

INDEX

- ADMINISTRATIVE LAW.** See **Merit Systems Protection Board.**
- ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDY EXHAUSTION.** See **Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1965.**
- AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967.** See **Employment Discrimination**, 3.
- AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990.** See **Employment Discrimination**, 1, 2.
- ARBITRATION.** See **Employment Discrimination**, 1.
- ARIZONA.** See **Supreme Court**, 2.
- ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** See **Supreme Court**, 2.
- AUTOMOBILE SEARCHES.** See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.
- BIVENS-TYPE CAUSES OF ACTION.**
Damages action—Private entities acting under color of federal law.—
Limited holding in *Bivens v. Six Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents*, 403 U.S. 388, may not be extended to confer a right of action for damages against private entities acting under color of federal law, such as petitioner operator of a halfway house under a Bureau of Prisons contract. *Correctional Services Corp. v. Malesko*, p. 61.
- BORDER PATROL.** See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.
- BUREAU OF PRISONS.** See *Bivens-Type Causes of Action.*
- CABLE TELEVISION.** See **Pole Attachments Act.**
- CAPITAL MURDER.** See **Constitutional Law**, I, 1.
- CAR SEARCHES.** See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.
- CERTIFIED QUESTION.** See **Supreme Court**, 2.
- CERTIORARI.** See **Supreme Court**, 3.
- CIVIL COMMITMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, I, 3.
- CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.** See **Employment Discrimination**, 3.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ACT OF 1978. See **Merit Systems Protection Board.**

COAL INDUSTRY RETIREE HEALTH BENEFIT ACT OF 1992.

Out-of-business coal operators—Assignment of retired miners to successors in interest.—Act does not permit Social Security Commissioner to assign retired miners to successors in interest of out-of-business coal operators that signed collective-bargaining agreements requiring contributions to 1950 or 1974 Benefits Plans for miners. *Barnhart v. Sigmon Coal Co.*, p. 438.

COAST GUARD. See **Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.**

COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS. See **Coal Industry Retiree Health Benefit Act of 1992; Merit Systems Protection Board.**

COLOR OF FEDERAL LAW. See ***Bivens-Type Causes of Action.***

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Supreme Court**, 2, 3.

I. Due Process.

1. *Death penalty—Jury instructions.*—Petitioner was entitled to a jury instruction that he would be ineligible for parole under a life sentence when his jury was deciding whether to recommend death or life imprisonment. *Kelly v. South Carolina*, p. 246.

2. *Forfeiture notice—Mailing to prisoner.*—Government's notice of cash forfeiture sent by certified mail to petitioner's place of incarceration satisfied due process. *Dusenbery v. United States*, p. 161.

3. *State Sexually Violent Predator Act—Civil commitment of sexual offenders.*—*Kansas v. Hendricks*, 521 U.S. 346, set forth no requirement that a dangerous sexual offender have a *total* or *complete* lack of control to civilly commit him under Kansas' law, but Constitution does not permit such commitment without any lack-of-control determination. *Kansas v. Crane*, p. 407.

II. Freedom of Speech.

Public forum—Time, place, and manner restriction.—A content-neutral time, place, and manner permit scheme regulating speech in a public forum need not contain procedural safeguards described in *Freedman v. Maryland*, 380 U.S. 51. *Thomas v. Chicago Park Dist.*, p. 316.

III. Searches and Seizures.

1. *Stop by border patrol—Reasonable suspicion.*—Considering totality of circumstances and giving due weight to factual inferences drawn by a border patrol agent and a District Court Judge, agent had reasonable suspicion to believe that respondent was engaged in illegal activity when he

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

was stopped while driving on an unpaved road in a remote area of southeastern Arizona. *United States v. Arvizu*, p. 266.

2. *Warrantless search—Probation condition.*—Warrantless search of petitioner, supported by reasonable suspicion and authorized by a condition of his probation that he submit to search at anytime, satisfied Fourth Amendment. *United States v. Knights*, p. 112.

