficult to establish the absence of less burdensome regulatory alternatives and the presence of a "reasonable fit" between the commercial speech restriction and the governmental interest.[49]

—Radio and Television

[P. 1126, delete last paragraph on page:]

—Governmentally Compelled Right of Reply to Newspapers

[P. 1127, add to n.65:]

See also Hurley v. Irish-American Gay Group, 115 S. Ct. 2338 (1995) (state may not compel parade organizer to allow participation by a parade unit proclaiming message that organizer does not wish to endorse).

[P. 1127, add new section following n.65:]

—Regulation of Cable Television

The Court has recognized that cable television "implicates First Amendment interests," since a cable operator communicates ideas through selection of original programming and through exercise of editorial discretion in determining which stations to include in its offering.[50] Moreover, "settled principles of . . . First Amendment jurisprudence" govern review of cable regulation; cable is not limited by "scarce" broadcast frequencies and does not require the same less rigorous standard of review that the Court applies to regulation of broadcasting.[51] Cable does, however, have unique characteristics that justify regulations that single out cable for special

[49] Justice Stevens has criticized the *Central Hudson* test because it seemingly allows regulation of any speech propounded in a commercial context regardless of the content of that speech. "[A]ny description of commercial speech that is intended to identify the category of speech entitled to less First Amendment protection should relate to the reasons for permitting broader regulation: namely, commercial speech's potential to mislead." Rubin v. Coors Brewing Co., 115 S. Ct. 1585, 1595 (1995) (concurring opinion). The Justice repeated these views in 1996: "when a State entirely prohibits the dissemination of truthful, nonmisleading commercial messages for reasons unrelated to the preservation of a fair bargaining process, there is far less reason to depart from the rigorous review that the First Amendment generally demands." 44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island, 116 S. Ct. 1495, 1507 (1996) (a portion of the opinion joined by Justices Kennedy and Ginsburg).

[50] City of Los Angeles v. Preferred Communications, 476 U.S. 488 (1986) (leaving for future decision how the operator's interests are to be balanced against a community's interests in limiting franchises and preserving utility space); Turner Broadcasting System v. FCC, 114 S. Ct. 2445, 2456 (1994).

[51] Turner Broadcasting System v. FCC, 114 S. Ct. 2445, 2456–57 (1994).

treatment.[52] The Court in *Turner Broadcasting System v. FCC*[53] upheld federal statutory requirements that cable systems carry local commercial and public television stations. Although these "must-carry" requirements "distinguish between speakers in the television programming market," they do so based on the manner of transmission and not on the content the messages conveyed, and hence are "content neutral."[54] The regulations could therefore be measured by the "intermediate level of scrutiny" set forth in *United States v. O'Brien*.[55] Two years later, however, a splintered Court could not agree on what standard of review to apply to content-based restrictions of cable broadcasts. Striking down a requirement that cable operators must, in order to protect children, segregate and block programs with patently offensive sexual material, a Court majority in *Denver Area Educational Telecommunications Consortium v. FCC*,[56] found it unnecessary to determine whether strict scrutiny or some lesser standard applies, since the restriction was deemed invalid under any of the alternative tests. There was no opinion of the Court on the other two holdings in the case,[57] and a plurality[58] rejected assertions that public forum analysis,[59] or a rule giving cable operators' editorial rights "general primacy" over the rights of programmers and viewers,[60] should govern.

[52] Id. at 2468 (referring to the "bottleneck monopoly power" exercised by cable operators in determining which networks and stations to carry, and to the resulting dangers posed to the viability of broadcast television stations). *See also* Leathers v. Medlock, 499 U.S. 439 (1991) (application of state gross receipts tax to cable industry permissible even though other segments of the communications media were exempted).

[53] 114 S. Ct. 2445 (1994).

[54] Id. at 2460. "Deciding whether a particular regulation is content-based or content-neutral is not always a simple task," the Court confessed. Id. at 2459. Indeed, dissenting Justice O'Connor, joined by Justices Scalia, Ginsburg, and Thomas, viewed the rules as content-based. Id. at 2475–79.

[55] 391 U.S. 367, 377 (1968). The Court remanded *Turner* for further factual findings relevant to the *O'Brien* test.

[56] 116 S. Ct. 2374, 2391 (1996) (invalidating § 10(b) of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992).

[57] Upholding § 10(a) of the Act, which permits cable operators to prohibit indecent material on leased access channels; and striking down § 10(c), which permits a cable operator to prevent transmission of "sexually explicit" programming on public access channels.

[58] This section of Justice Breyer's opinion was joined by Justices Stevens, O'Connor, and Souter. 116 S. Ct. at 2384.

[59] Justice Kennedy, joined by Justice Ginsburg, advocated this approach. 116 S. Ct. at 2409, and took the plurality to task for its "evasion of any clear legal standard." Id. at 2405.

[60] Justice Thomas, joined by Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justice Scalia, advocated this approach.

Government Restraint of Content of Expression

—Group Libel, Hate Speech

[P. 1136, add to n.111:]

On the other hand, the First Amendment does permit enhancement of a criminal penalty based on the defendant's motive in selecting a victim of a particular race. Wisconsin v. Mitchell, 508 U.S. 476 (1993). The law has long recognized motive as a permissible element in sentencing, the Court noted. Id. at 2199. *R.A.V.* was distinguished as involving a limitation on "speech" rather than conduct, and because the state might permissibly conclude that bias-inspired crimes inflict greater societal harm than do non-bias inspired crimes (e.g., they are more likely to provoke retaliatory crimes). Id. at 2201. *See generally* Laurence H. Tribe, *The Mystery of Motive, Private and Public: Some Notes Inspired by the Problems of Hate Crime and Animal Sacrifice*, 1993 SUP. CT. REV. 1.

—Obscenity

[P. 1152, add to n.14:]

None of these strictures apply, however, to forfeitures imposed as part of a criminal penalty. Alexander v. United States, 509 U.S. 544 (1993) (upholding RICO forfeiture of the entire adult entertainment book and film business of an individual convicted of obscenity and racketeering offenses). Justice Kennedy, dissenting in *Alexander*, objected to the "forfeiture of expressive material that had not been adjudged to be obscene." Id. at 2786.

—Nonobscene But Sexually Explicit and Indecent Expression

[P. 1161, add to n.61:]

Similar rules apply in regulation of cable TV. In Denver Area Educ. Tel. Consortium v. FCC, 116 S. Ct. 2374, 2391 (1996), the Court, acknowledging that protection of children from sexually explicit programming is a "compelling" governmental interest (but refusing to determine whether strict scrutiny applies), nonetheless struck down a requirement that cable operators segregate and block indecent programming on leased access channels. The segregate and block restrictions, which included a requirement that a request for access be in writing, and which allowed for up to 30 days' delay in blocking or unblocking a channel, were not sufficiently protective of adults' speech/viewing interests to be considered either narrowly or reasonably tailored to serve the government's compelling interest in protecting children.

Speech Plus

—The Public Forum

[P. 1167, add to n.98 following cite to *Niemotko v. Maryland*:]

Capitol Square Review Bd. v. Pinette, 115 S. Ct. 2440 (1995) (denial of permission to Ku Klux Klan, allegedly in order to avoid Establishment Clause violation, to place a cross in plaza on grounds of state capitol); Rosenberger v. University of Virginia, 115 S. Ct. 2510 (1995) (University's subsidy for printing costs of student publications, available for student "news, information, opinion, entertainment, or academic communications," could not be withheld because of the religious content of a student publication); Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches School Dist., 508 U.S. 384 (1993) (school district rule prohibiting after-hours use of school property for

showing of a film presenting a religious perspective on child-rearing and family values, but allowing after-hours use for non-religious social, civic, and recreational purposes).

—Public Issue Picketing and Parading

P. 1179, add to text at end of section:]

More recently, disputes arising from anti-abortion protests outside abortion clinics have occasioned another look at principles distinguishing lawful public demonstrations from proscribable conduct. In *Madsen v. Women's Health Center*,[61] the Court refined principles governing issuance of "content-neutral" injunctions that restrict expressive activity.[62] The appropriate test, the Court stated, is "whether the challenged provisions of the injunction burden no more speech than necessary to serve a significant governmental interest."[63] Regular time, place, and manner analysis (requiring that regulation be narrowly tailored to serve a significant governmental interest) "is not sufficiently rigorous," the Court explained, because injunctions create greater risk of censorship and discriminatory application, and because of the established principle that an injunction should be no broader than necessary to achieve its desired goals."[64] Applying its new test, the Court upheld an injunction prohibiting protesters from congregating, picketing, patrolling, demonstrating, or entering any portion of the public right-of-way within 36 feet of an abortion clinic. Similarly upheld were noise restrictions designed to ensure the health and well-being of clinic patients. Other aspects of the injunction, however, did not pass the test. Inclusion of private property within the 36-foot buffer was not adequately justified, nor was inclusion in the noise restriction of a ban on "images observable" by clinic patients. A ban on physically approaching any person within 300 feet of the clinic unless that person indicated a desire to communicate burdened more speech than necessary. Also, a ban on demonstrating within 300 feet of the residences of clinic staff was not sufficiently justified, the restriction covering a much larger zone than an earlier residential picketing ban that the Court had upheld.[65]

---

[61] 114 S. Ct. 2516 (1994).

[62] The Court rejected the argument that the injunction was necessarily content-based or viewpoint-based because it applied only to anti-abortion protesters. "An injunction by its very nature applies only to a particular group (or individuals). . . . It does so, however, because of the group's past actions in the context of a specific dispute." There had been no similarly disruptive demonstrations by pro-abortion factions at the abortion clinic. Id. at 2523.

[63] Id. at 2525.

[64] Id. at 2524–25.

[65] Referring to Frisby v. Schultz, 487 U.S. 474 (1988).

Different types of issues were presented by *Hurley v. Irish-American Gay Group*,[66] in which the Court held that a state's public accommodations law could not be applied to compel private organizers of a St. Patrick's Day parade to accept in the parade a unit that would proclaim a message that the organizers did not wish to promote. Each participating unit affects the message conveyed by the parade organizers, the Court observed, and application of the public accommodations law to the content of the organizers' message contravened the "fundamental rule . . . that a speaker has the autonomy to choose the content of his own message."[67]

Leafleting, Handbilling, and the Like

[P. 1181, add to text after n.168:]

Talley's anonymity rationale was strengthened in *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n*,[68] invalidating Ohio's prohibition on the distribution of anonymous campaign literature. There is a "respected tradition of anonymity in the advocacy of political causes," the Court noted, and neither of the interests asserted by Ohio justified the limitation. The State's interest in informing the electorate was "plainly insufficient," and, while the more weighty interest in preventing fraud in the electoral process may be accomplished by a direct prohibition, it may not be accomplished indirectly by an indiscriminate ban on a whole category of speech. Ohio could not apply the prohibition, therefore, to punish anonymous distribution of pamphlets opposing a referendum on school taxes.

[P. 1181, substitute for first full paragraph on page:]

The handbilling cases were distinguished in *City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent*,[69] in which the Court held that a city may prohibit altogether the use of utility poles for posting of signs. While a city's concern over visual blight could be addressed by an anti-littering ordinance not restricting the expressive activity of distributing handbills, in the case of utility pole signs "it is the medium of expression itself" that creates the visual blight. Hence, the city's prohibition, unlike a prohibition on distributing handbills, was narrowly tailored to curtail no more speech than necessary to accomplish the city's legitimate purpose.[70] Ten years later, how-

[66] 115 S. Ct. 2338 (1995).
[67] Id. at 2347.
[68] 115 S. Ct. 1511 (1995).
[69] 466 U.S. 789 (1984).
[70] Justice Brennan argued in dissent that adequate alternative forms of communication were not readily available because handbilling or other person-to-person

ever, the Court unanimously invalidated a town's broad ban on residential signs that permitted only residential identification signs, "for sale" signs, and signs warning of safety hazards.[71] Prohibiting homeowners from displaying political, religious, or personal messages on their own property entirely foreclosed "a venerable means of communication that is unique and important," and that is "an unusually cheap form of communication" without viable alternatives for many residents.[72] The ban was thus reminiscent of total bans on leafleting, distribution of literature, and door-to-door solicitation that the Court had struck down in the 1930s and 1940s. The prohibition in *Vincent* was distinguished as not removing a "uniquely valuable or important mode of communication," and as not impairing citizens' ability to communicate.[73]

methods would be substantially more expensive, and that the regulation for the sake of aesthetics was not adequately justified.

[71] City of Ladue v. Gilleo, 114 S. Ct. 2038 (1994).

[72] Id. at 2045, 2046.

[73] Id. at 2045. Ladue's legitimate interest in reducing visual clutter could be addressed by "more temperate" measures, the Court suggested. Id. at 2047.

SECOND AMENDMENT

[P. 1194, add to n.7:]

See also Hickman v. Block, 81 F.3d 98 (9th Cir.) (plaintiff lacked standing to challenge denial of permit to carry concealed weapon, because Second Amendment is a right held by states, not by private citizens), *cert. denied* 117 S. Ct. 276 (1996); United States v. Gomez, 92 F.3d 770, 775 n.7 (9th Cir. 1996) (interpreting federal prohibition on possession of firearm by a felon as having a justification defense "ensures that [the provision] does not collide with the Second Amendment").

