

## INDEX

---

### **ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT.**

*Stewardship of public lands—Off-road vehicle damage.*—Bureau of Land Management's alleged failures to protect Utah public lands from environmental damage caused by off-road vehicles are not remediable under APA. *Norton v. Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance*, p. 55.

**AGGRAVATING FACTORS.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 6.

**ALIEN TORT STATUTE.** See **Torts**.

**ANTITRUST.** See also **Evidence**.

*Sherman Act—Price fixing—Independent adverse foreign effect.*—Where price-fixing conduct significantly and adversely affects customers outside and within United States, but adverse foreign effect is independent of any adverse domestic effect, exception to Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act of 1982—which excludes from Sherman Act's reach most anticompetitive conduct causing only foreign injury—does not apply, and thus, neither does Sherman Act, to a claim based solely on foreign effect. *F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd v. Empagran S. A.*, p. 155.

**ARIZONA.** See **Taxes**.

**ARTICLE III.** See **Constitutional Law**, V.

**ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

### **BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2002.**

*Injunction barring enforcement—Appeal pending.*—Applicant's request for an injunction pending appeal barring enforcement of BCRA §203—which bans corporations from using general treasury funds to finance certain electioneering communications and which petitioner claims violates First Amendment as applied to petitioner's advertisements—is denied. *Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc. v. Federal Election Comm'n (REHNQUIST, C. J., in chambers)*, p. 1305.

**CALIFORNIA.** See **Constitutional Law**, V.

**CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM.** See **Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002**.

**CAPITAL MURDER.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1, 5, 6.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

**CHILD ONLINE PROTECTION ACT.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.

**CITIZEN'S DETENTION AS ENEMY COMBATANT.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2; **Jurisdiction**, 2.

**CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.**

*Title VII—Constructive discharge based on sexual harassment.*—To establish “constructive discharge” violative of Title VII, a plaintiff alleging sexual harassment must show that abusive working environment became so intolerable that her resignation qualified as a fitting response; her employer may defend by showing both (1) that it had a readily accessible and effective policy for reporting and resolving sexual harassment complaints, and (2) that plaintiff unreasonably failed to avail herself of that apparatus; but this affirmative defense will not be available if plaintiff quit in reasonable response to an adverse action officially changing her employment status or situation, *e. g.*, a humiliating demotion, extreme cut in pay, or transfer to a position in which she would face unbearable working conditions. *Pennsylvania State Police v. Suders*, p. 129.

**COLORADO.** See **Stays**.

**COMMISSION OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES.** See **Evidence**.

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

**CONFESSIONS.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.

**CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.**

**I. Freedom of Speech.**

*Child Online Protection Act—Injunction.*—Third Circuit correctly affirmed District Court's ruling that COPA's enforcement should be enjoined because statute likely violates First Amendment. *Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union*, p. 656.

**II. Privilege Against Self-Incrimination.**

1. *Miranda warnings—Confession secured by police use of unwarned statements.*—Missouri Supreme Court's judgment that respondent's confession should have been suppressed where police secured a confession before giving *Miranda* warnings, then gave warnings and used earlier confession to secure a postwarning confession, is affirmed. *Missouri v. Seibert*, p. 600.

2. *Miranda warnings—Suppression of fruit of unwarned statement.*—Tenth Circuit's decision that respondent's pistol should be suppressed as fruit of police's failure to give respondent his *Miranda* warnings is reversed, and case is remanded. *United States v. Patane*, p. 630.

**CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.**

3. *State stop and identify statute—Refusal to comply.*—Hiibel's conviction for refusing to identify himself to a police officer during an investigative stop as required by Nevada's "stop and identify" statute does not violate Fifth Amendment's prohibition on self-incrimination. *Hiibel v. Sixth Judicial Dist. Court of Nev., Humboldt Cty.*, p. 177.

**III. Right to Jury Trial.**

*Sentencing—Enhancement based on judicial determination.*—Because facts supporting petitioner's exceptional sentence were neither admitted by petitioner nor found by a jury, but were found by judge, that sentence violated his Sixth Amendment right to trial by jury. *Blakely v. Washington*, p. 296.

