

INDEX

- ABUSE OF DISCRETION.** See **Courts of Appeals.**
- ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT.** See **Communications Act of 1934.**
- AGGRAVATION EVIDENCE.** See **Constitutional Law, VII.**
- ALASKA.** See **Federal-State Relations.**
- ALEXANDER ARCHIPELAGO.** See **Federal-State Relations.**
- AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990.**
Title III—Foreign-flag cruise ships.—Fifth Circuit's decision holding Title III inapplicable to foreign-flag cruise ships in U. S. waters is reversed, and case is remanded. *Spector v. Norwegian Cruise Line Ltd.*, p. 119.
- AMOUNT-IN-CONTROVERSY REQUIREMENT.** See **Jurisdiction, 1.**
- ANNUAL TRUCKING FEES.** See **Constitutional Law, II.**
- ANTITERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT OF 1996.** See **Habeas Corpus, 2, 3.**
- APPOINTED APPELLATE COUNSEL.** See **Constitutional Law, III, 1; V, 1.**
- ARTICLE III.** See **Jurisdiction, 1.**
- ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** See **Constitutional Law, V, 1; VII.**
- BATSON CLAIM.** See **Constitutional Law, V, 2, 3.**
- BREACH OF CONTRACT.** See **Immunity from Suit.**
- BROADBAND CABLE MODEM COMPANIES.** See **Communications Act of 1934.**
- BUREAU OF RECLAMATION.** See **Immunity from Suit.**
- CABLE MODEM COMPANIES.** See **Communications Act of 1934.**
- CALIFORNIA.** See **Constitutional Law, I; V, 3.**

CAPITAL MURDER. See **Constitutional Law**, VII; **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

CAPITOL GROUNDS TEN COMMANDMENTS DISPLAY. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 2.

CASE OR CONTROVERSY. See **Jurisdiction**, 1.

CERTIORARI. See **Courts of Appeals**.

COMMERCE CLAUSE. See **Constitutional Law**, I; II.

COMMON-CARRIER REGULATION. See **Communications Act of 1934**.

COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.

Common-carrier regulation—Coverage of broadband cable modem companies.—Federal Communications Commission's conclusion that broadband cable modem companies are exempt from mandatory common-carrier regulation is a lawful construction of Act under *Chevron U. S. A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U. S. 837, and Administrative Procedure Act. *National Cable & Telecommunications Assn. v. Brand X Internet Services*, p. 967.

COMPASSIONATE USE ACT. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

CONDEMNATION. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

I. Commerce Clause.

California law—Medical marijuana.—Congress' Commerce Clause power includes power to prohibit local cultivation and use of marijuana for medicinal purposes as permitted by California's Compassionate Use Act. *Gonzales v. Raich*, p. 1.

II. Discrimination Against Interstate Commerce.

1. *Trucks engaged in interstate hauling—Pre-emption of state fee.*—Title 49 U. S. C. § 14504 does not pre-empt an annual \$100 fee Michigan imposes on each Michigan license-plated truck operating entirely in interstate commerce. *Mid-Con Freight Systems, Inc. v. Michigan Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, p. 440.

2. *Trucks engaged in interstate hauling—State fee.*—Michigan's flat annual fee on trucks engaged in intrastate commercial hauling does not violate dormant Commerce Clause when applied to trucks engaging in both interstate and intrastate hauling. *American Trucking Assns., Inc. v. Michigan Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, p. 429.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.**III. Due Process.**

1. *Appointment of appellate counsel—Indigents convicted on pleas of guilty or nolo contendere.*—Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause requires appointment of counsel for defendants convicted on pleas who seek access to first-tier review in Michigan Court of Appeals. *Halbert v. Michigan*, p. 605.

2. *Prisons—Inmate classification.*—Procedures by which Ohio classifies prisoners for placement at its "Supermax" prison provide inmates with sufficient protection to comply with Fourteenth Amendment. *Wilkinson v. Austin*, p. 209.

