

## INDEX

---

**ABORTION.** See **Stays**, 2.

**ABUSIVE WORK ENVIRONMENT HARASSMENT.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**.

**ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS.** See **Labor**.

**ADMIRALTY.**

*Pre-emption of state law—Doctrine of forum non conveniens.*—In admiralty cases filed in a state court under Jones Act and “saving to suitors clause” of 28 U.S.C. § 1333(1), federal law does not pre-empt state law regarding doctrine of *forum non conveniens*. *American Dredging Co. v. Miller*, p. 443.

**AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES.** See **Taxes**.

**AGGRAVATING FACTORS.** See **Constitutional Law**, III.

**AIRPORT USER FEES.** See **Anti-Head Tax Act**; **Constitutional Law**, II.

**ALIENS.** See **Stays**, 4.

**ANNUITY CONTRACTS.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

**ANTI-HEAD TAX ACT.**

*Airport user fees.*—User fees charged to commercial airlines are not unreasonable or discriminatory in violation of federal Act. *Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. County of Kent*, p. 355.

**APPELLATE COURTS.** See **Immunity from Suit**, 1.

**APPOINTMENTS OF MILITARY JUDGES.** See **Constitutional Law**, I; IV, 2.

**ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

**ATTORNEY'S FEES.**

*Copyright Act of 1976—Prevailing parties.*—Prevailing plaintiffs and prevailing defendants must be treated alike when attorney's fees are awarded in copyright infringement actions under Act; fees are to be

**ATTORNEY'S FEES**—Continued.

awarded to prevailing parties as a matter of court's discretion. *Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.*, p. 517.

**BACKPAY.** See **Labor.**

**BANK REPORTS.** See **Criminal Law**, 1.

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

**BIAS AND PREJUDICE BY JUDGES.** See **Recusal.**

**BIVENS-TYPE CAUSES OF ACTION.**

*Actions against federal agencies.*—A *Bivens*-type cause of action cannot be implied directly against a federal agency because logic of *Bivens* itself does not support extending it from federal *agents* to federal *agencies* and because it would usurp Congress' fiscal power by creating a potentially enormous federal financial burden. *FDIC v. Meyer*, p. 471.

**BROADCASTING.** See **Stays**, 1.

**CAPITAL MURDER.** See **Constitutional Law**, III.

**CASH TRANSACTIONS.** See **Criminal Law**, 1.

**CERTIORARI.** See **Supreme Court**, 2.

**CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.** See **Individuals With Disabilities Education Act.**

**CIVIL FORFEITURE.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.

**CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 3.

**CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.**

*Title VII—Sexual harassment—“Abusive work environment.”*—To be actionable under Title VII as “abusive work environment” harassment, conduct need not seriously affect an employee's psychological well-being or lead plaintiff to suffer injury. *Harris v. Forklift Systems, Inc.*, p. 17.

**COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL.** See **Constitutional Law**, III.

**COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.** See **Privacy Act of 1974.**

**COMMERCE CLAUSE.** See **Constitutional Law**, II.

**COMMERCIAL PARODY.** See **Copyright Act of 1976.**

**CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

**CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.** See also **Immunity from Suit**, 2; **Stays**, 1, 3.

**I. Appointments.**

*Military judges.*—Current method of appointing military judges does not violate Appointments Clause. *Weiss v. United States*, p. 163.

**II. Discrimination Against Interstate Commerce.**

*Airport user fees.*—User fees charged to commercial airlines are not unreasonable or discriminatory in violation of dormant Commerce Clause. *Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. County of Kent*, p. 355.

**III. Double Jeopardy.**

*Capital murder—Vacation of death sentence.*—Where a jury convicted Schiro of felony murder but was silent as to “intentional” murder, and trial court sentenced him to death based on an “intentional” murder aggravating factor, neither double jeopardy nor collateral estoppel required vacation of sentence. *Schiro v. Farley*, p. 222.