FOURTH AMENDMENT

History and Scope of the Amendment

—The Interest Protected

[P. 1206, add to n.38:]

Property rights are still protected by the Amendment, however. A "seizure" of property can occur when there is some meaningful interference with an individual's possessory interests in that property, and regardless of whether there is any interference with the individual's privacy interest. Soldal v. Cook County, 506 U.S. 56 (1992) (a seizure occurred when sheriff's deputies assisted in the disconnection and removal of a mobile home in the course of an eviction from a mobile home park). The reasonableness of a seizure, however, is an additional issue that may still hinge on privacy interests. United States v. Jacobsen, 466 U.S. 109, 120–21 (1984) (DEA agents reasonably seized package for examination after private mail carrier had opened the damaged package for inspection, discovered presence of contraband, and informed agents).

[P. 1214, add to text following n.82:]

In another unusual case, the Court held that a sheriff's assistance to a trailer park owner in disconnecting and removing a mobile home constituted a "seizure" of the home. [1]

Searches and Seizures Pursuant to Warrant

—Probable Cause

[P. 1218, add to n.98:]

Similarly, the preference for proceeding by warrant leads to a stricter rule for appellate review of trial court decisions on warrantless stops and searches than is employed to review probable cause to issue a warrant. Ornelas v. United States, 116 S. Ct. 1657 (1996) (determinations of reasonable suspicion to stop and probable cause to search without a warrant should be subjected to *de novo* appellate review).

—Execution of Warrants

[P. 1227, add to text following sentence containing n.158:]

In *Wilson v. Arkansas*, [2] the Court determined that the common law "knock and announce" rule is an element of the Fourth Amendment reasonableness inquiry. The rule does not, however, require announcement under all circumstances. The presumption in favor of announcement yields under various circumstances, including those posing a threat of physical violence to officers, those in which a prisoner has escaped and taken refuge in his dwelling,

---

[1] Soldal v. Cook County, 506 U.S. 56, 61 (1992) (home "was not only seized, it literally was carried away, giving new meaning to the term 'mobile home'").

[2] 115 S. Ct. 1914 (1995).

and those in which officers have reason to believe that destruction of evidence is likely.

Valid Searches and Seizures Without Warrants

—Detention Short of Arrest—Stop-and-Frisk

[P. 1230, add to text following n.12:]

If, in the course of a weapons frisk, “plain touch” reveals presence of an object that the officer has probable cause to believe is contraband, the officer may seize that object.[3] The Court viewed the situation as analogous to that covered by the “plain view” doctrine: obvious contraband may be seized, but a search may not be expanded to determine whether an object is contraband.[4]

—Vehicular Searches

[P. 1239, add to n.62:]

An automobile’s “ready mobility [is] an exigency sufficient to excuse failure to obtain a search warrant once probable cause is clear”; there is no need to find the presence of “unforeseen circumstances” or other additional exigency. Pennsylvania v. Labron, 116 S. Ct. 2485, 2487 (1996).

[P. 1239, delete text accompanying n.63, and substitute the following:]

and they may not make random stops of vehicles on the roads, but instead must base stops of individual vehicles on probable cause or some “articulable and reasonable suspicion”[5] of traffic or safety violation or some other criminal activity.[6]

---

[3] Minnesota v. Dickerson, 508 U.S. 366 (1993).

[4] Id. at 2237, 2139. In *Dickerson* the Court held that seizure of a small plastic container that the officer felt in the suspect’s pocket was not justified; the officer should not have continued the search, manipulating the container with his fingers, after determining that no weapon was present.

[5] Delaware v. Prouse, 440 U.S. 648, 663 (1979) (discretionary random stops of motorists to check driver’s license and registration papers and safety features of cars constitute Fourth Amendment violation); United States v. Brignoni-Ponce, 422 U.S. 873 (1975) (violation for roving patrols on lookout for illegal aliens to stop vehicles on highways near international borders when only ground for suspicion is that occupants appear to be of Mexican ancestry). In *Prouse*, the Court cautioned that it was not precluding the States from developing methods for spot checks, such as questioning all traffic at roadblocks, that involve less intrusion or that do not involve unconstrained exercise of discretion. 440 U.S. at 663.

[6] An officer who observes a traffic violation may stop a vehicle even if his real motivation is to investigate for evidence of other crime. Whren v. United States, 116 S. Ct. 1769 (1996). The existence of probable cause to believe that a traffic violation has occurred establishes the constitutional reasonableness of traffic stops regardless of the actual motivation of the officers involved, and regardless of whether it is customary police practice to stop motorists for the violation observed.

—Drug Testing

[P. 1249, substitute for paragraph beginning after n.128:]

Emphasizing the "special needs" of the public school context, reflected in the "custodial and tutelary" power that schools exercise over students, and also noting schoolchildren's diminished expectation of privacy, the Court in *Vernonia School District v. Acton*[7] upheld a school district's policy authorizing random urinalysis drug testing of students who participate in interscholastic athletics. The Court redefined the term "compelling" governmental interest. The phrase does not describe a "fixed, minimum quantum of governmental concern," the Court explained, but rather "describes an interest which appears *important enough* to justify the particular search at hand."[8] Applying this standard, the Court concluded that "deterring drug use by our Nation's schoolchildren is at least as important as enhancing efficient enforcement of the Nation's laws against the importation of drugs . . . or deterring drug use by engineers and trainmen."[9] On the other hand, the interference with privacy interests was not great, the Court decided, since schoolchildren are routinely required to submit to various physical examinations and vaccinations. Moreover, "[l]egitimate privacy expectations are even less [for] student athletes, since they normally suit up, shower, and dress in locker rooms that afford no privacy, and since they voluntarily subject themselves to physical exams and other regulations above and beyond those imposed on non-athletes. The Court "caution[ed] against the assumption that suspicionless drug testing will readily pass muster in other contexts," identifying as "the most significant element" in *Vernonia* the fact that the policy was implemented under the government's responsibilities as guardian and tutor of schoolchildren.[10]

Enforcing the Fourth Amendment: The Exclusionary Rule

—Narrowing Application of the Exclusionary Rule

[P. 1267, add to n.211:]

Similarly, the exclusionary rule does not require suppression of evidence that was seized incident to an arrest that was the result of a clerical error by a court clerk. Arizona v. Evans, 115 S. Ct. 1185 (1995).

---

[7] 115 S. Ct. 2386 (1995).
[8] Id. at 2394–95.
[9] Id. at 2395.
[10] Id. at 2396.

—Operation of the Rule: Standing

[P. 1270, add to n.229 following cite to *Rakas v. Illinois*:]

United States v. Padilla, 508 U.S. 77 (1993) (only persons whose privacy or property interests are violated may object to a search on Fourth Amendment grounds; exerting control and oversight over property by virtue of participation in a criminal conspiracy does not alone establish such interests).

FIFTH AMENDMENT

RIGHTS OF PERSONS

DOUBLE JEOPARDY

Development and Scope

[P. 1282, n.59, delete citation to *One Lot Emerald Cut Stones* case:]

[P. 1283, n.60, delete reference to *89 Firearms* case and add:]

Montana Dep't of Revenue v. Kurth Ranch, 114 S. Ct. 1937 (1994) (tax on possession of illegal drugs, "to be collected only after any state or federal fines or forfeitures have been satisfied," constitutes punishment for purposes of double jeopardy).

[P. 1283, add to text following n.60:]

Ordinarily, however, civil *in rem* forfeiture proceedings may not be considered punitive for purposes of double jeopardy analysis.[1]

Reprosecution Following Acquittal

—Acquittal by Jury

[P. 1290, add note to end of first sentence in section:]

What constitutes a jury acquittal may occasionally be uncertain. In Schiro v. Farley, 114 S. Ct. 783 (1994), the Court ruled that a jury's action in leaving the verdict sheet blank on all but one count did not amount to an acquittal on those counts, and that consequently conviction on the remaining count, alleged to be duplicative of one of the blank counts, could not constitute double jeopardy. In any event, the Court added, no successive prosecution violative of double jeopardy could result from an initial sentencing proceeding in the course of an initial prosecution.

---

[1] United States v. Ursery, 116 S. Ct. 2135 (1996) (forfeitures, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 981 and 21 U.S.C. § 881, of property used in drug and money laundering offenses, are not punitive). The Court in *Ursery* applied principles that had been set forth in Various Items of Personal Property v. United States, 282 U.S. 577 (1931) (forfeiture of distillery used in defrauding government of tax on spirits); One Lot Emerald Cut Stones v. United States, 409 U.S. 232 (1972) (*per curiam*) (forfeiture of jewels brought into United States without customs declaration); and United States v. One Assortment of 89 Firearms, 465 U.S. 354 (1984) (forfeiture, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 924(d), of firearms "used or intended to be used in" firearms offenses). A two-part inquiry is followed. First, the Court inquires whether Congress intended the forfeiture proceeding to be civil or criminal. Then, if Congress intended that the proceeding be civil, the court determines whether there is nonetheless the "clearest proof" that the sanction is "so punitive" as to transform it into a criminal penalty. *89 Firearms*, supra, 465 U.S. at 366.

"For the Same Offence"

—Legislative Discretion as to Multiple Sentences

[P. 1299, add to n.142:]

But cf. Rutledge v. United States, 116 S. Ct. 1241 (1996) (21 U.S.C. § 846, prohibiting conspiracy to commit drug offenses, does not require proof of any fact that is not also a part of the continuing criminal enterprise offense under 21 U.S.C. § 848, so there are not two separate offenses).

—Successive Prosecutions for the Same Offense

[P. 1300, substitute for the two sentences immediately following n.150:]

In 1990, the Court modified the *Brown* approach, stating that the appropriate focus is on same conduct rather than same evidence.[2] That interpretation held sway only three years, however, before being repudiated as "wrong in principle [and] unstable in application."[3]

[P. 1301, add to n.154:]

The fact that *Felix* constituted a "large exception" to *Grady* was one of the reasons the Court cited in overruling *Grady*. United States v. Dixon, 509 U.S. 688, 709–10 (1993).

[P. 1301, add to text following n.154:]

For double jeopardy purposes, a defendant is "punished . . . only for the offense of which [he] is convicted"; a later prosecution or later punishment is not barred simply because the underlying criminal activity has been considered at sentencing for a different offense.[4]

---

[2] Grady v. Corbin, 495 U.S. 508 (1990) (holding that the state could not prosecute a traffic offender for negligent homicide because it would attempt to prove conduct for which the defendant had already been prosecuted—driving while intoxicated and failure to keep to the right of the median). A subsequent prosecution is barred, the Court explained, if the government, to establish an essential element of an offense, will prove conduct that constitutes an offense for which the defendant has already been prosecuted. Id. at 521.

[3] United States v. Dixon, 509 U.S. 688, 709 (1993) (applying *Blockburger* test to determine whether prosecution for a crime, following conviction for criminal contempt for violation of a court order prohibiting that crime, constitutes double jeopardy).

[4] Witte v. United States, 115 S. Ct. 2199, 2204 (1995) (consideration of defendant's alleged cocaine dealings in determining sentence for marijuana offenses does not bar subsequent prosecution on cocaine charges).

SELF-INCRIMINATION

Development and Scope

[P. 1309, add to n.190:]

In determining whether a state prisoner is entitled to federal habeas corpus relief because the prosecution violated due process by using his post-*Miranda* silence for impeachment purposes at trial, the proper standard for harmless-error review is that announced in Kotteakos v. United States, 328 U.S. 750, 776 (1946)—whether the due process error "had substantial and injurious effect or influence in determining the jury's verdict—not the stricter "harmless beyond a reasonable doubt" standard of Chapman v. California, 386 U.S. 18, 24 (1967), applicable on direct review. Brecht v. Abrahamson, 507 U.S. 619 (1993).

Confessions: Police Interrogation, Due Process, and Self-Incrimination

—*Miranda v. Arizona*

[P. 1332, substitute for paragraph that carries over to P. 1333:]

Although the Court had suggested in 1974 that most *Miranda* claims could be disallowed in federal *habeas corpus* cases,[5] such a course was squarely rejected in 1993. The *Stone v. Powell*[6] rule, precluding federal *habeas corpus* review of a state prisoner's claim that his conviction rests on evidence obtained through an unconstitutional search or seizure, does not extend to preclude federal *habeas* review of a state prisoner's *Miranda* claim, the Court ruled in *Withrow v. Williams*.[7] The *Miranda* rule differs from the *Mapp v. Ohio*[8] exclusionary rule denied enforcement in *Stone*, the Court explained. While both are prophylactic rules, *Miranda* unlike *Mapp*, safeguards a fundamental trial right, the privilege against self-incrimination. *Miranda* also protects against the use at trial of unreliable statements, hence, unlike *Mapp*, relates to the correct ascertainment of guilt.[9] A further consideration was that eliminating review of *Miranda* claims would not significantly reduce federal *habeas* review of state convictions, since most *Miranda* claims could be recast in terms of due process denials resulting from admission of involuntary confessions.[10]

---

[5] In Michigan v. Tucker, 417 U.S. 433, 439 (1974), the Court had suggested a distinction between a constitutional violation and a violation of "the prophylactic rules developed to protect that right." The actual holding in *Tucker*, however, had turned on the fact that the interrogation had preceded the *Miranda* decision and that warnings—albeit not full *Miranda* warnings—had been given.

