

## INDEX

---

**ABUSE-OF-DISCRETION STANDARD OF REVIEW.** See **Courts of Appeals**, 2.

**AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967.** See also **Courts of Appeals**, 1.

*Charges—Necessary information.*—For a filing to be deemed a “charge” of unlawful discrimination, it must contain an allegation of discrimination and name of charged party, and it must be reasonably construed as a request for Equal Employment Opportunity Commission remedial action. *Federal Express Corp. v. Holowecki*, p. 389.

**ALABAMA.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

**ALIENS.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

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

**ARBITRATION.** See **Federal Arbitration Act**.

**ARMED CAREER CRIMINAL ACT OF 1984.** See **Criminal Law**, 3.

**ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** See **Constitutional Law**, III; **Mootness**.

**BENEFITS PLANS.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

**BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

**CANDIDATE SELECTION PROCESSES.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.

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

**CIVIL RIGHTS RESTORATION.** See **Criminal Law**, 3.

**COCAINE GUIDELINES.** See **Criminal Law**, 2.

**COMPACTS BETWEEN STATES.**

*Riparian rights—Improvements along Delaware River.*—A 1905 Compact between New Jersey and Delaware did not give New Jersey *exclusive*

**COMPACTS BETWEEN STATES**—Continued.

jurisdiction over all riparian improvements commencing on its shores of Delaware River; rather, States have overlapping authority to regulate structures and operations of extraordinary character extending outshore of New Jersey into territory over which Delaware is sovereign. *New Jersey v. Delaware*, p. 597.

**CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.****I. Equal Protection of the Laws.**

*Exclusion of jurors based on race—Prosecution's peremptory challenges.*—Trial judge in petitioner's capital murder trial committed clear error in rejecting claim that prosecution exercised its peremptory challenge against juror Brooks based on race, in violation of *Batson v. Kentucky*, 476 U. S. 79. *Snyder v. Louisiana*, p. 472.

**II. Freedom of Association.**

1. *New York Supreme Court—Candidate selection process.*—New York's system for choosing party nominees for State Supreme Court does not violate First Amendment. *New York State Bd. of Elections v. Lopez Torres*, p. 196.

2. *State primary law—Burden on political parties.*—Washington State's primary law—which provides that candidates must be identified on primary ballot by their self-designated party preference; that voters may vote for any candidate; and that two top votegetters for each office, regardless of party preference, advance to general election—does not on its face impose a severe burden on state political parties' First Amendment rights. *Washington State Grange v. Washington State Republican Party*, p. 442.

**III. Right to Counsel.**

*Effective assistance—Plea hearing—Participation by speakerphone.*—Because this Court has never held that an attorney's assistance is presumed ineffective if he participates in a plea hearing by speakerphone rather than by physical appearance, nor extended *United States v. Cronin*, 466 U. S. 648, to this novel factual context, Seventh Circuit erred in allowing its original opinion granting relief on this basis to stand in light of *Carey v. Musladin*, 549 U. S. 70. *Wright v. Van Patten*, p. 120.

**CORPORATE DISTRIBUTION OF PROPERTY.** See **Taxes**, 1.

**COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.** See **Statutes of Limitations**.

**COURTS OF APPEALS.** See also **Mootness**.

1. *Age discrimination case—Error on appeal.*—Because Tenth Circuit erred in finding that District Court applied a *per se* rule when it excluded evidence of age discrimination against other employees not “similarly situated” to respondent, it erred in engaging in its own analysis of relevant

**COURTS OF APPEALS**—Continued.

factors under Federal Rules of Evidence 401 and 403, rather than remanding case for District Court to clarify its ruling. *Sprint/United Management Co. v. Mendelsohn*, p. 379.

2. *Sentencing decision—Standard of review.*—While extent of difference between a particular sentence and recommended Federal Sentencing Guidelines range is relevant, courts of appeals must review all sentences—whether inside, just outside, or significantly outside Guidelines range—under a deferential abuse-of-discretion standard; here, Eighth Circuit failed to give due deference to District Court’s reasoned and reasonable sentencing decision. *Gall v. United States*, p. 38.

