

INDEX

ACCOMMODATION OF DISABLED WORKER. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.**

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964; Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993; Federal Power Act; Social Security Act, 2; Telecommunications Act of 1996.**

ADULT ENTERTAINMENT ESTABLISHMENTS. See **Constitutional Law, II, 3.**

ADVERTISING. See **Constitutional Law, II, 4.**

ALIENS. See **Labor Law.**

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990.

Reasonable accommodation—Conflict with seniority rules.—An employer's showing that an "accommodation" requested under Act conflicts with seniority rules is ordinarily sufficient to show that accommodation is not "reasonable"; but employee remains free to show special circumstances making a seniority rule exception reasonable in a particular case. *US Airways, Inc. v. Barnett*, p. 391.

APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law, III, 3.**

ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law, III; Habeas Corpus.**

ATTORNEY'S FEES. See **Social Security Act, 1.**

BACKPAY AWARDS. See **Labor Law.**

BANKRUPTCY.

Tax liability—Lookback period.—Bankruptcy Code's lookback period, which provides that a discharge does not extinguish certain tax liabilities for which a return was due within three years before individual debtor's petition is filed, is tolled during pendency of a prior bankruptcy petition. *Young v. United States*, p. 43.

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

CHILD ONLINE PROTECTION ACT. See **Constitutional Law, II, 1.**

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY PREVENTION ACT OF 1996. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

Title VII—Validity of Equal Employment Opportunity Commission regulation—Verifying a discrimination charge.—Regulation permitting an otherwise timely charge filer to verify charge after filing time has expired is an unassailable interpretation of § 706 of Act and is thus valid. *Edelman v. Lynchburg College*, p. 106.

COMMERCIAL SPEECH. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 4.

COMMUNITY STANDARDS. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.

COMPUTER-GENERATED PORNOGRAPHIC IMAGES. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

I. Eminent Domain.

Development moratoria—Per se takings.—Two moratoria on development that planning agency imposed while formulating a comprehensive land-use plan for Lake Tahoe Basin did not constitute *per se* takings of property requiring compensation under Takings Clause. *Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council, Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*, p. 302.

II. Freedom of Speech.

1. *Child Online Protection Act—Harmful to minors—Community standards.*—Act's reliance on "community standards" to identify what World Wide Web material "is harmful to minors" does not by itself render statute substantially overbroad for First Amendment purposes. *Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union*, p. 564.

2. *Child Pornography Prevention Act of 1996—Virtual pornography.*—Act's provisions prohibiting "any visual depiction" that "is, or appears to be, of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct," as well as any sexually explicit image "advertised, promoted, presented, described, or distributed in such a manner that conveys the impression" it depicts a minor engaging in such conduct, are overbroad and therefore violate First Amendment. *Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition*, p. 234.

3. *City ordinance—Ban on multiple-use adult entertainment establishments.*—Ninth Circuit's judgment striking down a Los Angeles ordinance that bans multiple-use adult entertainment establishments under *Renton v. Playtime Theatres, Inc.*, 475 U. S. 41, is reversed. *Los Angeles v. Alameda Books, Inc.*, p. 425.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

4. *Commercial speech—Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997.*—Act's prohibitions on soliciting prescriptions for, and advertising, compounded drugs are unconstitutional restrictions on commercial speech violative of First Amendment. *Thompson v. Western States Medical Center*, p. 357.

III. Right to Counsel.

1. *Conflict of interest—Trial court's inquiry.*—In order to demonstrate a Sixth Amendment violation where trial court fails to inquire into defense counsel's potential conflict of interest about which court knew or reasonably should have known, defendant must establish that conflict adversely affected counsel's performance. *Mickens v. Taylor*, p. 162.

2. *Effective assistance of counsel—Sentencing hearing.*—Respondent's claim that his counsel rendered ineffective assistance during his sentencing hearing was governed by *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668. *Bell v. Cone*, p. 685.

3. *Misdemeanor offense punishable by incarceration—Suspended sentence.*—Under *Argersinger v. Hamlin*, 407 U.S. 25, 40, a suspended sentence that may end up in actual deprivation of a person's liberty may not be imposed unless defendant was accorded "guiding hand of counsel" in prosecution for crime charged. *Alabama v. Shelton*, p. 654.

IV. States' Immunity from Suit.

1. *Federal Maritime Commission suit—Private party's complaint.*—State sovereign immunity bars Commission from adjudicating a private party's complaint against a nonconsenting State. *Federal Maritime Comm'n v. South Carolina Ports Authority*, p. 743.

