

INDEX

ABORTIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII.

ADMIRALTY.

Tort damages—Defective equipment added after initial sale.—Equipment added to a ship by an initial user before ship is resold is not part of product that itself caused physical harm, for which no admiralty tort damages can be recovered, but is “other property,” for which such damages can be recovered. *Saratoga Fishing Co. v. J. M. Martinac & Co.*, p. 875.

ALABAMA. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 1; **Supreme Court**, 7.

AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL ACTS. See **False Claims Act**.

APPEALS.

Denial of qualified immunity—Interlocutory appeal.—State officials who are defendants in a state-court action for damages under 42 U. S. C. § 1983 do not have a federal right to an interlocutory appeal from a denial of qualified immunity. *Johnson v. Fankell*, p. 911.

APPOINTMENTS CLAUSE. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

ARIZONA. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

ASSOCIATIONAL RIGHTS. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

BALLOTS FOR ELECTED OFFICES. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

BANKRUPTCY.

Chapter 13—“Cram down” option—Value of retained property.—Under § 506 of Bankruptcy Code, value of property retained in a Chapter 13 plan because debtor has exercised “cram down” option is collateral’s replacement, not foreclosure, value. *Associates Commercial Corp. v. Rash*, p. 953.

BENEFIT PLANS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 2.

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

CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE. See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 1.

CAPITAL MURDER. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 1; **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

CASE OR CONTROVERSY. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

CERTIORARI. See **Supreme Court**, 5, 6, 7.

CHAPTER 13. See **Bankruptcy**.

CHARITABLE ESTATE TAX DEDUCTION. See **Taxes**, 1.

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS. See **Social Security Act**.

CIVILIAN JUDGES ON MILITARY COURTS. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871. See also **Appeals**.

1. *Section 1983—County sheriff's wrongdoing—County's liability.*—Monroe County, Alabama, is not liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for its sheriff's alleged wrongdoing in suppressing exculpatory evidence that cleared McMillian of capital murder, because Alabama sheriffs, when executing their law enforcement duties, are policymakers for State, not county. *McMillian v. Monroe County*, p. 781.

2. *Section 1983—Municipal liability—Judgment based on sheriff's hiring decision.*—A county is not liable under § 1983 for its sheriff's isolated decision to hire a deputy without adequately screening his criminal record absent a showing that sheriff consciously disregarded a high risk that deputy would use excessive force. *Board of Comm'rs of Bryan Cty. v. Brown*, p. 397.

3. *Section 1983—Prison disciplinary proceeding.*—*Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, precludes respondent's claim for declaratory relief and damages—based on allegations that procedures used in his prison disciplinary proceeding violated due process—from being cognizable under § 1983. *Edwards v. Balisok*, p. 641.

CLASS ACTIONS. See **Supreme Court**, 7.

COAST GUARD COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

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

COMMUNITY PROPERTY. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 3.

CONCURRENT SENTENCES. See **Criminal Law**, 1.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

I. Appointments Clause.

Coast Guard Court of Criminal Appeals—Appointment of civilian judges.—Title 49 U.S.C. § 323(a) authorizes Secretary of Transportation to appoint civilian judges to Coast Guard Court of Criminal Appeals, and that authorization is constitutional under Appointments Clause. *Edmond v. United States*, p. 651.

II. Case or Controversy.

Mootness—State law—English as official language.—Because this case was moot once initiating plaintiff left state employment, Ninth Circuit erred in considering whether Arizona State Constitution, which requires state business to be conducted exclusively in English, violates First Amendment's Free Speech Clause. *Arizonans for Official English v. Arizona*, p. 43.

III. Commerce Clause.

State property tax—Discrimination against charitable institutions operated principally for nonresidents.—An otherwise generally applicable state property tax violates Commerce Clause if its exemption for property owned by charitable institutions excludes organizations operated principally for nonresidents' benefit. *Camps Newfound/Owatonna, Inc. v. Town of Harrison*, p. 564.