**CRIMINAL LAW.** See also **Constitutional Law**, I; III; **Courts of Appeals**, 2; **Federal-State Relations**; **Mootness**; **Taxes**, 1.

1. *Minimum mandatory sentence—Drug trafficking crime—Using a firearm.*—A person does not “use” a firearm under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(1)(A)—which sets a mandatory minimum sentence for a defendant who, “during and in relation to any . . . drug trafficking crime[,] . . . uses . . . a firearm”—when he receives a gun in trade for drugs. *Watson v. United States*, p. 74.

2. *Sentence determination—Cocaine Guidelines.*—Cocaine Guidelines, like all other Federal Sentencing Guidelines, are advisory only; a district judge must include Guidelines range in array of factors warranting consideration, but may determine that, in a particular case, a within-Guidelines sentence is “greater than necessary” to serve sentencing objectives, 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), and may consider disparity between Guidelines’ treatment of crack and powder offenses in making that determination; thus, Kimbrough’s sentence, which was 4.5 years below Guidelines minimum, should survive appellate consideration. *Kimbrough v. United States*, p. 85.

3. *Sentence enhancement—Civil rights retained rather than restored.*—Title 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20)—under which a prior conviction may be disregarded for sentence-enhancement purposes under Armed Career Criminal Act if offender “has had civil rights restored”—does not cover an offender who retained civil rights at all times, and whose legal status, postconviction, remained in all respects unaltered by any state dispensation. *Logan v. United States*, p. 23.

**CUSTOMS OFFICERS.** See **Federal Tort Claims Act**.**DELAWARE.** See **Compacts Between States**.**DISCRIMINATION BASED ON AGE.** See **Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967**; **Courts of Appeals**, 1.**DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.

**DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT.** See **Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967; Courts of Appeals, 1.**

**DISCRIMINATORY STATE TAXATION OF RAILROAD PROPERTY.** See **Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976.**

**DRUG TRAFFICKING.** See **Criminal Law, 1, 2.**

**EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** See **Constitutional Law, III; Mootness.**

**EFFECTIVENESS OF MEDICAL DEVICES.** See **Medical Device Amendments of 1976.**

**ELECTIONS.** See **Constitutional Law, II.**

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

*Individual recovery—Impact of fiduciary breach on plan assets.*—Although ERISA § 502(a)(2) does not provide a remedy for individual injuries distinct from plan injuries, it does authorize recovery for fiduciary breaches that impair value of plan assets in a participant's individual account. *LaRue v. DeWolff, Boberg & Associates, Inc.*, p. 248.

**EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION.** See **Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967; Courts of Appeals, 1.**

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

**FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT.**

1. *Jurisdiction over contract disputes—Pre-emption of state law.*—When parties agree to arbitrate all questions arising under a contract, Act supersedes state laws lodging primary jurisdiction in another forum, whether judicial or administrative. *Preston v. Ferrer*, p. 346.

2. *Vacatur and modification—Expansion by contract.*—Act's grounds for prompt vacatur and modification of arbitration awards are exclusive for parties seeking expedited review under Act and may not be supplemented by contract. *Hall Street Associates, L. L. C. v. Mattel, Inc.*, p. 576.

**FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1994.**

*Motor-carrier regulation—Pre-emption of state tobacco law.*—Act—which prohibits States from enacting any law “related to” a motor carrier “price, route, or service,” 49 U.S.C. § 14501(c)(1)—pre-empts Maine tobacco law provisions that regulate delivery of tobacco to customers within that State. *Rowe v. New Hampshire Motor Transp. Assn.*, p. 364.