[6] 428 U.S. 465 (1976).

[7] 507 U.S. 680 (1993).

[8] 367 U.S. 643 (1961).

[9] 507 U.S. at 691–92.

[10] Id. at 693.

[P. 1334, add to text following n.324:]

Whether a person is "in custody" is an objective test assessed in terms of how a reasonable person in the suspect's shoes would perceive his or her freedom to leave; a police officer's subjective and undisclosed view that a person being interrogated is a suspect is not relevant for *Miranda* purposes.[11]

[P. 1338, add to text following n.344:]

After a suspect has knowingly and voluntarily waived his *Miranda* rights, police officers may continue questioning until and unless the suspect clearly requests an attorney.[12]

The Operation of the Exclusionary Rule

—Supreme Court Review

[P. 1341, add to text at end of section:]

In *Withrow v. Williams*,[13] the Court held that the rule of *Stone v. Powell*,[14] precluding federal *habeas corpus* review of a state prisoner's claim that his conviction rests on evidence obtained through an unconstitutional search or seizure, does not extend to preclude federal *habeas* review of a state prisoner's claim that his conviction rests on statements obtained in violation of the safeguards mandated by *Miranda*.

DUE PROCESS

Substantive Due Process

—Discrimination

[P. 1357, add to n.71:]

Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena, 115 S. Ct. 2097, 2106–08 (1995).

[P. 1358, add to n.75 following *Richardson v. Belcher* citation:]

FCC v. Beach Communications, 508 U.S. 307 (1993) (exemption from cable TV regulation of facilities that serve only dwelling units under common ownership).

---

[11] Stansbury v. California, 114 S. Ct. 1526 (1994).

[12] Davis v. United States, 114 S. Ct. 2350 (1994) (suspect's statement that "maybe I should talk to a lawyer," uttered after *Miranda* waiver and after an hour and a half of questioning, did not constitute such a clear request for an attorney when, in response to a direct follow-up question, he said "no, I don't want a lawyer").

[13] 507 U.S. 680 (1993).

[14] 428 U.S. 465 (1976). *See* main text, pp. 1265–66.

—Retroactive Taxes

[P. 1364, substitute for last paragraph in section:]

Although the Court during the 1920s struck down gift taxes imposed retroactively upon gifts that were made and completely vested before the enactment of the taxing statute,[15] those decisions have recently been distinguished, and their precedential value limited.[16] In *United States v. Carlton*, the Court declared that "[t]he due process standard to be applied to tax statutes with retroactive effect . . . is the same as that generally applicable to retroactive economic legislation"—retroactive application of legislation must be shown to be "'justified by a rational legislative purpose.'"[17] Applying that principle, the Court upheld retroactive application of a 1987 amendment limiting application of a federal estate tax deduction originally enacted in 1986. Congress' purpose was "neither illegitimate nor arbitrary," the Court noted, since Congress had acted "to correct what it reasonably viewed as a mistake in the original 1986 provision that would have created a significant and unanticipated revenue loss." Also, "Congress acted promptly and established only a modest period of retroactivity." The fact that the taxpayer had transferred stock in reliance on the original enactment was not dispositive, since "[t]ax legislation is not a promise, and a taxpayer has no vested right in the Internal Revenue Code."[18]

—Deprivation of Property: Retroactive Legislation

[P. 1365, add to n.130:]

Concrete Pipe & Products v. Construction Laborers Pension Trust, 508 U.S. 602, 636–41 (1993) (imposition of multiemployer pension plan withdrawal liability on an employer is not irrational, even though none of its employees had earned vested benefits by the time of withdrawal).

---

[15] Untermyer v. Anderson, 276 U.S. 440 (1928); Blodgett v. Holden, 275 U.S. 142 (1927), modified, 276 U.S. 594 (1928); Nichols v. Coolidge, 274 U.S. 531 (1927). *See also* Heiner v. Donnan, 285 U.S. 312 (1932) (invalidating as arbitrary and capricious a conclusive presumption that gifts made within two years of death were made in contemplation of death).

[16] *Untermyer* was distinguished in United States v. Hemme, 476 U.S. 558, 568 (1986), upholding retroactive application of unified estate and gift taxation to a taxpayer as to whom the overall impact was minimal and not oppressive. All three cases were distinguished in United States v. Carlton, 114 S. Ct. 2018, 2024 (1994), as having been "decided during an era characterized by exacting review of economic legislation under an approach that 'has long since been discarded.'" The Court noted further that *Untermyer* and *Blodgett* had been limited to situations involving creation of a wholly new tax, and that *Nichols* had involved a retroactivity period of 12 years. Id.

[17] 114 S. Ct. 2018, 2022 (1994) (quoting Usery v. Turner Elkhorn Mining Co., 428 U.S. 1, 16–17 (1976)). These principles apply to estate and gift taxes as well as to income taxes, the Court added. 114 S. Ct. at 2024.

[18] 114 S. Ct. at 2023.

NATIONAL EMINENT DOMAIN POWER

When Property Is Taken

—Regulatory Takings

[P. 1387, add to n.277 after initial citation:]

Accord, Concrete Pipe & Products v. Construction Laborers Pension Trust, 508 U.S. 602, 645–46 (1993).

[P. 1391, delete remainder of paragraph after n.299 and substitute the following:]

"If [the government] wants an easement across the Nollans' property, it must pay for it."[19] Because the *Nollan* Court found no essential nexus between the permit condition and the asserted government interest, it did not address whether there is any additional requirement when such a nexus does exist, as is often the case with land dedications and other permit conditions.[20] Seven years later, however, the Court announced in *Dolan v. City of Tigard*[21] that conditions attached to development permits must be related to the impact of the proposed development not only in nature but also in degree. Government must establish a "rough proportionality" between permit conditions and the developmental impacts at which they are aimed.[22] The Court ruled in *Dolan* that

[19] 483 U.S. at 842.

[20] Justice Scalia, author of the Court's opinion in *Nollan*, amplified his views in a concurring and dissenting opinion in Pennell v. City of San Jose, 485 U.S. 1 (1988), explaining that "common zoning regulations requiring subdividers to observe lot-size and set-back restrictions, and to dedicate certain areas to public streets, are in accord with [constitutional requirements] because the proposed property use would otherwise be the cause of" the social evil (e.g., congestion) that the regulation seeks to remedy. By contrast, the Justice asserted, a rent control restriction pegged to individual tenant hardship lacks such cause-and-effect relationship and is in reality an attempt to impose on a few individuals public burdens that "should be borne by the public as a whole." 485 U.S. at 20, 22.

[21] 114 S. Ct. 2309 (1994). This was a 5–4 decision. Chief Justice Rehnquist's opinion of the Court was joined by Justices O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, and Thomas. Justices Blackmun and Ginsburg joined Justice Stevens' dissenting opinion, and Justice Souter added a dissenting opinion.

[22] Id. at 2319–20. Justice Stevens' dissent criticized the Court's "abandon[ment of] the traditional presumption of constitutionality and imposi[tion of] a novel burden of proof on [the] city." Id. at 2326. The Court responded by distinguishing between challenges to generally applicable zoning regulations, where the burden appropriately rests on the challenging party, and imposition of property exactions through adjudicative proceedings, where "the burden properly rests on the city." Id. at 2320 n.8. As for the standard of proof, the Court looked to state law and rejected the two extremes—a generalized statement of connection deemed "too lax" to protect the Fifth Amendment right to just compensation, and a "specific and uniquely attributable" test deemed too exacting. Instead, the Court chose an "intermediate position" requiring a showing of "reasonable relationship," but recharacterized it as "rough proportionality" in order to avoid confusion with "rational basis." Id. at 2319.

the city's conditioning of a building permit for expansion of a hardware store on the store owner's dedication of a portion of her land for a floodplain/recreational easement and for an adjacent pedestrian/bicycle pathway amounted to a taking. In general, the requisite nexus existed between the city's interest in flood control and imposition of an easement restricting development in the floodplain, and between the city's interest in minimizing traffic congestion and the required bike path dedication. The floodplain easement, however, went beyond a mere building restriction; it also contained a recreational component that deprived the property owner of the right to exclude others from her land. Because the city had not said "why a public greenway, as opposed to a private one, was required in the interest of flood control," [23] the Court concluded that the city had failed to establish "the required reasonable relationship" for this component of the easement. [24] Similarly, the city had not adequately demonstrated a reasonable relationship between the bikepath dedication requirement and the additional vehicle and bicycle trips that would be generated by the applicant's development. [25]

Note, however, that the Court stated its holdings in terms of lack of "reasonable relationship," rather than lack of "rough proportionality."

[23] Id. at 2320.

[24] Id. at 2321. This conclusion, Justice Souter pointed out in dissent, sounds very much like "an application of *Nollan's* nexus analysis." Id. at 2330.

[25] The city had quantified the traffic increases that could be expected from the development, but had merely speculated that construction of the bike path "could offset" some of that increase. While "[n]o precise mathematical calculation is required," the Court concluded, "the city must make some effort to quantify its findings in support of the dedication." Id. at 2322.

SIXTH AMENDMENT

RIGHTS OF ACCUSED IN CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS

RIGHT TO TRIAL BY IMPARTIAL JURY

Jury Trial

[P. 1408, change heading to:]

—The Attributes and Function of the Jury

[P. 1410, add to text following n.64:]

Certain functions of the jury are likely to remain consistent between the federal and state court systems. For instance, the requirement that a jury find a defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, which had already been established under the Due Process Clause,[1] has been held to be a standard mandated by the Sixth Amendment.[2] The Court has further held that the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause and the Sixth Amendment require that a jury find a defendant guilty of every element of the crime with which he is charged, including questions of mixed law and fact.[3] Thus, a district court presiding over a case of providing false statements to a federal agency in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001 erred when it took the issue of the "materiality" of the false statement away from the jury.[4]

—Criminal Proceedings to Which the Guarantee Applies

[P. 1411, add to text following n.68:]

A defendant who is prosecuted in a single proceeding for multiple petty offenses, however, does not have a constitutional right to a jury trial, even if the aggregate of sentences authorized for the offense exceeds six months.[5]

[P. 1411, add to n.73:]

The distinction between criminal and civil contempt may be somewhat more elusive. International Union, UMW v. Bagwell, 512 U.S. 821 (1994) (fines levied on the union were criminal in nature where the conduct did not occur in the court's presence, the court's injunction required compliance with an entire code of conduct, and the fines assessed were not compensatory).

---

[1] *See* In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358, 364 (1970).

[2] Sullivan v. Louisiana, 508 U.S. 275 (1993).

[3] United States v. Gaudin, 115 S. Ct. 2310 (1995).

[4] *Gaudin*, 115 S. Ct. at 2320.

[5] Lewis v. United States, 116 S. Ct. 2163 (1996).

ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL

Development of an Absolute Right to Counsel

—*Gideon v. Wainwright*

[P. 1435, n.217, delete citation and parenthetical to *Baldasar v. Illinois* appearing after last semi-colon, and insert the following:]

But see Nichols v. United States, 511 U.S. 738 (1994) (as Scott v. Illinois, 440 U.S. 367 (1979) provides that an uncounseled misdemeanor conviction is valid if defendant is not incarcerated, such a conviction may be used as the basis for penalty enhancement upon a subsequent conviction).

—Effective Assistance of Counsel

[P. 1439, add to n.244:]

In *Hill v. Lockhart*, 474 U.S. 52 (1985), the Court applied the *Strickland* test to attorney decisions in plea bargaining, holding that a defendant must show a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's errors, he would not have pleaded guilty.

[P. 1439, delete last sentence at end of first full paragraph on page and add the following:]

In *Lockhart v. Fretwell,* [6] the Court refined the *Strickland* test to require that not only would a different trial result be probable because of attorney performance, but that the trial result which did occur was fundamentally unfair or unreliable. [7]

[6] 506 U.S. 364 (1993).

[7] 506 U.S. at 368–70 (1993) (failure of counsel to raise a constitutional claim that was valid at time of trial did not constitute "prejudice" because basis of claim had since been overruled).

SEVENTH AMENDMENT

CIVIL TRIALS

TRIAL BY JURY IN CIVIL CASES

Application of the Amendment

—Cases "at Common Law"

[P. 1455, add to text following n.30:]

Where there is no direct historical antecedent dating to the adoption of the amendment, the court may also consider whether existing precedent and the sound administration of justice favor resolution by judges or juries. [1]

—Procedures Limiting Jury's Role

[P. 1461, add to n.59:]

A federal appellate court may also review a district court's denial of a motion to set aside an award as excessive under an abuse of discretion standard. Gasperini v. Center for Humanities, Inc., 116 S. Ct. 2211 (1996) (New York State law which requires a review of jury awards to determine if they "deviate materially from reasonable compensation" may be adopted by federal district, but not appellate, court exercising diversity jurisdiction).

---

[1] Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 116 S. Ct. 1384 (1996) (interpretation and construction of terms underlying patent claims may be reserved entirely for the court).