IV. Due Process.

1. *Liberty interest—State preparole program—Procedural protections.*—Oklahoma's Preparole Conditional Supervision Program for reducing overcrowding in its prisons was sufficiently like parole that a program participant was entitled to procedural protections of *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, before he could be removed from program. *Young v. Harper*, p. 143.

2. *Public employee's suspension—Notice and hearing requirement.*—A State does not violate Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause by failing to provide notice and a hearing before suspending a tenured public employee without pay. *Gilbert v. Homar*, p. 924.

V. Freedom of Association.

Elections—Multiple-party candidacies for elected office.—Minnesota laws forbidding an individual from appearing on an electoral ballot as candidate of more than one party, thus prohibiting multiple-party, or fusion, candidacies for elected office, do not violate First and Fourteenth Amendments. *Timmons v. Twin Cities Area New Party*, p. 351.

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

Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992—“Must-carry” provisions.—Because record supports Congress’ judgment that Act’s “must-carry” provisions are narrowly tailored to further important Government interests, they satisfy First Amendment. *Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC*, p. 180.

VII. Immunity from Suit.

Separation of powers—Private action against President—Deferral of litigation.—Constitution does not afford President temporary immunity from civil damages litigation arising out of his unofficial conduct before he took office, and separation of powers doctrine does not require federal courts to stay such litigation until President leaves office. *Clinton v. Jones*, p. 681.

VIII. Right to Abortion.

1. *Montana parental notification law—Judicial bypass provision.*—Ninth Circuit’s holding that Montana’s Parental Notice of Abortion Act is unconstitutional because its judicial bypass provision does not sufficiently protect minors’ right to have abortions is in direct conflict with this Court’s precedents. *Lambert v. Wicklund*, p. 292.

2. *Physician-only state law—Preliminary injunction.*—Summary reversal of Ninth Circuit’s decision finding threshold showing for preliminary injunction against Montana’s physician-only abortion law is appropriate where decision conflicts with this Court’s precedents and law is unenforceable at present. *Mazurek v. Armstrong*, p. 968.

IX. Searches and Seizures.

1. *Candidates for state office—Drug tests.*—Georgia’s requirement that candidates for state office pass a drug test does not fit within suspicionless searches permitted under Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments. *Chandler v. Miller*, p. 305.

2. *Knock and announce requirement—Felony drug investigations.*—Fourth Amendment does not permit a blanket exception to “knock and announce” requirement for felony drug investigations, but facts in this case support police officers’ decision not to knock and announce before entering petitioner’s motel room. *Richards v. Wisconsin*, p. 385.

COUNTY SHERIFFS AS POLICYMAKERS. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 1.

“CRAM DOWN” OPTION. See **Bankruptcy**.

CRIMINAL LAW. See also **Constitutional Law**, IX, 2; **Habeas Corpus**; **United States Sentencing Guidelines**.

1. *Drug-related firearms use—Mandatory prison term.*—Plain language of 18 U. S. C. § 924(c) forbids a federal district court to direct that that section's mandatory 5-year prison term for drug-related firearms use run concurrently with any other prison term, whether state or federal. *United States v. Gonzales*, p. 1.

2. *Perjury—Materiality.*—A trial court's decision in a perjury case that materiality was an issue for judge, rather than jury, was not a plain error affecting substantial rights that can be noticed under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 52(b) even though no objection has been made. *Johnson v. United States*, p. 461.

3. *Plea agreement—Withdrawal before sentencing.*—Where a federal court accepts a defendant's guilty plea, pursuant to a plea agreement, but defers decision on whether to accept plea agreement, defendant must have a fair and just reason under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32(e) to withdraw plea before sentencing. *United States v. Hyde*, p. 670.

4. *Sexual assault by state judge—Deprivation of victims' liberty interest.*—In reversing a state judge's 18 U. S. C. § 242 convictions for sexually assaulting women in violation of their due process right to liberty, Sixth Circuit erred in ruling that such a "right" must first be identified by this Court in a "fundamentally similar" case. *United States v. Lanier*, p. 259.

