

INDEX

- ABUSE OF WRIT.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.
- ACTIVITY FEES AT PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES.** See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 1.
- ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE.** See **Criminal Law**, 3.
- AIRBAGS.** See **Pre-emption of State Law**, 3.
- ANONYMOUS TIPS.** See **Constitutional Law**, X, 2.
- ANTITERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT OF 1996.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.
- ARBITRATION.** See **Venue**.
- ARSON.** See **Criminal Law**, 1.
- ATTORNEY'S FEES.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.
- AUTOMOBILE SAFETY.** See **Pre-emption of State Law**, 3.
- BAGGAGE SEARCHES.** See **Constitutional Law**, X, 1.
- BRIBERY.** See **Criminal Law**, 2.
- BUILDING REGULATIONS FOR SUPREME COURT.**
Text of Regulations, p. 1199.
- BUS PASSENGERS.** See **Constitutional Law**, X, 1.
- CABLE TELEVISION.** See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2.
- CAUSE AND PREJUDICE STANDARD.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.
- COMMERCE CLAUSE.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.
- COMMON-LAW TORT ACTIONS.** See **Pre-emption of State Law**, 3.
- COMPENSATORY TIME.** See **Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938**.
- COMPULSORY SELF-INCRIMINATION.** See **Constitutional Law**, VII.
- CONFRONTATION OF WITNESSES.** See **Constitutional Law**, VIII.
- CONSPIRACY.** See **Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act**.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Criminal Law, 5; False Claims Act.**

I. Commerce Clause.

Violence Against Women Act of 1994—Impact on interstate commerce.—Congress had no authority under Commerce Clause to enact 42 U.S.C. § 13981, which provides victims of gender-motivated violence a federal civil remedy. *United States v. Morrison*, p. 598.

II. Due Process.

1. *Attorney's fees—Amendment of fee award.*—Due process was violated when a District Court amended its attorney's fees judgment for respondent by joining petitioner—president and sole shareholder of defendant—as a party and simultaneously making petitioner liable for fee award. *Nelson v. Adams USA, Inc.*, p. 460.

2. *Prosecutor's comments on presence at trial.*—A prosecutor's comments that respondent had an opportunity to hear all other witnesses before testifying and tailor his testimony accordingly did not violate his Fourteenth Amendment right to due process. *Portuondo v. Agard*, p. 61.

III. Enforcement Power.

Violence Against Women Act of 1994—Civil remedy against private individuals.—Congress had no authority under § 5 of Fourteenth Amendment to enact 42 U.S.C. § 13981, which provides victims of gender-motivated violence a federal civil remedy against private individuals. *United States v. Morrison*, p. 598.

IV. Ex Post Facto Laws.

1. *Extending intervals between parole considerations.*—Retroactive application of a Georgia law permitting extension of intervals between parole considerations does not necessarily violate *Ex Post Facto* Clause, but case is remanded for a determination whether Georgia law, in its operation, violates Clause. *Garner v. Jones*, p. 244.

2. *Sexual offenses—Repeal of corroboration requirement.*—Retrospective application of a Texas statute repealing a corroboration requirement for conviction of a defendant charged with certain sexual offenses violates *Ex Post Facto* Clause. *Carmell v. Texas*, p. 513.

V. Freedom of Expression.

Banning public nudity.—Pennsylvania Supreme Court's judgment invalidating, on freedom of expression grounds, Erie's ordinance banning public nudity is reversed. *Erie v. Pap's A. M.*, p. 277.

VI. Freedom of Speech.

1. *Public university—Funding student speech.*—First Amendment permits a public university to charge its students an activity fee used to fund

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

a viewpoint-neutral program to facilitate extracurricular student speech. Board of Regents of Univ. of Wis. System v. Southworth, p. 217.

2. *Telecommunications Act of 1996—Cable television regulation—Sexually oriented programming.*—Because Government failed to prove that §505 of Act, which requires cable television operators to fully scramble sexually oriented programming before 10 p.m., is least restrictive means for addressing “signal bleed,” District Court did not err in holding statute violative of First Amendment. United States v. Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc., p. 803.

