

INDEX

- ABUSE OF CHILDREN.** See Constitutional Law, II.
- "ADEQUATE AND INDEPENDENT STATE GROUND" DOCTRINE.**
See Habeas Corpus, 4.
- ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES.** See Jurisdiction, 3.
- ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMONS.** See Internal Revenue Service.
- ADMISSION TO FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT BAR.** See Constitutional Law, VII; Supreme Court, 3.
- ALCOHOL AND DRUG TESTING.** See Constitutional Law, IX, 1.
- ALLOCATUR.** See Habeas Corpus, 2.
- APPEALS.** See Habeas Corpus, 1; Jurisdiction, 1, 2.
- APPORTIONMENT FOR PURPOSE OF ELECTING LEGISLATIVE BODIES.** See Constitutional Law, III.
- ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS STANDARD OF JUDICIAL REVIEW.** See Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.
- ARBITRATION.** See Constitutional Law, X, 1.
- ATTORNEYS.** See Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976; Constitutional Law, VII; Supreme Court, 3.
- ATTORNEY'S FEES.** See Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976.
- BANKRUPTCY.**
Chapter 11—Nonconsensual oversecured claim—Postpetition interest.—Bankruptcy Code § 506(b) entitles a creditor to receive postpetition interest on a nonconsensual claim allowed in a bankruptcy proceeding. *United States v. Ron Pair Enterprises, Inc.*, p. 235.
- BENEFIT PLANS.** See Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.
- "BOOT."** See Taxes, 1.
- BREACH OF DUTY OF FAIR REPRESENTATION.** See Civil Service Reform Act of 1978.

CAPITAL GAINS TAX. See *Taxes*, 1.

CAPITAL MURDER. See *Habeas Corpus*, 1.

CASH AND EXCHANGES OF STOCK AS TAXABLE INCOME. See *Taxes*, 1.

CAUSES OF ACTION. See *Civil Service Reform Act of 1978*.

CENTRAL ISSUE TEST AS STANDARD FOR DETERMINING PREVAILING PARTY STATUS. See *Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976*, 2.

CHAPTER 11 OF BANKRUPTCY CODE. See *Bankruptcy*.

CHILD ABUSE. See *Constitutional Law*, II.

CHOICE-OF-LAW CLAUSES. See *Constitutional Law*, X, 1.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871. See also *Constitutional Law*, IX, 2; *Jurisdiction*, 7.

Municipality's liability—Failure to train employees.—A municipality may be held liable under 42 U. S. C. § 1983 for constitutional violations resulting from its failure to train its police, provided that failure to train in a relevant respect amounts to deliberate indifference to constitutional rights of persons with whom police come into contact. *Canton v. Harris*, p. 378.

CIVIL RIGHTS ATTORNEY'S FEES AWARDS ACT OF 1976.

1. *Cap on award—Effect of contingent-fee arrangement.*—An attorney's fee allowed by Act is not limited to amount provided in plaintiff's contingent-fee arrangement with counsel. *Blanchard v. Bergeron*, p. 87.

2. *Determination of prevailing party status.*—Where petitioners prevailed on a significant issue in litigation brought pursuant to 42 U. S. C. § 1983, they were prevailing parties entitled to an award of attorney's fees under 42 U. S. C. § 1988, and court below erred in rejecting significant issue standard in favor of a "central issue" test. *Texas State Teachers Assn. v. Garland Independent School District*, p. 782.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ACT OF 1978.

Breach of duty of fair representation—Private causes of action.—Title VII of Act does not confer on federal employees a private cause of action against their union's breach of statutory duty of fair representation. *Karahalios v. Federal Employees*, p. 527.

COMMERCE CLAUSE. See *Constitutional Law*, I.

CONSENSUAL CLAIMS IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS. See *Bankruptcy*.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Civil Rights Act of 1871; Habeas Corpus, 1, 3; Jurisdiction, 6; Supreme Court, 3.**

I. Commerce Clause.

Discrimination against interstate commerce—State regulation of natural gas production.—State regulation controlling natural gas production does not violate Commerce Clause, where it does not amount to *per se* unconstitutional economic protectionism and where it applies evenhandedly, regardless of whether producer supplies intrastate or interstate market. *Northwest Central Pipeline Corp. v. State Corporation Commission of Kansas*, p. 493.