**IV. Due Process.**

1. *Civil forfeiture—Predeprivation notice and hearing.*—Absent exigent circumstances, due process requires predeprivation notice and hearing before Government seizure of real property subject to civil forfeiture. *United States v. James Daniel Good Real Property*, p. 43.

2. *Military judges—Terms of office.*—Lack of a fixed term of office for military judges does not violate Due Process Clause. *Weiss v. United States*, p. 163.

3. *Prosecution without probable cause.*—Court of Appeals’ decision that prosecution without probable cause is a constitutional tort actionable under 42 U. S. C. § 1983 only if accompanied by incarceration or loss of employment or some other palpable consequence, is affirmed. *Albright v. Oliver*, p. 266.

**COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1976.** See also **Attorney’s Fees**.

*Fair use—Parody.*—Rap music group 2 Live Crew’s commercial parody of Roy Orbison’s rock ballad “Oh, Pretty Woman” may be a fair use within Act’s meaning. *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, p. 569.

**COURTS OF APPEAL.** See **Immunity from Suit**, 1.

**CRIMINAL LAW.** See also **Constitutional Law**, III; IV, 3; **Habeas Corpus**; **Jurisdiction**.

1. *Disclosure of cash transactions—Willful violation.*—A “willfu[l] violat[ion]” of 31 U. S. C. § 5324(3)—prohibiting “structuring” of a financial transaction to evade requirement that banks report cash transactions exceeding \$10,000—requires Government to prove that defendant knew his conduct was unlawful. *Ratzlaf v. United States*, p. 135.

**CRIMINAL LAW**—Continued.

2. *Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act*—*Proof of economic motivation*.—RICO does not require proof of an economic motivation in either racketeering enterprise or predicate acts of racketeering for liability under 18 U. S. C. § 1962(c). *National Organization for Women, Inc. v. Scheidler*, p. 249.

**DEATH SENTENCE.** See **Constitutional Law**, III.

**DEPORTATIONS.** See **Stays**, 4.

**DISABLED CHILDREN.** See **Individuals With Disabilities Education Act**.

**DISCLOSURE OF CASH TRANSACTIONS.** See **Criminal Law**, 1.

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

**DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**.

**DISCRIMINATION ON BASIS OF SEX.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**.

**DISMISSAL OF WRITS OF CERTIORARI.** See **Supreme Court**, 2.

**DISQUALIFICATION OF FEDERAL JUDGES.** See **Recusal**.

**DISTRICT COURTS.** See **Federal Mine Safety and Health Amendments Act of 1977**.

**DOUBLE JEOPARDY.** See **Constitutional Law**, III; **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

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

**EDUCATION.** See **Individuals With Disabilities Education Act**.

**EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.**

*Fiduciary standards—Plan assets—Guaranteed benefit policy.*—Because “free funds” under parties’ participating group annuity do not fit within ERISA’s guaranteed benefit policy exclusion, they are “plan assets” and their management is subject to ERISA’s fiduciary standards. *John Hancock Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Harris Trust and Sav. Bank*, p. 86.

**EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES.** See **Labor; Privacy Act of 1974**.

**EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**.

**EVIDENCE.** See **Criminal Law**, 2.

**EXPEDITIOUS PROSECUTION.** See **Forfeiture of Property**.

**EXTRAJUDICIAL SOURCE DOCTRINE.** See **Recusal**.

**EXTRAORDINARY WRITS.** See **Supreme Court**, 3.

**FAIR USE.** See **Copyright Act of 1976**.

**FEDERAL AGENCIES.** See *Bivens-Type Causes of Action*.

**FEDERAL COURTS.** See **Federal Mine Safety and Health Amendments Act of 1977**.

**FEDERAL EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES.** See **Privacy Act of 1974**.

**FEDERAL JUDGES.** See **Recusal**.

**FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1977.**

*Statutory-review scheme—Subject-matter jurisdiction.*—Act's comprehensive statutory-review scheme precludes a federal district court from exercising subject-matter jurisdiction over a pre-enforcement challenge to Act. *Thunder Basin Coal Co. v. Reich*, p. 200.

**FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION.** See **Immunity from Suit**, 2.

**FEDERAL SERVICE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS STATUTE.** See **Privacy Act of 1974**.

**FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS.** See **Admiralty; Taxes**.

**FEES FOR ATTORNEYS.** See **Attorney's Fees**.

**FELONY MURDER.** See **Constitutional Law**, III.

**FIDUCIARY STANDARDS.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

**FIFTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, III; IV, 2.

**FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS.** See **Criminal Law**, 1.

**FIRST AMENDMENT.** See **Stays**, 1, 3.

**FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY.** See also **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.

*Dismissal of action—Failure to prosecute expeditiously.*—Filing a forfeiture suit within statute of limitations suffices to make action timely, and action may not be dismissed for failure to comply with certain other statutory directives for expeditious prosecution in forfeiture cases. *United States v. James Daniel Good Real Property*, p. 43.

**FORUM NON CONVENIENS.** See **Admiralty**.

**FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, III; IV, 3.

**FOURTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.

**FREEDOM OF SPEECH.** See **Stays**, 1, 3.

**FREE FUNDS.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

**GROUP ANNUITIES.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

**GUARANTEED BENEFIT POLICY EXCLUSION.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

**HABEAS CORPUS.**

1. *Ineffective assistance of counsel—State-court findings—Presumption of correctness.*—Eleventh Circuit, on remand from this Court, committed manifest mistake in failing to accord presumption of correctness to a state-court determination in upholding denial of habeas relief on Burden's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel due to a conflict of interest. *Burden v. Zant*, p. 132.

2. *Sentence enhancement proceedings—New rule.*—Court of Appeals erred in extending *Bullington v. Missouri*, 451 U. S. 430, a capital case, to hold that Double Jeopardy Clause prohibits a State from subjecting a defendant to successive noncapital sentence enhancement proceedings, since doing so required application of a "new rule" violative of *Teague v. Lane*, 489 U. S. 288. *Caspari v. Bohlen*, p. 383.

**IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT OF 1986.** See **Stays**, 4.

**IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.**

1. *Qualified immunity—Appellate review.*—Appellate review of a judgment according public officials qualified immunity from a damages suit charging violation of a federal right must be conducted in light of all relevant precedents, not simply those cited to, or discovered by, district court. *Elder v. Holloway*, p. 510.

2. *Waiver of sovereign immunity—Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.*—"Sue-and-be-sued" clause in FSLIC's organic statute waived agency's sovereign immunity for respondent's constitutional tort claim. *FDIC v. Meyer*, p. 471.

**IMPLIED CAUSES OF ACTION.** See ***Bivens*-Type Causes of Action**.

**INDIAN COUNTRY.** See **Jurisdiction**.

**INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.**

*Reimbursement for private school education—Unilateral withdrawal from public school.*—Courts may order reimbursement for parents who

**INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT**—Continued.  
unilaterally withdraw their disabled child from a public school that provides an inappropriate education under IDEA and put her in a private school that provides a proper education under IDEA, but does not meet all IDEA requirements. *Florence County School Dist. Four v. Carter*, p. 7.

**INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

**IN FORMA PAUPERIS.** See **Supreme Court**, 3, 4.

**INFRINGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT.** See **Attorney's Fees**.

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

**JONES ACT.** See **Admiralty**.

**JUDICIAL BIAS AND PREJUDICE.** See **Recusal**.

**JURISDICTION.** See also **Federal Mine Safety and Health Amendments Act of 1977**.

*Criminal jurisdiction—Indian country.*—Utah courts had criminal jurisdiction over petitioner Indian because Uintah Reservation was “diminished” in 1905, such that town where crime was committed is not in “Indian country.” *Hagen v. Utah*, p. 399.

**LABOR.** See also **Privacy Act of 1974**.

*Reinstatement—Administrative hearing—False testimony.*—An employee's false testimony under oath in a formal proceeding before a National Labor Relations Board Administrative Law Judge did not preclude Board from granting employee reinstatement with backpay. *ABF Freight System, Inc. v. NLRB*, p. 317.