**FEDERAL CLAIMS COURT.** See **Statutes of Limitations.**

**FEDERAL INCOME TAXES.** See **Taxes.**

**FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS' IMMUNITY.** See **Federal Tort Claims Act.**

**FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.** See **Courts of Appeals**, 1.

**FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES.** See **Courts of Appeals**, 2; **Criminal Law**, 2.

**FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS.** See also **Federal Arbitration Act**, 1; **Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994**; **Habeas Corpus**, 2; **Medical Device Amendments of 1976**.

*Retroactive application of new rules of criminal procedure—State-court authority.*—*Teague v. Lane*, 489 U.S. 288, does not constrain state courts' authority to give broader effect to new constitutional rules of criminal procedure than is required by that opinion. *Danforth v. Minnesota*, p. 264.

**FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT.**

*Waiver of Government's immunity from suit—Exception for law enforcement officers.*—Title 28 U.S.C. § 2680(c)—which creates an exception to FTCA's sovereign-immunity waiver for a claim arising from detention of property by “any officer of customs or excise or any other law enforcement officer”—covers all law enforcement officers, not just those enforcing customs or excise laws. *Ali v. Federal Bureau of Prisons*, p. 214.

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

**FIREARM USE.** See **Criminal Law**, 1.

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

**FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION APPROVAL OF MEDICAL DEVICES.** See **Medical Device Amendments of 1976**.

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

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

**GEORGIA.** See **Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976**.

**HABEAS CORPUS.**

1. *Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996—Limitations period—Tolling.*—Respondent is not entitled to tolling of AEDPA's 1-year statute of limitations for filing a federal habeas petition where his prior state postconviction petition was rejected as untimely by Alabama courts and thus, under *Pace v. DiGuglielmo*, 544 U.S. 408, 414, 417, was not a “properly filed” pending state petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2). *Allen v. Siebert*, p. 3.

**HABEAS CORPUS**—Continued.

2. *State limitations on successive petitions—Pre-emption.*—Neither International Court of Justice's *Avena* decision that U. S. violated Vienna Convention on Consular Relations by failing to inform 51 Mexican state-court defendants of their Convention rights nor President's Memorandum stating that U. S. would have state courts give effect to *Avena* constitutes directly enforceable federal law that pre-empts state limitations on filing of successive habeas petitions. *Medellín v. Texas*, p. 491.

**IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.** See **Federal Tort Claims Act.**

**INCOME TAXES.** See **Taxes.**

**INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** See **Constitutional Law**, III; **Mootness.**

**INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.** See **Taxes.**

**INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

**ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.** See **Taxes**, 2.

**JURY SELECTION.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS' IMMUNITY.** See **Federal Tort Claims Act.**

**LIMITATIONS PERIODS.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1; **Statutes of Limitations.**

**LOUISIANA.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.

**MAINE.** See **Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994.**

**MEDICAL DEVICE AMENDMENTS OF 1976.**

*Medical device safety and effectiveness—Pre-emption of state law.*—Act's pre-emption clause bars common-law claims challenging safety or effectiveness of a medical device marketed in a form that received premarket approval from Food and Drug Administration. *Riegel v. Medtronic, Inc.*, p. 312.

**MINIMUM SENTENCES.** See **Criminal Law**, 1.

**MODIFICATION OF ARBITRATION AWARDS.** See **Federal Arbitration Act**, 2.

**MOOTNESS.**

*Withdrawal of ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim.*—Because respondent's wish to withdraw his claim of ineffective assistance of counsel during pretrial plea bargaining moots that claim, his motion to vacate judgment below is granted, and Ninth Circuit's judgment is vacated to extent that it addressed that claim. *Arave v. Hoffman*, p. 117.