2. *Telecommunications regulation—Suit against state public utilities commissions.*—Doctrine of *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123, permits telecommunication carrier's suit—which claims that state public utility commission's order requiring reciprocal compensation for telephone calls to Internet service providers is pre-empted by federal law—to go forward against state commissioners in their official capacities. *Verizon Md. Inc. v. Public Serv. Comm'n of Md.*, p. 635.

3. *Waiver of immunity—Effect of removal.*—A State waives its Eleventh Amendment immunity when it removes a case from state court to federal court. *Lapides v. Board of Regents of Univ. System of Ga.*, p. 613.

CONTINGENT-FEE AGREEMENTS. See **Social Security Act**, 1.

CREDITORS AND DEBTORS. See **Bankruptcy**.

CRIMINAL LAW. See also **Constitutional Law**, III; **Federal Courts**, 1; **Habeas Corpus**.

CRIMINAL LAW—Continued.

Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure—Withdrawal of guilty plea—Trial court's Rule 11 error.—A defendant who does not object to a trial court's error under Rule 11—which lays out steps a judge must take to ensure a knowing and voluntary guilty plea—must satisfy Rule 52(b)'s plain-error rule in order to withdraw a guilty plea; a reviewing court may look beyond plea colloquy to whole record in determining whether defendant's substantial rights were affected by Rule 11 error. *United States v. Vonn*, p. 55.

DEBTORS AND CREDITORS. See **Bankruptcy**.

DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROPERTY. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

DISABILITY BENEFITS. See **Social Security Act**.

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON DISABILITY. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**.

DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGES. See **Federal Courts**, 2.

DISTRICT COURTS. See **Federal Courts**, 2.

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

DRUG PRESCRIPTIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 4.

DRUG-RELATED ACTIVITY. See **Public Housing**.

EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1, 2; **Habeas Corpus**.

ELECTRIC UTILITY REGULATION. See **Federal Power Act**.

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

EMINENT DOMAIN. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**.

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**; **Civil Rights Act of 1964**.

ENHANCED SENTENCES. See **Federal Courts**, 1.

EQUIVALENTS DOCTRINE. See **Patent Law**.

ESTOPPEL. See **Patent Law**.

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT OF 1993.

Validity of Labor Department regulation—Failure to inform employee of rights.—Regulation requiring an employer to grant an additional 12 weeks' leave to an employee because it did not inform employee that a previous absence would be counted as part of 12 weeks' leave guaranteed by Act is contrary to Act and beyond Labor Secretary's authority. *Ragsdale v. Wolverine World Wide, Inc.*, p. 81.

FEDERAL COURTS. See also **Jurisdiction.**

1. *Jurisdiction—Omission of fact from federal indictment.*—A defective indictment does not deprive a court of jurisdiction; omission from a federal indictment of a fact that enhances statutory maximum sentence does not justify a court of appeals' vacating an enhanced sentence, even though defendant did not object in trial court. *United States v. Cotton*, p. 625.

2. *Recusal—Judge's name associated with similar suit.*—In this tobacco-products liability case, District Judge, whose name appeared erroneously, prior to his appointment to bench, on a motion to file an *amicus* brief in a similar suit against some of defendants, was not required to disqualify himself pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455(a). *Sao Paulo State of Federative Republic of Brazil v. American Tobacco Co.*, p. 229.

FEDERAL POWER ACT.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission jurisdiction—Electricity transmission.—FERC did not exceed its jurisdiction when it required electric utilities that “unbundle”—*i. e.*, separate—transmission costs from electricity costs when billing their retail consumers to transmit competitors' electricity over their lines on same terms that utilities apply to their own transmissions; and FERC's decision not to impose that requirement on utilities offering only “bundled” retail sales was a permissible policy choice. *New York v. FERC*, p. 1.

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1123.

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1139.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1147.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. See also **Criminal Law.**

Amendments to Rules, p. 1157.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Constitutional Law, IV; Jurisdiction, 2; Telecommunications Act of 1996.**

FEDERAL TAXES. See **Bankruptcy; Taxes.**

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

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION MODERNIZATION ACT OF 1997. See **Constitutional Law, II, 4.**

FRAUD. See **Securities Law.**

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

GEORGIA. See **Constitutional Law, IV, 3.**

GUILTY PLEAS. See **Criminal Law.**

HABEAS CORPUS.

Grounds for relief—Ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim.—Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals’ rejection of respondent’s claim that his counsel rendered ineffective assistance during his sentencing hearing neither was “contrary to” nor involved “an unreasonable application of clearly established Federal law” under 28 U.S.C. §2254(d)(1). *Bell v. Cone*, p. 685.

IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT OF 1986. See **Labor Law.**

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

INCOME TAXES. See **Taxes.**

INDICTMENTS. See **Federal Courts, 1.**

INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law, III, 1, 2; Habeas Corpus.**

INTERNET. See **Constitutional Law, II, 1; IV, 2; Jurisdiction, 2.**

JUDGES’ RECUSAL. See **Federal Courts, 2.**

JURISDICTION. See also **Federal Courts, 1.**

1. *Court of Appeals for Federal Circuit—Patent-law counterclaim.*—Federal Circuit cannot assert jurisdiction over a case in which complaint does not allege a claim arising under federal patent law, but answer contains a patent-law counterclaim. *Holmes Group, Inc. v. Vornado Air Circulation Systems, Inc.*, p. 826.

2. *Federal courts—Telecommunications regulation—State public utility commission order.*—Title 28 U.S.C. §1331 provides a basis for federal-court jurisdiction over a telecommunication carrier’s claim that a state public utility commission’s order requiring reciprocal compensation for telephone calls to Internet Service Providers is pre-empted by federal law. *Verizon Md. Inc. v. Public Serv. Comm’n of Md.*, p. 635.

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

LABOR LAW. See also **Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.**

Backpay award—Undocumented alien.—Federal immigration policy, as expressed in Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, foreclosed National Labor Relations Board from awarding backpay to an undocumented alien who was never legally authorized to work in United States. *Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB*, p. 137.

LAKE TAHOE. See **Constitutional Law, I.**

LANDLORD AND TENANTS. See **Public Housing.**

LAND-USE PLANS. See **Constitutional Law, I.**

LEASE TERMINATION. See **Public Housing.**

LIBERTY DEPRIVATION. See **Constitutional Law, III, 3.**

LOOKBACK PERIOD. See **Bankruptcy.**

MARITIME LAW. See **Constitutional Law, IV, 1.**

MARYLAND. See **Constitutional Law, IV, 2; Jurisdiction, 2.**

MAXIMUM SENTENCES. See **Federal Courts, 1.**

MEDICAL LEAVE. See **Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.**

NEW YORK. See **Federal Power Act.**

NORTH CAROLINA. See **Supreme Court, 7.**

PATENT LAW. See also **Jurisdiction, 1.**

Prosecution history estoppel—Doctrine of equivalents.—Prosecution history estoppel may apply to any claim amendment made to satisfy Patent Act requirements, not just to amendments made to avoid prior art, but estoppel need not bar suit against every equivalent to amended claim element. *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, p. 722.

PLAIN-ERROR RULES. See **Criminal Law.**

PLEA COLLOQUIES. See **Criminal Law.**

PORNOGRAPHY. See **Constitutional Law, II, 1–3.**

PRE-EMPTION. See **Constitutional Law, IV, 2; Jurisdiction, 2.**

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS. See **Constitutional Law, II, 4.**

PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT. See **Constitutional Law, I.**

PROPERTY RIGHTS. See **Constitutional Law, I; Taxes.**

PROSECUTION HISTORY ESTOPPEL. See **Patent Law.**

PUBLIC HOUSING.

Drug-related activity—Lease termination.—Title 42 U. S. C. § 1437d(l) (6)'s plain language unambiguously requires public housing lease terms that give local authorities discretion to terminate a tenant's lease when a member of tenant's household or a guest engages in drug-related activity, regardless of whether tenant knew, or should have known, of that activity. *Department of Housing and Urban Development v. Rucker*, p. 125.

PUBLIC UTILITIES. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2; **Jurisdiction**, 2.

RATESETTING FOR TELEPHONE SERVICE. See **Telecommunications Act of 1996.**

REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.**

REASONABLENESS OF ATTORNEY'S FEES. See **Social Security Act**, 1.

RECUSAL OF JUDGES. See **Federal Courts**, 2.

REDISTRICTING. See **Supreme Court**, 7.

REGULATORY AUTHORITY. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**; **Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993**; **Federal Power Act**; **Social Security Act**, 2; **Telecommunications Act of 1996.**

REMOVAL TO FEDERAL COURT. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 3.

RIGHT TO COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, III.

RULE 10B-5. See **Securities Law.**

SECURITIES LAW.

Securities Exchange Act of 1934—Violation of §10(b) and Rule 10b-5.—Assuming that allegations in Securities and Exchange Commission's complaint are true, respondent's alleged fraudulent conduct—selling his customer's securities and using proceeds for his own benefit without customer's knowledge or consent—was “in connection with the purchase or sale of any security” within meaning of § 10(b) of Act and SEC Rule 10b-5. *SEC v. Zandford*, p. 813.