AMENDMENT 8—PUNISHMENT FOR CRIME
EIGHTH AMENDMENT

EXCESSIVE FINES

[P. 1471, add to text following n.35:]

The Court has held, however, that the excessive fines clause can be applied in civil forfeiture cases. [1]

CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT

—Capital Punishment

[P. 1478, add to n.69:]

Consequently, a judge may be given significant discretion to override a jury sentencing recommendation, as long as the court's decision is adequately channeled to prevent arbitrary results. Harris v. Alabama, 115 S. Ct. 1031 (1995) (Eighth Amendment not violated where judge is only required to "consider" a capital jury's sentencing recommendation).

[P. 1480, add to n.76:]

But see Tuilaepa v. California, 114 S. Ct. 2630 (1994) (holding that permitting capital juries to consider the circumstances of the crime, the defendant's prior criminal activity, and the age of the defendant, without further guidance, is not unconstitutionally vague).

[P. 1480, add to n.77:]

Arave v. Creech, 507 U.S. 463 (1993) (consistent application of narrowing construction of phrase "exhibited utter disregard for human life" to require that the defendant be a "cold-blooded, pitiless slayer" cures vagueness).

[P. 1481, add to n.82:]

Romano v. Oklahoma, 114 S. Ct. 2004 (1994) (imposition of death penalty after introduction of evidence that defendant had been sentenced to death previously did not diminish the jury's sense of responsibility so as to violate the Eighth Amendment).

---

[1] In Austin v. United States, 509 U.S. 602 (1993), the Court noted that the application of the excessive fines clause to civil forfeiture did not depend on whether it was a civil or criminal procedure, but rather on whether the forfeiture could be seen as punishment. The Court was apparently willing to consider any number of factors in making this evaluation; civil forfeiture was found to be at least partially intended as punishment, and thus limited by the clause, based on its common law roots, its focus on culpability, and various indications in the legislative histories of its more recent incarnations.

[P. 1483, add new note following period after word "considered" in second sentence of paragraph beginning after n.93:]

See, e.g., Johnson v. Texas, 509 U.S. 350 (1993) (consideration of youth as a mitigating factor may be limited to jury estimation of probability that defendant would commit future acts of violence).

[P. 1483, add new note at end of third sentence of paragraph beginning after n.93:]

Richmond v. Lewis, 506 U.S. 40 (1992) (no cure of trial court's use of invalid aggravating factor where appellate court fails to reweigh mitigating and aggravating factors).

[P. 1484, add to n.103:]

Thus, where psychiatric testimony was introduced regarding an invalid statutory aggravating circumstance, and where the defendant was not provided the assistance of an independent psychiatrist in order to develop rebuttal testimony, the lack of rebuttal testimony might have affected how the jury evaluated another aggravating factor. Consequently, the reviewing court erred in reinstating a death sentence based on this other valid aggravating factor. Tuggle v. Netherland, 116 S. Ct. 283 (1995).

[P. 1487, add to text following n.116:]

In addition, the Court has held that, absent an independent constitutional violation, habeas corpus relief for prisoners who assert innocence based on newly discovered evidence should generally be denied. [2]

[P. 1498, add to n.171:]

Helling v. McKinney, 509 U.S. 25 (1993) (prisoner who alleged exposure to secondhand "environmental" tobacco smoke stated a cause of action under the Eighth Amendment).

[P. 1498, add to n.174:]

Deliberate indifference in this context means something more than disregarding an unjustifiably high risk of harm that should have been known, as might apply in the civil context. Rather, it requires a finding that the responsible person acted in reckless disregard of a risk of which he or she was aware, as would generally be required for a criminal charge of recklessness. Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825 (1994).

---

[2] Herrera v. Collins, 506 U.S. 390 (1993) (holding that a petitioner would have to meet an "extraordinarily high" threshold of proof of innocence to warrant federal habeas relief).

TENTH AMENDMENT

RESERVED POWERS

Effect of Provisions on Federal Powers

—Federal Police Powers

[P. 1514, add to text following first sentence in paragraph starting after n.42:]

More recently, the Court struck down a statute prohibiting possession of a gun at or near a school, rejecting an argument that possession of firearms in school zones can be punished under the Commerce Clause because it impairs the functioning of the national economy. Acceptance of this rationale, the Court said, would eliminate "a[ny] distinction between what is truly national and what is truly local," would convert Congress' commerce power into "a general police power of the sort retained by the States," and would undermine the "first principle" that the Federal Government is one of enumerated and limited powers. [1]

[1] United States v. Lopez, 115 S. Ct. 1624, 1633–34 (1995).

ELEVENTH AMENDMENT

State Immunity

Suits Against States

—The Nature of the States' Immunity

[P. 1527, add to n.33:]

Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida, 116 S. Ct. 1114, 1127–28 (1996).

[P. 1528, add to n.43 after first sentence and accompanying citation:]

Of course, when a state is sued in federal court pursuant to federal law, the Federal Government, not the defendant state, is "the authority that makes the law" creating the right of action. *See* Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida, 116 S. Ct. 1114, 1170–71 (1996) (Justice Souter dissenting).

[P. 1530, delete n.51 and accompanying text]

[P. 1530, delete second full paragraph on page]

[P. 1531, add to text at end of section:]

The *Hans* interpretation has been solidified with the Court's ruling in *Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida*,[1] that Congress lacks the power under Article I to abrogate state immunity under the Eleventh Amendment. That too, however, was a 5–4 decision, with the four dissenting Justices believing that *Hans* was wrongly decided.[2]

—Congressional Withdrawal of Immunity

[P. 1535, delete last sentence of first paragraph and substitute the following new paragraph:]

Pennsylvania v. Union Gas lasted less than seven years, the Court overruling it in *Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida*.[3] Chief Justice Rehnquist, writing for a 5–4 majority, concluded that there is "no principled distinction in favor of the States to be drawn between the Indian Commerce Clause [at issue in *Seminole Tribe*] and the Interstate Commerce Clause [relied upon in *Union Gas*]."[4]

---

[1] 116 S. Ct. 1114 (1996).

[2] Chief Justice Rehnquist wrote the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, and Thomas. Justice Stevens dissented, as did Justice Souter, whose opinion was joined by Justices Ginsburg and Breyer.

[3] 116 S. Ct. 1114 (1996) (invalidating a provision of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act authorizing an Indian tribe to sue a State in federal court to compel performance of a duty to negotiate in good faith toward the formation of a compact).

[4] 116 S. Ct. at 1127.

In the majority's view, *Union Gas* had deviated from a line of cases tracing back to *Hans v. Louisiana*[5] that viewed the Eleventh Amendment as implementing the "fundamental principle of sovereign immunity [that] limits the grant of judicial authority in Article III."[6] Because "the Eleventh Amendment restricts the judicial power under Article III, . . . Article I cannot be used to circumvent the constitutional limitations placed upon federal jurisdiction."[7] Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment, of course, is another matter. *Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer*,[8] "based upon a rationale wholly inapplicable to the Interstate Commerce Clause, *viz.*, that the Fourteenth Amendment, adopted well after the adoption of the Eleventh Amendment and the ratification of the Constitution, operated to alter the pre-existing balance between state and federal power achieved by Article III and the Eleventh Amendment," remains good law.[9]

---

[5] 134 U.S. 1 (1890).

[6] 116 S. Ct. at 1127–28 (quoting Pennhurst State School & Hosp. v. Halderman, 465 U.S. 89, 97–98 (1984).

[7] Id. at 1131–32. Justice Souter's dissent undertook a lengthy refutation of the majority's analysis, asserting that the Eleventh Amendment is best understood, in keeping with its express language, as barring only suits based on diversity of citizenship, and as having no application to federal question litigation. Moreover, Justice Souter contended, the state soverign immunity that the Court mistakenly recognized in *Hans v. Louisiana* was a common law concept that "had no constitutional status and was subject to congressional abrogation." 116 S. Ct. at 1153. The Constitution made no provision for wholesale adoption of the common law, but, on the contrary, was premised on the view that common law rules would always be subject to legislative alteration. This "imperative of legislative control grew directly out of the Framers' revolutionary idea of popular sovereignty." Id. at 1173.

[8] 427 U.S. 445 (1976).

[9] 116 S. Ct. at 1128.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

DUE PROCESS

RIGHTS GUARANTEED

DUE PROCESS OF LAW

Health, Safety and Morals

—Protecting Morality

[P. 1636, add to text following n.163:]

Similarly, a court may order a car used in an act of prostitution forfeited as a public nuisance, even if this works a deprivation on an innocent joint owner of the car.[1]

Procedure in Taxation

—Sufficiency of Remedy

[P. 1665, add to n.177:]

See also Reich v. Collins, 115 S. Ct. 547 (1994) (violation of due process to hold out a post-deprivation remedy for unconstitutional taxation and then, after the disputed taxes had been paid, to declare that no such remedy exists).

PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS: CIVIL

Power of the State to Regulate Procedure

—Costs, Damages, and Penalties

[P. 1698, add to n.34:]

See also Honda Motor Co. v. Oberg, 512 U.S. 415 (1994) (striking down a provision of the Oregon Constitution limiting judicial review of the amount of punitive damages awarded by a jury).

[P. 1698, add to text after n.34:]

The Court has indicated, however, that the amount of punitive damages is limited to those reasonably necessary to vindicate a state's interest in deterring unlawful conduct.[2] These limits may

---

[1] Bennis v. Michigan, 116 S. Ct. 994 (1996).

[2] BMW v. Gore, 116 S. Ct. 1589 (1996) (holding that a $2 million judgement for failing to disclose to a purchaser that a "new" car had been repainted was "grossly excessive" in relation to the state's interest, as only a few of the 983 similarly repainted cars had been sold in that same state). *But see* TXO Prod. Corp. v. Alliance Resources, 509 U.S. 443 (1993) (punitive damages of $10 million for slander of title does not violate the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment even though the jury awarded actual damages of only $19,000).

be discerned by a court by examining the degree of reprehensibility of the act, the ratio between the punitive award and plaintiff's actual or potential harm, and the legislative sanctions provided for comparable misconduct. [3]

Jurisdiction

[P. 1716, change heading:]

—Actions In Rem: Proceeding Against Property

[P. 1717, add to n.144:]

Predeprivation notice and hearing may be required if the property is not the sort that, given advance warning, could be removed to another jurisdiction, destroyed, or concealed. United States v. James Daniel Good Real Property, 510 U.S. 43 (1993) (notice to owner required before seizure of house by government).

The Procedure Which is Due Process

—The Interests Protected: Entitlement and Positivist Recognition

[P. 1731, add to text following n.215:]

In an even more recent case, the Court limited the application of this test to those circumstances where the restraint on freedom imposed by the State creates an "atypical and significant" deprivation. [4]

—The Requirements of Due Process

[P. 1741, add to n.269:]

See also Richards v. Jefferson County, 116 S. Ct. 1761 (1996) (res judicata may not apply where taxpayer who challenged a county's occupation tax was not informed of prior case and where taxpayer interests were not adequately protected).

PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS: CRIMINAL

The Elements of Due Process

—Initiation of Prosecution

[P. 1753, add to n.43:]

The Court has also rejected an argument that due process requires that criminal prosecutions go forward only on a showing of probable cause. Albright v. Oliver, 114 S. Ct. 807 (1994) (holding that there is no civil rights action based on the Fourteenth Amendment for arrest and imposition of bond without probable cause).

---

[3] BMW v. Gore, 116 S. Ct. at 1589 (1996).

[4] Sandin v. Conner, 115 S. Ct. 2293, 2300 (1995) (solitary confinement not atypical "in relation to the ordinary incidents of prison life").

—Fair Trial

[P. 1756, add to n.59:]

But see Montana v. Egelhoff, 116 S. Ct. 2013 (1996) (state may bar defendant from introducing evidence of intoxication to prove lack of *mens rea*).

—Prosecutorial Misconduct

[P. 1760, add to n.76:]

See also Wood v. Bartholomew, 116 S. Ct. 7 (1995) (per curiam) (holding no Due Process violation where prosecutor's failure to disclose the result of a witness' polygraph test would not have affected the outcome of the case).

—Proof, Burden of Proof, and Presumptions

[P. 1761, add to n.83:]

See also Sullivan v. Louisiana, 508 U.S. 275 (1993) (Sixth Amendment guarantee of trial by jury requires a jury verdict of guilty beyond a reasonable doubt).

[P. 1762, add to n.87:]

But see Victor v. Nebraska, 511 U.S. 1 (1994) (considered as a whole, jury instructions that define "reasonable doubt" as requiring a "moral certainty" or as equivalent to "substantial doubt" did not violate due process because other clarifying language was included.)

[P. 1764, add to n.96:]

The Court has held, however, that for purposes of a recidivism-based sentence enhancement where a prosecutor carries the burden of establishing a prior conviction, a defendant can be required to bear the burden of production in challenging the validity of such conviction. *See* Parke v. Raley, 506 U.S. 20 (1992) (a sentencing court considering a guilty plea in prior case may rely upon a presumption of regularity during that proceeding).

[P. 1765, add to n.104 after *Spencer v. Texas* cite:]

Parke v. Raley, 506 U.S. 20 (1992).

—The Problem of the Incompetent of Insane Defendant of Convict

[P. 1769, add to n.120:]

It is a violation of due process, however, for a state to require that a defendant must prove competence to stand trial by clear and convincing evidence. Cooper v. Oklahoma, 116 S. Ct. 1373 (1996).