II. Due Process.

Child abuse—State's failure to protect individual from private violence.—Petitioner child's due process rights were not violated by respondents' failure to adequately protect him from his father's abuse by removing him from father's custody. *DeShaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services*, p. 189.

III. Equal Protection of the Laws.

City board's structure—Apportionment.—Structure of Board of Estimate—made up of mayor and two officials elected citywide and five elected borough presidents—is inconsistent with Equal Protection Clause because, although boroughs have widely disparate populations, each has equal representation on board, thus departing from one-person, one-vote requirement. *Board of Estimate of City of New York v. Morris*, p. 688.

IV. Establishment of Religion.

State sales and use tax exemption for religious periodicals.—State Court of Appeals' judgment holding that state sales and use tax exemption for religious periodicals satisfied tripartite test of *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U. S. 602, 612–613, in that it served secular purpose of preserving separation of church and state, did not have primary effect of advancing or inhibiting religion, and did not produce impermissible government entanglement with religion, is reversed. *Texas Monthly, Inc. v. Bullock*, p. 1.

V. Freedom of Religion.

Denial of unemployment compensation benefits—Beliefs not based on tenets or dogma of an established religious sect.—Where appellant refused to accept position requiring him to work on Sunday in violation of his personal religious beliefs, State's denial of unemployment compensation benefits to him because his refusal to work was not based on tenets or dogma of an established religious sect violated Free Exercise Clause. *Frazee v. Illinois Department of Employment Security*, p. 829.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.**VI. Freedom of Speech.**

1. *California Elections Code—Ban on primary endorsements and restrictions on political parties' governing bodies.*—State Code provisions banning political parties' official governing bodies from endorsing or opposing candidates in primary elections and restricting governing bodies' organization and composition violate free speech and associational rights of parties and their members without serving a compelling state interest. *Eu v. San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee*, p. 214.

2. *Obscenity—State Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act—Pretrial seizure.*—There is no constitutional bar to a State's inclusion of substantive obscenity violations among predicate offenses under its RICO statute; however, pretrial seizure of petitioner's bookstore and its contents was improper, since books or films may not be taken out of circulation completely until there has been a determination of obscenity after an adversary proceeding. *Fort Wayne Books, Inc. v. Indiana*, p. 46.

VII. Privileges and Immunities Clause.

Admission to bar—Residency requirements.—Residency requirements for admission to bar of Virgin Islands District Court violate Clause since justifications offered to support requirements are insufficient to meet petitioners' burden of demonstrating that discrimination against nonresidents is warranted by a substantial objective and bears a close or substantial relation to such an objective. *Barnard v. Thorstenn*, p. 546.

VIII. Right to Jury Trial.

Driving under influence—First-time offenders.—There is no right to trial by jury for first-time offenders charged under Nevada law with driving under influence of alcohol, because it is a petty offense. *Blanton v. North Las Vegas*, p. 538.

IX. Searches and Seizures.

1. *Federal Railroad Administration—Drug and alcohol testing.*—Drug and alcohol testing of railroad employees, mandated and authorized by FRA after accidents or when certain safety rules are violated, is reasonable under Fourth Amendment even though neither a warrant nor a reasonable suspicion that an employee may be impaired is required, since regulations serve compelling governmental interests outweighing employees' privacy rights. *Skinner v. Railway Labor Executives' Assn.*, p. 602.

2. *Termination of movement—Police roadblock as effecting an unreasonable seizure.*—Where Brower died when he crashed a stolen car into a police roadblock effected by placing an 18-wheel truck across roadway, behind a curve, with a police cruiser's headlights aimed so as to blind him on his approach, a seizure occurred because government terminated his movement through a means intentionally applied; petitioners may claim right to

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

recover for his death under 42 U. S. C. § 1983 if unreasonableness alleged consists of setting up roadblock in such a manner as to be likely to kill him. *Brower v. County of Inyo*, p. 593.

