

INDEX

ACTUAL INNOCENCE. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. See **Immigration and Nationality Act**.

ADMIRALTY. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

ALCOHOL TESTS. See **Federal Employer and Employees**.

ALIENS. See **Immigration and Nationality Act**.

“ANTICIPATORY” SEARCH WARRANTS. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 5.

ANTI-LIEN PROVISION OF MEDICAID LAW. See **Social Security**.

ANTITERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT OF 1996. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

ANTITRUST ACTS.

Sherman Act—Price setting—Per se illegality.—It is not *per se* illegal under § 1 of Act for a lawful, economically integrated joint venture to set prices at which it sells its products. *Texaco Inc. v. Dagher*, p. 1.

ARKANSAS. See **Social Security**.

ASYLUM CLAIMS. See **Immigration and Nationality Act**.

BANKRUPTCY. See also **Jurisdiction**, 1.

Priorities—Unpaid workers’ compensation premiums.—Insurance carriers’ claims for unpaid workers’ compensation premiums owed by an employer fall outside priority, among unsecured creditors’ claims, that Bankruptcy Code allows for unpaid contributions to “an employee benefit plan,” 11 U. S. C. § 507(a)(5). *Howard Delivery Service, Inc. v. Zurich American Ins. Co.*, p. 651.

BIVENS ACTIONS.

Retaliatory prosecution—Pleading and proof requirements.—A plaintiff in a retaliatory-prosecution action filed pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents*, 403 U. S. 388, must plead and show absence of probable cause for pressing underlying criminal charges. *Hartman v. Moore*, p. 250.

BURDEN OF PROOF. See *Bivens Actions*.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871.

Section 1983—Cruel and unusual punishments claim.—Because Hill’s action claiming lethal injection procedure that Florida likely would use on him could violate Eighth Amendment’s cruel and unusual punishments prohibition is comparable in its essentials to a 42 U. S. C. § 1983 action this Court allowed to proceed in *Nelson v. Campbell*, 541 U. S. 637, it does not have to be brought in habeas corpus, but may proceed under § 1983. *Hill v. McDonough*, p. 573.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ACT OF 1978. See **Federal Employer and Employees.**

CLASS-ACTION SECURITIES FRAUD ACTIONS. See **Securities Law.**

CLEAN WATER ACT.

1. *Hydroelectric dam—State certification.*—Because a hydroelectric dam raises a potential for a “discharge into the navigable water[s]” of United States under § 401 of Act, federal license to operate petitioner’s dams requires state certification that water protection laws will not be violated. *S. D. Warren Co. v. Maine Bd. of Environmental Protection*, p. 370.

2. *Wetlands—Navigable waters.*—Sixth Circuit’s judgments that petitioners’ wetlands were adjacent to navigable waters and thus covered by Act are vacated, and cases are remanded. *Rapanos v. United States*, p. 715.

COLLEGES. See **Constitutional Law, III, 1.**

COMPUTATION OF TIME. See **Habeas Corpus, 1.**

CONFRONTATION OF WITNESSES. See **Constitutional Law, I.**

CONSPIRACY. See **Hobbs Act.**

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

I. Confrontation of Witnesses.

Testimonial versus nontestimonial statements.—For Confrontation Clause purposes, statements made during police interrogation under circumstances objectively indicating that interrogation’s primary purpose is to enable police assistance to meet an ongoing emergency are nontestimonial; they are testimonial when circumstances objectively indicate that there is no such emergency, and that interrogation’s primary purpose is to establish or prove past events potentially relevant to later criminal prosecution. Thus, statements identifying petitioner Davis as assailant during a 911 call were not testimonial, but statements made by

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

petitioner Hammon's wife to police after he allegedly battered her were testimonial and properly excluded because he did not have opportunity to cross-examine her, unless he coerced her failure to testify. *Davis v. Washington*, p. 813.

II. Due Process.

1. *Brady claim—Suppression of favorable evidence.*—Judgment is reversed and case is remanded for views of full Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia on petitioner's claim that State's suppression of evidence favorable to defense violated his federal constitutional rights under *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U. S. 83. *Youngblood v. West Virginia*, p. 867.