—Corrective Process: Appeals and Other Remedies

[P. 1773, add to n.150:]

Establishing a right of access to law materials, however, requires an individualized demonstration of an inmate having been hindered in efforts to pursue a legal claim. *See* Lewis v. Casey, 116 S. Ct. 2174 (1996) (no requirement that the State "enable [a] prisoner to discover grievances, and to litigate effectively").

TRADITIONAL EQUAL PROTECTION: ECONOMIC REGULATION AND RELATED EXERCISES OF THE POLICE POWERS

Police Power Regulation

—Classification

[P. 1831, add to n.260 after paragraph headed "Attorneys":]

Cable Television: exemption from regulation under the Cable Communications Policy Act of facilities that serve only dwelling units under common ownership. FCC v. Beach Communications, 508 U.S. 307 (1993). Regulatory efficiency is served by exempting those systems for which the costs of regulation exceed the benefits to consumers, and potential for monopoly power is lessened when a cable system operator is negotiating with a single-owner.

EQUAL PROTECTION AND RACE

Permissible Remedial Utilization of Racial Classifications

[P. 1868, delete last sentence and add to text at end of section:]

The distinction between federal and state power to apply racial classifications proved ephemeral. The Court ruled in *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena*[5] that racial classifications imposed by federal law must be analyzed by the same strict scrutiny standard that is applied to evaluate state and local classifications based on race. The Court overruled *Metro Broadcasting* and, to the extent that it applied a review standard less stringent than strict scrutiny, *Fullilove v. Klutznick*. Strict scrutiny is to be applied regardless of the race of those burdened or benefited by the particular classification; there is no intermediate standard applicable to "benign" racial classifications. The underlying principle, the Court explained, is that the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments protect persons, not groups. It follows, therefore, that classifications based on the group characteristic of race "should be subjected to detailed judicial inquiry to ensure that the *personal* right to equal protection . . . has not been infringed."[6]

---

[5] 115 S. Ct. 2097 (1995). This was a 5–4 decision. Justice O'Connor's opinion of Court was joined by Chief Justice Rehnquist, and by Justices Kennedy, Thomas, and—to the extent not inconsistent with his own concurring opinion—Scalia. Justices Stevens, Souter, Ginsburg and Breyer dissented.

[6] 115 S. Ct. at 2113 (emphasis original).

THE NEW EQUAL PROTECTION

Classifications Meriting Close Scrutiny

—Sex

[P. 1879, add to text after n.51:]

Even when the negative "stereotype" which is evoked is that of a stereotypical male, the Court has evaluated this as potential gender discrimination. In *J. E. B. v. Alabama ex rel. T. B.*,[7] the Court addressed a paternity suit where men had been intentionally excluded from a jury through peremptory strikes. The Court rejected as unfounded the argument that men, as a class, would be more sympathetic to the defendant, the putative father. The Court also determined that genderbased exclusion of jurors would undermine the litigants' interest by tainting the proceedings, and in addition would harm the wrongfully excluded juror.

[P. 1885, add to text after n.76:]

In a 1996 case, the Court required that a state demonstrate "exceedingly persuasive justification" for gender discrimination. When a female applicant challenged the exclusion of women from the historically male-only Virginia Military Institute (VMI), the State of Virginia defended the exclusion of females as essential to the nature of training at the military style institution.[8] The State argued that the VMI program, which included rigorous physical training, deprivation of personal privacy, and an "adversative model" that featured minute regulation of behavior, would need to be unacceptably modified to facilitate the admission of women. While recognizing that women's admission would require accommodation such as different housing assignments and physical training programs, the Court found that the reasons set forth by the State were not "exceedingly persuasive," and thus the State did not meet its burden of justification. The Court also rejected the argument that a parallel program established by the State at a private women's college served as an adequate substitute, finding that the program lacked the military-style structure found at VMI, and that it did not equal VMI in faculty, facilities, prestige or alumni network.

[7] 511 U.S. 127 (1994).

[8] United States v. Virginia, 116 S. Ct. 2264 (1996).

Fundamental Interests: The Political Process

—Apportionment and Districting

[P. 1905, add to n.157 after cite for *Summers v. Cenarrusa*:]

But see Voinovich v. Quilter, 507 U.S. 146 (1993) (vacating and remanding for further consideration the rejection of a deviation in excess of 10% intended to preserve political subdivision boundaries).

[P. 1906, add to text following n.161:]

Even if racial gerrymandering is intended to benefit minority voting populations, it is subject to strict scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause if racial considerations are the dominant and controlling rationale in drawing district lines.[9] Showing that a district's "bizarre" shape departs from traditional districting principles such as compactness, contiguity, and respect for political subdivision lines may serve to reinforce such a claim,[10] although a plurality of the Justices would not preclude the creation of "reasonably compact" majority-minority districts in order to remedy past discrimination or to comply with the requirements of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.[11]

[P. 1916, add new heading and text following n.24:]

Sexual Orientation

In *Romer v. Evans*,[12] the Supreme Court struck down a state constitutional amendment which both overturned local ordinances prohibiting discrimination against homosexuals, lesbians or bisexuals, and prohibited any state or local governmental action to either remedy discrimination or to grant preferences based on sexual orientation. The Court declined to follow the lead of the Supreme Court of Colorado, which had held that the amendment infringed on gays' and lesbians' fundamental right to participate in the political process.[13] The Court also rejected the application of

---

[9] Miller v. Johnson, 115 S. Ct. 2475 (1995) (drawing congressional district lines in order to comply with § 5 of the Voting Rights Act as interpreted by the Department of Justice not a compelling governmental interest).

[10] *Id.*; Shaw v. Reno, 509 U.S. 630 (1993). *See also* Shaw v. Hunt, 116 S.Ct. 1894 (1996) (creating an unconventionally-shaped majority-minority congressional district in one portion of state in order to alleviate effect of fragmenting geographically compact minority population in another portion of state does not remedy a violation of § 2 of Voting Rights Act, and is thus not a compelling governmental interest).

[11] Bush v. Vera, 116 S. Ct. 1941, 1961 (1996) (opinion of Justice O'Connor, joined by Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justice Kennedy) (also involving congressional districts).

[12] 116 S. Ct. 1620 (1996).

[13] Evans v. Romer, 854 P.2d 1270 (Colo. 1993).

the heightened standard reserved for suspect classes, and sought only to establish whether the legislative classification had a rational relation to a legitimate end.

The Court found that the amendment failed even this restrained review. Animus against a class of persons was not considered by the Court as a legitimate goal of government: "[I]f the constitutional conception of 'equal protection of the laws' means anything, it must at the very least mean that a bare . . . desire to harm a politically unpopular group cannot constitute a *legitimate* governmental interest."[14] The Court then rejected arguments that the amendment protected the freedom of association rights of landlords and employers, or that it would conserve resources in fighting discrimination against other groups. The Court found that the scope of the law was unnecessarily broad to achieve these stated purposes, and that no other legitimate rationale existed for such a restriction.

[14] 116 S.Ct. at 1628, *quoting* Department of Agriculture v. Moreno, 413 U.S. 528, 534 (1973).

TWENTY-FIRST AMENDMENT

Effect of Section 2 Upon Other Constitutional Provisions

[P. 1982, delete sentence containing n.31 and substitute the following:]

The Court departed from this line of reasoning in *California v. LaRue*.[1]

[P. 1983, add to text at end of section:]

In *44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island*,[2] the Court disavowed *LaRue* and *Bellanca*, and reaffirmed that, "although the Twenty-first Amendment limits the effect of the dormant Commerce Clause on a state's regulatory power over the delivery or use of intoxicating beverages within its borders, 'the Amendment does not license the States to ignore their obligations under other provisions of the Constitution,'"[3] and therefore does not afford a basis for state legislation infringing freedom of expression protected by the First Amendment. There is no reason, the Court asserted, for distinguishing between freedom of expression and the other constitutional guarantees (e.g., those protected by the Establishment and Equal Protection Clauses) held to be insulated from state impairment pursuant to powers conferred by the Twenty-first Amendment. The Court hastened to add by way of dictum that states retain adequate police powers to regulate "grossly sexual exhibitions in premises licensed to serve alcoholic beverages." 'Entirely apart from the Twenty-first Amendment, the State has ample power to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages in inappropriate locations."[4]

---

[1] 409 U.S. 109 (1972).

[2] 116 S. Ct. 1495 (1996) (statutory prohibition against advertisements that provide the public with accurate information about retail prices of alcoholic beverages is not shielded from constitutional scrutiny by the Twenty-first Amendment).

[3] Id. at 1514 (quoting Capital Cities Cable, Inc., v. Crisp, 467 U.S. 691, 712 (1984)).

[4] Id.

ACTS OF CONGRESS HELD UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN WHOLE OR IN PART BY THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

128. Act of August 29, 1935, ch. 814 § 5(e), 49 Stat. 982, 27 U.S.C. § 205(e).

The prohibition in section 5(e)(2) of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act of 1935 on the display of alcohol content on beer labels is inconsistent with the protections afforded to commercial speech by the First Amendment. The government's interest in curbing strength wars among brewers is substantial, but, given the "overall irrationality" of the regulatory scheme, the labeling prohibition does not directly and materially advance that interest.

Rubin v. Coors Brewing Co., 115 S. Ct. 1585 (1995).
Justices concurring: Thomas, O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, Souter, Ginsburg, Breyer, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.
Justice concurring specially: Stevens.

129. Act of Aug. 16, 1954, ch. 736, 68A Stat. 521, 26 U.S.C. § 4371(1).

A federal tax on insurance premiums paid to foreign insurers not subject to the federal income tax violates the Export Clause, Art. I, § 9, cl. 5, as applied to casualty insurance for losses incurred during the shipment of goods from locations within the United States to purchasers abroad.

United States v. IBM Corp., 116 S. Ct. 1793 (1996).
Justices concurring: Thomas, Rehnquist, O'Connor, Scalia, Souter, Breyer, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.
Justices dissenting: Kennedy, Ginsburg.

130. Act of May 11, 1976 (Pub. L. 94–283, § 112(2)), 90 Stat. 489; 2 U.S.C. § 441a(d)(3).

The Party Expenditure Provision of the Federal Election Campaign Act, which limits expenditures by a political party "in connection with the general election campaign of a [congressional] candidate," violates the First Amendment when applied to expenditures that a political party makes independently, without coordination with the candidate.

Colorado Republican Campaign Comm. v. FEC, 116 S. Ct. 2309 (1996).
Justices concurring: Breyer, O'Connor and Souter.
Justices concurring in part and dissenting in part: Kennedy, Rehnquist, Scalia, and Thomas.
Justices dissenting: Stevens and Ginsburg.

131. Act of Oct. 17, 1988 (Pub. L. 100–497, § 11(d)(7)), 102 Stat. 2472, 25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(7).

A provision of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act authorizing an Indian tribe to sue a State in federal court to compel performance of a duty to negotiate in good faith toward the formation of a compact

violates the Eleventh Amendment. In exercise of its powers under Article I, Congress may not abrogate States' Eleventh Amendment immunity from suit in federal court. *Pennsylvania v. Union Gas Co.*, 491 U.S. 1 (1989), is overruled.

Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida, 116 S. Ct. 1114 (1996).
Justices concurring: Chief Justice Rehnquist, and O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, and Thomas.
Justices dissenting: Stevens, Souter, Ginsburg and Breyer.

132. Act of Nov. 30, 1989 (Pub. L. 101–194, § 601), 103 Stat. 1760, 5 U.S.C. app. § 501.

Section 501(b) of the Ethics in Government Act, as amended in 1989 to prohibit Members of Congress and federal employees from accepting honoraria, violates the First Amendment as applied to Executive Branch employees below grade GS–16. The ban is limited to expressive activity and does not include other outside income, and the "speculative benefits" of the ban do not justify its "crudely crafted burden" on expression.

United States v. National Treasury Employees Union, 115 S. Ct. 1003 (1995).
Justices concurring: Stevens, Kennedy, Souter, Ginsburg, and Breyer.
Justice concurring in part and dissenting in part: O'Connor.
Justices dissenting: Chief Justice Rehnquist, and Scalia and Thomas.

133. Act of Nov. 29, 1990 (Pub. L. 101–647, § 1702), 104 Stat. 4844, 18 U.S.C. § 922q.

The Gun Free School Zones Act of 1990, which makes it a criminal offense to knowingly possess a firearm within a school zone, exceeds congressional power under the Commerce Clause. It is "a criminal statute that by its terms has nothing to do with 'commerce' or any sort of economic enterprise." Possession of a gun at or near a school "is in no sense an economic activity that might, through repetition elsewhere, substantially affect any sort of interstate commerce."

United States v. Lopez, 115 S. Ct. 1624 (1995).
Justices concurring: Chief Justice Rehnquist, O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, and Thomas.
Justices dissenting: Stevens, Souter, Breyer, and Ginsburg.

134. Act of Dec. 19, 1991 (Pub. L. 102–242 § 476), 105 Stat. 2387, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa–1.

Section 27A(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added in 1991, requiring reinstatement of any section 10(b) actions that were dismissed as time barred subsequent to a 1991 Supreme Court decision, violates the Constitution's separation of powers to the extent that it requires federal courts to reopen final judgments in private civil actions. The provision violates a fundamental principle of Article III that the federal judicial power comprehends the power to render dispositive judgments.

Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc., 115 S. Ct. 1447 (1995).

Justices concurring: Scalia, O'Connor, Kennedy, Souter, and Thomas, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.
Justice concurring specially: Breyer.
Justices dissenting: Stevens and Ginsburg.

135. Act of Oct. 5, 1992 (Pub. L. 102–385, §§ 10(b) and 10(c)), 106 Stat. 1487, 1503; 47 U.S.C. § 532(j) and § 531 note, respectively.

Section 10(b) of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, which requires cable operators to segregate and block indecent programming on leased access channels if they do not prohibit it, violates the First Amendment. Section 10(c) of the Act, which permits a cable operator to prevent transmission of "sexually explicit" programming on public access channels, also violates the First Amendment.

Denver Area Educ. Tel. Consortium v. FCC, 116 S. Ct. 2374 (1996).
Justices concurring: Breyer, Stevens, O'Connor (§ 10(b) only), Kennedy, Souter, and Ginsburg.
Justices dissenting: Thomas, Rehnquist, Scalia, O'Connor (§ 10(c) only).

STATE ACTS HELD UNCONSTITUTIONAL

1090. *Edenfield v. Fane*, 507 U.S. 761 (1993).

A rule of the Florida Board of Accountancy banning "direct, in-person, uninvited solicitation" of business by certified public accountants is inconsistent with the free speech guarantees of the First Amendment.

Justices concurring: Kennedy, White, Blackmun, Stevens, Scalia, Souter, Thomas, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.
Justice dissenting: O'Connor.

1091. *Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Sac & Fox Nation*, 508 U.S. 114 (1993).

Oklahoma may not impose income taxes or motor vehicle taxes on members of the Sac and Fox Nation who live in "Indian country," whether the land is within reservation boundaries, on allotted lands, or in dependent communities. Such tax jurisdiction is considered to be preempted unless Congress has expressly provided to the contrary.

1092. *Department of Treasury v. Fabe*, 508 U.S. 491 (1993).

An Ohio statute setting priority of claims against insolvent insurance companies is preempted by the federal priority statute, 31 U.S.C. § 3713, which accords first priority to the United States, to the extent that the Ohio law protects the claims of creditors who are not policyholders. Insofar as it protects the claims of policyholders, the law is saved from preemption by section 2(b) of the McCarran-Ferguson Act.

Justices concurring: Blackmun, White, Stevens, O'Connor, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.
Justices dissenting: Kennedy, Scalia, Souter, Thomas.

1093. *Oregon Waste Systems v. Oregon Dep't of Environmental Quality*, 114 S. Ct. 1345 (1994).

Oregon's imposition of a surcharge on in-state disposal of solid waste generated in other states—a tax three times greater than the fee charged for disposal of waste that was generated in Oregon—constitutes an invalid burden on interstate commerce. The tax is facially discriminatory against interstate commerce, is not a valid compensatory tax, and is not justified by any other legitimate state interest.

Justices concurring: Thomas, Stevens, O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, Souter, Ginsburg.
Justices dissenting: Chief Justice Rehnquist, and Blackmun.

1094. *Associated Industries v. Lohman*, 114 S. Ct. 1815 (1994).

Missouri's uniform, statewide use tax constitutes an invalid discrimination against interstate commerce in those counties in which the use tax is greater than the sales tax imposed as a local option, even though the overall statewide effect of the use tax places a lighter

aggregate tax burden on interstate commerce than on intrastate commerce.

1095. *Montana Dep't of Revenue v. Kurth Ranch*, 114 S. Ct. 1937 (1994).

Montana's tax on the possession of illegal drugs, to be "collected only after any state or federal fines or forfeitures have been satisfied," constitutes punishment, and violates the prohibition, derived from the Double Jeopardy Clause, against successive punishments for the same offense.

Justices concurring: Stevens, Blackmun, Kennedy, Souter, and Ginsburg.
Justices dissenting: Chief Justice Rehnquist, and O'Connor, Scalia, and Thomas.

1096. *West Lynn Creamery, Inc. v. Healy*, 512 U.S. 186 (1994).

A Massachusetts milk pricing order, imposing an assessment on all milk sold by dealers to Massachusetts retailers, is an unconstitutional discrimination against interstate commerce because the entire assessment is then distributed to Massachusetts dairy farmers in spite of the fact that about two-thirds of the assessed milk is produced out of state. The discrimination imposed by the pricing order is not justified by a valid factor unrelated to economic protectionism.

Justices concurring: Stevens, O'Connor, Kennedy, Souter, and Ginsburg.
Justices concurring specially: Scalia and Thomas.
Justices dissenting: Chief Justice Rehnquist and Blackmun.

1097. *Honda Motor Co. v. Oberg*, 114 S. Ct. 2331 (1994).

A provision of the Oregon Constitution, prohibiting judicial review of the amount of punitive damages awarded by a jury unless the court can affirmatively say there is no evidence to support the verdict, is invalid under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Judicial review of the amount awarded was one of the few procedural safeguards available at common law, yet Oregon has removed that safeguard without providing any substitute procedure, and with no indication that the danger of arbitrary awards has subsided.

Justices concurring: Stevens, Blackmun, O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, Souter, and Thomas.
Justices dissenting: Ginsburg and Chief Justice Rehnquist.

1098. *Board of Educ. of Kiryas Joel Village v. Grumet*, 114 S. Ct. 2481 (1994).

A New York State law creating a special school district for an incorporated village composed exclusively of members of one small religious sect violates the Establishment Clause.

Justices concurring: Souter, Blackmun, Stevens, O'Connor, and Ginsburg.
Justice concurring specially: Kennedy.
Justices dissenting: Scalia, Thomas, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.

1099. *American Airlines v. Wolens*, 115 S. Ct. 817 (1995).

The Illinois Consumer Fraud Act, to the extent that it authorizes actions in state court challenging as "unfair or deceptive" marketing practices an airline company's changes in its frequent flyer program, is preempted by the Airline Deregulation Act, which prohibits states from "enact[ing] or enforc[ing] any law . . . relating to [air carrier] rates, routes, or services."

Justices concurring: Ginsburg, Kennedy, Souter, Breyer, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.
Justices concurring specially: O'Connor, Thomas.
Justice dissenting: Stevens.

1100. *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n*, 115 S. Ct. 1511 (1995).

Ohio's prohibition on the distribution of anonymous campaign literature abridges the freedom of speech. The law, aimed at speech designed to influence voters in an election, is a limitation on political expression subject to exacting scrutiny. Neither of the interests asserted by Ohio justifies the limitation.

Justices concurring: Stevens, O'Connor, Kennedy, Souter, Ginsburg, and Breyer.
Justice concurring specially: Thomas.
Justices dissenting: Scalia, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.

1101. *U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 115 S. Ct. 1842 (1995).

An amendment to the Arkansas Constitution denying ballot access to congressional candidates who have already served three terms in the House of Representatives or two terms in the Senate is invalid as conflicting with the qualifications for office set forth in Article I of the U.S. Constitution, (specifying age, duration of U.S. citizenship, and state inhabitancy requirements). Article I sets the exclusive qualifications for a United States Representative or Senator.

Justices concurring: Stevens Kennedy, Souter, Ginsburg, and Breyer.
Justices dissenting: Thomas, O'Connor, Scalia, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.

1102. *Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Chickasaw Nation*, 115 S. Ct. 2214 (1995).

Oklahoma may not impose its motor fuels excise tax upon fuel sold by Chickasaw Nation retail stores on tribal trust land. The legal incidence of the motor fuels tax falls on the retailer, located within Indian country, and the petitioner did not properly raise the issue of whether Congress had authorized such taxation in the Hayden-Cartwright Act.

1103. *Hurley v. Irish-American Gay Group* 115 S. Ct. 2338 (1995).

Application of Massachusetts' public accommodations law to require the private organizers of a St. Patrick's Day parade to allow participation in the parade by a gay and lesbian group wishing to proclaim its members' gay and lesbian identity violates the First Amendment because it compels parade organizers to include in the parade a message they wish to exclude.

1104. *Miller v. Johnson*, 115 S. Ct. 2475 (1995).

Georgia's congressional districting plan violates the Equal Protection Clause. The district court's finding that race was the predominant factor in drawing the boundaries of the Eleventh District was not clearly erroneous. The State did not meet its burden under strict scrutiny review to demonstrate that its districting was narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling interest.

Justices concurring: Kennedy, Rehnquist, O'Connor, Scalia, and Thomas.
Justices dissenting: Stevens Ginsburg, Breyer, and Souter.

1105. *Fulton Corp. v. Faulkner*, 116 S. Ct. 848 (1996).

North Carolina's intangibles tax on a fraction of the value of corporate stock owned by North Carolina residents inversely proportional to the corporation's exposure to the State's income tax, violates the "dormant" Commerce Clause. The tax facially discriminates against interstate commerce, and is not a "compensatory tax" designed to make interstate commerce bear a burden already borne by intrastate commerce.

1106. *Barnett Bank of Marion County v. Nelson*, 116 S. Ct. 1103 (1996).

A federal law empowering national banks in small towns to sell insurance (12 U.S.C. § 92) preempts a Florida law prohibiting banks from dealing in insurance. The federal law contains no explicit statement of preemption, but preemption is implicit because the state law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment of one of the federal law's purposes.

1107. *44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island*, 116 S. Ct. 1495 (1996).

Rhode Island's statutory prohibition against advertisements that provide the public with accurate information about retail prices of alcoholic beverages abridges freedom of speech protected by the First Amendment, and is not shielded from constitutional scrutiny by the Twenty-first Amendment. There is not a "reasonable fit" between the blanket prohibition and the State's goal of reducing alcohol consumption.

Justices concurring: Stevens, Scalia (in part), Kennedy (in part), Souter (in part), Thomas (in part), and Ginsburg (in part).
Justices concurring specially: Scalia, Thomas, O'Connor, Souter, Breyer, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.

1108. *Romer v. Evans*, 116 S. Ct. 1620 (1996).

Amendment 2 to the Colorado Constitution, which prohibits all legislative, executive, or judicial action at any level of state or local government if that action is designed to protect homosexuals, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The amendment, adopted by statewide referendum in 1992, does not bear a rational relationship to a legitimate governmental purpose.

Justices concurring: Kennedy, Stevens, O'Connor, Souter, Ginsburg, and Breyer.
Justices dissenting: Scalia, Thomas, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.

1109. *Doctor's Associates, Inc. v. Casarotto*, 116 S. Ct. 1652 (1996).

A Montana law declaring an arbitration clause unenforceable unless notice that the contract is subject to arbitration appears in underlined capital letters on the first page of the contract is preempted by the Federal Arbitration Act.

Concurring Justices: Ginsburg, Stevens, O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, Souter, Breyer, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.
Justice dissenting: Thomas.

1110. *Shaw v. Hunt*, 116 S. Ct. 1894 (1996).

North Carolina's congressional districting law, containing the racially gerrymandered 12th Congressional District as well as another majority-black district, violates the Equal Protection Clause because, under strict scrutiny applicable to racial classifications, creation of District 12 was not narrowly tailored to serve a compelling state interest. Creation of District 12 was not necessary to comply with either section 2 or section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and the lower court found that the redistricting plan was not actually aimed at ameliorating past discrimination.

Justices concurring: Chief Justice Rehnquist, and O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, and Thomas.
Justices dissenting: Stevens, Ginsburg, Souter, and Breyer.1111. *Bush v. Vera*, 116 S. Ct. 1941 (1996).

1111. *Bush v. Vera*, 116 S. Ct. 1941 (1996).

Three congressional districts created by Texas law constitute racial gerrymanders that are unconstitutional under the Equal Protection Clause. The district court correctly held that race predominated over legitimate districting considerations, including incumbency, and consequently strict scrutiny applies. None of the three districts is narrowly tailored to serve a compelling state interest.

Justices concurring: O'Connor, Kennedy, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.
Justices concurring specially: O'Connor, Kennedy, Thomas, and Scalia.
Justices dissenting: Stevens, Ginsburg, Breyer, and Souter.

1112. *United States v. Virginia*, 116 S. Ct. 2264 (1996).

Virginia's exclusion of women from the educational opportunities provided by Virginia Military Institute denies to women the equal protection of the laws. A state must demonstrate "exceedingly persuasive justification" for gender discrimination, and Virginia has failed to do so in this case.

Justices concurring: Ginsburg, Stevens, O'Connor, Kennedy, Souter, and Breyer. Justice concurring specially: Chief Justice Rehnquist.
Justice dissenting: Scalia.

ORDINANCES HELD UNCONSTITUTIONAL

125. *City of Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc.*, 507 U.S. 410 (1993).

The city's refusal, pursuant to an ordinance prohibiting distribution of commercial handbills on public property, to allow the distribution of commercial publications through freestanding newsracks located on public property, while at the same time allowing similar distribution of newspapers and other noncommercial publications, violates the First Amendment.

Justices concurring: Stevens, Blackmun, O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, and Souter.
Justices dissenting: Chief Justice Rehnquist, and White and Thomas.

126. *Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520 (1993).

The city's ordinances banning the killing of animals in a ritual sacrifice are unconstitutional as infringing the free exercise of religion by members of the Santeria religion.

