

INDEX

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDY EXHAUSTION. See **Prisoners.**

ADMIRALTY.

Wrongful death—Negligent breach of maritime duty of care.—General maritime cause of action recognized in *Moragne v. States Marine Lines, Inc.*, 398 U. S. 375, 409, for death caused by violation of maritime duties is available for negligent breach of a maritime duty of care. *Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp. v. Garriss*, p. 811.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990. See also **Attorney's Fees.**

Access to golf tour—Golf cart usage.—Title III of ADA prohibits petitioner from denying golfer Casey Martin equal access to its golf tours based on a disability preventing him from walking a golf course; allowing Martin to use a golf cart, despite petitioner's walking requirement, is not a modification that would "fundamentally alter the nature" of petitioner's tours. *PGA TOUR, Inc. v. Martin*, p. 661.

APPEALS.

Federal courts—Failure to sign notice—Dismissal.—A party's failure to sign a notice of appeal that is timely filed in federal district court does not require a court of appeals to dismiss appeal. *Becker v. Montgomery*, p. 757.

ARBITRATION. See also **Federal Arbitration Act.**

1. *Judicial review of labor-arbitration decision—Rejection of factual findings.*—Ninth Circuit committed reversible error when it rejected an arbitrator's factual findings and then resolved merits of parties' labor dispute instead of remanding case for further arbitration proceedings. *Major League Baseball Players Assn. v. Garvey*, p. 504.

2. *Tribal sovereign immunity—Enforcement of arbitral awards.*—Under an agreement it proposed and signed, respondent Tribe clearly consented to arbitration and to enforcement of arbitral awards in Oklahoma state court; Tribe thereby waived its sovereign immunity from petitioner contractor's state-court suit to enforce its arbitration award. *C & L Enterprises, Inc. v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Tribe of Okla.*, p. 411.

ARKANSAS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

ARRESTS WITHOUT WARRANTS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 3.

ASSERTION OF INNOCENCE. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2.

ATTORNEY'S FEES.

Catalyst theory—Prevailing party.—“Catalyst theory,” which posits that a plaintiff is a prevailing party if it achieves desired result because lawsuit brought about a voluntary change in defendant’s conduct, is not a permissible basis for award of attorney’s fees under Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 and Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. *Buckhannon Board & Care Home, Inc. v. West Virginia Dept. of Health and Human Resources*, p. 598.

AUTOMOBILE SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

BACK WAGES. See **Taxes**, 2.

BASEBALL. See **Arbitration**, 1.

BENEFICIARY DESIGNATION REVOCATION. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

BOUNDARIES.

New Hampshire-Maine boundary—Estoppel.—Because New Hampshire, in an earlier proceeding fixing its boundary with Maine, agreed that phrase “Middle of the River” in a 1740 decree means middle of Piscataqua River’s main navigation channel, New Hampshire is estopped from asserting now that boundary runs along Maine shore. *New Hampshire v. Maine*, p. 742.

BREACH OF CONTRACT. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3.

CALIFORNIA. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3.

CANNABIS. See **Controlled Substances Act**.

CAPITAL MURDER. See **Constitutional Law**, II; III, 1; VI, 1.

CAR SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

CATALYST THEORY. See **Attorney’s Fees**.

CELLULAR TELEPHONES. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 1.

CERTIORARI. See **Jurisdiction**.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964. See also **Civil Rights Act of 1991**.

1. *Title VI—Disparate-impact regulations—Private right of action.*—There is no private right of action to enforce disparate-impact regulations promulgated under Title VI. *Alexander v. Sandoval*, p. 275.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964—Continued.

2. *Title VII—Retaliation for engaging in protected activities.*—Petitioner was entitled to summary judgment on respondent's claims that petitioner violated Title VII when it took adverse employment actions against her in response to protected activities in which she had engaged. *Clark County School Dist. v. Breeden*, p. 268.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991.

Front pay—Compensatory damages cap.—Front pay, a remedy authorized under Title VII of Civil Rights Act of 1964, is not an element of compensatory damages under Civil Rights Act of 1991 and thus is not subject to damages cap imposed by 42 U.S.C. § 1981a(b)(3). *Pollard v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, p. 843.

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

COMPENSATORY DAMAGES CAP. See **Civil Rights Act of 1991**.

