

INDEX

ABSOLUTE IMMUNITY. See *Immunity from Suit*.

ABSTENTION. See *Mootness*, 2.

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF JUDGES. See *Immunity from Suit*, 2.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT. See *Judicial Review*.

ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE. See *Constitutional Law*, IV; *Federal Rules of Evidence*.

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCE FOR IMPOSITION OF DEATH PENALTY. See *Constitutional Law*, II.

APPEALS. See also *Parties*, 2.

Nonparties to underlying litigation—Failure to intervene.—Petitioners—white police officers claiming to be adversely affected by a Title VII consent decree—could not appeal from decree because they had not been parties to underlying employment discrimination lawsuit and because they had not intervened for purposes of appeal. *Marino v. Ortiz*, p. 301.

ARBITRATION.

Court's authority to review arbitrator's award—Setting aside award on public policy ground.—Court of Appeals exceeded limited authority possessed by courts in reviewing arbitrator's award entered pursuant to a collective-bargaining agreement when it reconsidered merits of, and refused to enforce, award; court also erred in setting aside award on public policy grounds because court improperly formulated policy and failed to show that it had been violated. *Paperworkers v. Misco, Inc.*, p. 29.

ARMY SECRETARY. See *Flood Control Act of 1944*.

BACK PAY ACT. See *Civil Service Reform Act of 1978*.

BANKRUPTCY CODE.

Undersecured creditors—Compensation for delay caused by stay.—Undersecured creditors are not entitled to compensation under § 362(d)(1) of Bankruptcy Code for delay caused by automatic stay in foreclosing on their collateral. *United Savings Assn. of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Associates, Ltd.*, p. 365.

BLACK LUNG BENEFITS.

Interim presumption of disability—Burden of proof.—Burden of proof mandated for entitlement to an interim presumption of eligibility for black lung disability benefits is that a claimant establish, by a preponderance of evidence, at least one of qualifying facts prescribed by regulations, not that presumption be invoked on basis of a single item of qualifying evidence. *Mullins Coal Co. v. Director, OWCP*, p. 135.

BURDEN OF PROOF. See **Black Lung Benefits; Constitutional Law, I.**

CASE OR CONTROVERSY. See **Mootness.**

CERTIFICATION OF STATE-LAW QUESTIONS TO STATE SUPREME COURT. See **Obscene Publications.**

CHILD CUSTODY. See **Parental Kidnaping Prevention Act of 1980.**

CITIZEN SUITS. See **Jurisdiction, 1.**

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871. See **Immunity from Suit, 2.**

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964. See **Appeals; Parties, 1.**

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ACT OF 1978.

Nonpreference eligible excepted service employees—Preclusion of judicial review.—Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, which affords to nonpreference eligibles in excepted service no administrative or judicial review of adverse personnel actions such as respondent's 30-day suspension, precludes judicial review for those employees under Tucker Act based on Back Pay Act. *United States v. Fausto*, p. 439.

CLEAN WATER ACT. See **Jurisdiction, 1.**

COERCION OF JURY. See **Criminal Law, 1.**

COLLATERAL ATTACK ON CONSENT DECREES. See **Parties, 1.**

COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS. See **Arbitration; Jurisdiction, 3.**

COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT. See **Jurisdiction, 5.**

COMPULSORY PROCESS CLAUSE. See **Constitutional Law, V.**

CONFRONTATION CLAUSE. See **Constitutional Law, IV.**

CONSENT DECREES. See **Appeals; Parties, 1.**

CONSPIRACY. See **Criminal Law, 2.**

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Criminal Law, 1; Obscene Publications; Parental Kidnaping Prevention Act of 1980; Standing to Sue.**

I. Due Process.

Jury instructions—Presumption of criminal intent—Retroactivity.—Decision in *Francis v. Franklin*, 471 U. S. 307—which applied principle of *Sandstrom v. Montana*, 442 U. S. 510, that Due Process Clause of Fourteenth Amendment prohibits jury instructions that have effect of relieving State of its burden of proof on question of intent in criminal proceedings—applies retroactively to petitioner's case because it did not announce a new constitutional rule but, rather, applied a rule that was well settled at time of petitioner's conviction. *Yates v. Aiken*, p. 211.