VII. Privilege Against Self-Incrimination.

Prosecutor’s comments on presence at trial.—A prosecutor’s comments that respondent had an opportunity to hear all other witnesses before testifying and tailor his testimony accordingly did not violate his Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. Portuondo v. Agard, p. 61.

VIII. Right to be Present at Trial and Confront Accusers.

Prosecutor’s comments.—A prosecutor’s comments that respondent had an opportunity to hear all other witnesses before testifying and tailor his testimony accordingly did not violate his Sixth Amendment rights to be present at trial and confront his accusers. Portuondo v. Agard, p. 61.

IX. Right to Counsel.

Effective assistance—Failure to present mitigating evidence.—Fourth Circuit’s decision concluding that petitioner was not denied his right to effective assistance of counsel when his trial lawyers failed to investigate and to present substantial mitigating evidence is reversed. Williams v. Taylor, p. 362.

X. Searches and Seizures.

1. *Bus passenger—Manipulation of luggage.*—A law enforcement officer’s physical manipulation of a bus passenger’s carry-on luggage violates Fourth Amendment’s proscription against unreasonable searches. Bond v. United States, p. 334.

2. *Stop and frisk—Anonymous tip.*—An anonymous tip that a person is carrying a gun is not, without more, sufficient to justify a police officer’s stop and frisk of that person. Florida v. J. L., p. 266.

CONVICTIONS AS EVIDENCE. See **Criminal Law**, 3.

CRIMINAL LAW. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2; IV; VII–X; **Habeas Corpus**.

1. *Arson—Federal prosecution.*—Because an owner-occupied residence not used for any commercial purpose does not qualify as property “used

CRIMINAL LAW—Continued.

in” commerce or commerce-affecting activity, arson of such a dwelling is not subject to federal prosecution under 18 U. S. C. § 844(i). *Jones v. United States*, p. 848.

2. *Federal bribery statute—Medicare provider fraud.*—In prohibiting defrauding organizations that “receiv[e] . . . benefits in excess of \$10,000 under a Federal program,” 18 U. S. C. § 666(b) covers fraud perpetrated on organizations participating in Medicare. *Fischer v. United States*, p. 667.

3. *Prior conviction—Pre-emptive admission by defendant.*—Where Government’s motion *in limine* to admit a defendant’s prior felony conviction as impeachment evidence is granted and defendant then pre-emptively introduces that prior conviction evidence on direct examination, defendant may not challenge admission of such evidence on appeal. *Ohler v. United States*, p. 753.

4. *Supervised release—Effect of excess prison time.*—Controlling statute, 18 U. S. C. § 3624(e), by its necessary operation, does not reduce length of a supervised release term by reason of excess time served in prison. *United States v. Johnson*, p. 53.

5. *Supervised release following reimprisonment.*—In authorizing a district court to impose an additional term of supervised release following reimprisonment of those who violate conditions of an initial term, 18 U. S. C. § 3583(h) does not apply retroactively, so no *ex post facto* violation occurred in this case; but § 3583(e)(3), at time of Johnson’s conviction, gave District Court authority to reimpose supervised release. *Johnson v. United States*, p. 694.

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

EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, IX; **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938**.

ENFORCEMENT POWER. See **Constitutional Law**, III.

EVIDENCE. See **Criminal Law**, 3.

EX POST FACTO LAWS. See **Constitutional Law**, IV; **Criminal Law**, 5.

EXTRACURRICULAR STUDENT SPEECH. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 1.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938.

Public employer—Compensatory time.—Nothing in FLSA or its implementing regulations prohibits a public employer from compelling use of compensatory time. *Christensen v. Harris County*, p. 576.

FALSE CLAIMS ACT.

Standing—Private suit against State.—A private individual has standing to bring suit in federal court on behalf of United States under FCA, but a State (or state agency) is not a “person” subject to *qui tam* liability under Act. *Vermont Agency of Natural Resources v. United States ex rel. Stevens*, p. 765.

FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT. See **Venue**.

FEDERAL COURTS. See **Venue**.

FEDERAL-QUESTION JURISDICTION. See **Jurisdiction**.