**IV. Searches and Seizures.**

*State stop and identify statute—Refusal to comply with requirement.*—Hiibel's conviction for refusing to identify himself to a police officer during an investigative stop as required by Nevada's "stop and identify" statute does not violate Fourth Amendment. *Hiibel v. Sixth Judicial Dist. Court of Nev., Humboldt Cty.*, p. 177.

**V. Standing.**

*Noncustodial parent's suit as next friend of minor child—Challenge to recitation of Pledge of Allegiance.*—Because California law deprives respondent atheist of right to sue on behalf of his elementary school daughter as next friend, he lacks prudential standing to bring a federal constitutional challenge to petitioner school district's policy requiring elementary classes to recite daily Pledge of Allegiance containing words "under God." *Elk Grove Unified School Dist. v. Newdow*, p. 1.

**CONSTRUCTIVE DISCHARGE.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964.**

**CRIMINAL LAW.** See also **Constitutional Law**, II–IV; **Stays.**

*Guilty plea—Error in plea colloquy.*—To obtain relief for District Court's plea colloquy failure to mention that respondent could not withdraw his guilty plea if court did not accept Government's sentence recommendations, Fed. Rule Crim. Proc. 11(c)(3)(B), respondent must show a reasonable probability that, but for court's error, he would not have pleaded guilty. *United States v. Dominguez Benitez*, p. 74.

**CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

**DAMAGES FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.** See **Torts.**

**DETENTION OF ENEMY COMBATANTS.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2; **Jurisdiction.**

**DISCOVERY.** See **Evidence; Mandamus.**

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

**DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964.**

**EIGHTH AMENDMENT.** See **Habeas Corpus, 1.**

**ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS.** See **Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002.**

**ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.** See **Constitutional Law, V.**

**EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.**

*Health care benefits—Wrongful benefits denials—Pre-emption.*—Respondents' state suits seeking to rectify allegedly wrongful benefits denials by their health maintenance organizations fall within ERISA § 502(a)(1)(B) and are therefore completely pre-empted by ERISA § 502 and removable to federal court. *Aetna Health Inc. v. Davila*, p. 200.

**EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964.**

**EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964.**

**ENEMY COMBATANTS.** See **Habeas Corpus, 2; Jurisdiction.**

**ENHANCED SENTENCES.** See **Constitutional Law, III.**

**ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE TO PUBLIC LANDS.** See **Administrative Procedure Act.**

**ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION.** See **Constitutional Law, V; Taxes.**

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES.** See **Evidence.**

**EVIDENCE.**

*Discovery—Antitrust investigation in Europe.*—Title 28 U. S. C. § 1782(a)—which provides that a federal district court “may order” a person found or residing in district to give testimony or produce documents “for use in a proceeding in a foreign or international tribunal . . . upon the application of any interested person”—authorizes, but does not require, District Court to provide discovery aid to respondent, complainant in Commission of European Communities' antitrust investigation. *Intel Corp. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*, p. 241.

**EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE.** See **Mandamus.**

**FEDERAL COURTS.** See **Criminal Law; Habeas Corpus, 2; Jurisdiction; Mandamus.**

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

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

**FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT.** See **Torts.**

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

**FIRST AMENDMENT.** See **Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002; Constitutional Law, I; V; Stays; Taxes.**

**FOREIGN NATIONALS' DETENTION AS ENEMY COMBATANTS.**  
See **Jurisdiction, 1.**

**FOREIGN TRADE ANTITRUST IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1982.**  
See **Antitrust.**

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

**FREEDOM OF SPEECH.** See **Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002; Constitutional Law, I.**

**FREEDOM OF THE PRESS.** See **Stays.**

**FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION.** See **Constitutional Law, V.**

**FRUIT OF UNWARNED STATEMENT.** See **Constitutional Law, II, 2.**

**GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL BASE.** See **Jurisdiction, 1.**

**GUILTY PLEAS.** See **Criminal Law.**

**HABEAS CORPUS.** See also **Jurisdiction.**

1. *Certificate of appealability—Texas capital sentencing scheme—Mitigating IQ evidence.*—Because “reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of [petitioner’s] constitutional claims debatable or wrong,” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U. S. 473, 484, a certificate of appealability should have issued on petitioner’s habeas claim that Texas capital sentencing scheme violated Eighth Amendment by not giving full effect to his low IQ evidence. *Tennard v. Dretke*, p. 274.