3. *Property interest—Restraining order enforcement.*—Respondent did not, for Due Process Clause purposes, have a property interest in police enforcement of her restraining order against her husband, who had taken, and later murdered, their children. *Castle Rock v. Gonzales*, p. 748.

IV. Eminent Domain.

Public use—Condemnation of property—Development plan to revitalize city.—Respondent city's proposed condemnation of petitioners' property for use under a development plan designed to revitalize city qualifies as a "public use" within meaning of Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause. *Kelo v. New London*, p. 469.

V. Equal Protection of the Laws.

1. *Appointment of appellate counsel—Indigents convicted on pleas of guilty or nolo contendere.*—Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause requires appointment of counsel for defendants convicted on pleas of guilty or *nolo contendere* who seek first-tier review in Michigan Court of Appeals. *Halbert v. Michigan*, p. 605.

2. *Exclusion of jurors because of race—Peremptory strikes.*—Petitioner is entitled to prevail on his claim that prosecutors' peremptory strikes of potential jurors in his capital murder trial were based on race in violation of Fourteenth Amendment, and is thus entitled to federal habeas relief. *Miller-El v. Dretke*, p. 231.

3. *Exclusion of jurors because of race—Proving purposeful discrimination.*—California's "more likely than not" standard is an inappropriate yardstick by which to measure sufficiency of a *prima facie* case of purposeful discrimination in jury selection under *Batson v. Kentucky*, 476 U. S. 79. *Johnson v. California*, p. 162.

VI. Establishment of Religion.

1. *Ten Commandments—Courthouse display.*—A determination of petitioner counties' purpose in posting Ten Commandments on their courthouse walls is a sound basis for ruling on, and may be dispositive of, Establishment Clause challenges to postings; evaluation of counties' claim of

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

secular purpose for their displays' final versions should take account of displays' evolution and development. *McCreary County v. American Civil Liberties Union of Ky.*, p. 844.

2. *Ten Commandments—Display on state capitol grounds.*—Fifth Circuit's decision that Establishment Clause allows display of a monument inscribed with Ten Commandments on Texas State Capitol grounds is affirmed. *Van Orden v. Perry*, p. 677.

VII. Right to Counsel.

Effective assistance—Evaluating mitigation and aggravation evidence.—Even when a capital defendant and his family have suggested that no mitigating evidence is available, his lawyer is bound to make reasonable efforts to obtain and review material that counsel knows prosecution will probably rely on as aggravation evidence at trial's sentencing phase. *Rompilla v. Beard*, p. 374.

COPYRIGHTS.

Infringement—Distributor's liability for third-party use.—Distributor who dispenses a device with object of promoting its use to infringe copyright, as shown by clear expression or other affirmative steps taken to foster infringement, going beyond mere distribution with knowledge of third-party action, is liable for resulting acts of infringement by third parties using device, regardless of device's lawful uses. *Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc. v. Gorkster, Ltd.*, p. 913.

COURTHOUSE TEN COMMANDMENTS DISPLAY. See **Constitutional Law**, VI, 1.

COURTS OF APPEALS.

Stay of mandate—Abuse of discretion.—Assuming that Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 41 authorizes a court of appeals to stay a mandate following a denial of certiorari and that a court may stay its mandate without entering an order, Sixth Circuit's decision to do so here was an abuse of discretion. *Bell v. Thompson*, p. 794.

CRIMINAL LAW. See **Constitutional Law**, VII.

CRUISE SHIPS. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**.

DEATH SENTENCE. See **Constitutional Law**, VII; **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INTERSTATE COMMERCE. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

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

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2, 3.

DISCRIMINATION IN JURY SELECTION. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2, 3.

DISTRIBUTOR'S LIABILITY FOR THIRD-PARTY USE. See **Copy-rights**.

DIVERSITY JURISDICTION. See **Jurisdiction**, 1.

DORMANT COMMERCE CLAUSE. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

DRUGS. See **Constitutional Law**, I; **Patent Law**.

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

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

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

FALSE CLAIMS ACT.