FEDERAL RAILROAD SAFETY ACT OF 1970. See **Pre-emption of State Law**, 1.

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1147.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1155.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1179.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1189.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Pre-emption of State Law**.

FEE AWARDS. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.

FIFTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1; VII.

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

FLORIDA. See **Constitutional Law**, X, 2.

FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT.

Tobacco regulation—Food and Drug Administration authority.—Reading FDCA as a whole, as well as in conjunction with Congress’ subsequent tobacco-specific legislation, it is plain that Congress has not given FDA authority to assert jurisdiction over tobacco products. *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, p. 120.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2; III.

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

FRAUD. See **Criminal Law**, 2.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

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

GENDER-MOTIVATED VIOLENCE. See **Constitutional Law**, I; III.

GEORGIA. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.

GRAZING. See **Taylor Grazing Act**.

HABEAS CORPUS.

1. *Cause for procedural default.*—A procedurally defaulted ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim can serve as cause for procedural default of another habeas claim only if habeas petitioner can satisfy “cause and prejudice” standard with respect to ineffective-assistance claim itself. *Edwards v. Carpenter*, p. 446.

2. *Development of claims in state court.*—Under 28 U. S. C. § 2254(e)(2), as amended by Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, a “fail[ure] to develop the factual basis of [a] claim in State court” is not established unless there is a lack of diligence, or some greater fault, attributable to federal habeas petitioner or his counsel. *Williams v. Taylor*, p. 420.

3. *Successive petition—Dismissal on procedural grounds.*—A federal habeas corpus petition filed after an initial petition was dismissed on procedural grounds without reaching prisoner’s underlying constitutional claim is not a “second or successive” petition subject to dismissal for abuse of writ. *Slack v. McDaniel*, p. 473.

IMPRISONMENT. See **Criminal Law**, 5.

INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, IX; **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

INFRINGEMENT OF TRADE DRESS. See **Trademark Act of 1946**.

IN LIMINE MOTION. See **Criminal Law**, 3.

JURISDICTION.

Federal-question jurisdiction—Challenge to Medicare enforcement regulations.—Title 42 U. S. C. § 405(h), incorporated into Medicare Act by 42 U. S. C. § 1331ii, sets out a special administrative and judicial review system for Medicare claim denials that bars respondent nursing home association from invoking federal-question jurisdiction to challenge Medicare enforcement regulations’ validity. *Shalala v. Illinois Council on Long Term Care, Inc.*, p. 1.

LANHAM ACT. See **Trademark Act of 1946.**

LUGGAGE SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, X, 1.

MARITIME OIL TRANSPORT. See **Pre-emption of State Law**, 2.

MEDICARE. See **Criminal Law**, 2; **Jurisdiction.**

NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT OF 1966.
See **Pre-emption of State Law**, 3.

NUDE DANCING. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

NURSING HOMES. See **Jurisdiction.**

OIL TRANSPORT. See **Pre-emption of State Law**, 2.

PAROLE. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.

PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW.

1. *Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970—Adequacy of railroad crossing warning devices—State tort laws.*—Act, in conjunction with 23 CFR §§ 646.214(b)(3) and (4), pre-empts state tort claims concerning a railroad's failure to maintain adequate warning devices at crossings where federal funds have participated in devices' installation. *Norfolk Southern R. Co. v. Shanklin*, p. 344.

2. *Maritime oil transport—State regulations.*—Washington's super-tanker regulations on general navigation watch procedures, crew English language skills and training, and maritime casualty reporting are pre-empted by a comprehensive federal regulatory scheme; case is remanded to determine validity of other state regulations in light of considerable federal interest at stake. *United States v. Locke*, p. 89.

3. *National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966—State common-law tort action—Automobile airbags.*—Act, read with relevant regulatory standard, pre-empted a state common-law tort action in which petitioners claimed that respondent manufacturer, who complied with standard, should have equipped a 1987 car with airbags. *Geier v. American Honda Motor Co.*, p. 861.

PRIOR CONVICTIONS AS EVIDENCE. See **Criminal Law**, 3.

PRISON TERMS. See **Criminal Law**, 4.

PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION. See **Constitutional Law**, VII.