DEFERRING LITIGATION AGAINST PRESIDENT. See **Constitutional Law**, VII.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROPERTY. See **Justiciability**.

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

DISCRIMINATION IN VOTING. See **Voting Rights Act of 1965**.

DIVERSITY SUITS. See **Supreme Court**, 5.

DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS. See **Patent Law**.

DRUG-RELATED CRIMES. See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 2; **United States Sentencing Guidelines**.

DRUG-RELATED FIREARMS USE. See **Criminal Law**, 1.

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

DUE PROCESS. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 3; **Constitutional Law**, IV; **Criminal Law**, 4; **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

ELECTORAL BALLOTS. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.

1. *ERISA-funded medical centers—Imposition of state gross receipts tax.*—Section 514(a) of ERISA does not preclude New York from imposing a tax, called Health Facility Assessment, on ERISA-funded centers. *De Buono v. NYSA–ILA Medical and Clinical Services Fund*, p. 806.

2. *Interference with attainment of rights under plan.*—Section 510 of ERISA, which prohibits discharge of a plan participant in order to interfere with attainment of any right to which participant may become entitled under plan, is not limited to interference with vested rights. *Inter-Modal Rail Employees Assn. v. Atchison, T. & S. F. R. Co.*, p. 510.

3. *Pre-emption of state law—Testamentary transfer of pension benefits.*—ERISA pre-empts a Louisiana law allowing a nonparticipant spouse to transfer by testamentary instrument a community property interest in undistributed pension plan benefits. *Boggs v. Boggs*, p. 833.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Constitutional Law**, II; IV, 2;
Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, 2.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973.

Federal reclamation project—Standing to challenge biological opinion.—Petitioners, irrigation districts receiving water from a federal reclamation project and operators of ranches in those districts, had standing to challenge a biological opinion, issued by Fish and Wildlife Service in accordance with Act, concerning project's operation and impact on endangered fish species. *Bennett v. Spear*, p. 154.

ENGLISH AS OFFICIAL LANGUAGE. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW. See **Endangered Species Act of 1973**.

EQUIVALENT PRODUCTS. See **Patent Law**.

ESTATE TAXES. See **Taxes**, 1.

EVIDENCE SUPPRESSION. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 1.

EXCESSIVE FORCE CLAIMS. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 2.

FAIR TRIAL. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

FALSE CLAIMS ACT.

Retroactive application of amendment.—A 1986 amendment to Act does not apply retroactively to *qui tam* suits regarding allegedly false claims submitted prior to its enactment. *Hughes Aircraft Co. v. United States ex rel. Schumer*, p. 939.

- FEDERAL QUESTIONS.** See **Supreme Court**, 7.
- FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE.**
Amendments to Rules, p. 1285.
- FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.**
Amendments to Rules, p. 1305.
- FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.** See also **Criminal Law**, 2, 3.
Amendments to Rules, p. 1313.
- FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.**
Amendments to Rules, p. 1323.
- FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS.** See **Appeals; Supreme Court**, 5.
- FEDERAL TAXES.** See **Taxes**, 1.
- FIREARMS USE.** See **Criminal Law**, 1.
- FIRST AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, II; V; VI.
- FIRST-DEGREE MURDER.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.
- FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE.** See **Endangered Species Act of 1973**.
- FLORIDA.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.
- FORCIBLE ENTRIES.** See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 2.
- FORECLOSURE VALUE OF PROPERTY.** See **Bankruptcy**.
- FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV; V; IX; **Criminal Law**, 4.
- FOURTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, IX.
- FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION.** See **Constitutional Law**, V.
- FREEDOM OF SPEECH.** See **Constitutional Law**, II; VI.
- FUSION CANDIDACIES FOR ELECTED OFFICE.** See **Constitutional Law**, V.
- GEORGIA.** See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 1.
- GOVERNMENT EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES.** See **Constitutional Law**, II.
- GROSS RECEIPTS TAXES.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 1.

GVR ORDER. See **Supreme Court**, 5.

HABEAS CORPUS.