3. *United States Customs Service—Drug testing.*—Service's drug testing, without a warrant, of employees applying for promotion to positions directly involving interdiction of illegal drugs, or to positions requiring them to carry firearms, is reasonable despite absence of probable cause or of some level of individualized suspicion; however, record is inadequate to determine whether testing of those applying for promotion to positions where they would handle "classified" information is reasonable, since it is unclear whether they would gain access to sensitive information. *Treasury Employees v. Von Raab*, p. 656.

X. Supremacy Clause.

1. *Federal Arbitration Act—Pre-emption of state law by federal law.*—Application of state statute allowing a court to stay arbitration pending resolution of related litigation is not pre-empted by FAA, where state court has ruled that parties to construction contract intended a choice-of-law clause to incorporate state arbitration rules into their arbitration agreement. *Voit Information Sciences, Inc. v. Board of Trustees of Leland Stanford Junior University*, p. 468.

2. *Natural Gas Act—Pre-emption of state law by federal law.*—Congress has not exercised its power under Supremacy Clause to pre-empt state commission's regulation controlling natural gas production. *North-west Central Pipeline Corp. v. State Corporation Commission of Kansas*, p. 493.

3. *Pre-emption of state law by federal law—Patent laws.*—State statute offering substantial protection to utilitarian and design ideas left otherwise unprotected by federal patent laws is pre-empted by Supremacy Clause. *Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.*, p. 141.

CONTINGENT-FEE ARRANGEMENTS. See *Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976*, 1.

CONTRACTS. See *Constitutional Law*, X, 1.

CONVENTION BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADA RESPECTING DOUBLE TAXATION. See *Internal Revenue Service*.

CORPORATE REORGANIZATIONS. See *Taxes*, 1.

COURTS OF APPEALS. See *Jurisdiction*, 1, 2.

CREDITORS. See *Bankruptcy; Jurisdiction*, 3.

CRIMINAL LAW. See also **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2; VIII; IX, 2; **Habeas Corpus**, 1, 3, 4; **Jurisdiction**, 1, 5, 6.

Mail fraud—Lesser included offenses.—Where petitioner used-car distributor was charged with mail fraud and his indictment alleged that he rolled back odometers before selling cars to used-car dealers who then sold them to consumers and mailed title-application forms to State on behalf of buyers, such mailings satisfied mailing element of crime of mail fraud; applying elements test—whereby one offense is necessarily included in another only when elements of lesser offense form a subset of elements of offense charged—petitioner was not entitled to instruction for lesser included offense of odometer tampering, since such offense includes element of knowingly and willfully causing an odometer to be altered, which is not a subset of any element of mail fraud. *Schmuck v. United States*, p. 705.

CUSTOMS SERVICE. See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 3.

DE NOVO STANDARD OF JUDICIAL REVIEW. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**; **Jurisdiction**, 3.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INTERSTATE COMMERCE. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

DISTRICT COURTS. See **Constitutional Law**, VII; **Jurisdiction**, 3; **Supreme Court**, 3.

DIVIDENDS. See **Taxes**, 1.

DRIVING UNDER INFLUENCE OF ALCOHOL. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII.

DRUG TESTING. See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 1, 3.

DRUNKEN DRIVING. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII.

DUE PROCESS. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

DUTY OF FAIR REPRESENTATION. See **Civil Service Reform Act of 1978**.

ECONOMIC PROTECTIONISM. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

EIGHTH AMENDMENT. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

ELECTION LAWS. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 1.

ELEMENTS TEST FOR DETERMINING LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES. See **Criminal Law**.

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.

Denial of benefits—Judicial review standard—Participants entitled to information about covered benefit plans.—A *de novo*, rather than an arbitrary and capricious, standard is appropriate standard for reviewing 29 U. S. C. § 1132(a)(1)(B) actions challenging denials of benefits based on plan interpretations; a person who merely claims to be, but is not, entitled to a plan benefit is not a “participant” entitled to disclosure and to damages for failure to disclose under Act. *Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. v. Bruch*, p. 101.

