

Per Curiam

## LEE v. MISSOURI

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT  
OF MISSOURI

No. 77-6066. Decided January 15, 1979\*

Judgments of Missouri Supreme Court and Missouri Court of Appeals affirming convictions as against fair-cross-section claims based on exclusion of women from juries are vacated, and the cases are remanded for reconsideration in light of *Duren v. Missouri*, ante, p. 357. Because *Duren* does not announce any "new standards" of constitutional law not evident from the decision in *Taylor v. Louisiana*, 419 U. S. 522, the considerations calling for departure from full retroactive application of constitutional holdings are inapplicable to juries sworn after the *Taylor* decision.

Certiorari granted in Nos. 77-6066, 77-6068, 77-6701, and 77-7012. 556 S. W. 2d 11; 556 S. W. 2d 25; 556 S. W. 2d 135; 559 S. W. 2d 749; 560 S. W. 2d 283; and 564 S. W. 2d 328, vacated and remanded.

## PER CURIAM.

The motions for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are granted.

In each of these cases, the trial court denied a timely motion to quash the petit jury panel. On appeal, the convictions were affirmed on the basis of *State v. Duren*, 556 S. W. 2d 11 (Mo. 1977). *State v. Lee*, 556 S. W. 2d 25 (Mo. 1977); *State v. Minor*, 556 S. W. 2d 35 (Mo. 1977); *State v. Arrington*, 559 S. W. 2d 749 (Mo. 1978); *State v. Burnfin*, 560 S. W. 2d 283 (Mo. App. 1977); *State v. Combs*, 564 S. W. 2d 328 (Mo. App. 1978).

We reversed the decision below in *Duren* because of inconsistency with the principles enunciated in *Taylor v.*

\*Together with No. 77-6068, *Minor v. Missouri*, also on certiorari to, and No. 77-6553, *Arrington v. Missouri*, on appeal from, the same court, and No. 77-6701, *Burnfin v. Missouri*, and No. 77-7012, *Combs v. Missouri*, on certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Missouri, Kansas City District.

Per Curiam

439 U. S.

*Louisiana*, 419 U. S. 522 (1975). *Ante*, p. 357. The State of Missouri has urged that our decision in *Duren* not be applied retroactively to petitioners or appellants other than *Duren* himself. However, because that decision does not announce any "new standards" of constitutional law not evident from the decision in *Taylor v. Louisiana*, the considerations that have led us in other cases to depart from full retroactive application of constitutional holdings, see, e. g., *Stovall v. Denno*, 388 U. S. 293, 297 (1967), are inapplicable to juries sworn after the decision in *Taylor v. Louisiana*. Compare *Daniel v. Louisiana*, 420 U. S. 31 (1975), holding *Taylor v. Louisiana* inapplicable to cases in which the jury was sworn prior to the date of that decision.

We note that in any case in which a jury was sworn subsequent to *Taylor v. Louisiana* and the fair-cross-section claim based on exclusion of women was rejected on direct review or in state collateral proceedings because of the defendant's failure to assert the claim in timely fashion, relief is unavailable under 28 U. S. C. § 2254 unless the petitioner can show cause for having failed to raise his claim properly in the state courts. See *Wainwright v. Sykes*, 433 U. S. 72 (1977).

The petitions for certiorari in Nos. 77-6066, 77-6068, 77-6701, and 77-7012 are granted. The judgments below in those cases, together with that in No. 77-6553, are vacated, and the cases are remanded for reconsideration in light of *Duren v. Missouri*, *ante*, p. 357.

*So ordered.*

[For opinion of MR. JUSTICE POWELL concurring in the judgments, see *ante*, p. 460.]

MR. JUSTICE REHNQUIST dissents.