CRIMINAL LAW. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 1; III.

DEATH PENALTY. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 1.

DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION. See **Employment Discrimination**, 1, 2.

DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROGRAM. See **Supreme Court**, 3.

DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS. See **Merit Systems Protection Board**.

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON AGE. See **Employment Discrimination**, 3.

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON DISABILITY. See **Employment Discrimination**, 1, 2.

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON NATIONAL ORIGIN. See **Employment Discrimination**, 3.

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE. See **Supreme Court**, 3.

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

EDUCATION RECORDS. See **Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974**.

EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Supreme Court**, 2.

ELEVENTH AMENDMENT. See **Jurisdiction**.

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.

Enforcement action—Reimbursement provision.—Because petitioners in this action to enforce an ERISA plan's reimbursement provision by requiring respondents to pay third-party recovery proceeds to plan are seeking legal relief, this suit is not authorized by ERISA § 502(a)(3), which prescribes a suit for "appropriate equitable relief." *Great-West Life & Annuity Ins. Co. v. Knudson*, p. 204.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; Employment Discrimination; Merit Systems Protection Board.**

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION.

1. *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990—Effect of arbitration agreement on Equal Employment Opportunity Commission actions for judicial relief.*—An agreement between an employer and an employee to arbitrate employment-related disputes does not bar EEOC from pursuing victim-specific judicial relief, such as backpay, reinstatement, and damages, in an action to enforce Title I of ADA. *EEOC v. Waffle House, Inc.*, p. 279.

2. *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990—Limitation of major life activities.*—Sixth Circuit did not apply proper standard in determining that respondent was disabled under ADA where it analyzed only a limited class of manual tasks and failed to ask whether respondent's impairments prevented or restricted her from performing tasks that are of central importance to most people's daily lives. *Toyota Motor Mfg., Ky., Inc. v. Williams*, p. 184.

3. *Civil Rights Act of 1964—Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967—Pleading standard for complaint.*—A complaint in an employment discrimination lawsuit need not contain specific facts establishing a prima facie case of discrimination under framework set forth in *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792, but instead must contain only “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,” Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 8(a)(2). *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N. A.*, p. 506.

EQUITABLE RELIEF. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES. See **Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1965.**

FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.

Limitations period—Exception to 2-year rule.—Act's statute of limitations—which requires an action to be brought “within two years from the date on which the liability arises, except that where a defendant has . . . willfully misrepresented any information required . . . to be disclosed to [the plaintiff] and the information . . . is material to [a claim under the Act], the action may be brought at any time within two years after” the plaintiff discovers the misrepresentation, 15 U.S.C. §1681p—is not governed by a general rule that limitations period begins to run when a plaintiff knows or has reason to know that she was injured. *TRW Inc. v. Andrews*, p. 19.

FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT OF 1974.

Education records release—Peer grading.—Peer grading—where students score each other's tests, papers, and assignments as teacher explains correct answers—does not violate Act's prohibition on release of education records without parental consent. *Owasso Independent School Dist. No. I-011 v. Falvo*, p. 426.

FEDERAL EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Merit Systems Protection Board**.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE. See **Employment Discrimination**, 3.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Habeas Corpus**.

FEDERAL TAXES. See **Indian Gaming Regulatory Act**.

FIFTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 2.

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

FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 2.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 1, 3.

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

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

GAMBLING. See **Indian Gaming Regulatory Act**.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Merit Systems Protection Board**.

GRIEVANCE PROCEEDINGS. See **Merit Systems Protection Board**.

HABEAS CORPUS. See also **Supreme Court**.

State grounds adequate to bar federal review.—Two Missouri procedural Rules, as injected into this case by state appellate court, did not constitute state grounds adequate to bar federal habeas review of merits of petitioner's federal constitutional claim. *Lee v. Kemna*, p. 362.

