

INDEX

ABORTION.

State law—Severability of provisions.—Tenth Circuit erred in invalidating one provision in Utah’s abortion law on ground that it was not severable from another provision that had been struck down as unconstitutional. *Leavitt v. Jane L.*, p. 137.

ABUSE-OF-DISCRETION STANDARD OF REVIEW. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1; **United States Sentencing Guidelines**, 2.

ADMISSION TO VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

ANTITERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT OF 1996. See also **Constitutional Law**, V.

Habeas corpus petitions.—Act, which makes substantial changes in habeas corpus procedures, does not preclude this Court from entertaining a habeas petition, but does affect standards governing granting of relief. *Felker v. Turpin*, p. 651.

ANTITRUST ACTS.

Sherman Act—Labors laws.—Federal labor laws shield from a Sherman Act antitrust attack an agreement among several members of a multiemployer bargaining unit to implement after impasse terms of their last best good-faith wage offer. *Brown v. Pro Football, Inc.*, p. 231.

ARIZONA. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

AT-WILL GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2, 3.

AUTOMOBILE SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, IX.

BANKRUPTCY.

Priorities—Tax claim.—Government’s claim for “tax” under 26 U. S. C. § 4971(a) is not entitled to bankruptcy priority as an “excise tax” under 11 U. S. C. § 507(a)(7)(E), but it was error to subordinate claim to claims of other general, unsecured creditors under § 510(c). *United States v. Reorganized CF&I Fabricators of Utah, Inc.*, p. 213.

BRADY CLAIM. See **Habeas Corpus**.

BREACH OF CONTRACT. See **Financial Institutional, Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989**.

CABLE TELEVISION CONSUMER PROTECTION AND COMPETITION ACT OF 1992. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 1.

CAMPAIGNS FOR CONGRESSIONAL OFFICES. See **Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971**.

CASE OR CONTROVERSY. See **Mootness**.

CIVIL FORFEITURES. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

CLAIM SUBORDINATION. See **Bankruptcy**.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF PATIENT-PSYCHOTHERAPIST COMMUNICATION. See **Federal Rules of Evidence**.

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES. See **Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971**.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

I. Access to Courts.

Prisoners—Adequacy of legal research facilities.—District Court's injunction ordering sweeping changes in Arizona's prison law library and legal assistance programs exceeds constitutional requirements for a right of access to courts set forth in *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U. S. 817, 828. *Lewis v. Casey*, p. 343.

II. Double Jeopardy.

What constitutes punishment—Civil forfeitures.—Civil forfeitures do not constitute punishment for purposes of Double Jeopardy Clause, and thus Clause does not prohibit Government from both punishing a defendant for a criminal offense and forfeiting his property for that same offense in a separate civil proceeding. *United States v. Ursery*, p. 267.

III. Due Process.

Murder trial—Accused's mental state—Effect of intoxication.—Montana Supreme Court's conclusion, that respondent was denied due process in his murder trial when state law prohibited his voluntary intoxication from being taken into consideration in determining existence of mental state element of criminal offense, is reversed. *Montana v. Egelhoff*, p. 37.

IV. Equal Protection of the Laws.

Discrimination on basis of sex—Virginia Military Institute—Admission policy.—Virginia's categorical exclusion of women from educational opportunities VMI provides denies equal protection to women; and Virginia's remedy—to maintain VMI as a male-only college and create a separate program for women—does not cure constitutional violation. *United States v. Virginia*, p. 515.

V. Exceptions and Suspension Clauses.

Habeas corpus—Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996.—Act, which makes substantial changes in habeas corpus proce-

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

dures, does not violate Exceptions Clause or Suspension Clause. *Felker v. Turpin*, p. 651.

VI. Freedom of Speech.

1. *Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992—Leased channel operators—Segregation of offensive programming.*—Section 10(b) of Act—which requires cable system operators to segregate certain patently offensive programming, to place it on a single channel, and to block that channel from viewer access unless viewer requests access—violates First Amendment. *Denver Area Ed. Telecommunications Consortium, Inc. v. FCC*, p. 727.

2. *Independent government contractors—Retaliation for speech.*—First Amendment protections of *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, and *Branti v. Finkel*, 445 U.S. 507—that prohibit government officials from discharging public employees for refusing to support a political party or its candidate, unless political affiliation is an appropriate requirement for job in question—extend to instances where government retaliates against a contractor for exercise of rights of political association or expression of political allegiance. *O'Hare Truck Service, Inc. v. City of Northlake*, p. 712.