Justices concurring: Kennedy, White, Stevens, Scalia, Souter, Thomas, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.
Justices concurring specially: Blackmun and O'Connor.

127. *C & A Carbone, Inc. v. Town of Clarkstown*, 114 S. Ct. 1677 (1994).

The town's "flow control" ordinance, which requires all solid waste within the town to be processed at a designated transfer station before leaving the municipality, discriminates against interstate commerce and is invalid under the Commerce Clause.

Justices concurring: Kennedy, Stevens, Scalia, Thomas, and Ginsburg.
Justice concurring specially: O'Connor.
Justices dissenting: Souter, Blackmun, and Chief Justice Rehnquist.

128. *City of Ladue v. Gilleo,*, 114 S. Ct. 2038 (1994).

The city's ordinance, which prohibits all signs but makes exceptions for several narrow categories, violates the First Amendment by prohibiting a resident from placing in the window of her home a sign containing a political message. By prohibiting residential signs that carry political, religious, or personal messages, the ordinance forecloses "a venerable means of communication that is both unique and important."

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS OVERRULED BY SUBSEQUENT DECISION

	Overruling Case	Overruled Case(s)
*	205. *United States v. Dixon,* 509 U.S. 688 (1993).	*Grady v. Corbin,* 495 U.S. 508 (1990).
*	206. *Nichols v. United States,* 511 U.S. 738 (1994).	*Baldasar v. Illinois,* 446 U.S. 222 (1980).
*	207. *Hubbard v. United States,* 115 S. Ct. 1754 (1995).	*United States v. Bramblett,* 348 U.S. 503 (1955).
*	208. *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena,* 115 S. Ct. 2097 (1995).	*Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC,* 497 U.S. 547 (1990); *Fullilove v. Klutznick,* 448 U.S. 448 (1990) (in part).
*	209. *United States v. Gaudin,* 115 S. Ct. 2310 (1995).	*Sinclair v. United States,* 279 U.S. 263 (1929).
*	210. *Fulton Corp. v. Faulkner,* 116 S. Ct. 848 (1996).	*Darnell v. Indiana,* 226 U.S. 390 (1912).
*	211. *Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida,* 116 S. Ct. 1114 (1996).	*Pennsylvania v. Union Gas Co.,* 491 U.S. 1 (1989).
*	212. *44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island,* 116 S. Ct. 1495 (1996).	*California v. LaRue,* 409 U.S. 109 (1972) (in part); *New York State Liquor Auth. v. Bellanca,* 452 U.S. 714 (1981) (in part); *City of Newport v. Iacobucci,* 479 U.S. 92 (1986) (in part).

TABLE OF CASES

44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island, 116 S. Ct. 1495 (1996)............................ 37–39, 77, 86, 91
Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner, 387 U.S. 136 (1967).. 20
Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200 (1996)....................................... 22, 54, 72, 91
Albright v. Oliver, 114 S. Ct. 807 (1994).. 70
Alexander v. United States, 509 U.S. 544 (1993)... 32, 41
Allegheny County v. Greater Pittsburgh ACLU, 492 U.S. 573 (1989)...................................... 27
Allen v. Wright, 468 U.S. 737 (1984).. 19
Allied-Bruce Terminix Cos. v. Dobson, 513 U.S. 265 (1995) 6, 10
American Airlines v. Wolens, 513 U.S. 219 (1995).. 9, 85
Arave v. Creech, 507 U.S. 463 (1993)... 63
Arizona v. Evans, 115 S. Ct. 1185 (1995)... 49
Associated Industries v. Lohman, 114 S. Ct. 1815 (1994) 83
Austin v. United States, 509 U.S. 602 (1993) 63
Baldasar v. Illinois, 446 U.S. 222 (1980).. 91
Barclays Bank v. Franchise Tax Bd. of California, 512 U.S. 298 (1994).................................... 8
Barnett Bank of Marion County v. Nelson, 116 S. Ct. 1103 (1996)................................... 10, 86
Bates v. State Bar of Arizona, 433 U.S. 350 (1977) 37, 38
Benjamin v. Jacobson, 935 F. Supp. 332 (S.D.N.Y. 1996).. 19
Bennis v. Michigan, 116 S. Ct. 994 (1996) 69
Blodgett v. Holden, 275 U.S. 142 (1927) 55
BMW v. Gore, 116 S. Ct. 1589 (1996)... 69, 70
Board of County Comm'rs v. Umbehr, 116 S. Ct. 2342 (1996).. 33, 34
Board of Educ. of Kiryas Joel Village v. Grumet, 114 S. Ct. 2481 (1994).................... 27–30, 84
Brecht v. Abrahamson, 507 U.S. 619 (1993) 53
Bush v. Vera, 116 S. Ct. 1941 (1996) 74, 87
Byrd v. Blue Ridge Rural Elec. Coop., 356 U.S. 525 (1958) 24
C & A Carbone, Inc. v. Town of Clarkstown, 511 U.S. 383 (1994) 6, 7, 89
California Dep't of Corrections v. Morales, 514 U.S. 499 (1995).. 12
California v. LaRue, 409 U.S. 109 (1972)... 77, 91
Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc., 510 U.S. 569 (1994) 11
Canedy v. Boardman, 16 F.3d 183 (7th Cir. 1994).. 30
Capital Cities Cable, Inc., v. Crisp, 467 U.S. 691 (1984) 77
Capitol Square Review Bd. v. Pinette, 115 S. Ct. 2440 (1995)...................................... 28, 29, 41
Cardinal Chemical Co. v. Morton Int'l, Inc., 508 U.S. 83 (1993)... 20
CBS v. Democratic Nat'l Comm., 412 U.S. 94 (1973).. 31, 32
Central Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Mealey, 334 U.S. 653 (1948) 6
Central Hudson Gas & Elec. Co. v. Public Serv. Comm'n, 447 U.S. 557 (1980)................ 36–39
Chapman v. California, 386 U.S. 18 (1967) 53
Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520 (1993) 31, 89
City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent, 466 U.S. 789 (1984) 43
City of Cincinnati v. Discovery Network, Inc., 507 U.S. 410 (1993).................................. 36, 89
City of Ladue v. Gilleo, 114 S. Ct. 2038 (1994) 44, 89
City of Los Angeles v. Preferred Communications, 476 U.S. 488 (1986).................................. 39
City of Newport v. Iacobucci, 479 U.S. 92 (1986) 91
Clements v. Fashing, 457 U.S. 957 (1982) 20
Colorado Republican Campaign Comm. v. FEC, 116 S. Ct. 2309 (1996) 22, 34, 79
Concrete Pipe & Products v. Construction Laborers Pension Trust, 508 U.S. 602 (1993).. 55, 56
Cooper v. Oklahoma, 116 S. Ct. 1373 (1996) 71
CSX Transportation, Inc. v. Easterwood, 507 U.S. 658 (1993).. 9
Dalton v. Specter, 511 U.S. 462 (1994) 14, 15

Darnell v. Indiana, 226 U.S. 390 (1912) ... 91
Davis v. United States, 114 S. Ct. 2350 (1994) ... 54
Delaware v. Prouse, 440 U.S. 648 (1979) ... 48
Denver Area Educ. Tel. Consortium v. FCC, 116 S. Ct. 2374 (1996) ... 40, 41, 81
Department of Agriculture v. Moreno, 413 U.S. 528 (1973) ... 75
Department of Taxation & Finance v. Milhelm Attea & Bros., 512 U.S. 61 (1994) ... 10
Department of Treasury v. Fabe, 508 U.S. 491 (1993) ... 9, 83
District of Columbia v. Greater Washington Bd. of Trade, 506 U.S. 125 (1992) ... 9
Doctor's Associates, Inc. v. Casarotto, 116 S. Ct. 1652 (1996) ... 10, 87
Dolan v. City of Tigard, 114 S. Ct. 2309 (1994) ... 56
Edenfield v. Fane, 507 U.S. 761 (1993) ... 35, 36, 83
Evans v. Romer, 854 P.2d 1270 (Colo. 1993) ... 74
Ex parte Virginia, 100 U.S. 339 (1880) ... 31
Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825 (1994) ... 64
FCC v. Beach Communications, 508 U.S. 307 (1993) ... 54, 72
FDIC v. Meyer, 510 U.S. 471 (1994) ... 23
Felker v. Turpin, 116 S. Ct. 2333 (1996) ... 18, 24, 26
Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer, 427 U.S. 445 (1976) ... 68
Flores v. City of Boerne, 877 F. Supp. 355 (W.D. Tex. 1995) ... 30
Florida Bar v. Went For It, Inc., 115 S. Ct. 2371 (1995) ... 34, 38
Frisby v. Schultz, 487 U.S. 474 (1988) ... 42
Fullilove v. Klutznick, 448 U.S. 448 (1990) ... 91
Fulton Corp. v. Faulkner, 116 S. Ct. 848 (1996) ... 86, 91
Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972) ... 1
Gardner v. Toilet Goods Ass'n, Inc., 387 U.S. 167 (1967) ... 20
Gasperini v. Center for Humanities, Inc., 116 S. Ct. 2211 (1996) ... 23, 61
Goldberg v. Sweet, 488 U.S. 252 (1989) ... 7
Grady v. Corbin, 495 U.S. 508 (1990) ... 52, 91
Grubart v. Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., 513 U.S. 527 (1995) ... 22
Guaranty Trust Co. v. York, 326 U.S. 99 (1945) ... 23
Gutierrez de Martinez v. Lamagno, 115 S. Ct. 2227 (1995) ... 15
Hagen v. Utah, 510 U.S. 399 (1994) ... 11
Hans v. Louisiana, 134 U.S. 1 (1890) ... 68
Harper v. Virginia Dep't of Taxation, 509 U.S. 86 (1993) ... 21
Harris v. Alabama, 115 S. Ct. 1031 (1995) ... 63
Heiner v. Donnan, 285 U.S. 312 (1932) ... 55
Helling v. McKinney, 509 U.S. 25 (1993) ... 64
Herrera v. Collins, 506 U.S. 390 (1993) ... 24, 64
Hickman v. Block, 81 F.3d 98 (9th Cir. 1996) ... 45
Hill v. Lockhart, 474 U.S. 52 (1985) ... 60
Honda Motor Co. v. Oberg, 512 U.S. 415 (1994) ... 69, 84
Hubbard v. United States, 115 S. Ct. 1754 (1995) ... 91
Hurley v. Irish-American Gay Group, 115 S. Ct. 2338 (1995) ... 32, 39, 43, 85
Ibanez v. Florida Bd. of Accountancy, 114 S. Ct. 2084 (1994) ... 35
In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358 (1970) ... 59
International Union, UMW v. Bagwell, 512 U.S. 821 (1994) ... 18, 59
Itel Containers Int'l Corp. v. Huddleston, 507 U.S. 60 (1993) ... 6, 8, 12
J. E. B. v. Alabama ex rel. T. B., 511 U.S. 127 (1994) ... 73
John Hancock Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Harris Trust and Sav. Bank, 510 U.S. 86 (1993) ... 9
Johnson v. Texas, 509 U.S. 350 (1993) ... 64
Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co., 511 U.S. 375 (1994) ... 22
Kotteakos v. United States, 328 U.S. 750 (1946) ... 53

Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches School Dist., 508 U.S. 384 (1993) 28, 41
Leathers v. Medlock, 499 U.S. 439 (1991).. 40
Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., 115 S. Ct. 961 (1995) 31
Lewis v. Casey, 116 S. Ct. 2174 (1996) 71
Lewis v. United States, 116 S. Ct. 2163 (1996) 59
Linda R. S. v. Richard D., 410 U.S. 614 (1973) 19
Lindh v. Murphy, 96 F.3d 856 (7th Cir. 1996)... 26
Linmark Assocs. v. Township of Willingboro, 431 U.S. 85 (1977).. 37
Livadas v. Bradshaw, 512 U.S. 107 (1994) 10
Lockhart v. Fretwell, 506 U.S. 364 (1993) 60
Loving v. United States, 116 S. Ct. 1737 (1996) 1, 11, 13
Lujan v. National Wildlife Federation, 497 U.S. 871 (1990) 20
Lynch v. Donnelly, 465 U.S. 668 (1984) 27
Madsen v. Women's Health Center, 114 S. Ct. 2516 (1994).. 42
Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 (1961)... 53
Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 116 S. Ct. 1384 (1996)..................................... 11, 61
McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n, 115 S. Ct. 1511 (1995) 43, 85
Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr, 116 S. Ct. 2240 (1996)... 9
Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC, 497 U.S. 547 (1990) 91
Michigan v. Tucker, 417 U.S. 433 (1974) 53
Miller v. Johnson, 115 S. Ct. 2475 (1995).. 74, 86
Minnesota v. Dickerson, 508 U.S. 366 (1993) 48
Mississippi v. Louisiana, 506 U.S. 73 (1992) 23
Montana Dep't of Revenue v. Kurth Ranch, 114 S. Ct. 1937 (1994) 51, 84
Montana v. Egelhoff, 116 S. Ct. 2013 (1996) 71
Murray v. Carrier, 477 U.S. 478 (1986) 25
New York State Conf. of Blue Cross & Blue Shield Plans v. Travelers Ins. Co., 514 U.S. 645 (1995)... 9
New York State Liquor Auth. v. Bellanca, 452 U.S. 714 (1981) 91
Nichols v. Coolidge, 274 U.S. 531 (1927)... 55
Nichols v. United States, 511 U.S. 738 (1994).. 60, 91
Nixon v. United States, 506 U.S. 224 (1993) 22
Northeastern Fla. Ch. of the Associated Gen. Contractors v. City of Jacksonville, 508 U.S. 656 (1993) 20, 21
O'Hare Truck Serv., Inc. v. City of Northlake, 116 S. Ct. 2353 (1996).................................... 33
O'Melveny & Myers v. FDIC, 512 U.S. 79 (1994).. 24
Ohralik v. Ohio State Bar Ass'n, 436 U.S. 447 (1978).. 35, 38
Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Chickasaw Nation, 115 S. Ct. 2214 (1995).............................. 10, 85
Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Jefferson Lines, Inc., 514 U.S. 175 (1995) 6, 7, 22
Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Sac & Fox Nation, 508 U.S. 114 (1993)................................... 10, 83
One Lot Emerald Cut Stones v. United States, 409 U.S. 232 (1972) 51
Oregon Waste Systems v. Department of Envtl. Quality, 511 U.S. 93 (1994)...................... 7, 83
Ornelas v. United States, 116 S. Ct. 1657 (1996)... 47
Parke v. Raley, 506 U.S. 20 (1992) 71
Peacock v. Thomas, 116 S. Ct. 862 (1996).. 22
Pennell v. City of San Jose, 485 U.S. 1 (1988)... 56
Pennhurst State School & Hosp. v. Halderman, 465 U.S. 89 (1984) 68
Pennsylvania v. Labron, 116 S. Ct. 2485 (1996)... 48
Pennsylvania v. Union Gas Co., 491 U.S. 1 (1989) 80, 91
Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc., 514 U.S. 211 (1995) 17, 80
Posadas de Puerto Rico Assocs. v. Tourism Co., 478 U.S. 328 (1986) 37
Quackenbush v. Allstate Ins. Co., 116 S. Ct. 1712 (1996) 24
Regents of the Univ. of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978) 20