COMPULSORY SELF-INCRIMINATION. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

CONSOLIDATED FEDERAL INCOME TAX RETURNS. See **Taxes**, 1.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Punitive Damages**.

I. Compensation Clause.

Federal judges' salaries—Withholding taxes.—Compensation Clause prevents Government from collecting Social Security, but not Medicare, taxes from federal judges who held office before Congress extended those taxes to federal employees; violation was not cured by a 1984 pay increase for federal judges. *United States v. Hatter*, p. 557.

II. Cruel and Unusual Punishment.

Death penalty—Jury instructions on mitigating evidence.—Jury instructions at Penry's resentencing for capital murder did not comply with Court's mandate in *Penry v. Lynaugh*, 492 U.S. 302. *Penry v. Johnson*, p. 782.

III. Due Process.

1. *Death penalty—Jury instructions.*—South Carolina Supreme Court incorrectly interpreted *Simmons v. South Carolina*, 512 U.S. 154—where this Court held that due process requires that a jury be informed of a capital defendant's parole ineligibility where such defendant's future dangerousness is at issue and only sentencing alternative to death is life imprisonment without parole—when it declared that case inapplicable to

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

South Carolina's current capital sentencing scheme. *Shafer v. South Carolina*, p. 36.

2. *Retroactive application of judicial decision—“Year and a day” rule.*—Tennessee Supreme Court's retroactive application to petitioner of its decision abolishing common-law “year and a day” rule—which provided that no defendant could be convicted of murder unless his victim died by defendant's act within a year and a day of such act—did not deny petitioner due process. *Rogers v. Tennessee*, p. 451.

3. *State labor law—Payments on public works project.*—Because California law affords respondent public works project subcontractor sufficient opportunity to pursue its claim for payment in state court, statutory scheme does not deprive respondent of due process when it authorizes State to order withholding of such payments from contractor if a subcontractor fails to comply with certain Labor Code requirements; permits contractor, in turn, to withhold similar sums from subcontractor; and permits contractor, or his assignee, to sue awarding body for alleged breach of contract. *Lujan v. G & G Fire Sprinklers, Inc.*, p. 189.

IV. Equal Protection of the Laws.

Redistricting plan.—District Court's conclusion that North Carolina violated Equal Protection Clause by using race as predominant factor in drawing its 12th Congressional District's boundaries is based on clearly erroneous findings. *Easley v. Cromartie*, p. 234.

V. Freedom of Speech.

1. *Illegally intercepted communication—Disclosure of contents.*—Respondent news media's disclosure of contents of an illegally intercepted cell phone conversation about a public issue is protected by First Amendment. *Bartnicki v. Vopper*, p. 514.

2. *Inmate communication—Right to provide legal assistance to fellow inmates.*—Inmates do not have such a special First Amendment right that enhances protections otherwise available under *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U. S. 78, in which this Court held that restrictions on prisoners' communications to other inmates are constitutional if restrictions are reasonably related to legitimate penological interests. *Shaw v. Murphy*, p. 223.

VI. Privilege Against Self-Incrimination.

1. *Admission of psychiatric evidence—Uncounseled interview.*—Admission into evidence at Penry's capital sentencing hearing of statements from a psychiatric report based on an uncounseled interview with Penry did not run afoul of Fifth Amendment's privilege against self-incrimination. *Penry v. Johnson*, p. 782.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

2. *Effect of innocence assertion.*—Ohio Supreme Court erred in holding that assertion of innocence deprived a witness of her Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. *Ohio v. Reiner*, p. 17.

VII. Right to Counsel.

Attachment of right—Factually related charges.—Because Sixth Amendment right to counsel is “offense specific,” it does not necessarily extend to crimes that are “factually related” to those actually charged. *Texas v. Cobb*, p. 162.

VIII. Searches and Seizures.

1. *Inventory search incident to arrest—Officer’s subjective motivation.*—Arkansas Supreme Court’s ruling—that evidence obtained during an inventory search of respondent’s car incident to respondent’s arrest should be suppressed because police officer had an improper subjective motivation for stop—cannot be squared with holding in *Whren v. United States*, 517 U.S. 806, that subjective intentions play no role in Fourth Amendment analysis. *Arkansas v. Sullivan*, p. 769.