3. *Independent government contractors—Retaliation for speech.*—First Amendment protects independent contractors from termination or prevention of automatic renewal of their at-will government contracts in retaliation for their speech; and balancing test of *Pickering v. Board of Ed. of Township High School Dist. 205, Will Cty.*, 391 U.S. 563, adjusted to weigh government's interests as contractor, determines that protection's extent. *Board of Comm'rs, Wabaunsee Cty. v. Umbehr*, p. 668.

VII. Immunity from Suit.

Federal Government—Rehabilitation Act of 1973.—Congress has not waived Government's sovereign immunity against monetary damages for violations of § 504(a) of Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which prohibits discrimination based on disability under any Executive agency program or activity. *Lane v. Peña*, p. 187.

VIII. Right to Jury Trial.

1. *Diversity case—Application of state damages law.*—New York law controlling excessive or inadequate damages awards can be given effect in federal courts, without detriment to Seventh Amendment right to jury trial, if federal trial judge applies State's review standard and appellate review is limited to abuse of discretion. *Gasparini v. Center for Humanities, Inc.*, p. 415.

2. *Multiple petty offenses—Aggregate prison term.*—A defendant who is prosecuted in a single proceeding for multiple petty offenses does not have a Sixth Amendment right to a jury trial where aggregate prison

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

term authorized for offenses exceeds six months. *Lewis v. United States*, p. 322.

IX. Searches and Seizures.

Warrant requirement—Automobile exception.—Pennsylvania Supreme Court misread automobile exception to Fourth Amendment's warrant requirement when it held that police must obtain a warrant before searching a car unless exigent circumstances are present. *Pennsylvania v. Labron*, p. 938.

COURTS OF APPEALS. See **Abortion**; **United States Sentencing Guidelines**, 2.

CRIMINAL LAW. See **Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996**; **Constitutional Law**, I; II; V; VIII, 2; IX; **Habeas Corpus**; **Mootness**; **United States Sentencing Guidelines**.

DE NOVO STANDARD OF REVIEW. See **United States Sentencing Guidelines**, 2.

DEPARTURE FROM SENTENCING RANGE. See **United States Sentencing Guidelines**.

DISCLOSURE OF PATIENT-PSYCHOTHERAPIST COMMUNICATION. See **Federal Rules of Evidence**.

DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

DISCRIMINATION ON BASIS OF DISABILITY. See **Constitutional Law**, VII.

DISCRIMINATION ON BASIS OF SEX. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

DIVERSITY JURISDICTION. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

DOUBLE JEOPARDY. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

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

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES DISCRIMINATION. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

ELECTIONS. See **Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971**.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Antitrust Acts**.

EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

EXCEPTIONS CLAUSE. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

EXCESSIVE DAMAGES. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

EXCISE TAXES. See **Bankruptcy.**

EXPENDITURES ON CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS. See **Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.**

FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.

Party Expenditure Provision.—Tenth Circuit's judgment upholding constitutionality of Act's "Party Expenditure Provision"—which imposes dollar limits upon political party expenditures in connection with a congressional candidate's general election campaign—is vacated. *Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Comm. v. Federal Election Comm'n*, p. 604.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Disclosure of patient-psychotherapist communication.—Confidential conversations between a patient and her psychotherapist, a clinical social worker, and notes taken during their counseling sessions are protected from compelled disclosure under Rule 501. *Jaffee v. Redmond*, p. 1.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1; **Medical Device Amendments of 1976.**

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONAL, REFORM, RECOVERY, AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1989.

Breach of contract—Government's liability for damages.—Federal Circuit's judgment that United States is liable to thrift institutions for breach of contract occasioned by Congress' subsequent passage of Act is affirmed. *United States v. Winstar Corp.*, p. 839.

FIRST AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

FOOTBALL. See **Antitrust Acts.**

FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

FOURTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, IX.

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

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2, 3.

GUIDELINES SENTENCING RANGES. See **United States Sentencing Guidelines.**

HABEAS CORPUS. See also **Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996**; **Constitutional Law**, V.

Brady, notice-of-evidence, and misrepresentation claims.—Habeas petitioner's *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U. S. 83, claim is procedurally barred and his notice-of-evidence claim seeks retroactive application of a new rule,

HABEAS CORPUS—Continued.

but Fourth Circuit must decide whether he properly raised a misrepresentation claim. *Gray v. Netherland*, p. 152.

