

INDEX

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT. See **Federal Communications Act of 1934.**

ADMISSIBILITY OF CONFESSIONS. See **Criminal Law, 1.**

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967. See **Labor Law.**

ALIENS. See **Immigration.**

APOLOGY RESOLUTION. See **States' Powers.**

APPEALS.

Federal appeals—Timeliness—Extension of filing period.—Because United States declined to intervene in this privately initiated False Claims Act action, it was not a “party” to litigation for purposes of either 28 U. S. C. § 2107 or Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4; therefore, petitioner’s notice of appeal was untimely, as it should have been filed within Rule’s 30-day period, not extended 60-day period when United States is a party. *United States ex rel. Eisenstein v. City of New York*, p. 928.

APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL. See **Habeas Corpus, 2.**

ARBITRATION. See **Jurisdiction, 2; Labor Law.**

Stay pending arbitration—Appellate court jurisdiction—Nonparties’ invocation of Federal Arbitration Act § 3.—Sixth Circuit had jurisdiction to review denial of petitioners’ request for a stay under § 3, which entitles litigants to stay an action that is “referable to arbitration under an agreement in writing”; a litigant who was not a party to arbitration agreement may invoke § 3 if relevant state contract law allows him to enforce agreement. *Arthur Andersen LLP v. Carlisle*, p. 624.

ARTICLE I MILITARY COURTS. See **Military Justice.**

ASBESTOSIS. See **Federal Employers’ Liability Act.**

ASSIGNED COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law, IV.**

ASSOCIATION-IN-FACT ENTERPRISES. See **Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act.**

ATTACHMENT OF ASSETS. See **Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002.**

AUTOMOBILE SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law, V.**

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

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS. See **Constitutional Law, II, 1.**

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

CAR SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law, V.**

CHEMICAL WASTE SITE CLEANUP. See **Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.**

CHRYSLER SALE. See **Supreme Court, 9.**

CLEANUP OF CHEMICAL WASTE SITES. See **Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.**

CLEAN WATER ACT.

Environmental Protection Agency regulations—National performance standards.—EPA permissibly relied on cost-benefit analysis in setting national performance standards for existing powerplants' cooling water intake structures and in providing for variances from those standards. *Entergy Corp. v. Riverkeeper, Inc.*, p. 208.

CLEMENCY PROCEEDINGS. See **Habeas Corpus, 2.**

COAL LEASES. See **Indian Tucker Act.**

COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS. See **Labor Law.**

COMMUNICATIONS LAW. See **Federal Communications Act of 1934.**

COMPELLING ARBITRATION. See **Jurisdiction, 2.**

COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE, COMPENSATION, AND LIABILITY ACT.

Chemical distribution facility contamination—Distribution of cleanup costs.—Under CERCLA, petitioner Shell Oil Company is not liable for contamination at an agricultural chemical distribution facility, and District Court reasonably apportioned petitioner railroads' share of site's remediation costs. *Burlington N. & S. F. R. Co. v. United States*, p. 599.

CONFESSIONS. See **Criminal Law, 1.**

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

CONSECUTIVE PRISON TERMS. See **Criminal Law**, 3.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

I. Double Jeopardy.

Capital murder—Execution of mentally retarded offender—Mental capacity hearing.—Double Jeopardy Clause does not bar Ohio courts from conducting a full hearing on whether Bies qualifies as a mentally retarded offender who cannot be executed under *Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U. S. 304, because of their earlier determination, under pre-*Atkins* standard, that his mental retardation qualified as a mitigating factor. *Bobby v. Bies*, p. 825.

II. Due Process.

1. *Campaign contributions to State Supreme Court justice—Requiring recusal in contributor's case.*—Where West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals reversed a \$50 million verdict, due process required recusal of a justice who had received campaign contributions in an extraordinary amount from board chairman and principal officer of corporation found liable for damages. *Caperton v. A. T. Massey Coal Co.*, p. 868.

2. *Jury selection—Peremptory challenge.*—Provided that all jurors seated in a criminal case are qualified and unbiased, Due Process Clause does not require automatic reversal of a conviction because of trial court's good-faith error in denying defendant's peremptory challenge to a juror. *Rivera v. Illinois*, p. 148.