1. *New rule—Capital murder—Sentencing.*—The rule announced in *Espinosa v. Florida*, 505 U.S. 1079 (*per curiam*)—that if a sentencing judge in a “weighing” State is required to give deference to a jury’s advisory sentencing recommendation, neither jury nor judge is constitutionally permitted to weigh invalid aggravating circumstances—is a “new rule” as defined in *Teague v. Lane*, 489 U.S. 288, and thus, a state prisoner whose first-degree murder conviction became final before *Espinosa* was decided is foreclosed from relying on that decision in a federal habeas proceeding. *Lambrix v. Singletary*, p. 518.

2. *Rule 6(a)—Good cause—Denial of a fair trial.*—Petitioner had good cause, under Habeas Rule 6(a), to conduct discovery to prove that he was denied a fair trial under Due Process Clause by a judge who wanted him convicted to hide fact that judge was taking bribes in other murder cases. *Bracy v. Gramley*, p. 899.

HEALTH FACILITY ASSESSMENT. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 1.

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

INDIAN COURTS. See **Jurisdiction**.

INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS UNDER FEDERAL STATUTES. See **Social Security Act**.

IN FORMA PAUPERIS. See **Supreme Court**, 6.

INFRINGEMENT ON PATENTS. See **Patent Law**.

INJUNCTIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 2.

INSTRUMENTALITIES OF UNITED STATES. See **Taxes**, 2.

INTERLOCUTORY APPEALS. See **Appeals**.

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

INVENTIONS. See **Patent Law**.

IRRIGATION PROJECTS. See **Endangered Species Act of 1973**.

JONES ACT.

Seaman—Painter on a tug.—Record in this case would not permit a reasonable jury to conclude that respondent was a seaman under Jones Act when he was injured while painting one of petitioner’s tugs. *Harbor Tug & Barge Co. v. Papai*, p. 548.

JUDICIAL BIAS. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

JUDICIAL BYPASS OF PARENTAL NOTIFICATION LAWS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

JURISDICTION.

Tribal courts—Personal injury actions—Defendants are not tribal members.—When an accident occurs on a public highway maintained by a State under a federally granted right-of-way over Indian reservation land, a tort suit against allegedly negligent nonmembers may not be brought in tribal court absent congressional authorization. *Strate v. A-1 Contractors*, p. 438.

JUSTICIABILITY. See also **Constitutional Law**, II.

Ripeness for adjudication—Regulatory taking of property.—Petitioner's claim—that respondent land use agency's denial of her request to build on her lot constitutes a taking of land without just compensation—is ripe for adjudication despite her failure to try to sell development rights that run with land. *Suitum v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*, p. 725.

KNOCK AND ANNOUNCE RULE. See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 2.

LIBERTY INTEREST. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1; **Criminal Law**, 4.

LOUISIANA. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 3.

MARITAL ESTATE TAX DEDUCTION. See **Taxes**, 1.

MARITIME EMPLOYEE. See **Jones Act**.

MARYLAND. See **Supreme Court**, 5.

MAXIMUM TERM OF IMPRISONMENT. See **United States Sentencing Guidelines**.

MEDICAL CENTERS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 1.

MINNESOTA. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

MISSISSIPPI. See **Voting Rights Act of 1965**, 1.

MONTANA. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII.