2. *Tax sale—Unclaimed notice.*—When mailed notice of a tax sale is returned unclaimed, a State must take additional reasonable steps to attempt to provide notice to property owner before selling his property, if it is practicable to do so; because additional steps were available here, State's effort to provide notice to petitioner did not satisfy due process. *Jones v. Flowers*, p. 220.

III. Freedoms of Speech and Association.

1. *Federal funding—Solomon Amendment—Military recruiters on college campuses.*—Because Congress could require law schools to provide equal access to military recruiters without violating schools' freedoms of speech and association, Third Circuit erred in holding that Solomon Amendment—which denies federal funds to educational institutions that fail to give military recruiters access equal to that provided other recruiters—likely violates First Amendment. *Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights, Inc.*, p. 47.

2. *Public employees—Statements pursuant official duties.*—When public employees make statements pursuant to their official duties, they are not speaking as citizens for First Amendment purposes, and Constitution does not insulate their communications from employer discipline. *Garcetti v. Ceballos*, p. 410.

IV. Right to Fair Trial.

State evidence rule—Proof of third-party guilt.—A criminal defendant's federal constitutional rights are violated by an evidence rule preventing a defendant from introducing proof of third-party guilt if prosecution has introduced forensic evidence that, if believed, strongly supports a guilty verdict. *Holmes v. South Carolina*, p. 319.

V. Searches and Seizures.

1. *Knock-and-announce violation—Suppression of evidence.*—Violation of knock-and-announce rule does not require suppression of evidence found in a search. *Hudson v. Michigan*, p. 586.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

2. *Parolees—Suspicionless searches.*—Fourth Amendment does not prohibit a police officer from conducting a suspicionless search of a parolee. *Samson v. California*, p. 843.

3. *Warrantless entry—Reasonableness.*—Police may enter a home without a warrant when they have an objectively reasonable basis for believing that an occupant is seriously injured or imminently threatened with injury. *Brigham City v. Stuart*, p. 398.

4. *Warrantless entry and search—Co-occupant's refusal to permit entry.*—In circumstances at issue, a physically present co-occupant's stated refusal to permit entry to a home renders warrantless entry and search unreasonable under Fourth Amendment and invalid as to him. *Georgia v. Randolph*, p. 103.

5. *Warrants—Probable cause.*—“Anticipatory” search warrants based on an affidavit showing probable cause that at some future time (but not presently) certain evidence of a crime will be located at a specified place are not categorically unconstitutional under Fourth Amendment's probable-cause provision; anticipatory warrant at issue did not violate Amendment's particularity requirement, which does not include conditions precedent to execution of such a warrant. *United States v. Grubbs*, p. 90.

VI. States' Immunity from Suit.

Admiralty—“Arm of the State.”—A governmental entity that does not qualify as an “arm of the State” for Eleventh Amendment purposes cannot assert sovereign immunity as a defense to an admiralty suit. *Northern Ins. Co. of N. Y. v. Chatham County*, p. 189.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES. See **Criminal Law**, 1.

CO-OCCUPANTS' RIGHTS. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 4.

CREDITOR AND DEBTOR. See **Bankruptcy**.

CRIMINAL LAW. See also **Civil Rights Act of 1871**; **Constitutional Law**, I; II, 1; V.

1. *Federal Sentencing Guidelines—Prior convictions.*—Fifth Circuit erred in treating petitioner's prior conviction for simple possession of a controlled substance as a “controlled substance offense” for purposes of Guidelines. *Salinas v. United States*, p. 188.

2. *Speedy Trial Act of 1974—Waiver—Estoppel—Standard of review.*—A defendant may not prospectively waive application of Act, which generally requires criminal trials to start within 70 days of indictment; petitioner is not estopped from challenging exclusion of a 91-day delay from 70-day period; District Court's decision to exclude that delay is not subject to harmless-error review; Act was violated because 91-day delay exceeded 70 days permitted by Act. *Zedner v. United States*, p. 489.

- CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES.** See **Constitutional Law, I.**
- CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1871.**
- DAMS.** See **Clean Water Act, 1.**
- DEATH SENTENCE.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1871.**
- DEBTOR AND CREDITOR.** See **Bankruptcy.**
- DELAY IN START OF CRIMINAL TRIAL.** See **Criminal Law, 2.**
- DELINQUENT TAXES.** See **Constitutional Law, II, 2.**
- DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.** See **Constitutional Law, I.**
- DRUG TESTS.** See **Federal Employer and Employees.**
- DUE PROCESS.** See **Constitutional Law, II.**
- EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.** See **Constitutional Law, III, 1.**
- EIGHTH AMENDMENT.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1871.**
- ELEVENTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law, VI.**
- EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLANS.** See **Bankruptcy; Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**
- EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.**
“Equitable relief”—Medical expense reimbursement.—Action filed by respondent, a fiduciary under ERISA, for reimbursement of medical expenses that petitioner beneficiaries had recovered for their injuries from a third party properly sought “equitable relief” under ERISA § 502(a)(3). *Sereboff v. Mid Atlantic Medical Services, Inc.*, p. 356.
- EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES.** See **Bankruptcy; Constitutional Law, III, 2; Federal Employer and Employees.**
- ENHANCED SENTENCES.** See **Criminal Law, 1.**
- ENTRY AND SEARCH OF HOME.** See **Constitutional Law, V, 1, 3, 4.**
- EQUITABLE RELIEF.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; Injunctions.**
- ESTOPPEL.** See **Criminal Law, 2.**
- EVIDENCE SUPPRESSION.** See **Constitutional Law, II, 1; V.**
- EXTORTION.** See **Hobbs Act.**

FEAR OF PERSECUTION. See **Immigration and Nationality Act.**

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959. See **Jurisdiction, 3.**

FEDERAL EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES.

Drug and alcohol tests—Preclusion.—Case is remanded for Ninth Circuit to address whether Federal Aviation Administration’s actions against an employee—who claimed that his constitutional rights were violated by a nonrandom drug and alcohol test—constitute a “prohibited personnel practice,” see 5 U. S. C. § 2302(b); 49 U. S. C. § 40122(g)(2)(A), as well as other issues raised in this Court but not decided below, resolution of which may obviate need to decide ultimate issue whether 5 U. S. C. § 7121 precludes employees from pursuing a remedy beyond those set out in Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. *Whitman v. Department of Transportation*, p. 512.

FEDERAL FUNDING FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS. See **Constitutional Law, III, 1.**

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1221.

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1227.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1233.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1269.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1281.

FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES. See **Criminal Law, 1.**

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Clean Water Act, 1; Constitutional Law, VI; Jurisdiction, 1; Securities Law; Social Security.**

FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITIES. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

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

FLORIDA. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871.**

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law, II; IV.**

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

FRANCHISE TAX CREDIT. See **Taxes.**

FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION. See **Constitutional Law, III, 1.**

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

HABEAS CORPUS. See also **Civil Rights Act of 1871.**

1. *Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996—Erroneous time computation.*—In circumstances at issue, District Court had discretion to correct State’s erroneous time computation and, accordingly, to dismiss Day’s federal habeas petition as untimely under AEDPA’s 1-year limitation period. *Day v. McDonough*, p. 198.

2. *State procedural default rule—Actual-innocence exception.*—Because House has made stringent showing required by actual-innocence exception to state procedural default rule, his federal habeas corpus action may proceed. *House v. Bell*, p. 518.

HARMLESS-ERROR REVIEW. See **Criminal Law, 2.**

HEALTH-CARE BENEFITS. See **Jurisdiction, 3.**

HOBBS ACT.

Physical violence—Relationship to robbery or extortion.—Congress intended only to forbid acts or threats of physical violence in furtherance of a plan to engage in robbery or extortion (and related attempts or conspiracies) when it prohibited “obstruct[ing], delay[ing], or affect[ing] commerce . . . by . . . robbery or extortion . . . or commit[ting] or threaten[ing] physical violence to any person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to do anything in violation of this section,” 18 U. S. C. § 1951(a), not to create a freestanding physical violence offense unrelated to robbery or extortion. *Scheidler v. National Organization for Women, Inc.*, p. 9.

HYDROELECTRIC DAMS. See **Clean Water Act, 1.**

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.

Asylum claim—Fear of persecution—“Particular social group.”—In this asylum claim based on fear of persecution, Ninth Circuit erred in finding in first instance, rather than remanding to appropriate administrative agency, question whether family members constitute a “particular social group” within Act’s meaning. *Gonzales v. Thomas*, p. 183.