III. Right to Counsel.

1. *Incriminating statement to informant—Admission for impeachment purposes.*—Respondent's incriminating statement to an informant planted in his jail cell, concededly elicited in violation of Sixth Amendment, was admissible to impeach his inconsistent testimony at trial. *Kansas v. Ventris*, p. 586.

2. *Ineffective assistance—Standard of review.*—Whether California Court of Appeal's decision rejecting Mirzayance's ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim is reviewed under 28 U. S. C. § 2254(d)(1) or *de novo*, he has failed to establish that his counsel's performance was ineffective. *Knowles v. Mirzayance*, p. 111.

3. *Police interrogation.—Michigan v. Jackson*, 475 U. S. 625, which forbade police to initiate interrogation of a criminal defendant once he invoked his Sixth Amendment right to counsel at an arraignment or similar proceeding, is overruled. *Montejo v. Louisiana*, p. 778.

IV. Right to Speedy Trial.

Balancing test—Delays caused by assigned counsel.—In applying balancing test of *Barker v. Wingo*, 407 U. S. 514, 530, which weighs prosecution's conduct against defense's in resolving speedy trial issues, Vermont Supreme Court erred in ranking assigned counsel essentially as state

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

actors, attributing delays they caused to State rather than to defendant. *Vermont v. Brillion*, p. 81.

V. Searches and Seizures.

Vehicle search incident to arrest.—Under Fourth Amendment, police may search a vehicle's passenger compartment incident to a recent occupant's arrest only if it is reasonable to believe that arrestee might access vehicle at time of search or that vehicle contains evidence of offense of arrest. *Arizona v. Gant*, p. 332.

VI. Supremacy Clause.

Federal-State relations—State court's jurisdiction over 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims.—A New York law that divests State's general jurisdiction courts of their jurisdiction to hear § 1983 damages suits filed by prisoners against state correction officers violates Supremacy Clause. *Haywood v. Drown*, p. 729.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT. See **Criminal Law**, 2.

COOLING WATER INTAKE STRUCTURES. See **Clean Water Act**.

CORAM NOBIS PETITIONS. See **Military Justice**.

CRIMINAL LAW. See also **Constitutional Law**, I; II, 2; III; IV; V.

1. *Confessions—Admissibility.*—Title 18 U.S.C. § 3501 modified, but did not supplant, rule of *McNabb v. United States*, 318 U.S. 332, and *Malloy v. United States*, 354 U.S. 449, which makes an arrested person's confession inadmissible if given after an unreasonable delay in bringing him before a judge. *Corley v. United States*, p. 303.

2. *Controlled Substances Act—Misdemeanor drug purchase—Use of telephone.*—Using a telephone to make a misdemeanor drug purchase does not “facilitat[e]” felony drug distribution in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 843(b), which prohibits “us[ing] any communication facility in . . . facilitating” certain drug felonies. *Abuelhawa v. United States*, p. 816.

3. *Identity theft—Mandatory consecutive prison term—Knowledge requirement.*—Title 18 U.S.C. § 1028(a)(1)—which imposes a mandatory consecutive 2-year prison term on an individual convicted of certain predicate crimes if, during (or in relation to) commission of those other crimes, offender “knowingly . . . uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person”—requires Government to show that defendant knew that means of identification at issue belonged to someone else. *Flores-Figueroa v. United States*, p. 646.

4. *Mandatory minimum sentences—Firearm discharge during crime—Proof of intent.*—Title 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(1)(A)(iii), which mandates a 10-year mandatory minimum sentence “if [a] firearm is discharged”

CRIMINAL LAW—Continued.

in course of a violent or drug trafficking crime, requires no separate proof of intent, and thus applies whether gun is discharged on purpose or by accident. *Dean v. United States*, p. 568.

5. *Plea agreement violation—Forfeited claim—Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure—Plain-error test.*—Rule 52(b)'s plain-error test applies to a forfeited claim, like Puckett's, that Government failed to meet its obligations under a plea agreement, and that test applies in usual fashion. *Puckett v. United States*, p. 129.

DEATH PENALTY. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

DISABILITY BENEFITS. See **Veterans Claims Assistance Act of 2000**.

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON PREGNANCY. See **Pregnancy Discrimination Act**.

DOUBLE JEOPARDY. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

DRUG TRAFFICKING. See **Criminal Law**, 2, 4.