2. *Citizen captured abroad—Detention as enemy combatant.*—Fourth Circuit’s decision ordering dismissal of habeas petition of Hamdi—a citizen captured in Afghanistan challenging his detention as an enemy combatant—is vacated, and case is remanded. *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, p. 507.

3. *Ineffective assistance of counsel claim—Unreasonable application of state law—Standard of proof.*—Sixth Circuit erred in finding state court’s application of *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U. S. 668—which requires a defendant to show a reasonable probability that, but for counsel’s errors, proceeding’s result would have been different—unreasonable on

**HABEAS CORPUS**—Continued.

basis of evidence not properly before state court, and in holding that state court acted contrary to federal law by requiring proof of prejudice by a preponderance of evidence rather than by a reasonable probability. *Holland v. Jackson*, p. 649.

4. *Pro se petitioner—Dismissal—Required warnings.*—District Court did not err in dismissing, pursuant to *Rose v. Lundy*, 455 U. S. 509, a *pro se* petitioner's mixed habeas petitions—*i. e.*, petitions with both exhausted and unexhausted claims—without giving him certain warnings directed by Ninth Circuit. *Piler v. Ford*, p. 225.

5. *Retroactivity—Capital sentencing scheme—Disregarding mitigating factors.*—*Mills v. Maryland*, 486 U. S. 367—in which this Court invalidated a capital sentencing scheme requiring juries to disregard mitigating factors not found unanimously—announced a new rule of constitutional criminal procedure that does not apply retroactively to cases already final on direct review. *Beard v. Banks*, p. 406.

6. *Retroactivity—Capital sentencing scheme—Proving aggravating factors to a jury.*—*Ring v. Arizona*, 536 U. S. 584—in which this Court held that aggravating factors have to be proved to a jury rather than to a judge—announced a new criminal procedure rule that does not apply retroactively to cases already final on direct review. *Schiro v. Summerlin*, p. 348.

**HEALTH CARE BENEFITS.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

**HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATIONS.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

**IN CAMERA PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS.** See **Stays.**

**INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

**INJUNCTIONS.** See **Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002; Constitutional Law**, I.

**INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS.** See **Evidence.**

**INTERNET PORNOGRAPHY.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.

**IQ EVIDENCE.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

**JURISDICTION.**

1. *Habeas corpus—Foreign nationals captured abroad—Detention as enemy combatants.*—United States courts have jurisdiction to consider challenges to legality of detention of foreign nationals captured abroad during hostilities and incarcerated at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base, Cuba. *Rasul v. Bush*, p. 466.

**JURISDICTION**—Continued.

2. *Habeas corpus*—*Proper respondent*—*Citizen's detention as an enemy combatant*.—Federal District Court for Southern District of New York lacks jurisdiction over Padilla's habeas petition because person having custody over Padilla is outside that court's jurisdiction; thus, this Court does not reach question whether President has authority to detain Padilla, a United States citizen, militarily as an enemy combatant. *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, p. 426.

**JURY TRIALS.** See **Constitutional Law**, III; **Habeas Corpus**, 1, 5, 6.

**LAND MANAGEMENT.** See **Administrative Procedure Act**.

**LAW OF NATIONS.** See **Torts**.

**LOW IQ MITIGATING EVIDENCE.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

**MANDAMUS.**

*Federal Courts of Appeals*—*Narrowing discovery orders*—*Executive privilege*.—Court of Appeals erred in concluding it lacked authority to issue mandamus directing District Court to narrow its discovery orders to Government because latter could protect its rights by asserting executive privilege in lower court. *Cheney v. United States Dist. Court for D. C.*, p. 367.