Retaliation action—Statute of limitations.—Because FCA's statute of limitations, 31 U.S.C. §3731(b)(1), does not govern §3730(h) actions brought by an individual retaliated against by his employer for assisting an FCA investigation or proceeding, most closely analogous state statute of limitations applies. *Graham County Soil & Water Conservation Dist. v. United States ex rel. Wilson*, p. 409.

FEDERAL-QUESTION JURISDICTION. See **Jurisdiction**, 2.

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE. See **Courts of Appeals**.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See also **Constitutional Law**, I; II; **Jurisdiction**, 2.

Submerged land ownership.—Court overrules Alaska's exceptions to Special Master's recommendations that United States has title to pockets and enclaves of submerged lands underlying waters in Alexander Archipelago and title to submerged lands underlying waters of Glacier Bay. *Alaska v. United States*, p. 75.

FEDERAL TAXES. See **Jurisdiction**, 2.

FIFTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, IV; V, 2, 3; **Full Faith and Credit Statute**.

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

FLAT FEES ON TRUCKING. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION. See **Patent Law**.

FOREIGN-FLAG CRUISE SHIPS. See **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, III; V, 1.

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT STATUTE.

Exceptions—Takings claim.—This Court will not create an exception to full faith and credit statute, 28 U. S. C. § 1738, in order to provide a federal forum for litigants seeking to advance Fifth Amendment takings claims. *San Remo Hotel, L. P. v. City and County of San Francisco*, p. 323.

GLACIER BAY. See **Federal-State Relations**.

GUILTY PLEA. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

HABEAS CORPUS. See also **Constitutional Law**, V, 2.

1. *Guilty plea and sentencing decision—Prosecution’s inconsistent theory in accomplice’s case.*—Sixth Circuit erred in granting respondent habeas relief on grounds that his guilty plea was not knowing, voluntary, and intelligent and that it was void because State, in a later trial of respondent’s accomplice, pursued a theory inconsistent with one advanced in respondent’s case; but case is remanded for that court to resolve in first instance merits of inconsistency claim as it relates to respondent’s death sentence. *Bradshaw v. Stumpf*, p. 175.

2. *Limitations period—Relation back of amended petition.*—A state prisoner’s amendment to his federal habeas petition does not relate back to his timely original petition (and thereby avoid 1-year limitations period imposed by Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996) when amendment asserts a new ground for relief supported by facts different in time and type from those set forth in original petition. *Mayle v. Felix*, p. 644.

3. *Motion for relief from habeas judgment—Successive habeas petitions.*—Because petitioner’s Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) motion challenged only District Court’s previous ruling on Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996’s statute of limitations, it is not equivalent to a successive habeas petition and can be ruled upon by that court without precertification by Eleventh Circuit; however, under proper Rule 60(b) standards, District Court correctly denied relief here. *Gonzalez v. Crosby*, p. 524.

4. *Statute of limitations—Date limitations period begins to run.*—Title 28 U. S. C. § 2255, ¶ 6(3)’s 1-year limitation period begins to run on date on which this Court “initially recognized” right asserted in an appli-

HABEAS CORPUS—Continued.

cant's motion for habeas relief, not date on which that right was made retroactive. *Dodd v. United States*, p. 353.

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.

Reclamation Reform Act of 1982—Waiver of immunity.—In enacting 43 U.S.C. §390uu, Congress did not waive United States' sovereign immunity from a breach of contract suit brought by petitioners, who purchase water from a local water district that receives its water under a contract with United States Bureau of Reclamation. *Orff v. United States*, p. 596.

INDIGENT DEFENDANTS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1; V, 1.

INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, VII.

INFRINGEMENT. See **Copyrights; Patent Law**.

INMATE CLASSIFICATIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.

INTERNET. See **Copyrights**.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

JURISDICTION.