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

EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.

ELECTIONS. See **Voting Rights Act of 1965**.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Federal Employers' Liability Act**; **Pregnancy Discrimination Act**.

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION. See **Pregnancy Discrimination Act**.

ENTERPRISES. See **Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act**.

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW. See **Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act**.

EXPERT WITNESS FEES. See **Supreme Court**, 8.

EXPLETIVES IN BROADCASTING. See **Federal Communications Act of 1934**.

FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**, 2.

FALSE CLAIMS ACT. See **Appeals**.

FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT. See **Arbitration**; **Jurisdiction**, 2.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.

Indecent language ban—Application to fleeting expletives.—FCC’s revised policy finding that federal ban on broadcasting “any . . . indecent language,” 18 U.S.C. §1464, sometimes applies to indecent expletives even when offensive words are not repeated is neither “arbitrary” nor “capricious” within meaning of Administrative Procedure Act. *FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.*, p. 502.

FEDERAL EMPLOYERS’ LIABILITY ACT.

Asbestosis suit—Fear-of-cancer jury instruction.—In affirming trial court’s refusal to give fear-of-cancer jury instructions in this FELA suit alleging that petitioner railroad had negligently caused respondent employee to contract asbestosis at work, Tennessee Court of Appeals misread and misapplied *Norfolk & Western R. Co. v. Ayers*, 538 U.S. 135. *CSX Transp., Inc. v. Hensley*, p. 838.

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE. See also **Appeals.**

Amendments to Rules, p. 1291.

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1307.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

1. Amendments to Rules, p. 1341.

2. *Failure to state a claim—9/11 detainee.*—Respondent 9/11 detainee’s complaint alleging that petitioner federal officials subjected him to harsh confinement conditions as a matter of policy on account of his religion, race, and/or national origin fails to plead sufficient facts to satisfy requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, as interpreted in *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, p. 662.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. See also **Criminal Law**, 5.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1363.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, VI; **Habeas Corpus**, 2; **Jurisdiction**, 1; **States’ Powers**.**FIDUCIARY DUTY.** See **Indian Tucker Act**.**FIFTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, I; II, 1.**FIREARM USE DURING CRIME.** See **Criminal Law**, 4.**FIRST-DEGREE MURDER.** See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.

Terrorism exception—Suit against Iraq.—Iraq is no longer subject to suit in federal court pursuant to terrorism exception to foreign sovereign immunity, now repealed, that had been codified at 28 U. S. C. § 1605(a)(7). *Republic of Iraq v. Beaty*, p. 848.

FORFEITED CLAIMS. See **Criminal Law**, 5.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

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

HABEAS CORPUS.

1. *Capital murder—Suppression of evidence.*—Tennessee courts' procedural rejection of Cone's claim of unlawful suppression of evidence does not bar federal habeas review of that claim's merits; although suppressed evidence was not material to Cone's first-degree murder conviction, lower federal courts erred in failing to assess cumulative effect of that evidence with respect to Cone's capital sentence. *Cone v. Bell*, p. 449.

2. *State clemency proceedings—Appointment of counsel.*—Title 18 U. S. C. § 3599 authorizes counsel appointed to represent state petitioners in 28 U. S. C. § 2254 habeas proceedings to represent those clients in subsequent state clemency proceedings and entitles counsel to compensation for that representation. *Harbison v. Bell*, p. 180.

HAWAII. See **States' Powers**.

HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES. See **Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act**.

IDENTITY THEFT. See **Criminal Law**, 3.

IMMIGRATION.

Removal—Stay pending court review.—Traditional stay factors, rather than 8 U. S. C. § 1252(f)(2)'s demanding standard for issuance of injunctions, govern a court of appeals' authority to stay an alien's removal from this country pending court's review of removal order. *Nken v. Holder*, p. 418.

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Foreign Sovereign Immunity**.

IMPEACHMENT EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

INCRIMINATING STATEMENTS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

INDECENT LANGUAGE. See **Federal Communications Act of 1934**.

INDIAN TUCKER ACT.