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

INJUNCTIONS.

Award of permanent relief—Four-factor test—Patent Act dispute.—Traditional four-factor test applied by courts of equity when considering whether to award permanent injunctive relief to a prevailing plaintiff applies to disputes arising under Patent Act. *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L. L. C.*, p. 388.

JOINT VENTURES. See **Antitrust Acts.**

JURISDICTION.

1. *Bankruptcy proceeding—Probate exception.*—Ninth Circuit had no warrant from Congress or this Court for its sweeping extension of “probate exception” to federal-court jurisdiction; because this case does not fall within exception’s scope, District Court properly asserted jurisdiction over petitioner’s tort counterclaim against respondent, despite ongoing proceedings in a Texas Probate Court. *Marshall v. Marshall*, p. 293.

2. *Court of Appeals—Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998—Removal—Remand to state court.*—Federal district-court orders remanding removed securities class actions to state court for want of preclusion under Act are subject to 28 U. S. C. § 1447(d), which makes remand orders unreviewable on appeal. *Kircher v. Putnam Funds Trust*, p. 633.

3. *Health-care plan provider’s suit—Reimbursement of benefits paid.*—Title 28 U. S. C. § 1331—which authorizes federal jurisdiction over “civil actions arising under the . . . laws . . . of the United States”—does not encompass a federal suit by a health-care plan providing benefits under Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 for reimbursement of medical bills plan paid on behalf of a plan beneficiary who, injured in an accident, recovered damages (unaided by plan administrator) in a state-court tort action against a third party alleged to have caused accident. *Empire HealthChoice Assurance, Inc. v. McVeigh*, p. 677.

KNOCK-AND-ANNOUNCE RULE. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 1.

LAW SCHOOLS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

LETHAL INJECTION. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871.**

LIMITATIONS PERIODS. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

MARKET POWER. See **Patents.**

MEDICAID. See **Social Security.**

MEDICAL BENEFITS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; Jurisdiction**, 3.

MILITARY RECRUITERS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

NAVIGABLE WATERS. See **Clean Water Act.**

NONTESTIMONIAL STATEMENTS TO POLICE. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

NOTICE OF TAX SALE. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

PAROLEE SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2.

PATENTS. See also **Injunctions.**

Market power—Tying arrangements.—Because a patent does not necessarily confer market power upon patentee, in cases involving a tying arrangement, a plaintiff must prove that defendant has market power in tying product. *Illinois Tool Works Inc. v. Independent Ink, Inc.*, p. 28.

PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE RELIEF. See **Injunctions.**

PERSECUTION FEARS. See **Immigration and Nationality Act.**

PER SE ILLEGALITY. See **Antitrust Acts.**

PHYSICAL VIOLENCE. See **Hobbs Act.**

POLICE STATEMENTS. See **Constitutional Law, I.**

PRECLUSION. See **Federal Employer and Employees; Jurisdiction, 2.**

PRE-EMPTION. See **Securities Law.**

PRICE SETTING. See **Antitrust Acts.**

PRIOR CONVICTIONS. See **Criminal Law, 1.**

PROBABLE CAUSE. See ***Bivens* Actions; Constitutional Law, V, 5.**

PROBATE EXCEPTION. See **Jurisdiction, 1.**

PROCEDURAL DEFAULT. See **Habeas Corpus, 2.**

PROPERTY SALE. See **Constitutional Law, II, 2.**

PROXIMATE CAUSE. See **Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act.**

PUBLIC EMPLOYER AND PUBLIC EMPLOYEES. See **Constitutional Law, III, 2; Federal Employers and Employees.**

RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT.

Proximate cause requirement.—Respondent cannot maintain a RICO claim against petitioners under 18 U. S. C. § 1962(c)—which forbids conducting or participating in conduct of an enterprise's affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity—because it has not shown proximate cause between injury asserted and injurious conduct alleged, petitioner's failure to pay state sales taxes; Second Circuit must on remand determine whether proximate cause requirement is met with respect to respondent's claim under § 1962(a), which makes it unlawful to "use or invest" income derived from a pattern of racketeering activity. *Anza v. Ideal Steel Supply Corp.*, p. 451.

REMOVAL. See **Jurisdiction**, 2.