EMPLOYEE WELFARE BENEFIT PLANS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Civil Service Reform Act of 1978; Constitutional Law, IX, 1, 3; Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; Railway Labor Act.**

ENDORSEMENTS OF CANDIDATES FOR ELECTION. See **Constitutional Law, VI, 1.**

EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. See **Constitutional Law, III; Habeas Corpus, 3.**

ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION. See **Constitutional Law, IV.**

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES AS PREREQUISITE FOR FILING SUIT. See **Jurisdiction, 3.**

EXHAUSTION OF STATE REMEDIES AS PREREQUISITE FOR HABEAS RELIEF. See **Habeas Corpus, 2.**

EXTRAORDINARY WRITS. See **Supreme Court, 2.**

FAIR CROSS SECTION REQUIREMENT IN JURY SELECTION. See **Habeas Corpus, 3.**

FAIR REPRESENTATION BY UNION. See **Civil Service Reform Act of 1978.**

FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT. See **Constitutional Law, X, 1.**

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION RECORDS. See **Freedom of Information Act.**

FEDERAL DISTRICT COURTS. See **Constitutional Law, VII; Jurisdiction, 3; Supreme Court, 3.**

FEDERAL EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Civil Service Reform Act of 1978; Constitutional Law, IX, 3.**

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD. See **Jurisdiction, 3.**

FEDERAL INCOME TAXES. See **Taxes, 1.**

FEDERAL OFFICIALS. See **Jurisdiction, 5.**

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION. See Constitutional Law, IX, 1.

FEDERAL RETIREMENT BENEFITS AS TAXABLE INCOME. See Taxes, 2.

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE. See Jurisdiction, 2.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE. See Jurisdiction, 2.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. See Jurisdiction, 1.

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION. See Jurisdiction, 3.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See Constitutional Law, I, X; Jurisdiction, 4.

FEE AWARDS. See Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976.

FIFTH AMENDMENT. See Constitutional Law, II.

FINAL DECISION AS PREREQUISITE FOR JURISDICTION ON APPEAL. See Jurisdiction, 1.

FIRST AMENDMENT. See Constitutional Law, IV-VI; Jurisdiction, 6.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See Constitutional Law, II; III; VI, 1; Habeas Corpus, 3.

FOURTH AMENDMENT. See Constitutional Law, IX.

FRAUD. See Criminal Law.

FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION. See Constitutional Law, VI, 1.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.

Exemption from disclosure—Rap sheets.—Disclosure of contents of Federal Bureau of Investigation rap sheet to a third party is prohibited by Exemption 7(C) of Act, since such disclosure “could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” *United States Department of Justice v. Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press*, p. 749.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION. See Constitutional Law, V.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH. See Constitutional Law, VI.

FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION. See Constitutional Law, V.

GRAND JURIES. See Jurisdiction, 1.

HABEAS CORPUS.

1. *Capital murder—Statements to jury—Failure to raise claim on direct appeal.*—Where, because respondent had not raised his challenge on direct appeal, State Supreme Court refused to hear his argument that judge in his capital murder trial had misinformed jury regarding its role under Florida law in violation of Eighth Amendment, this Court's subsequent decision in *Caldwell v. Mississippi*, 472 U. S. 329—which held that a prosecutor's misleading comments to a jury in a capital case violated Amendment—did not provide cause for his procedural default. *Dugger v. Adams*, p. 401.

2. *Failure to exhaust state remedies.*—Petitioner, by raising claims in state court only in petitions for allocatur, a procedural context in which claims' merits would not be considered unless "there [were] special and important reasons therefor," had not exhausted his state remedies; but decision whether requisite exhaustion nonetheless exists because claims were procedurally barred under state law should be decided by Court of Appeals on remand. *Castille v. Peoples*, p. 346.

3. *Jury selection—Peremptory challenges excluding blacks—Fair cross section requirement.*—Court of Appeals' judgment that petitioner could not benefit from rule of *Batson v. Kentucky*, 476 U. S. 79—which set forth evidentiary showing necessary to make a prima facie case of racial discrimination under Equal Protection Clause of Fourteenth Amendment with respect to a peremptory challenge system—because *Batson* could not be applied retroactively to cases on collateral review, that his claim that prosecutor could be questioned about his use of peremptory challenges was procedurally barred and meritless, and that fair cross section requirement was limited to jury venire and should not be extended to petit jury, is affirmed. *Teague v. Lane*, p. 288.