Tribal claims—Coal leases—Interior Secretary's fiduciary duty.—Respondent Tribe's 15-year-old damages suit against Government—which alleges that Interior Secretary breached his fiduciary duty to Tribe in approving amendments to a coal lease Tribe executed in 1964—fails because none of laws Tribe relies on provides any more sound a basis for suit than those rejected in *United States v. Navajo Nation*, 537 U. S. 488. *United States v. Navajo Nation*, p. 287.

INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 2.

INTERROGATION OF SUSPECTS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3.

IRAN. See **Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002.**

IRAQ. See **Foreign Sovereign Immunity.**

JUDICIAL BIAS. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.

JURISDICTION. See also **Arbitration; Constitutional Law**, VI; **Military Justice.**

1. *Court of appeals' jurisdiction—Remand to state court—Supplemental jurisdiction.*—A federal district court's order remanding a case to state court after declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state-law claims is not a remand for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction for which appellate review is barred by 28 U. S. C. §§ 1447(c) and (d). *Carlsbad Technology, Inc. v. HIF Bio, Inc.*, p. 635.

2. *Subject-matter jurisdiction—Petition to compel arbitration.*—A federal court may “look through” a petition to compel arbitration filed under Federal Arbitration Act § 4 to determine whether it is predicated on a controversy that “arises under” federal law; in keeping with well-pleaded complaint rule, court may not entertain a § 4 petition based on a counterclaim when whole controversy between parties does not qualify for federal-court adjudication. *Vaden v. Discover Bank*, p. 49.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS. See **Federal Employers' Liability Act; Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act.**

JURY SELECTION. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

LABOR LAW.

National Labor Relations Act—Collective-bargaining agreements—Arbitration.—A collective-bargaining agreement provision that clearly and unmistakably requires union members to arbitrate Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 claims is enforceable as a matter of federal law. *14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett*, p. 247.

LEGISLATIVE-DISTRICT LINES. See **Voting Rights Act of 1965.**

MANDATORY SENTENCES. See **Criminal Law**, 3, 4.

MATERNITY LEAVE. See **Pregnancy Discrimination Act**.

MENTAL RETARDATION. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

MILITARY JUSTICE.

Jurisdiction—Coram nobis petitions.—Article I military courts have jurisdiction to entertain *coram nobis* petitions to consider allegations that an earlier judgment of conviction was flawed in a fundamental respect. *United States v. Denedo*, p. 904.

MINIMUM SENTENCES. See **Criminal Law**, 4.

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

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT. See **Labor Law**.

NEW YORK. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

9/11 DETAINEES. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**, 2.

NORTH CAROLINA. See **Voting Rights Act of 1965**.

NOTICES OF APPEAL. See **Appeals**.

OHIO. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

PENSION BENEFITS. See **Pregnancy Discrimination Act**; **Supreme Court**, 10.

PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES. See **Constitutional Law**, II, 2.

PLAIN-ERROR TEST. See **Criminal Law**, 5.

PLEA AGREEMENTS. See **Criminal Law**, 5.

POLICE INTERROGATION OF SUSPECTS. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3.

POWERPLANTS. See **Clean Water Act**.

PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION ACT.

Employment discrimination—Pension benefits calculation—Credit for pregnancy leave.—An employer does not necessarily violate PDA when it pays pension benefits calculated in part under an accrual rule, applied only prior to PDA, that gave less retirement credit for pregnancy leave than for medical leave generally; because AT&T's pension payments accord with a bona fide seniority system's terms, they are insulated from challenge under § 703(h) of Title VII of Civil Rights Act of 1964. *AT&T Corp. v. Hulteen*, p. 701.

PRISONERS' SUITS. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT.

Association-in-fact “enterprise”—Jury instructions.—An association-in-fact “enterprise” under RICO must have a “structure,” but pertinent jury instruction need not be framed in petitioner’s proposed language, *i. e.*, as having “an ascertainable structure beyond that inherent in pattern of racketeering activity in which it engages.” *Boyle v. United States*, p. 938.

RAILROAD’S NEGLIGENCE. See **Federal Employers’ Liability Act.**

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

REMEDIATION OF CLEANUP COSTS. See **Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.**

REMOVAL. See **Immigration.**

RIGHT TO COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1, 3.