**MOTOR-CARRIER REGULATION.** See **Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994.**

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

**NEW JERSEY.** See **Compacts Between States.**

**NEW RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.** See **Federal-State Relations.**

**NEW YORK.** See **Constitutional Law, II, 1.**

**PENSION PLANS.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

**PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES.** See **Constitutional Law, I.**

**PLEA HEARINGS.** See **Constitutional Law, III.**

**POLITICAL PARTIES' FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION.** See **Constitutional Law, II, 2.**

**PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW.** See **Federal Arbitration Act, 1; Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994; Habeas Corpus, 2; Medical Device Amendments of 1976.**

**PRIMARY ELECTION LAWS.** See **Constitutional Law, II, 2.**

**PRIVATE RIGHTS OF ACTION.** See **Securities Exchange Act of 1934.**

**RACIAL DISCRIMINATION.** See **Constitutional Law, I.**

**RAILROAD REVITALIZATION AND REGULATORY REFORM ACT OF 1976.**

*State taxation of railroad property—Railroad's right to challenge State's valuation methods.*—Act allows a railroad to attempt to show that state methods for determining value of in-state railroad property for tax purposes result in a discriminatory determination of true market value. *CSX Transp., Inc. v. Georgia State Bd. of Equalization*, p. 9.

**RETIREMENT BENEFITS PLANS.** See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

**RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF NEW RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.** See **Federal-State Relations.**

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

**RIPARIAN RIGHTS.** See **Compacts Between States.**

**RULE 10B-5.** See **Securities Exchange Act of 1934.**

**SAFETY OF MEDICAL DEVICES.** See **Medical Device Amendments of 1976.**

**SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.**

*Private right of action—Customer/supplier statements.*—Private right of action implied in § 10(b) of Act and Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 10b–5 does not reach respondents because investors did not rely upon respondents’ statements or representations in purchasing stock at issue. *Stoneridge Investment Partners, LLC v. Scientific-Atlanta, Inc.*, p. 148.

**SENTENCING.** See **Courts of Appeals, 2; Criminal Law.**

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

**SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.** See **Federal Tort Claims Act.**

**STATE TAXATION OF RAILROAD PROPERTY.** See **Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976.**

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

*Court of Federal Claims—Effect of Government’s waiver of timeliness issue.*—Court of Claims statute of limitations requires *sua sponte* consideration of a lawsuit’s timeliness, despite Government’s waiver of that issue. *John R. Sand & Gravel Co. v. United States*, p. 130.

**STOCK PURCHASES.** See **Securities Exchange Act of 1934.**

**SUCCESSIVE HABEAS PETITIONS.** See **Habeas Corpus, 2.**

**SUPREME COURT.**

Presentation of Attorney General, p. v.

**TAXES.** See also **Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976.**

1. *Federal income taxes—Evasion—Corporate distribution.*—A taxpayer accused of criminal tax evasion may claim that a corporate distribution is an untaxable return of capital—which would leave Government unable to establish tax deficiency required for conviction—without producing evidence that, when distribution occurred, either he or corporation intended a return of capital. *Boulware v. United States*, p. 421.

2. *Federal income taxes—Itemized deductions.*—Investment advisory fees paid by a trust generally are subject to 2% floor for itemized deductions under Internal Revenue Code. *Knight v. Commissioner*, p. 181.

**TEXAS.** See **Habeas Corpus, 2.**

**TOBACCO REGULATION.** See **Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994.**

**TRUST FEES.** See **Taxes, 2.**



**UNITED STATES SENTENCING GUIDELINES.** See **Courts of Appeals**, 2; **Criminal Law**, 2.

**VACATUR OF ARBITRATION AWARDS.** See **Federal Arbitration Act**, 2.

**VALUATION OF RAILROAD PROPERTY.** See **Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976**.

**VIENNA CONVENTION.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

**VOTER CONFUSION.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

**WAIVER OF IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.** See **Federal Tort Claims Act**.

**WASHINGTON.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

**WORDS AND PHRASES.**

1. *“Any other law enforcement officer.”* Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2680(c). *Ali v. Federal Bureau of Prisons*, p. 214.

2. *“During and in relation to any . . . drug trafficking crime[,], . . . uses . . . a firearm.”* 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(1)(A). *Watson v. United States*, p. 74.

3. *Greater than necessary.* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). *Kimbrough v. United States*, p. 85.

4. *“Has had civil rights restored.”* 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20). *Logan v. United States*, p. 23.