II. Eighth Amendment.

Death sentence—Aggravating circumstance duplicating element of underlying offense.—Death sentence did not violate Eighth Amendment because single statutory "aggravating circumstance" found by jury duplicated an element of underlying first-degree murder offense, where Louisiana Legislature itself had narrowed definition of capital offenses so that a jury finding at guilt phase responded to constitutional concern that a capital sentencing scheme must genuinely narrow class of persons eligible for death penalty and must reasonably justify imposition of a more severe sentence on defendant compared to others found guilty of murder, and Constitution did not require an additional aggravating circumstance finding at penalty phase. *Lowenfield v. Phelps*, p. 231.

III. Freedom of Speech.

Students' rights—Deletion of articles from high school newspaper.—Deletion, by principal, of high school newspaper's pages containing objectionable articles did not violate First Amendment rights of student staff members, since newspaper was not a forum for public expression and principal's actions were reasonably related to legitimate pedagogical interests. *Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier*, p. 260.

IV. Right to Confront Witnesses.

Out-of-court identification—Witness' memory loss.—Confrontation Clause is not violated by admission of a prior, out-of-court identification statement of a witness who is unable, because of memory loss, to explain basis for identification, since Clause's guarantee of an *opportunity* for effective cross-examination was satisfied where defendant had a full and fair opportunity to bring out witness' bad memory and other facts tending to discredit his testimony. *United States v. Owens*, p. 554.

V. Sixth Amendment.

Compulsory Process Clause—Sanctions for violating discovery rules.—Although Compulsory Process Clause of Sixth Amendment may be vio-

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

lated by imposition of a discovery sanction that entirely excludes testimony of a material defense witness, such Clause does not create an absolute bar to preclusion of witness' testimony; where record implied that petitioner's counsel sought practical advantage by not listing witness during discovery and was finding witnesses who "really weren't there," severe sanction of preclusion was justified, and it was not unfair to hold petitioner responsible for his lawyer's misconduct. *Taylor v. Illinois*, p. 400.

CONTRACT BY GOVERNMENT AGENCY. See **Flood Control Act of 1944.**

COURTS OF APPEALS. See **Arbitration; Jurisdiction, 2.**

CREDITORS. See **Bankruptcy Code.**

CRIMINAL LAW. See also **Constitutional Law, I; IV; V; Federal Rules of Evidence; Standing to Sue.**

1. *Death sentence—Jury coercion—Supplemental charge.*—Two jury polls determining that a majority thought that further deliberations would be helpful, and a supplemental charge stating that, without a unanimous opinion, court would, under Louisiana law, impose a life sentence without parole and that jury members should consult and consider each other's views but not surrender their own beliefs did not impermissibly coerce jury into returning a death sentence under Due Process Clause or Eighth Amendment. *Lowenfield v. Phelps*, p. 231.

2. *Mail and wire fraud—Conspiracy—Trading on confidential securities information.*—Petitioners violated mail and wire fraud statutes by conspiring to trade on Wall Street Journal's confidential information, thus depriving Journal of its intangible property right in keeping confidential and exclusive use of information before its publication; use of mail and wires to print and send Journal satisfies statutory requirement that mails and wires be used to execute scheme. *Carpenter v. United States*, p. 19.

CROSS-EXAMINATION. See **Constitutional Law, IV; Federal Rules of Evidence.**

DEATH SENTENCES. See **Constitutional Law, II; Criminal Law, 1.**

DISABILITY BENEFITS. See **Black Lung Benefits.**

DISABLED CHILDREN. See also **Education of the Handicapped Act; Mootness, 1.**

Order requiring that State provide services directly to child.—Court of Appeals' judgment affirming District Court's order directing State to provide services under Education of the Handicapped Act directly to a disabled child where local agency has failed to do so, is affirmed. *Honig v. Doe*, p. 305.