HEALTH CARE BENEFITS. See **Coal Industry Retiree Health Benefit Act of 1992**.

HIGH-SPEED INTERNET ACCESS. See **Pole Attachments Act**.

HIGHWAY PROJECTS. See **Supreme Court**, 3.

INDIAN GAMING REGULATORY ACT.

Exemption from federal gambling-related taxes.—Title 25 U.S.C. §2719(d)(i) does not exempt tribes from paying gambling-related taxes imposed by Internal Revenue Code chapter 35. *Chickasaw Nation v. United States*, p. 84.

INMATE LAWSUITS. See **Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1965.**

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE. See **Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.**

INTERNET ACCESS. See **Pole Attachments Act.**

JURISDICTION. See also **Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.**

Supplemental jurisdiction—Suit against nonconsenting State—Tolling of limitations period.—Title 28 U. S. C. § 1367(d), which purports to toll statute of limitations for supplemental state-law claims while they are pending in federal court and for 30 days after they are dismissed, does not apply to claims against nonconsenting state defendants that are dismissed on Eleventh Amendment grounds. *Raygor v. Regents of Univ. of Minn.*, p. 533.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS. See **Constitutional Law, I, 1.**

KANSAS. See **Constitutional Law, I, 3.**

LABOR. See **Merit Systems Protection Board.**

LEGAL RELIEF. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

LIMITATIONS PERIODS. See **Fair Credit Reporting Act; Jurisdiction.**

MARINE CASUALTIES. See **Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.**

MEDICAID. See **Social Security Act.**

MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE ACT OF 1988. See **Social Security Act.**

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD.

Federal Government employees—Termination and disciplinary actions—Review of prior disciplinary actions.—When reviewing termination and other serious disciplinary actions under Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, Board may review independently prior disciplinary actions pending in collectively bargained grievance proceedings. *Postal Service v. Gregory*, p. 1.

MINERS BENEFITS. See **Coal Industry Retiree Health Benefit Act of 1992.**

MINNESOTA. See **Jurisdiction.**

MISSOURI. See **Habeas Corpus.**

MURDER. See **Constitutional Law, I, 1.**

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1970.

Pre-emption of jurisdiction—Barge as a “workplace.”—Occupational Safety and Health Administration’s jurisdiction to issue citations to respondent barge owner for violations stemming from an explosion on board was not pre-empted by Coast Guard under §4(b)(1) of Act; and barge in question was a “workplace” covered by Act. *Chao v. Mallard Bay Drilling, Inc.*, p. 235.

OHIO. See **Supreme Court.**

PARENTS AND CHILDREN. See **Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974.**

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

PATENTS.

Utility patents—Plants.—Utility patents may be issued for newly developed plant breeds under 35 U. S. C. § 101; neither Plant Variety Protection Act nor Plant Patent Act of 1930 limits scope of § 101’s coverage. *J. E. M. Ag Supply, Inc. v. Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc.*, p. 124.

PEER GRADING. See **Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974.**

PLANT PATENT ACT OF 1930. See **Patents.**

PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION ACT. See **Patents.**

POLE ATTACHMENTS ACT.

Rate regulation—Attachments for high-speed Internet access and wireless telecommunications.—Act authorizes Federal Communications Commission to regulate rates that utilities charge for attachments providing high-speed Internet access at same time as cable television and for attachments providing wireless telecommunications. *National Cable & Telecommunications Assn., Inc. v. Gulf Power Co.*, p. 327.

PRISONERS. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 2.

PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACT OF 1965.

Inmate lawsuits—Exhaustion of administrative remedies.—Act’s exhaustion-of-administrative-remedies requirement applies to all inmate suits about prison life, whether they involve general circumstances or particular episodes, and whether they allege corrections officers’ use of excessive force or some other wrong. *Porter v. Nussle*, p. 516.