MOOTNESS. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

MULTIPLE-PARTY CANDIDACIES FOR ELECTED OFFICE. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

- MUNICIPALITY LIABILITY.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 2.
- MURDER.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 1; **Habeas Corpus**.
- MUST-CARRY REQUIREMENTS FOR CABLE TELEVISION.** See **Constitutional Law**, VI.
- NEW RULES.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.
- NEW YORK.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 1.
- OKLAHOMA.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.
- PARENTAL NOTICE OF ABORTION ACT.** See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.
- PARENTS AND CHILDREN.** See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1; **Social Security Act**.
- PAROLE.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.
- PATENT LAW.**
Infringement—"Doctrine of equivalents."—Doctrine—under which a product or process that does not literally infringe upon a patent claim's express terms may be found to infringe if there is equivalence between elements of accused product or process and claimed elements of patented invention—is affirmed substantially as it was set out in *Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Products Co.*, 339 U.S. 605. *Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chemical Co.*, p. 17.
- PENSION BENEFITS.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 2, 3.
- PERJURY.** See **Criminal Law**, 2.
- PERSONAL INJURY LAWSUITS.** See **Jurisdiction**.
- PHYSICIAN-ONLY ABORTION LAWS.** See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 2.
- PLAIN ERROR.** See **Criminal Law**, 2.
- PLEA AGREEMENTS.** See **Criminal Law**, 3.
- POLICYMAKERS.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 1.
- PRECLEARANCE OF VOTING CHANGES.** See **Voting Rights Act of 1965**.
- PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 3.

- PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS.** See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 2.
- PREPAROLE PROGRAMS.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.
- PRESIDENTIAL IMMUNITY.** See **Constitutional Law**, VII.
- PRISON DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 3.
- PRISON TERMS.** See **Criminal Law**, 1.
- PRIVATE ACTIONS AGAINST PRESIDENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, VII.
- PRODUCT LIABILITY.** See **Admiralty**.
- PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT.** See **Justiciability**.
- PROPERTY TAXES.** See **Constitutional Law**, III.
- PUBLIC EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2.
- QUALIFIED IMMUNITY.** See **Appeals**.
- QUI TAM SUITS.** See **False Claims Act**.
- REAL ESTATE TAXES.** See **Constitutional Law**, III.
- RECLAMATION PROJECTS.** See **Endangered Species Act of 1973**.
- REGULATORY TAKING OF PROPERTY.** See **Justiciability**.
- REPETITIOUS FILINGS.** See **Supreme Court**, 6.
- REPLACEMENT VALUE OF PROPERTY.** See **Bankruptcy**.
- RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL ACTS.** See **False Claims Act**.
- RIGHT TO ABORTION.** See **Constitutional Law**, VIII.
- RIGHT TO FAIR TRIAL.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.
- RIGHT TO FILE SUIT.** See **Social Security Act**.
- RIGHT TO LIBERTY.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1; **Criminal Law**, 4.
- RIGHT TO NOTICE AND A HEARING.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2.
- RIGHT TO VOTE.** See **Voting Rights Act of 1965**.

RIPENESS FOR ADJUDICATION. See **Justiciability.**

SEAMAN. See **Jones Act.**

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

SECRETARY OF TREASURY. See **Constitutional Law, I.**

SECTION 1983. See **Appeals; Civil Rights Act of 1871.**

SENTENCING. See **Criminal Law, 1, 3; Habeas Corpus, 1; United States Sentencing Guidelines.**

SEPARATION OF POWERS. See **Constitutional Law, VII.**

SEXUAL ASSAULT BY STATE OFFICIAL. See **Criminal Law, 4.**

SHERIFFS AS POLICYMAKERS. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871, 1.**

SHIPS' DEFECTIVE EQUIPMENT. See **Admiralty.**

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.

State child support enforcement programs—Federal right to enforce program requirements.—Title IV–D of Act, which sets forth requirements for federally funded state child support enforcement programs, does not give individuals a federal right to force a state agency to substantially comply with those requirements. *Blessing v. Freestone*, p. 329.

STANDING TO SUE. See **Endangered Species Act of 1973.**

STATE TAXES. See **Constitutional Law, III; Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, 1; Taxes.**

STATUTORY SENTENCE ENHANCEMENTS. See **United States Sentencing Guidelines.**

SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871, 1.**

SUPREME COURT.

1. Amendments to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, p. 1285.
2. Amendments to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, p. 1305.
3. Amendments to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, p. 1313.
4. Amendments to Federal Rules of Evidence, p. 1323.
5. *Diversity suit—Order granting certiorari petition, vacating judgment, and remanding (GVR).*—In this diversity case, where soundness of Fourth Circuit's holding has been called into question by Maryland's high court, it is appropriate for this Court to issue a GVR order. *Lords*

SUPREME COURT—Continued.