DISCLOSURE OF TAX RETURN INFORMATION. See **Internal Revenue Code.**

DISCOVERY. See **Constitutional Law, V.**

DISCRETIONARY CONDUCT OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS. See **Immunity from Suit, 1.**

DISMISSAL OF APPEAL. See **Judgments.**

DISTRICT COURTS. See **Jurisdiction, 3, 4.**

DUE PROCESS. See **Constitutional Law, I; Criminal Law, 1.**

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT. See also **Disabled Children; Mootness, 1.**

“Stay-put” provision—Unilateral exclusion of disabled children.— “Stay-put” provision of Education of the Handicapped Act—which mandates that a child *shall* remain in current educational placement—prohibits state and local school authorities from unilaterally excluding disabled children from classroom for dangerous or disruptive conduct growing out of their disabilities during pendency of review proceedings. *Honig v. Doe*, p. 305.

EIGHTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law, II; Criminal Law, 1.**

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974 (ERISA). See **Jurisdiction, 3.**

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Jurisdiction, 3.**

EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law, IV; Federal Rules of Evidence.**

FEDERAL CAUSES OF ACTION. See **Parental Kidnaping Prevention Act of 1980.**

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT OF 1950.

Warranty as part of “agreement”—Failure to meet statutory requirements.— Warranty alleged in petitioners’ misrepresentation defense to a bank claim pursued by FDIC as receiver was part of an “agreement” within meaning of Act and, as such, had to meet specific statutory requirements; because warranty representations did not meet statute’s requirements, they could not be asserted as a defense. *Langley v. FDIC*, p. 86.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES. See **Civil Service Reform Act of 1978; Merit Systems Protection Board.**

FEDERAL OFFICIALS. See **Immunity from Suit, 1.**

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Admission of out-of-court identification—Witness' memory loss.—Rule 802 was not violated by admission of a prior out-of-court identification statement of a witness who was unable, because of memory loss, to explain basis for identification; identification statement was not hearsay because declarant, who was placed on stand, under oath, and willingly responded to questions, was "subject to cross-examination" within meaning of Rule 801(d)(1)(C). *United States v. Owens*, p. 554.

FIRST AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law, III; Standing to Sue.**

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1944.

Interior Secretary's authority—Industrial use of Army reservoir water.—Secretary of Interior exceeded authority delegated to him by Congress in Act where he executed a contract to provide water from an Army reservoir for industrial use without obtaining Army Secretary's approval. *ETSI Pipeline Project v. Missouri*, p. 495.

FRAUD. See **Criminal Law, 2; Securities Regulation.**

FREEDOM OF SPEECH. See **Constitutional Law, III.**

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT CLAUSE. See **Parental Kidnaping Prevention Act of 1980.**

HASKELL AMENDMENT. See **Internal Revenue Code.**

HEARSAY. See **Federal Rules of Evidence.**

IDENTIFICATION OF DEFENDANT. See **Constitutional Law, IV; Federal Rules of Evidence.**

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.

1. *Federal officials—Discretionary conduct.*—Conduct by federal officials must be discretionary in nature, as well as within scope of their employment, before conduct is absolutely immune from state-law tort liability. *Westfall v. Erwin*, p. 292.

2. *Judges—Administrative functions.*—A state-court judge does not have absolute immunity from a damages suit under 42 U. S. C. § 1983 for decisions to demote and dismiss a court employee as these are administrative functions rather than judicial acts, but this does not imply that qualified immunity is also unavailable. *Forrester v. White*, p. 219.

IMPLIED FEDERAL CAUSE OF ACTION. See **Parental Kidnaping Prevention Act of 1980.**

"INJURY IN FACT" STANDING REQUIREMENT. See **Standing to Sue.**

IN PERSONAM JURISDICTION. See **Jurisdiction, 5.**

INTANGIBLE PROPERTY RIGHTS. See **Criminal Law**, 2.

INTEREST ON TAX DEFICIENCY. See **Jurisdiction**, 2.

INTERIOR SECRETARY. See **Flood Control Act of 1944**.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE. See also **Jurisdiction**, 2.

Haskell Amendment—Disclosure of tax return information—Redaction.—Haskell Amendment does not exempt from definition of confidential "return information" material in IRS files that can be redacted to delete those parts that would identify a particular taxpayer, but was intended to permit continuation of IRS practice of releasing statistical studies and compilations. *Church of Scientology of California v. IRS*, p. 9.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE FILES. See **Internal Revenue Code**.

INTERVENTION. See **Appeals; Parties**.