PROSECUTOR'S TRIAL COMMENTS. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2; VII; VIII.

PROVIDER REIMBURSEMENT. See **Jurisdiction.**

PUBLIC EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.**

PUBLIC NUDITY. See **Constitutional Law, V.**

PUBLIC RANGELANDS. See **Taylor Grazing Act.**

QUI TAM SUITS. See **False Claims Act.**

RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT.

Conspiracy—Overt act.—A person injured by an overt act done in furtherance of a RICO conspiracy does not have a civil cause of action under 18 U. S. C. § 1964(c) unless overt act is an act of racketeering or otherwise wrongful under RICO. *Beck v. Prupis*, p. 494.

RAILROAD CROSSING WARNING DEVICES. See **Pre-emption of State Law, 1.**

RANGELANDS. See **Taylor Grazing Act.**

REGULATIONS FOR SUPREME COURT BUILDING.

Text of Regulations, p. 1199.

REIMPRISONMENT. See **Criminal Law, 5.**

RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION OF LAWS. See **Constitutional Law, IV, 2.**

RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT. See **Constitutional Law, VII.**

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

SELF-INCRIMINATION. See **Constitutional Law, VII.**

SEXUALLY ORIENTED CABLE PROGRAMMING. See **Constitutional Law, VI, 2.**

SEXUAL OFFENSES. See **Constitutional Law, IV, 2.**

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

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT. See **Jurisdiction.**

STANDING. See **False Claims Act.**

STOP AND FRISK. See **Constitutional Law, X, 2.**

STUDENT SPEECH. See **Constitutional Law, VI, 1.**

SUCCESSIVE HABEAS PETITIONS. See **Habeas Corpus, 3.**

SUPERTANKER REGULATION. See **Pre-emption of State Law**, 2.

SUPERVISED RELEASE. See **Criminal Law**, 4, 5.

SUPREME COURT.

1. Amendments to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, p. 1147.
2. Amendments to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, p. 1155.
3. Amendments to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, p. 1179.
4. Amendments to Federal Rules of Evidence, p. 1189.
5. Building Regulations, p. 1199.

TAYLOR GRAZING ACT.

Public rangelands—Secretary of Interior’s regulatory authority.—Grazing regulations on public rangelands at issue do not exceed Secretary of Interior’s authority under Act. *Public Lands Council v. Babbitt*, p. 728.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2.

TELEVISION. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2.

TEXAS. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2.

TOBACCO REGULATION. See **Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act**.

TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.

Trade dress infringement.—In an action for infringement of unregistered trade dress under § 43(a) of Act, a product’s design is distinctive, and therefore protectible, only upon a showing of secondary meaning. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Brothers, Inc.*, p. 205.

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

VENUE.

Federal Arbitration Act—Motion to confirm, vacate, or modify.—Act’s venue provisions are permissive, allowing a motion to confirm, vacate, or modify an arbitration award to be brought either in district where award was made or in any district proper under general venue statute. *Cortez Byrd Chips, Inc. v. Bill Harbert Constr. Co.*, p. 193.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT OF 1994. See **Constitutional Law**, I; III.

WASHINGTON. See **Pre-emption of State Law**, 2.

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

WITNESSES. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2; VII; VIII.

WORDS AND PHRASES.

1. “*Benefits.*” 18 U. S. C. § 666(b). *Fischer v. United States*, p. 667.
2. “Fail[ure] to develop the factual basis of [a] claim in State court.” 28 U. S. C. § 2254(e)(2). *Williams v. Taylor*, p. 420.

WORDS AND PHRASES—Continued.

3. “*Is released from imprisonment.*” 18 U. S. C. § 3624(e). United States v. Johnson, p. 53.

4. “*Person.*” False Claims Act, 31 U. S. C. § 3729(a). Vermont Agency of Natural Resources v. United States ex rel. Stevens, p. 765.

5. “*To recover on any claim arising under.*” § 205(h), Social Security Act, 42 U. S. C. § 405(h). Shalala v. Illinois Council on Long Term Care, Inc., p. 1.

6. “*Used.*” 18 U. S. C. § 844(i). Jones v. United States, p. 848.