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Constitutional Law**, VII.

INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2, 3.

INTOXICATION AS ELEMENT OF A DEFENSE. See **Constitutional Law**, III.

JURY TRIALS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII.

JUSTICIABILITY. See **Mootness**.

LABOR. See **Antitrust Acts**.

LEGAL RESEARCH FACILITIES FOR PRISONERS. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

MEDICAL DEVICE AMENDMENTS OF 1976.

Pre-emption of state law.—Amendments did not pre-empt Lohrs' state-law, common-law claims against manufacturer of a failed pacemaker. *Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr*, p. 470.

MENTAL STATE AS ELEMENT OF A CRIMINAL DEFENSE. See **Constitutional Law**, III.

MISREPRESENTATION CLAIM. See **Habeas Corpus**.

MONTANA. See **Constitutional Law**, III.

MOOTNESS.

Appeal of District Court's order.—Petitioner's appeal of a District Court's order that he release respondent from custody or schedule him for a new trial is not made moot by fact that a new trial has been ordered, since a substantial remedy will be available to State if it can avoid burden of a new trial. *Calderon v. Moore*, p. 149.

MULTIEMPLOYER BARGAINING UNITS. See **Antitrust Acts**.

MULTIPLE PETTY OFFENSES. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 2.

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

NEW YORK. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

NOTICE-OF-EVIDENCE CLAIM. See **Habeas Corpus**.

PACEMAKERS. See **Medical Device Amendments of 1976**.

PARTY EXPENDITURE PROVISION. See **Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971**.

- PATIENT-PSYCHOTHERAPIST COMMUNICATION.** See **Federal Rules of Evidence.**
- PENNSYLVANIA.** See **Constitutional Law, IX.**
- PETTY OFFENSES.** See **Constitutional Law, VIII, 2.**
- POLITICAL PARTY EXPENDITURES.** See **Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.**
- POLITICAL SPEECH.** See **Constitutional Law, VI, 2, 3.**
- PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW.** See **Medical Device Amendments of 1976.**
- PRIORITIES OF CREDITORS' CLAIMS.** See **Bankruptcy.**
- PRISONERS.** See **Constitutional Law, I.**
- PRODUCT LIABILITY.** See **Medical Device Amendments of 1976.**
- PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL.** See **Antitrust Acts.**
- PSYCHOTHERAPIST-PATIENT COMMUNICATION.** See **Federal Rules of Evidence.**
- PUNISHMENT.** See **Constitutional Law, II.**
- REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.** See **Constitutional Law, VII.**
- RENEWAL OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.** See **Constitutional Law, VI, 2, 3.**
- RIGHT OF ACCESS TO COURTS.** See **Constitutional Law, I.**
- RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL.** See **Constitutional Law, VIII, 1.**
- SEARCHES AND SEIZURES.** See **Constitutional Law, IX.**
- SENTENCING RANGES.** See **United States Sentencing Guidelines.**
- SEVENTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law, VIII, 1.**
- SEVERABILITY OF STATUTORY PROVISIONS.** See **Abortion.**
- SEX DISCRIMINATION.** See **Constitutional Law, IV.**
- SHERMAN ACT.** See **Antitrust Acts.**
- SIXTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law, VIII, 2.**
- SOCIAL WORKERS.** See **Federal Rules of Evidence.**
- SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.** See **Constitutional Law, VII.**
- SUPREME COURT.**
Term statistics, p. 1059.

SUSPENSION CLAUSE. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

TAXES. See **Bankruptcy**.

TELEVISION. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 1.

TERMINATION OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2, 3.

THRIFT INSTITUTIONS. See **Financial Institutional, Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989**.

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

UNITED STATES SENTENCING GUIDELINES.

1. *Sentencing range—Departure below statutory minimum range.*—A Government motion attesting to a defendant's substantial assistance in a criminal investigation and requesting that a district court depart below minimum of applicable Guideline sentencing range does not also authorize court to depart below a lower statutory minimum sentence. *Melendez v. United States*, p. 120.

2. *Sentencing range—Standard of review—Rejection of downward departure factors.*—An appeals court should not review *de novo* a decision to depart from Guideline sentencing range, but instead should ask whether district court abused its discretion; Ninth Circuit erred in rejecting certain downward departure factors. *Koon v. United States*, p. 81.

UTAH. See **Abortion**.

VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

WARRANTLESS SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, IX.