JUDGES. See **Immunity from Suit**, 2.

JUDGMENTS.

Dismissal of appeal—Mootness.—Judgments below were not vacated when this Court dismissed appeal because officials who had intervened in suit in their official capacity no longer held office, where officials had been proper party-intervenors before leaving office and dismissal did not render controversy moot or unreviewable. *Karcher v. May*, p. 72.

JUDICIAL REVIEW. See also **Civil Service Reform Act of 1978**.

Informal settlement—NLRB General Counsel's decision.—A post-complaint, prehearing informal settlement decision by NLRB's General Counsel is not subject to judicial review under National Labor Relations Act or Administrative Procedure Act. *NLRB v. Food and Commercial Workers*, p. 112.

JURISDICTION. See also **Mootness**, 1.

1. *Clean Water Act—Citizen suits—Past or continuing violations.*—Section 505(a) of Clean Water Act does not confer federal jurisdiction over citizen suits for wholly past violations but does confer jurisdiction when plaintiffs make a good-faith allegation of continuous or intermittent violation. *Gwaltney of Smithfield, Ltd. v. Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Inc.*, p. 49.

2. *Court of Appeals—Forgiveness of tax interest and penalty—Review of Tax Court's decision.*—Court of Appeals exceeded its jurisdictional authority when it granted petition to forgive interest and late-payment penalty on federal tax deficiency because it was not empowered to decide questions related to interest and penalties—which had not been before, and could not have been presented to, Tax Court—or to grant relief that Tax Court itself could not provide. *Commissioner v. McCoy*, p. 3.

JURISDICTION—Continued.

3. *District courts—Employer's refusal to make postcontract pension plan contributions.*—Remedy provided in §§ 502(g)(2) and 515 of Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974—which authorize multiemployer plan's trustees to bring an action in federal district court to enforce an employer's obligation to pay plan contributions required under terms of collective-bargaining agreement—is limited to "promised contributions" and does not confer jurisdiction on courts to determine whether an employer's unilateral decision to refuse to make postcontract contributions violates National Labor Relations Act. *Laborers Health and Welfare Trust Fund for Northern California v. Advanced Lightweight Concrete Co.*, p. 539.

4. *Remands involving removed pendent claims—Elimination of federal-law claims.*—A federal district court has discretion under doctrine of pendent jurisdiction to remand to state court a removed case upon a proper determination that retaining jurisdiction would be inappropriate, such as where all federal-law claims in action have been eliminated and only pendent state-law claims remain. *Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill*, p. 343.

5. *Service of summons—Commodity Exchange Act—State long-arm statute.*—Where Commodity Exchange Act, under which federal-question litigation was brought, was silent about service of summons, and requirements of applicable state long-arm statute were not met, District Court lacked personal jurisdiction over respondents. *Omni Capital International, Ltd. v. Rudolf Wolff & Co.*, p. 97.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, I; **Criminal Law**, 1.

JURY POLLS. See **Criminal Law**, 1.

JUSTICIABLE CONTROVERSY. See **Mootness**, 1.

LABOR. See **Arbitration**.

LONG-ARM STATUTES. See **Jurisdiction**, 5.

LOUISIANA. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

MAIL AND WIRE FRAUD. See **Criminal Law**, 2.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD.

Review authority—Security-clearance determination.—Merit Systems Protection Board does not have authority to review merits of underlying security-clearance determinations in course of reviewing an adverse personnel action on appeal pursuant to 5 U. S. C. § 7513, which authorizes review of a removal for "cause." *Department of Navy v. Egan*, p. 518.

MOOTNESS. See also **Judgments**.

1. *Disabled children—Conduct likely to be repeated.*—Where one of respondents—who, although not currently faced with expulsion or suspension proceedings, was still a state resident entitled to a free public educa-

MOOTNESS—Continued.

tion and had not completed high school—remained eligible for services under Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), his case was not moot, and this Court had jurisdiction because there was a reasonable likelihood that he would again suffer deprivation of EHA-mandated rights that gave rise to this suit; however, case was moot as to respondent who exceeded age 21—maximum age of eligibility for EHA services—during pendency of appeal. *Honig v. Doe*, p. 305.