2. *State hospital—Maternity patients—Diagnostic tests as evidence for law enforcement purposes.*—A state hospital’s performance of drug tests to obtain evidence of maternity patients’ cocaine use for law enforcement purposes is an unreasonable search if patients have not consented to procedure; interest in using threat of criminal sanctions to deter such use cannot justify a departure from general rule that an official nonconsensual search is unconstitutional if not authorized by a valid warrant. *Ferguson v. Charleston*, p. 67.

3. *Warrantless arrest—Minor criminal offense.*—Fourth Amendment does not forbid a warrantless arrest for a minor criminal offense, such as a misdemeanor seatbelt violation punishable only by a fine. *Atwater v. Lago Vista*, p. 318.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.

Marijuana—Medical necessity exception.—There is no medical necessity exception to Act’s prohibitions on manufacturing and distributing marijuana. *United States v. Oakland Cannabis Buyers’ Cooperative*, p. 483.

CORPORATIONS. See **Taxes**, 1.

COURTS OF APPEALS. See **Appeals**; **Arbitration**, 1; **Punitive Damages**; **United States Sentencing Commission Guidelines**.

CRIMINAL LAW. See **Constitutional Law**, II; III, 1, 2; VI–VIII; **Habeas Corpus**; **United States Sentencing Commission Guidelines**.

CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

DEATH PENALTY. See **Constitutional Law**, II; III, 1.

DEFERENTIAL REVIEW STANDARD. See **Punitive Damages**; **United States Sentencing Commission Guidelines**.

DE NOVO REVIEW STANDARD. See **Punitive Damages**; **United States Sentencing Commission Guidelines**.

DISABILITIES. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**.

DISCLOSURE OF ILLEGALLY INTERCEPTED COMMUNICATION.
See **Constitutional Law**, V, 1.

DISCLOSURE OF INTER- OR INTRA-AGENCY DOCUMENTS. See **Freedom of Information Act**.

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE, COLOR, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 1; **Constitutional Law**, IV.

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEX. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 2.

DISMISSAL OF APPEALS. See **Appeals**.

DISPARATE IMPACT REGULATIONS. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 1.

DISTRICT COURTS. See **Appeals**.

DIVORCE. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

DRUGS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 2; **Controlled Substances Act**.

DUE PROCESS. See **Constitutional Law**, III; **Punitive Damages**.

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.

Pre-emption of state law—Revocation of beneficiary designation upon divorce.—Washington statute providing that designation of a spouse as beneficiary of a nonprobate asset is revoked automatically upon divorce is expressly pre-empted by ERISA to extent it applies to ERISA plans. *Egelhoff v. Egelhoff*, p. 141.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 2; **Civil Rights Act of 1991**; **Federal Arbitration Act**; **Labor**.

EMPLOYMENT CONTRACTS. See **Federal Arbitration Act**.

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 2; **Civil Rights Act of 1991**.

ENHANCEMENT OF SENTENCES. See **Habeas Corpus.**

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

ESTOPPEL. See **Boundaries.**

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES. See **Prisoners.**

FAIR HOUSING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1988. See **Attorney's Fees.**

FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT.

Exemption from coverage—Employment contracts.—Section 1 of FAA—which excludes from that Act's coverage "contracts of employment of seamen, railroad employees, or any other class of workers engaged in foreign or interstate commerce"—exempts employment contracts of transportation workers, but not other employment contracts. *Circuit City Stores v. Adams*, p. 105.

FEDERAL COURTS. See **Appeals; Arbitration, 1; Punitive Damages; United States Sentencing Commission Guidelines.**

FEDERAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTION ACT. See **Constitutional Law, I; Taxes, 2.**

FEDERAL JUDGES. See **Constitutional Law, I.**

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1077.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1085.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; Habeas Corpus.**

FEDERAL TAXES. See **Constitutional Law, I; Taxes.**

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ACT. See **Taxes, 2.**

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

FINAL JUDGMENTS. See **Jurisdiction.**

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

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

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

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.

Exemption for inter- or intra-agency memorandums or letters—Documents addressing tribal interests.—Documents passing between Indian Tribes and Interior Department addressing tribal interests subject to state and federal water-allocation proceedings are not exempt from disclosure as “inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters” under FOIA Exemption 5. *Department of Interior v. Klamath Water Users Protective Assn.*, p. 1.

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

FRONT PAY. See **Civil Rights Act of 1991**.