PRIVACY RIGHTS. See **Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974.**

PRIVATE ENTITIES ACTING UNDER COLOR OF FEDERAL LAW.
See *Bivens-Type Causes of Action.*

PROBATION CONDITIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.

PUBLIC FORUMS. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

RACE DISCRIMINATION. See **Supreme Court**, 3.

REASONABLE SUSPICION. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS. See **Coal Industry Retiree Health Benefit Act of 1992**.

RIGHT TO COUNSEL. See **Supreme Court**, 2.

RIGHT TO PRIVACY. See **Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974**.

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

SEXUALLY VIOLENT PREDATOR ACT. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 3.

SIXTH AMENDMENT. See **Supreme Court**, 2.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.

Medicaid—Spousal impoverishment—Income and resource allocation.—Wisconsin Medicaid statute’s “income-first” prescription requiring that potential income transfers from an institutionalized spouse to a spouse living at home be considered in determining whether to increase latter’s “Community Spouse Resource Allowance” is a permissible interpretation of federal Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, which permits community spouses to reserve income and assets to meet their maintenance needs when institutionalized spouses become eligible for Medicaid. Wisconsin Dept. of Health and Family Servs. v. Blumer, p. 473.

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

STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS. See **Fair Credit Reporting Act; Jurisdiction**.

SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION. See **Jurisdiction**.

SUPREME COURT.

1. Appointment and presentation of Pamela Talkin as Marshal, pp. v, 801.

2. *Certified question—Determining state-law predicate.*—To help this Court determine proper state-law predicate for determining federal constitutional questions raised in this case, following question is certified to Arizona Supreme Court: At time of respondent’s third petition for post-conviction relief under Ariz. Rule Crim. Proc. 32, did question whether an ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim was of “sufficient constitutional magnitude” to require a knowing, voluntary, and intelligent waiver for

SUPREME COURT—Continued.

purposes of Rule 32.2(a)(3) depend upon particular claim's merits or merely upon particular right alleged to have been violated? *Stewart v. Smith*, p. 157.

3. *Certiorari—Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program.*—Certiorari is dismissed as improvidently granted because petitioner now challenges statutes and regulations pertaining to Department of Transportation's direct procurement of highway construction on federal lands when Tenth Circuit considered only constitutionality of DOT's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program as it pertains to using federal funds for state and local highway projects. *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Mineta*, p. 103.

4. *Stay—Habeas corpus relief—Death-row inmate.*—Warden's application to stay District Court proceedings that would develop a factual record to determine if an Ohio death-row inmate should be permitted to file a second federal habeas petition is denied. *Bagley v. Byrd*, p. 1301 (STEVENS, J., in chambers).

TAXES. See **Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.**

TELECOMMUNICATIONS. See **Pole Attachments Act.**

TIME, PLACE, AND MANNER RESTRICTIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

TOLLING OF LIMITATIONS PERIODS. See **Jurisdiction.**

UTILITY PATENTS. See **Patents.**

UTILITY REGULATION. See **Pole Attachments Act.**

WARRANTLESS SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.

WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS. See **Pole Attachments Act.**

WISCONSIN. See **Social Security Act.**

WORDS AND PHRASES.

1. "*Appropriate equitable relief.*" § 502(a)(3), Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, 29 U. S. C. § 1132(a)(3). *Great-West Life & Annuity Ins. Co. v. Knudson*, p. 204.

2. "*Date on which the liability arises.*" Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U. S. C. § 1681p. *TRW Inc. v. Andrews*, p. 19.

3. "*Substantially limits . . . major life activities.*" Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U. S. C. § 12102(2)(A). *Toyota Motor Mfg., Ky., Inc. v. Williams*, p. 184.

WORDS AND PHRASES—Continued.

4. “*Workplace*.” § 4(a), Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, 29 U. S. C. § 653(a). *Chao v. Mallard Bay Drilling, Inc.*, p. 235.

WORKPLACE SAFETY. See **Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.**