**MEXICAN NATIONAL ABDUCTED FOR TRIAL IN UNITED STATES.** See **Torts**.

**MILITARY DETENTION.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2; **Jurisdiction**.

**MIRANDA WARNINGS.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1, 2.

**MISSOURI.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.

**MITIGATING FACTORS.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1, 5.

**MIXED HABEAS CLAIMS.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 4.

**NEVADA.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 3; IV.

**OFF-ROAD VEHICLES ON PUBLIC LANDS.** See **Administrative Procedure Act**.

**PARENTS AND CHILDREN.** See **Constitutional Law**, V.

**PLEA COLLOQUY.** See **Criminal Law**.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.** See **Constitutional Law**, V.

**POLICE INTERROGATION CONDUCT.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.

**PORNOGRAPHY ON INTERNET.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.

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

**PRICE FIXING.** See **Antitrust.**

**PRIMARY SCHOOLS.** See **Constitutional Law, V.**

**PRIOR RESTRAINT.** See **Stays.**

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

**PRUDENTIAL STANDING.** See **Constitutional Law, V.**

**PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT.** See **Administrative Procedure Act.**

**RAPE SHIELD LAW.** See **Stays.**

**RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL.** See **Constitutional Law, III; Habeas Corpus, 5, 6.**

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

**SCHOOLS.** See **Constitutional Law, V; Taxes.**

**SCHOOL TUITION.** See **Taxes.**

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

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

**SENTENCING.** See **Constitutional Law, III; Criminal Law; Habeas Corpus, 1, 5, 6.**

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

**SEXUAL ASSAULT.** See **Stays.**

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964.**

**SEXUALLY EXPLICIT MATERIAL ON INTERNET.** See **Constitutional Law, I.**

**SHERMAN ACT.** See **Antitrust.**

**SIXTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law, III; Habeas Corpus, 5, 6.**

**SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.** See **Torts.**

**STANDING.** See **Constitutional Law, V.**

**STAYS.**

*Sexual assault prosecution—Publication of transcripts of in camera pretrial proceedings—Restrictions under state rape shield law.—Because*



**STAYS**—Continued.

trial court has yet to decide whether to permit publication of transcripts of a sexual assault case's *in camera* pretrial proceedings and its determination as to relevancy of state rape shield law will significantly change circumstances leading to this stay application, application is denied without prejudice. *Associated Press v. District Court for Fifth Judicial Dist. of Colo.* (BREYER, J., in chambers), p. 1301.

**STEWARDSHIP OF PUBLIC LANDS.** See **Administrative Procedure Act.**

**STOP AND IDENTIFY STATUTE.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 3; IV.

**TAXES.**

*Tax Injunction Act—State tax credit for contributions to school tuition organizations—Establishment of religion.*—TIA, 28 U.S.C. §1341—which forbids federal district courts to “restrain the assessment . . . of any tax under State law where a plain, speedy and efficient remedy may be had in the courts of such State”—does not bar respondents’ suit to enjoin on Establishment Clause grounds an Arizona statute providing a tax credit for contributions to nonprofit “school tuition organizations.” *Hibbs v. Winn*, p. 88.

**TEXAS.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

**TITLE VII.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964.**

**TORTS.**

*Federal Tort Claims Act—Alien Tort statute.*—Respondent—a Mexican citizen abducted from Mexico to stand trial in United States for a federal agent’s murder, but later acquitted—may not recover damages from Federal Government for false arrest because FTCA’s exception to waiver of sovereign immunity for claims “arising in a foreign country,” 28 U.S.C. §2680(k), bars claims based on injury suffered abroad, regardless of where tortious act or omission occurred; nor may he recover damages from petitioner, one of his abductors, under Alien Tort statute for an alleged violation of law of nations. *Sosa v. Alvarez-Machain*, p. 692.

**UTAH.** See **Administrative Procedure Act.**

**VICE PRESIDENT.** See **Mandamus.**

**WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.** See **Torts.**

**WASHINGTON.** See **Constitutional Law**, III.