FUTURE DANGEROUSNESS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

GOLF. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**.

HABEAS CORPUS.

1. *Sentence enhancements—Validity of prior convictions.*—Petitioner, having failed to pursue available remedies to challenge his prior state convictions while in custody on those convictions, may not now use a 28 U. S. C. § 2255 motion to vacate, set aside, or correct a federal sentence enhanced by those convictions to collaterally attack convictions. *Daniels v. United States*, p. 374.

2. *Sentence enhancements—Validity of prior convictions.*—Title 28 U. S. C. § 2254 does not provide a remedy when a state prisoner challenges a current sentence on ground that it was enhanced based on an allegedly unconstitutional prior conviction for which petitioner is no longer in custody. *Lackawanna County District Attorney v. Coss*, p. 394.

HIGHWAY SIGNS. See **Trademark Act of 1946**.

HOSPITAL PROCEDURES. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 2.

HOTEL OCCUPANCY TAXES. See **Taxes**, 3.

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Arbitration**, 2.

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

INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. See **Labor**.

INDIANS. See **Arbitration**, 2; **Taxes**, 3; **Freedom of Information Act**.

INMATES' RIGHT TO PROVIDE LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO FELLOW PRISONERS. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2.

INNOCENCE ASSERTION. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2.

INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATION. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 1.

INVENTORY SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

JURISDICTION.

Supreme Court—Final judgment.—Because judgment below was not “[f]inal” within meaning of 28 U. S. C. §1257(a), this Court lacks jurisdiction to decide question on which certiorari was granted. *Florida v. Thomas*, p. 774.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, II; III, 1.

LABOR. See also **Arbitration**, 1.

National Labor Relations Act—Supervisory status.—Burden of proving supervisory status in a representation hearing and unfair-labor-practice proceeding falls on respondent employer, which is party asserting supervisory status; NLRB’s test for determining supervisory status is inconsistent with Act. *NLRB v. Kentucky River Community Care, Inc.*, p. 706.

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

LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO PRISON INMATES. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2.

MAINE. See **Boundaries**.

MARIJUANA. See **Controlled Substances Act**.

MARITIME DUTY OF CARE. See **Admiralty**.

MEDICAL NECESSITY. See **Controlled Substances Act**.

MEDICARE. See **Constitutional Law**, I; **Taxes**, 2.

MITIGATING EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

MURDER. See **Constitutional Law**, II; III, 1, 2; VI, 1.

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

NATIONAL ORIGIN DISCRIMINATION. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 1.

NEW HAMPSHIRE. See **Boundaries**.

NORTH CAROLINA. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

NOTICES OF APPEAL. See **Appeals**.

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

OKLAHOMA. See **Arbitration**, 2.

PAROLE ELIGIBILITY. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

PENOLOGICAL INTERESTS. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2.

POLICE OFFICERS' SUBJECTIVE MOTIVATION. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

PRE-EMPTION. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

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

PRISONERS. See also **Constitutional Law**, V, 2.

Exhaustion of administrative remedies—Money damages.—Under 42 U. S. C. § 1997e(a), as amended by Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, an inmate seeking only money damages must complete any prison administrative process capable of addressing inmate's complaint and providing some form of relief, even if process does not make specific provision for monetary relief. *Booth v. Churner*, p. 731.

PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACT OF 1995. See **Prisoners**.

PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 1.

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

PRODUCT LOSS LIABILITY. See **Taxes**, 1.

PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT. See **Labor**.

PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACTS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3.

PUNITIVE DAMAGES.

Courts of appeals—Standard of review.—Federal courts of appeals should apply a *de novo*, not abuse-of-discretion, standard when reviewing district-court determinations of constitutionality of punitive damages awards. *Cooper Industries, Inc. v. Leatherman Tool Group, Inc.*, p. 424.

RACE DISCRIMINATION. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 1; **Constitutional Law**, IV.

REDISTRICTING PLANS. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

REPRESENTATION HEARINGS. See **Labor**.

RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF LAWS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.

REVOCATION OF BENEFICIARY DESIGNATION. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

RIGHT TO PROVIDE LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO FELLOW PRISON INMATES. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2.

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

RIGHT TO VOTE. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

ROAD SIGNS. See **Trademark Act of 1946**.

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

SEATBELT VIOLATIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 3.

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.