RETIALIATORY PROSECUTION. See *Bivens Actions*.

RIGHT TO CROSS-EXAMINATION. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

RIVERS AND DAMS. See **Clean Water Act**, 1.

ROBBERY. See **Hobbs Act**.

SALES TAXES. See **Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act**.

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

SECTION 1983. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**.

SECURITIES LAW.

Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1988—Pre-emption of state-law fraud claims.—Background, text, and purpose of Act's pre-emption provision demonstrate that Act pre-empts state-law holder class-action securities fraud claims of kind alleged here. *Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Inc. v. Dabit*, p. 71.

SECURITIES LITIGATION UNIFORM STANDARDS ACT OF 1988.
See **Jurisdiction**, 2; **Securities Law**.

SENTENCING GUIDELINES. See **Criminal Law**, 1.

SHERMAN ACT. See **Antitrust Acts**.

SIXTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, I; IV.

SOCIAL SECURITY.

Medicaid—State's lien on tort settlement.—Federal Medicaid law does not authorize Arkansas to assert a lien on Ahlborn's tort settlement in an amount exceeding that portion of settlement that represented Medicaid payments for Ahlborn's medical care, and federal anti-lien provision affirmatively prohibits State from doing so. *Arkansas Dept. of Health and Human Servs. v. Ahlborn*, p. 268.

SOLOMON AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

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

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

SPEEDY TRIAL ACT OF 1974. See **Criminal Law**, 2.

STANDING. See **Taxes**.

STATE SALES TAXES. See **Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act**.

STATES' IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1; V.

SUPREME COURT.

1. Proceedings in memory of Chief Justice Rehnquist, p. IX.
2. Retirement of Justice O'Connor, p. v.
3. Amendments to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, p. 1221.
4. Amendments to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, p. 1227.
5. Amendments to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, p. 1233.
6. Amendments to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, p. 1269.
7. Amendments to Federal Rules of Evidence, p. 1281.

SUSPICIONLESS SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 2.

TAXES. See also **Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act**.

Franchise tax credit—Standing.—Plaintiff taxpayers have not established standing to challenge a state franchise tax credit; because they lack standing, lower courts erred in considering their claims on merits. *DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno*, p. 332.

TAX SALE. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

TESTIMONIAL STATEMENTS TO POLICE. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

TEXAS. See **Jurisdiction**, 1.

THIRD-PARTY GUILT EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

TIME COMPUTATION. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

TYING ARRANGEMENTS. See **Patents**.

UNCLAIMED TAX SALE NOTICE. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING GUIDELINES. See **Criminal Law**, 1.

UNIVERSITIES. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

UNSECURED CREDITORS' CLAIMS. See **Bankruptcy**.

WARRANTLESS ENTRY. See **Constitutional Law**, V, 3, 4.

WATER PROTECTION LAWS. See **Clean Water Act**.

WETLANDS. See **Clean Water Act**, 2.

WITNESSES. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

WORDS AND PHRASES.

1. “*An employee benefit plan.*” Bankruptcy Code, 11 U. S. C. § 507(a)(5). *Howard Delivery Service, Inc. v. Zurich American Ins. Co.*, p. 651.

2. “*Civil actions arising under the . . . laws . . . of the United States.*” 28 U. S. C. § 1331. *Empire HealthChoice Assurance, Inc. v. McVeigh*, p. 677.

3. “*Discharge into the navigable water[s].*” § 401, Clean Water Act, 33 U. S. C. § 1341. *S. D. Warren Co. v. Maine Bd. of Environmental Protection*, p. 370.

4. “*Equitable relief.*” § 502(a)(3), Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, 29 U. S. C. § 1132(a)(3). *Sereboff v. Mid Atlantic Medical Services, Inc.*, p. 356.

5. “*Obstruct[ing], delay[ing], or affect[ing] commerce . . . by . . . robbery or extortion . . . or commit[ting] or threaten[ing] physical violence to any person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to do anything in violation of this section.*” Hobbs Act, 18 U. S. C. § 1951(a). *Scheidler v. National Organization for Women, Inc.*, p. 9.

6. “*Particular social group.*” § 101(a)(42)(A), Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U. S. C. § 1101(a)(42)(A). *Gonzales v. Thomas*, p. 183.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION PREMIUMS. See **Bankruptcy.**