**LAWYERS.** See **Attorney's Fees**.

**LIMITATIONS PERIODS.** See **Forfeiture of Property**.

**MEAT PACKING.** See **Stays**, 1.

**MILITARY JUDGES.** See **Constitutional Law**, I; IV, 2.

**MINING.** See **Federal Mine Safety and Health Amendments Act of 1977**.

**MURDER.** See **Constitutional Law**, III.

**NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT.** See **Labor**.

**NEW RULES.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

**NOTICE OF FORFEITURE.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.

**OHIO.** See **Stays**, 3.

**“OH, PRETTY WOMAN.”** See **Copyright Act of 1976.**

**PARODY.** See **Copyright Act of 1976.**

**PENNSYLVANIA.** See **Stays, 2.**

**PLAN ASSETS.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

**PREDEPRIVATION NOTICE OF FORFEITURE.** See **Constitutional Law, IV, 1.**

**PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW BY FEDERAL LAW.** See **Admiralty.**

**PRESUMPTIONS OF CORRECTNESS.** See **Habeas Corpus, 1.**

**“PRETTY WOMAN.”** See **Copyright Act of 1976.**

**PREVAILING PARTIES.** See **Attorney’s Fees.**

**PRIOR RESTRAINT.** See **Stays, 1.**

**PRIVACY ACT OF 1974.**

*Collective bargaining—Disclosure of federal employee addresses.*—Act forbids disclosure of federal employee addresses to collective-bargaining representatives pursuant to requests made under Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute. *Department of Defense v. FLRA*, p. 487.

**PRIVATE SCHOOL EDUCATION.** See **Individuals With Disabilities Education Act.**

**PROBABLE CAUSE.** See **Constitutional Law, IV, 3.**

**PROPERTY SEIZURES.** See **Constitutional Law, IV, 1; Forfeiture of Property.**

**PROPERTY TAXES.** See **Taxes.**

**PROSECUTION WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE.** See **Constitutional Law, IV, 3.**

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

**PUBLIC PROPERTY.** See **Stays, 3.**

**PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION.** See **Individuals With Disabilities Education Act.**

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

**RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT.** See **Criminal Law, 2.**



**RAILROAD REVITALIZATION AND REGULATORY REFORM ACT OF 1976.** See **Taxes**.

**REAL PROPERTY.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.

**RECUSAL.**

*Federal judges—“Extrajudicial source” doctrine.*—Recusal under 28 U. S. C. § 455(a)—which requires a federal judge to “disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned”—is subject to limitation that has come to be known as “extrajudicial source” doctrine. *Liteky v. United States*, p. 540.

**REINSTATEMENT OF EMPLOYEES.** See **Labor**.

**REPETITIOUS FILINGS.** See **Supreme Court**, 3, 4.

**RESERVATIONS.** See **Jurisdiction**.

**ROY ORBISON.** See **Copyright Act of 1976**.

**SCHOOLS.** See **Individuals With Disabilities Education Act**.

**SEAMEN.** See **Admiralty**.

**SEIZURE OF PROPERTY.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1; **Forfeiture of Property**.

**SENTENCE ENHANCEMENT.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**.

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

**SOUTH DAKOTA.** See **Stays**, 1.

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

**STANDING.** See **Stays**, 4.

**STATE TAXES.** See **Taxes**.

**STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS.** See **Forfeiture of Property**.

**STATUTORY-REVIEW SCHEMES.** See **Federal Mine Safety and Health Amendments Act of 1977**.

**STAYS.**

1. *Broadcast of a videotape—Prior restraint.*—A South Dakota Circuit Court injunction prohibiting CBS from airing videotape footage taken at a South Dakota meat-packing company is stayed because decision below conflicts with this Court’s First Amendment decisions on prior restraint. *CBS Inc. v. Davis* (BLACKMUN, J., in chambers), p. 1315.