4. *"Plain statement" rule.*—Rule of *Michigan v. Long*, 463 U. S. 1032—which allows this Court to reach federal question where it appears state court rested its decision primarily on federal law, unless state court's opinion contains a plain statement that its decision rests upon adequate and independent state grounds—applies in a case on federal habeas review as well as in a case on direct review. *Harris v. Reed*, p. 255.

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Jurisdiction**, 4.

INCOME TAXES. See **Taxes**.

INDIAN TRIBES. See **Jurisdiction**, 4.

IN FORMA PAUPERIS PETITIONS. See **Supreme Court**, 2.

INSOLVENT SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS. See **Jurisdiction**, 3.

INTEREST. See **Bankruptcy; Jurisdiction**, 2.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL TAX IMMUNITY. See **Taxes**, 2.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE. See **Internal Revenue Service; Taxes**, 1.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

Administrative summons—Canadian tax investigation.—Where IRS served administrative summons on a bank at request of Canadian authorities pursuant to Convention Respecting Double Taxation between United States and Canada, IRS was not required by either Convention or Internal Revenue Code to attest that Canadian tax investigation had not reached a stage analogous to a Justice Department referral by IRS—a stage at which such a summons is unenforceable—in order to obtain enforcement of summons. *United States v. Stuart*, p. 353.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

INVASION OF PRIVACY. See **Freedom of Information Act**.

JUDICIAL REVIEW. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

JURIES. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII; **Criminal Law; Habeas Corpus**, 1, 3; **Jurisdiction**, 1.

JURISDICTION.

1. *Courts of Appeals—Immediate appealability of order declining to dismiss an indictment.*—A district court order denying a defendant's motion to dismiss an indictment because of an alleged violation of Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e)(2)—which generally prohibits public disclosure by Government attorneys of matters occurring before a grand jury—is not immediately appealable as a final decision under 28 U. S. C. § 1291. *Midland Asphalt Corp. v. United States*, p. 794.

2. *Courts of Appeals—Notice of appeal—Effect of motion for prejudgment interest.*—Petitioners' motion for prejudgment interest constituted a motion to alter or amend judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) and, thus, rendered ineffective, under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(4), their notice of appeal filed before District Court ruled on Rule 59(e) motion. *Osterneck v. Ernst & Whinney*, p. 169.

3. *District Courts—Adjudication of claims against insolvent savings and loan associations under Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation receivership.*—Statutes governing FSLIC and Federal Home Loan Bank Board do not grant FSLIC adjudicatory power over creditors' claims against insolvent savings and loan associations under FSLIC receivership and do not divest courts of jurisdiction to consider those claims *de novo*; creditors are not required to exhaust Bank Board's administrative claims procedure before bringing suit because that procedure does not

JURISDICTION—Continued.

place a reasonable time limit on FSLIC's consideration of creditors' claims. *Coit Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation*, p. 561.

4. *Removal of action from state to federal court—Federal tribal immunity defense.*—Action against, *inter alios*, Chickasaw Nation for state tax law violations in state court was improperly removed to federal court, since possible existence of federal tribal immunity defense to State's claims did not convert a suit otherwise arising under state law into one arising under federal law, and since there was no independent basis for federal jurisdiction. *Oklahoma Tax Commission v. Graham*, p. 838.

5. *Removal—Prosecution of federal officer—Averment of federal defense.*—Right of federal workers to invoke 28 U. S. C. § 1442(a)(1) to remove state criminal prosecutions to federal court is predicated on averment of a federal defense. *Mesa v. California*, p. 121.

6. *Supreme Court—Finality of judgment.*—Where case involves possible limits First Amendment places on government efforts to control organized crime, adjudicating proper scope of First Amendment's protection is a federal policy meriting application of an exception to general finality rule of 28 U. S. C. § 1257. *Fort Wayne Books, Inc. v. Indiana*, p. 46.