Reich v. Collins, 115 S. Ct. 547 (1994) 69
Reno v. Catholic Social Services, Inc., 509 U.S. 43 (1993) 20
Reno v. Flores, 507 U.S. 292 (1993) 11
Reynoldsville Casket Co. v. Hyde, 514 U.S. 749 (1995) 21
Richards v. Jefferson County, 116 S. Ct. 1761 (1996) 70
Richmond v. Lewis, 506 U.S. 40 (1992) 64
Romano v. Oklahoma, 114 S. Ct. 2004 (1994) 63
Romer v. Evans, 116 S. Ct. 1620 (1996) 74, 86
Rosenberger v. University of Virginia, 115 S. Ct. 2510 (1995) 28, 41
Rubin v. Coors Brewing Co., 115 S. Ct. 1585 (1995) 35–39, 79
Ryder v. United States, 515 U.S. 177 (1995) 15, 21
Sale v. Haitian Centers Council, 509 U.S. 155 (1993) 11
Sandin v. Conner, 115 S. Ct. 2293 (1995) 70
Sawyer v. Whitney, 505 U.S. 333 (1995) 25
Schiro v. Farley, 114 S. Ct. 783 (1994) 51
Schlup v. Delo, 513 U.S. 298 (1995) 25
Scott v. Illinois, 440 U.S. 367 (1979) 60
Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida, 116 S. Ct. 1114 (1996) 22, 67, 80, 91
Shaw v. Hunt, 116 S.Ct. 1894 (1996) 74, 87
Shaw v. Reno, 509 U.S. 630 (1993) 74
Simon v. Eastern Kentucky Welfare Rights Org., 426 U.S. 26 (1976) 19
Sinclair v. United States, 279 U.S. 263 (1929) 91
Smiley v. Citibank, 116 S. Ct. 1730 (1996) 9
Soldal v. Cook County, 506 U.S. 56 (1992) 47
South Dakota v. Bourland, 508 U.S. 679 (1993) 11
Stansbury v. California, 114 S. Ct. 1526 (1994) 54
Stone v. Powell, 428 U.S. 465 (1976) 53, 54
Sullivan v. Louisiana, 508 U.S. 275 (1993) 59, 71
Toilet Goods Ass'n, Inc. v. Gardner, 387 U.S. 158 (1967) 20
Torcaso v. Watkins, 367 U.S. 488 (1961) 27
Tuggle v. Netherland, 116 S. Ct. 283 (1995) 64
Tuilaepa v. California, 114 S. Ct. 2630 (1994) 63
Turner Broadcasting System v. FCC, 114 S. Ct. 2445 (1994) 39, 40
Turner v. Fouche, 396 U.S. 346 (1970) 20
TXO Prod. Corp. v. Alliance Resources, 509 U.S. 443 (1993) 69
U. S. Bancorp Mortgage Co. v. Bonner Mall Partnership, 513 U.S. 18 (1994) 20
U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton, 514 U.S. 779 (1995) 2, 85
United States v. Bramblett, 348 U.S. 503 (1955) 91
United States v. Brignoni-Ponce, 422 U.S. 873 (1975) 48
United States v. Carlton, 114 S. Ct. 2018 (1994) 55
United States v. Dixon, 509 U.S. 688 (1993) 52, 91
United States v. Edge Broadcasting Co., 509 U.S. 418 (1993) 35–38
United States v. Gaudin, 115 S. Ct. 2310 (1995) 59, 91
United States v. Gomez, 92 F.3d 770 (9th Cir. 1996) 45
United States v. Hemme, 476 U.S. 558 (1986) 55
United States v. IBM Corp., 116 S. Ct. 1793 (1996) 11, 12, 22, 79
United States v. Jacobsen, 466 U.S. 109 (1984) 47
United States v. James Daniel Good Real Property, 510 U.S. 43 (1993) 70
United States v. Lopez, 514 U.S. 549 (1995) 4, 6, 65, 80
United States v. National Treasury Employees Union, 115 S. Ct. 1003 (1995) 33, 80
United States v. NTEU, 513 U.S. 454 (1995) 15
United States v. One Assortment of 89 Firearms, 465 U.S. 354 (1984) 51
United States v. Padilla, 508 U.S. 77 (1993) 50

United States v. Ursery, 116 S. Ct. 2135 (1996) 51
United States v. Virginia, 116 S. Ct. 2264 (1996) 73, 87
Untermyer v. Anderson, 276 U.S. 440 (1928) 55
Usery v. Turner Elkhorn Mining Co., 428 U.S. 1 (1976) 55
Vernonia School Dist. v. Acton, 115 S. Ct. 2386 (1995) 49
Victor v. Nebraska, 511 U.S. 1 (1994) 71
Virginia State Bd. of Pharmacy v. Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, 425 U.S. 748 (1976) 37, 38
Voinovich v. Quilter, 507 U.S. 146 (1993) 74
Warth v. Seldin, 422 U.S. 490 (1975) 19
Waters v. Churchill, 114 S. Ct. 1878 (1994) 34
Weiss v. United States, 510 U.S. 163 (1994) 15
West Lynn Creamery, Inc. v. Healy, 512 U.S. 186 (1994) 6, 7, 84
Whren v. United States, 116 S. Ct. 1769 (1996) 48
Wilson v. Arkansas, 115 S. Ct. 1914 (1995) 47
Wilton v. Seven Falls Co., 515 U.S. 277 (1995) 20
Wisconsin v. City of New York, 116 S. Ct. 1091 (1996) 4
Wisconsin v. Mitchell, 508 U.S. 476 (1993) 32, 41
Withrow v. Williams, 507 U.S. 680 (1993) 53, 54
Wood v. Bartholomew, 116 S. Ct. 7 (1995) 71
Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Calhoun, 116 S. Ct. 619 (1996) 23
Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel, 471 U.S. 626 (1985) 38
Zobrest v. Catalina Foothills School Dist., 509 U.S. 1 (1993) 27, 28

INDEX

Abortion
- protests, injunctions, First Amendment protections 42

Admiralty
- maritime torts 22

Advertising
- compelled disclosure of information 38

Affirmative action
- federal legislation subject to strict scrutiny 72

Appointments Clause
- military judges 14

Association, right of
- parade organizers, control of parade message 32

Cable Television
- First Amendment protections 39

Campaign finance
- independent party expenditures, First Amendment 34

Census
- decision not to make statistical adjustment 4

Commerce Clause
- discriminatory local solid waste "flow control" law 7
- discriminatory state taxation 6, 7
- state taxation, apportionment, multinational corporation 9

Commerce power
- invalidity of Gun-Free School Zones Act 4

Congress
- power under Commerce Clause 4
- qualifications of Members, term limits 2

Congressional districting
- racial gerrymandering, bizarrely shaped districts 74

Contempt
- distinction between civil and criminal contempt 18

Counsel, assistance of
- ineffective counsel, grounds for new trial 60

Death penalty
- military justice, standards promulgated by President 1
- permissible jury instructions 63

Delegation
- military justice, President's authority as Commander-in-Chief 1, 13

Diversity of Citizenship
- federal court cases, choice of law 23

Double jeopardy
- same conduct test 52
- sentence enhancement 52

Drug testing
- public high school athletes 49

Due Process
- retroactive taxation 55
- solitary confinement of prisoners 70

Ex Post Facto Clause
- decreasing frequency of parole-suitability hearings 12

Excessive fines
- civil forfeiture 63

Exclusionary rule
federal habeas corpus, review of Miranda claims 54
False statements
federal statute, materiality as issue for jury 59
Federalism
Gun-Free School Zones Act, invalidity 65
principles reflected in commerce power analysis........ 5
First Amendment
protected expression, state authority under 21st Amendment 77
state action requirement 31
Forfeiture
innocent joint owner, car used in prostitution........ 69
non-punitive nature, double jeopardy analysis........ 51
Government contractors
free speech rights 33
Gun-Free School Zones Act
invalid as exceeding congressional commerce power 4, 65
Habeas corpus
claim of innocence, capital cases........ 64
statutory limitations 24
Homosexuals
Colorado constitutional amendment limiting local laws concerning........ 74
Honoraria ban
government employees, free speech rights........ 33
Impeachment
judicial review of Senate trial, "political question" 15
Import-Export Clause
federal excise tax on insurance for exported goods 11
Indian Gaming Regulatory Act
invalidity, abrogation of state immunity in federal court........ 67
Injunctions
public demonstrations, First Amendment limitations 42
Judicial review
preclusion of review, military base closures 14
Westfall Act, Federal Tort Claims Act 15
Jury trial
civil, when required 61
criminal, mixed questions of law and fact 59
when required, multiple petty offenses 59
Limitations period
retroactive change, final judgments, unconstitutionality 17
Military justice
appointment of military judges........ 14
death penalty, President's promulgation of standards 1
Miranda rule
federal habeas corpus claim 53
waiver of rights 54
Mootness
appropriateness of vacatur as remedy........ 20
Newsracks
use on public property, ban limited to commercial materials 36
Parades
organizers, right to control parade message 43

Political question
impeachment proceedings, judicial review 15, 22
Preemption
Medical Device Amendments 9
Press, freedom of
cable television 39
Prisons
Prison Litigation Reform Act, restrictions on litigation 19
Punitive damages
amount, due process constraints 69
Racial discrimination
affirmative action, federal legislation, strict scrutiny 72
Racial gerrymandering
"bizarre" shape of congressional districts 74
Religion: Establishment Clause
equal access of religious groups to school property 28
public funding for sign-language interpreter in public schools 27
religious displays on public property 29
special school district for religioius sect 29
test for validity 27
Religion: Free Exercise
animal sacrifice 31
Religious Freedom Restoration Act 30
Retroactivity
Supreme Court ruling, cases still on direct review 21
taxation 55
Search and seizure
"knock and announce" rule 47
definition of "seizure" 47
drug testing of public high school athletes 49
frisk, "plain touch" seizure of contraband 48
traffic violation, pretextual stop 48
Separation of powers
changed position of Justice Department 13
delegation to President in role as Commander-in-Chief 2
legislative alteration of final judgments of courts 17
Sex discrimination
jury selection 73
military college 73
Speech, commercial
beer labels, display of alcohol content 35
compelled disclosure in advertising 38
liquor ads, price information 37
reasonable fit between ends and means of regulation 36
Speech, freedom of
anonymous advocacy 43
cable television 39
hate crimes, enhancement of criminal penalty 41
in-person solicitation by CPAs 35
independent government contractors 33, 34
parade organizers, right to control parade message 43
public demonstrations, injunctions 42
public employees, honoraria ban 33

Speech, freedom of—Continued
residential signs 44
signs, use of utility poles 43
Standing to sue
suit by organization on behalf of members 19
Stare decisis
conflicting views of Justices 22
States
immunity in federal courts, congressional power to abrogate 67
Taking of property
land dedications, permit conditions 56
Taxation, Federal
excise tax, import-export clause 12
retroactive application 55
Taxation, State
apportionment, multinational corporation, franchise tax 8
discrimination against interstate commerce 6, 7
Term limits
Members of Congress, state-imposed limitations 2
Twenty-first Amendment
authority of states, regulation of expressive behavior 77
prohibition against liquor price advertising not shielded by 77
Vacatur
remedy for mootness, limitations 20

○