**STAYS**—Continued.

2. *Enforcement of State Abortion Control Act*.—Application for a stay of Court of Appeals' mandate allowing enforcement of Pennsylvania's Abortion Control Act, pending filing of a petition for certiorari, is denied. *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pa. v. Casey* (SOUTER, J., in chambers), p. 1309.

3. *Erection of a cross on public property*.—An application to stay an injunction requiring petitioners to allow respondents to erect a Latin cross in front of Ohio Statehouse is denied, since cross is already in place and set to be taken down in one day, making risk of additional harm to petitioners minimal. *Capitol Square Review and Advisory Bd. v. Pinette* (STEVENS, J., in chambers), p. 1307.

4. *Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986*.—An application for a stay of a District Court order—requiring Immigration and Naturalization Service to, among other things, identify and adjudicate legalization applications filed by certain categories of applicants, not arrest or deport certain immigrant classes, and temporarily grant certain immigrant classes stays of deportation and employment authorization—is granted because this Court would conclude that respondent organizations are outside zone of interests that Act seeks to protect and thus lack standing to seek order granted. *INS v. Legalization Assistance Project of Los Angeles County Federation of Labor* (O'CONNOR, J., in chambers), p. 1301.

5. *Subpoena duces tecum*.—Senator Bob Packwood's application for a stay, pending appeal to Court of Appeals of a District Court decision enforcing a subpoena *duces tecum* issued by respondent Senate Select Committee on Ethics, is denied. *Packwood v. Senate Select Comm. on Ethics* (REHNQUIST, C. J., in chambers), p. 1319.

**SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION.** See **Federal Mine Safety and Health Amendments Act of 1977**.

**SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM.** See **Stays**, 5.

**SUE-AND-BE-SUED CLAUSES.** See **Immunity from Suit**, 2.

**SUPPRESSION OF SPEECH.** See **Stays**, 1.

**SUPREME COURT.**

1. *Proceedings in memory of Justice Marshall*, p. v.

2. *Dismissal of writ*.—Writ of certiorari is dismissed as improvidently granted, since, in order to reach merits of case, Court would have to address a question that was neither presented in petition for certiorari nor fairly included in question that was presented. *Izumi Seimitsu Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha v. U. S. Philips Corp.*, p. 27.

3. *In forma pauperis—Repetitious filings*.—Under this Court's Rule 39.8, *pro se* petitioner, after filing numerous frivolous petitions with this

**SUPREME COURT**—Continued.

Court, is prospectively denied leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on all certiorari petitions and petitions for extraordinary writs in noncriminal cases. In re Sassower, p. 4.

4. *In forma pauperis*—*Repetitious filings*.—Under this Court's Rule 39.8, *pro se* petitioner, an abuser of Court's certiorari process, is prospectively denied leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on all certiorari petitions in noncriminal matters. Day v. Day, p. 1.

**TAXES.**

*Ad valorem state property taxes*—*Railroad property*.—Section 306(1)(d) of Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 does not limit States' discretion to exempt nonrailroad property, but not railroad property, from ad valorem property taxes of general application. Department of Revenue of Ore. v. ACF Industries, Inc., p. 332.

**TEAGUE RULE.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

**TERMS OF OFFICE.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2.

**TITLE VII.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**.

**2 LIVE CREW.** See **Copyright Act of 1976**.

**USER FEES.** See **Anti-Head Tax Act**; **Constitutional Law**, II.

**UTAH.** See **Jurisdiction**.

**WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.** See **Immunity from Suit**, 2.

**WORDS AND PHRASES.**

1. “Disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.” 28 U. S. C. §455(a). Liteky v. United States, p. 540.

2. “The court may . . . award a reasonable attorney’s fee to the prevailing part as part of the costs.” Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U. S. C. §505. Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc., p. 517.

3. “Willfu[l] violat[ion].” 31 U. S. C. §5324(3). Ratzlaf v. United States, p. 135.

**WRITS OF CERTIORARI.** See **Supreme Court**, 2.