7. *Supreme Court—Writ of certiorari—Preserving issues for review.*—Where petition for certiorari directly addressed question before Supreme Court—actionability under 42 U. S. C. § 1983 of a municipality's failure to train its employees—and respondent's brief in opposition did not raise objection that petitioner had failed to press its claims on courts below and did not inform Court that petitioner had arguably conceded below that inadequate training is actionable, Court exercised its discretion to deem such defects waived. *Canton v. Harris*, p. 378.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS. See **Criminal Law; Habeas Corpus**, 1.

JURY SELECTION. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

JURY TRIALS. See **Constitutional Law, VIII; Criminal Law; Habeas Corpus**, 1, 3.

LABOR RELATIONS. See **Civil Service Reform Act of 1978; Railway Labor Act**.

LAWYERS. See **Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976; Constitutional Law, VII; Supreme Court**, 3.

LAYOFFS. See **Railway Labor Act**.

LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES. See **Criminal Law**.

MAIL FRAUD. See **Criminal Law**.

MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND JUDGMENT. See **Jurisdiction**, 2.

- MUNICIPALITY AS LIABLE UNDER CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871.**
See Civil Rights Act of 1871.
- MURDER.** See Habeas Corpus, 1.
- NATURAL GAS ACT.** See Constitutional Law, X, 2.
- NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION.** See Constitutional Law, I; X, 2.
- NONCONSENSUAL CLAIMS IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS.**
See Bankruptcy.
- NOTICES OF APPEAL.** See Jurisdiction, 2.
- OBSCENITY.** See Constitutional Law, VI, 2.
- ONE-PERSON, ONE-VOTE REQUIREMENT.** See Constitutional Law, III.
- ORGANIZED CRIME.** See Constitutional Law, VI, 2; Jurisdiction, 6.
- PARENT AND CHILD.** See Constitutional Law, II.
- PATENT LAWS.** See Constitutional Law, X, 3.
- PENSION PLANS.** See Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.
- PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES IN JURY SELECTION PROCESS.**
See Habeas Corpus, 3.
- PETIT JURIES.** See Habeas Corpus, 3.
- PETTY OFFENSES.** See Constitutional Law, VIII.
- "PLAIN STATEMENT" RULE.** See Habeas Corpus, 4.
- POLICE MISCONDUCT.** See Civil Rights Act of 1871.
- POLICE ROADBLOCK AS SEIZURE.** See Constitutional Law, IX, 2.
- POLITICAL PARTIES.** See Constitutional Law, VI, 1.
- PORNOGRAPHY.** See Constitutional Law, VI, 2.
- POSTPETITION INTEREST IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS.**
See Bankruptcy.
- PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW BY FEDERAL LAW.** See Constitutional Law, X.
- PREJUDGMENT INTEREST.** See Jurisdiction, 2.
- PRETRIAL SEIZURES.** See Constitutional Law, VI, 2.
- PREVAILING PARTY STATUS DETERMINATIONS IN MAKING ATTORNEY'S FEES AWARDS.** See Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976, 2.
- PRIMARY ELECTIONS.** See Constitutional Law, VI, 1.

- PRIVACY RIGHTS.** See Constitutional Law, IX, 1, 3; Freedom of Information Act.
- PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE.** See Constitutional Law, VII.
- PROBABLE CAUSE.** See Constitutional Law, IX, 1, 3.
- RACIAL DISCRIMINATION.** See Habeas Corpus, 3.
- RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT.** See Constitutional Law, VI, 2.
- RAILROADS.** See Constitutional Law, IX, 1.
- RAILWAY LABOR ACT.**
Strikes—Layoff of junior crossover employees—Reinstatement of senior strikers.—Act does not require an employer to lay off junior crossover employees in order to reinstate more senior full-term strikers at conclusion of a strike. *Trans World Airlines, Inc. v. Flight Attendants*, p. 426.
- RAP SHEETS.** See Freedom of Information Act.
- REFUNDS OF TAXES.** See Taxes, 2.
- REINSTATEMENT OF STRIKERS.** See Railway Labor Act.
- RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.** See Constitutional Law, V.
- RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.** See Constitutional Law, IV.
- REMEDIES.** See Civil Service Reform Act of 1978.
- REMOVAL OF ACTION FROM STATE TO FEDERAL COURT.** See Jurisdiction, 4, 5.
- RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION TO FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT BAR.** See Constitutional Law, VII; Supreme Court, 3.
- RETIREMENT BENEFITS AS TAXABLE INCOME.** See Taxes, 2.
- RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL.** See Constitutional Law, VIII.
- RIGHT TO PRIVACY.** See Constitutional Law, IX, 1, 3; Freedom of Information Act.
- RIGHT TO VOTE.** See Constitutional Law, III.
- ROADBLOCKS AS SEIZURES.** See Constitutional Law, IX, 2.
- SALES TAXES.** See Constitutional Law, IV.
- SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS.** See Jurisdiction, 3.
- SEARCHES AND SEIZURES.** See Constitutional Law, IX.
- SECTION 1983.** See Civil Rights Act of 1871.