SENIORITY SYSTEMS. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.**

SENTENCING. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2, 3; **Federal Courts**, 1; **Habeas Corpus.**

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

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.

1. *Social Security disability benefits—Attorney’s fees—Contingent-fee agreements.*—Title 42 U.S.C. § 406(b) does not displace contingent-fee agreements between Social Security benefits claimants and their counsel that are within ceiling set forth in § 406(b)(1)(A); instead it instructs courts to review for reasonableness fees yielded by those agreements. *Gisbrecht v. Barnhart*, p. 789.

2. *Social Security disability benefits—Supplemental Security Income—Validity of agency interpretations.*—Social Security Administration’s interpretations of Act’s provisions authorizing payment of Social Security disability benefits and SSI to individuals who have an “inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable . . . impairment . . . which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months,” 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(1)(A); accord, § 1382c(a)(3)(A), are lawful. *Barnhart v. Walton*, p. 212.

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

STATES’ IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME. See **Social Security Act**, 2.

SUPREME COURT.

1. Notation of the death of Justice White (retired), p. v.
2. Amendments to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, p. 1123.
3. Amendments to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, p. 1139.
4. Amendments to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, p. 1147.
5. Amendments to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, p. 1157.
6. *Certiorari improvidently granted.*—Because petitioners seek review of uncongenial findings not essential to judgment and not binding upon them in future litigation, certiorari is dismissed as improvidently granted. *Mathias v. WorldCom Technologies, Inc.*, p. 682.
7. *Stay—Invalidation of state redistricting plan.*—Application of North Carolina officials to stay a State Supreme Court decision invalidating 2001 state legislative redistricting plan under State Constitution is denied. *Bartlett v. Stephenson*, p. 1301 (REHNQUIST, C. J., in chambers).

TAKING OF PROPERTY. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

TAXES. See **Bankruptcy.**

Federal income taxes—Tax lien—Transfer of property owned as tenants in the entirety.—Michigan law gives a tenant by the entirety individual rights in an estate sufficient to constitute “property” or “rights to property” to which a federal tax lien may attach under 26 U. S. C. § 6321. *United States v. Craft*, p. 274.

TAX LIENS. See **Taxes.****TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.**

Federal Communications Commission authority—Telephone service—Ratesetting.—FCC can require state utility commissions to set rates charged for leased telecommunications network elements on a forward-looking basis untied to network owners’ investment, and can require those owners to combine such elements upon request of a leasing competitor that cannot do combining itself. *Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC*, p. 467.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS REGULATION. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2; **Jurisdiction**, 2; **Telecommunications Act of 1996.****TELEPHONE SERVICE.** See **Telecommunications Act of 1996.****TENNESSEE.** See **Habeas Corpus.****TERMINATION OF PUBLIC HOUSING LEASES.** See **Public Housing.****TITLE VII.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964.****TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRICITY.** See **Federal Power Act.****UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS.** See **Labor Law.****UTILITY REGULATION.** See **Federal Power Act.****VERIFICATION OF TITLE VII DISCRIMINATION CHARGES.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964.****VIRTUAL PORNOGRAPHY.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.**VOTING RIGHTS.** See **Supreme Court**, 7.**WAIVER OF IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 3.**WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY PLEAS.** See **Criminal Law.****WORDS AND PHRASES.**

1. “*Any drug-related criminal activity.*” Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, 42 U. S. C. § 1437d(l)(6). *Department of Housing and Urban Development v. Rucker*, p. 125.

WORDS AND PHRASES—Continued.

2. “*Charge.*” § 706(e)(1), Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U. S. C. § 2000e–5(e)(1). *Edelman v. Lynchburg College*, p. 106.

3. “*Conveys the impression.*” Child Pornography Prevention Act of 1996, 18 U. S. C. § 2256(8)(D). *Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition*, p. 234.

4. “*Harmful to minors*”; “*contemporary community standards.*” Child Online Protection Act, 47 U. S. C. § 231(e)(6). *Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union*, p. 564.

5. “*Inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable . . . impairment . . . which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months.*” § 223(d)(1)(A), Social Security Act, 42 U. S. C. § 423(d)(1)(A). *Barnhart v. Walton*, p. 212.

6. “*In connection with the purchase or sale of any security.*” § 10(b), Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U. S. C. § 78j(b). *SEC v. Zandford*, p. 813.

7. “*Property and rights to property.*” Internal Revenue Code, 26 U. S. C. § 6321. *United States v. Craft*, p. 274.

8. “*Reasonable accommodatio[n].*” Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U. S. C. § 12112(b)(5)(A). *US Airways, Inc. v. Barnett*, p. 391.

WORLD WIDE WEB. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.