1. *Diversity action—Supplemental jurisdiction—Amount-in-controversy requirement.*—Where other elements of jurisdiction are present and at least one named plaintiff in an action satisfies 28 U.S.C. §1332(a)'s amount-in-controversy requirement, §1367 authorizes supplemental jurisdiction over claims of other plaintiffs in same Article III case or controversy, even if those claims are for less than requisite amount. *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Services, Inc.*, p. 546.

2. *Removal to federal court—Federal-question jurisdiction—State quiet title action.*—National interest in providing a federal forum for federal tax litigation is sufficiently substantial to support exercise of federal-question jurisdiction over petitioner's state quiet title action on removal to federal court. *Grable & Sons Metal Products, Inc. v. Darue Engineering & Mfg.*, p. 308.

JURY SELECTION. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2, 3.

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

KNOWING, VOLUNTARY, AND INTELLIGENT GUILTY PLEA. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

LIABILITY FOR THIRD-PARTY INFRINGEMENT. See **Copyrights**.

LIMITATIONS PERIODS. See **False Claims Act; Habeas Corpus**, 2, 4.

MANDATE WITHHELD. See **Courts of Appeals**.

MARIJUANA. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

MEDICAL MARIJUANA. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

MICHIGAN. See **Constitutional Law**, II; III, 1; V, 1.

MITIGATION EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law**, VII.

MOTIONS FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

MURDER. See **Constitutional Law**, VII; **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

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

PATENT LAW.

Infringement—Patented compound's use in preclinical studies.—Title 35 U. S. C. § 271(e)(1) exempts from patent infringement use of a patented compound in preclinical studies at least as long as there is a reasonable basis to believe that compound tested could be subject of a Food and Drug Administration submission and experiments will produce types of information relevant to an investigational new drug application or a new drug application made to FDA. *Merck KGaA v. Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd.*, p. 193.

POLICE ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRAINING ORDERS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3.

PRECLINICAL STUDIES. See **Patent Law**.

PRE-EMPTION. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.

PRISONERS' RIGHTS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.

PROPERTY INTEREST FOR DUE PROCESS PURPOSES. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3.

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

QUIET TITLE ACTIONS. See **Jurisdiction**, 2.

RACE DISCRIMINATION. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2, 3.

RECLAMATION REFORM ACT OF 1982. See **Immunity from Suit**.

REDEVELOPMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

RELATION BACK OF AMENDED HABEAS PETITIONS. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

- REMOVAL.** See **Jurisdiction**, 2.
- RESTRAINING ORDER ENFORCEMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3.
- RETALIATION ACTIONS.** See **False Claims Act**.
- RIGHT TO COUNSEL.** See **Constitutional Law**, VII.
- SENTENCING.** See **Constitutional Law**, VII.
- SIXTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, VII.
- SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.** See **Immunity from Suit**.
- STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS.** See **False Claims Act**; **Habeas Corpus**, 2, 4.
- STAY OF MANDATE.** See **Courts of Appeals**.
- SUBMERGED LAND OWNERSHIP.** See **Federal-State Relations**.
- SUCCESSIVE HABEAS PETITIONS.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.
- SUPERMAX PRISON.** See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.
- SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION.** See **Jurisdiction**, 1.
- SUPREME COURT.** See also **Courts of Appeals**.
1. Death of CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST, p. XI.
 2. Appointment of CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, p. VII.
 3. Term statistics, p. 1166.
- TAKING OF PROPERTY.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV; **Full Faith and Credit Statute**.
- TAXES.** See **Jurisdiction**, 2.
- TEN COMMANDMENTS.** See **Constitutional Law**, VI.
- TEXAS.** See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2; VI, 2.
- THIRD-PARTY INFRINGEMENT.** See **Copyrights**.
- TRUCKING FEES.** See **Constitutional Law**, II.
- WAIVER OF IMMUNITY.** See **Immunity from Suit**.
- WATER PURCHASES.** See **Immunity from Suit**.
- WORDS AND PHRASES.**

"The date on which the right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court." 28 U. S. C. § 2255, ¶ 6(3). *Dodd v. United States*, p. 353.