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE. See **Constitutional Law, IV.**

SIGNIFICANT ISSUE STANDARD AS TEST FOR DETERMINING PREVAILING PARTY STATUS. See **Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976, 2.**

SIXTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law, VIII.**

STATE INCOME TAXES. See **Taxes, 2.**

STATE RETIREMENT BENEFITS AS TAXABLE INCOME. See **Taxes, 2.**

STOCK AND CASH EXCHANGES AS TAXABLE INCOME. See **Taxes, 1.**

STRIKES. See **Railway Labor Act.**

SUMMONS. See **Internal Revenue Service.**

SUPREMACY CLAUSE. See **Constitutional Law, X.**

SUPREME COURT. See also **Jurisdiction, 6, 7.**

1. Appointment of Shelley L. Dowling as Librarian, p. 1061.

2. *Extraordinary writs—In forma pauperis filings—Abuse of privilege.*—Where *pro se* petitioner previously filed 19 frivolous requests for extraordinary relief before Supreme Court, motion for leave to file extraordinary writ *in forma pauperis* is denied and Clerk is directed to refuse to accept further petitions for extraordinary writs from him unless he pays docketing fee. In re McDonald, p. 180.

3. *Supervisory power—Federal District Court—Residency requirements for admission of attorneys to practice.*—Court refused to exercise its supervisory power over District Court of Virgin Islands to invalidate residency requirements for admission to practice, since nature of District Court—which has attributes of both a federal and territorial court—and reach of its residency requirements implicate interests beyond federal system. *Barnard v. Thorstenn*, p. 546.

TAXES. See also **Constitutional Law, IV; Jurisdiction, 4; Internal Revenue Service.**

1. *Federal income tax—Capital gains—Treatment of “boot.”*—Where a taxpayer exchanged his interest in a corporation for less than one percent of acquiring corporation's stock and a substantial cash payment—commonly referred to as “boot”—and held no interest in acquiring corporation before reorganization, cash payment was not appropriately characterized as a dividend, and should be treated as capital gains. *Commissioner v. Clark*, p. 726.

TAXES—Continued.

2. *State income tax—Federal retirement benefits—Intergovernmental tax immunity.*—State tax law exempting from taxation all retirement benefits paid by Michigan or its political subdivisions, but taxing all retirement benefits paid by other employers, including Federal Government, applied to federal retirees and violated principles of intergovernmental tax immunity by favoring retired state and local government employees over retired federal employees; appellant is entitled to refund of taxes paid under State's scheme. *Davis v. Michigan Department of the Treasury*, p. 803.

TESTING FOR ALCOHOL AND DRUGS. See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 1, 3.

TRIAL BY JURY. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII.

TRIBAL IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Jurisdiction**, 4.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

UNIONS. See **Civil Service Reform Act of 1978**.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE. See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 3.

UNREASONABLE SEARCHES AND SEIZURES. See **Constitutional Law**, IX.

USE TAXES. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

VIRGIN ISLANDS. See **Constitutional Law**, VII; **Supreme Court**, 3.

VOTING RIGHTS. See **Constitutional Law**, III.

WARRANTS. See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 1, 3.

WELFARE BENEFIT PLANS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

WORDS AND PHRASES.

"Participant." **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 29 U. S. C. § 1002(7). *Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. v. Bruch*, p. 101.

ISBN 0-16-038203-3




90000





9 780160 382031





















A00007894