2. *Withdrawal of claims—Dismissal with prejudice.*—Where respondents represented that they wished to withdraw their federal-court equitable claims and seek injunctive relief exclusively in state-court proceedings, abstention issue was moot, and, there no longer being a case or controversy, this Court vacated claims and remanded with instructions to dismiss with prejudice to prevent regeneration of controversy by respondents' reassertion of right to litigate their equitable claims in federal court. *Deakins v. Monaghan*, p. 193.

MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION PLAN. See **Jurisdiction**, 3.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT. See **Judicial Review; Jurisdiction**, 3.

NONNAVIGABLE WATERS. See **Public Lands**.

NONPREFERENCE ELIGIBLE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN EXCEPTED SERVICE. See **Civil Service Reform Act of 1978**.

OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS. See also **Standing to Sue**.

Certification of state-law questions to State Supreme Court.—Two questions of statutory interpretation are certified to Virginia Supreme Court; answers to these questions would substantially aid review of constitutionality of state statute prohibiting commercial display of certain sexual or sado-masochistic material in a manner whereby juveniles may examine and peruse it and may determine case entirely. *Virginia v. American Booksellers Assn., Inc.*, p. 383.

OFFICIAL IMMUNITY. See **Immunity from Suit**, 1.

PARENTAL KIDNAPING PREVENTION ACT OF 1980.

Implied cause of federal action—Full faith and credit.—Act does not provide an implied cause of action in federal court to determine which of two conflicting state child custody decisions is valid, but was enacted to extend requirements of Full Faith and Credit Clause to custody determinations. *Thompson v. Thompson*, p. 174.

PARTIES. See also **Appeals; Standing to Sue**.

1. *Dismissal of suit—Collateral attack by nonparties.*—Court of Appeals' judgment affirming District Court dismissal of suit by petitioners—

PARTIES—Continued.

white police officers claiming to be adversely affected by Title VII consent decree—as an impermissible collateral attack on a consent decree by persons who could have intervened in underlying employment discrimination action, is affirmed. *Marino v. Ortiz*, p. 301.

2. *Former public officials—Appeal of adverse judgment.*—Public officials who intervened in a lawsuit solely in their official capacities were not parties entitled to appeal an adverse judgment after they had left office. *Karcher v. May*, p. 72.

PENALTY ON TAX DEFICIENCY. See *Jurisdiction*, 2.

PENDENT JURISDICTION. See *Jurisdiction*, 4.

PENSION FUND CONTRIBUTIONS. See *Jurisdiction*, 3.

PERSONAL JURISDICTION. See *Jurisdiction*, 5.

PERSONNEL ACTIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. See *Civil Service Reform Act of 1978; Merit Systems Protection Board.*

PORNOGRAPHY. See *Obscene Publications; Standing to Sue.*

PRECLUSION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW. See *Civil Service Reform Act of 1978.*

PRESUMPTION OF CRIMINAL INTENT. See *Constitutional Law*, I.

PRESUMPTION OF DISABILITY. See *Black Lung Benefits.*

"PROMISED CONTRIBUTIONS" TO PENSION FUND. See *Jurisdiction*, 3.

PROOF. See *Black Lung Benefits.*

PROPERTY RIGHTS. See *Criminal Law*, 2.

PUBLIC LANDS.

Ownership of lands beneath tidal waters.—Since States, upon entering Union, were given ownership over all lands beneath waters subject to tide's influence, Mississippi, at time of statehood, took title to lands lying underwater that were influenced by tide running in Gulf of Mexico but were not navigable in fact; such a holding is not inequitable and would not upset various kinds of property expectations and interests. *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Mississippi*, p. 469.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS ACTING IN OFFICIAL CAPACITY. See *Parties*, 2.

PUBLIC POLICY GROUNDS FOR SETTING ASIDE ARBITRAL AWARD. See *Arbitration.*

QUALIFIED IMMUNITY. See *Immunity from Suit*, 2.