Landing Village Condominium Council of Unit Owners v. Continental Ins. Co., p. 893.

6. *In forma pauperis*—*Repetitious filings*.—Abusive filer is denied *in forma pauperis* status on this and further noncriminal certiorari petitions. In re Vey, p. 303; Vey v. Clinton, p. 937.

7. *Writ of certiorari*—*Dismissal*.—Because Alabama Supreme Court did not address federal issue on which certiorari was granted—whether trial court's approval of a class and a settlement agreement without affording class members right to exclude themselves violated due process—and it is now apparent that petitioners have failed to establish that they properly presented issue to that court, writ is dismissed as improvidently granted. Adams v. Robertson, p. 83.

SUSPENSION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2.

SUSPICIONLESS SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 1.

TAKING OF PROPERTY. See **Justiciability**.

TAXES. See also **Constitutional Law**, III; **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 1.

1. *Federal estate taxes*—*Reduction of marital and charitable deductions*.—Court of Appeals' decision that taxpayer did not have to reduce estate tax deduction for marital or charitable bequests to extent administration expenses were paid from income generated during administration by assets allocated to those bequests is affirmed. Commissioner v. Estate of Hubert, p. 93.

2. *Tax Injunction Act*—*Application to instrumentalities of United States*.—United States instrumentalities do not, by virtue of that designation alone, have same right as United States to avoid Act's restriction on federal courts' power to prevent collection or enforcement of state taxes. Arkansas v. Farm Credit Servs. of Central Ark., p. 821.

TAX INJUNCTION ACT. See **Taxes**, 2.

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

TEMPORARY IMMUNITY. See **Constitutional Law**, VII.

TESTAMENTARY TRANSFERS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 3.

TREASURY SECRETARY. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

TRIBAL COURTS. See **Jurisdiction**.

UNANNOUNCED ENTRIES. See **Constitutional Law**, IX, 2.

UNITED STATES INSTRUMENTALITIES. See **Taxes**, 2.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION GUIDELINES.

Imposition of maximum term—Consideration of statutory sentence enhancement.—An amendment to Sentencing Guideline §4B1.1 commentary, precluding a District Court from considering a statutory sentence enhancement in imposing “maximum term” on a career drug- or violent-crime offender, is inconsistent with 28 U. S. C. §994(h)’s plain language, which directs Sentencing Commission to assure that Guidelines specify a prison sentence “at or near the maximum term authorized for categories of adult offenders who commit their third felony drug offense or violent crime.” *United States v. LaBonte*, p. 751.

VALUATION OF PROPERTY. See **Bankruptcy**.

VESTING. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 2.

VIOLENT CRIMES. See **United States Sentencing Guidelines**.

VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993. See **Voting Rights Act of 1965**, 1.

VOTING DISCRIMINATION. See **Voting Rights Act of 1965**.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965.

1. *Preclearance—Changes in voting registration system.*—Mississippi must preclear under §5 of Act changes it made in its voter registration system in order to comply with National Voter Registration Act of 1993. *Young v. Fordice*, p. 273.

2. *Violation of §2 as reason to deny §5 preclearance.*—Preclearance under §5 of Act may not be denied solely on basis that a new voting standard, practice, or procedure violates §2 of Act, but §2 evidence may be relevant to §5 inquiry. *Reno v. Bossier Parish School Bd.*, p. 471.

WATER PROJECTS. See **Endangered Species Act of 1973**.

WELFARE BENEFIT PLANS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 2.

WORDS AND PHRASES.

1. “At or near the maximum term authorized for categories of adult offenders who commit their third felony drug offense or violent crime.” 28 U. S. C. §994(h). *United States v. LaBonte*, p. 751.

2. “The sentence . . . under this subsection [shall not] run concurrently with any other term of imprisonment.” 18 U. S. C. §924(c). *United States v. Gonzales*, p. 1.

WRITS OF CERTIORARI. See **Supreme Court**, 5, 6, 7.