Securities fraud—Stock option.—A company that sells a stock option while secretly intending never to honor that option violates § 10(b) of Act, which prohibits using “any manipulative or deceptive device or contrivance” “in connection with the purchase or sale of any security.” *Wharf (Holdings) Ltd. v. United Int’l Holdings, Inc.*, p. 588.

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

SENTENCING. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1; **Habeas Corpus**; **United States Sentencing Commission Guidelines**.

SEX DISCRIMINATION. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 2.

SIGNS. See **Trademark Act of 1946**.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY. See **Constitutional Law**, I; **Taxes**, 2.

SOUTH CAROLINA. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY. See **Arbitration**, 2.

SPORTS. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**.

STATE BOUNDARIES. See **Boundaries**.

STOCK OPTIONS. See **Securities Exchange Act of 1934**.

SUBJECTIVE MOTIVATION OF POLICE OFFICERS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

SUPERVISORY STATUS. See **Labor**.

SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 1.

SUPREME COURT. See also **Jurisdiction**.

1. Amendments to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, p. 1077.
2. Amendments to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, p. 1085.

TAXES. See also **Constitutional Law**, I.

1. *Federal income tax—Affiliated corporations filing consolidated return—“Product liability loss.”*—PLL of an affiliated group of corporations electing to file a consolidated federal income tax return must be figured on a consolidated, single-entity basis, not by aggregating PLLs separately determined company by company. *United Dominion Industries, Inc. v. United States*, p. 822.

2. *Federal Insurance Contribution Act—Federal Unemployment Tax Act—Back wages.*—Back wages are subject to FICA and FUTA taxes by reference to year wages are in fact paid. *United States v. Cleveland Indians Baseball Co.*, p. 200.

3. *Tribal taxes—Nonmember activity.*—Navajo Nation's imposition of a hotel occupancy tax upon nonmembers on non-Indian fee land within its reservation is invalid. *Atkinson Trading Co. v. Shirley*, p. 645.

TENNESSEE. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.

TEXAS. See **Constitutional Law**, II; VI, 1; VII.

TITLE VI. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 1.

TITLE VII. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 2; **Civil Rights Act of 1991**.

TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.

Trade dress protection—Highway signs.—Because respondent MDI's dual-spring design mechanism for keeping road signs upright is a functional feature for which there is no trade dress protection, MDI's claim for such protection is barred. *TraFFix Devices, Inc. v. Marketing Displays, Inc.*, p. 23.

TRANSPORTATION WORKERS. See **Federal Arbitration Act**.

TRIBAL SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY. See **Arbitration**, 2.

TRIBAL TAXES. See **Taxes**, 3.

UNFAIR-LABOR-PRACTICE PROCEEDINGS. See **Labor**.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION GUIDELINES.

Consolidation of prior convictions—Standard of review.—Deferential, not *de novo*, review is appropriate when an appeals court reviews a trial court's Sentencing Guideline determination as to whether an offender's prior convictions were consolidated for sentencing purposes. *Buford v. United States*, p. 59.

VALIDITY OF CONVICTIONS. See **Habeas Corpus**.

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

WARRANTLESS ARRESTS. See **Constitutional Law**, VIII, 3.

WASHINGTON. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

WATER ALLOCATION. See **Freedom of Information Act**.

WITHHOLDING TAXES. See **Constitutional Law**, I; **Taxes**, 2.

WORDS AND PHRASES.

1. “*Any manipulative or deceptive device or contrivance*” “*in connection with the purchase or sale of any security.*” §10(b), Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U. S. C. §78j(b). *Wharf (Holdings) Ltd. v. United Int’l Holdings, Inc.*, p. 588.

2. “*Contracts of employment of seamen, railroad employees, or any other class of workers engaged in foreign or interstate commerce.*” §1, Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U. S. C. §1. *Circuit City Stores v. Adams*, p. 105.

3. “*Fundamentally alter the nature of . . . accommodation.*” Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U. S. C. §12182(b)(2)(A)(ii). *PGA TOUR, Inc. v. Martin*, p. 661.

4. “*Independent judgment.*” §2(11), National Labor Relations Act, 15 U. S. C. §152(11). *NLRB v. Kentucky River Community Care, Inc.*, p. 706.

WRONGFUL DEATH. See **Admiralty**.

“YEAR AND A DAY” RULE. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.