- REDACTION OF IDENTIFYING TAX DATA.** See **Internal Revenue Code.**
- REMAND OF PENDENT CLAIMS TO STATE COURT.** See **Jurisdiction, 4.**
- REMOVAL JURISDICTION.** See **Jurisdiction, 4.**
- REMOVAL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.** See **Merit Systems Protection Board.**
- RESERVOIRS.** See **Flood Control Act of 1944.**
- RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RULE TO CRIMINAL CASES ON COLLATERAL REVIEW.** See **Constitutional Law, I.**
- SANCTIONS FOR DISCOVERY VIOLATIONS.** See **Constitutional Law, V.**
- SCHOOL AUTHORITIES' CONDUCT.** See **Education of the Handicapped Act.**
- SCHOOL NEWSPAPER AS FORUM FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION.** See **Constitutional Law, III.**
- SECRETARY OF ARMY.** See **Flood Control Act of 1944.**
- SECRETARY OF INTERIOR.** See **Flood Control Act of 1944.**
- SECURITIES REGULATION.**
Fraud—Newspaper as victim.—Judgment that fraud against a newspaper was in connection with a purchase or sale of stock and, thus, was a violation of § 10(b) of Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, is affirmed. *Carpenter v. United States*, p. 19.
- SECURITY-CLEARANCE DETERMINATIONS.** See **Merit Systems Protection Board.**
- SERVICE OF SUMMONS.** See **Jurisdiction, 5.**
- SIXTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law, IV; V.**
- STANDING TO SUE.**
First Amendment—"Injury in fact"—Asserting violations of others' rights.—Booksellers alleging bookbuyers' First Amendment rights met "injury in fact" standing requirement because state law was aimed directly at booksellers who, if their allegations were correct, would have to take significant and costly compliance measures or risk criminal prosecution for displaying certain sexual or sadomasochistic material harmful to juveniles. *Virginia v. American Booksellers Assn., Inc.*, p. 383.
- STATES' RIGHTS.** See **Public Lands.**

"STAY-PUT" PROVISION OF EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT. See *Education of the Handicapped Act*.

STAYS. See also *Bankruptcy Code*.

Claims not cognizable in state proceeding.—District Court had no discretion to dismiss rather than stay federal claims for monetary relief that could not be redressed in parallel state criminal court proceedings. *Deakins v. Monaghan*, p. 193.

STOCK PURCHASE OR SALE. See *Securities Regulation*.

STUDENTS' FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS. See *Constitutional Law*, III.

SUPPLEMENTAL CHARGE TO JURY. See *Criminal Law*, 1.

SUPREME COURT.

1. Appointment of JUSTICE KENNEDY, p. XI.
2. Retirement of Justice Powell, p. IX.
3. Amendments of Rules of the Supreme Court, p. 1085.

SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES. See *Civil Service Reform Act of 1978*.

TAX COURT. See *Jurisdiction*, 2.

TAX RETURN INFORMATION. See *Internal Revenue Code*.

TIDAL WATERS. See *Public Lands*.

TITLE VII OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964. See *Appeals; Parties*, 1.

TORT LIABILITY OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS. See *Immunity from Suit*, 1.

TUCKER ACT. See *Civil Service Reform Act of 1978*.

UNDERSECURED CREDITORS. See *Bankruptcy Code*.

VIRGINIA. See *Obscene Publications; Standing to Sue*.

WATERS. See *Flood Control Act of 1944; Public Lands*.

WIRE FRAUD. See *Criminal Law*, 2.

WITHDRAWAL OF CLAIMS. See *Mootness*, 2.

WITNESSES. See *Constitutional Law*, IV; *Federal Rules of Evidence*.

WORDS AND PHRASES.

1. "*Agreement*." 12 U. S. C. § 1823(e). *Langley v. FDIC*, p. 86.
2. "*In a form*." Internal Revenue Code. 26 U. S. C. § 6103(b)(2). *Church of Scientology of California v. IRS*, p. 9.

WORDS AND PHRASES—Continued.

3. "*Interest in property.*" Bankruptcy Code. 11 U. S. C. § 362(d)(1). United Savings Assn. of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Associates, Ltd., p. 365.

4. "*Return information.*" Internal Revenue Code. 26 U. S. C. § 6103 (b)(2). Church of Scientology of California v. IRS, p. 9.

5. "*To be in violation.*" § 505(a), Clean Water Act, 33 U. S. C. § 1365 (a). Gwaltney of Smithfield, Ltd. v. Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Inc., p. 49.



