RIGHT TO SPEEDY TRIAL. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

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

SECTION 1983. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

SENIORITY SYSTEMS. See **Pregnancy Discrimination Act.**

SENTENCING. See **Criminal Law**, 3, 4; **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

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

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY. See **Foreign Sovereign Immunity.**

SPEEDY TRIALS. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

STATES’ POWERS.

Alienation of Hawaii’s sovereign territory—Effect of congressional apology.—Congress did not strip Hawaii of its authority to alienate its sovereign territory by passing a joint resolution apologizing for role United States played in overthrowing Hawaiian monarchy in 1893. *Hawaii v. Office of Hawaiian Affairs*, p. 163.

STAYS. See **Arbitration; Immigration; Supreme Court**, 9.

SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION. See **Jurisdiction.**

SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION. See **Jurisdiction**, 1.

SUPREME COURT.

1. Retirement of JUSTICE SOUTER, p. IV.
2. Presentation of Attorney General, p. IX.
3. Presentation of Solicitor General, p. VII.
4. Amendments to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, p. 1291.

SUPREME COURT—Continued.

5. Amendments to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, p. 1307.
6. Amendments to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, p. 1341.
7. Amendments to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, p. 1363.
8. *Original cases—Expert witness fees.*—Expert witness attendance fees that are available in cases brought under this Court’s original jurisdiction are same as expert witness attendance fees that would be available in a district court under 28 U. S. C. § 1821(b). *Kansas v. Colorado*, p. 98.
9. *Stays—Chrysler sale.*—Applications for stay of Chrysler sale denied, and temporary stay vacated. *Indiana State Police Pension Trust v. Chrysler LLC*, p. 960.
10. *Stays—Pending certiorari petition.*—Stay requested by applicants—who claim that Second Circuit’s mandate will require them to pay out pension payments to beneficiaries which they will be unable to recoup should they be successful in this Court—pending a decision on their certiorari petition is denied. *Conkright v. Frommert* (GINSBURG, J., in chambers), p. 1401.

TELEPHONE USE FACILITATING DRUG CRIMES. See **Criminal Law**, 2.

TENNESSEE. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

TERRORISM. See **Foreign Sovereign Immunity**.

TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE ACT OF 2002.

Iranian asset—Attachment.—At time of Ninth Circuit’s decision in this case, a judgment held by Iran was not an asset “blocked” by United States that could be attached by respondent under Act; even if Iran’s judgment is presently “blocked,” respondent has waived his right to attach it under Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000. *Ministry of Defense and Support for Armed Forces of Islamic Republic of Iran v. Elahi*, p. 366.

TIME LIMITS FOR APPEALS. See **Appeals**.

TRIBES AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. See **Indian Tucker Act**.

VEHICLE SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

VERMONT. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

VETERANS CLAIMS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2000.

Disability benefits claim—Notice error—Harmlessness determination.—Federal Circuit’s framework for determining harmlessness of errors by Department of Veterans Affairs in notifying a veteran of information

VETERANS CLAIMS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2000—Continued.

or evidence necessary to substantiate his disability claim conflicts with 38 U. S. C. § 7261(b)(2)'s requirement that Veterans Court take “due account of the rule of prejudicial error.” *Shinseki v. Sanders*, p. 396.

VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING AND VIOLENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2000. See **Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002.****VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965.**

Legislative-district lines—Vote dilution.—North Carolina Supreme Court's holding that a minority group must constitute a numerical majority of voting-age population in an area before VRA § 2 requires creating a legislative district to prevent dilution of that group's votes is affirmed. *Bartlett v. Strickland*, p. 1.

WATER INTAKE STRUCTURES. See **Clean Water Act.****WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT RULE.** See **Jurisdiction**, 2.**WEST VIRGINIA.** See **Constitutional Law**, II, 1.**WITNESS FEES.** See **Supreme Court**, 8.**WORDS AND PHRASES.**

1. “*Due account of the rule of prejudicial error.*” 38 U. S. C. § 7261(b)(2). *Shinseki v. Sanders*, p. 396.
2. “*Facilitating [felony drug distribution].*” Controlled Substances Act, 21 U. S. C. § 843(b). *Abuelhawa v. United States*, p. 816.
3. “*If [a] firearm is discharged.*” 18 U. S. C. § 924(c)(1)(A)(iii). *Dean v. United States*, p. 568.
4. “*Knowingly . . . uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person.*” 18 U. S. C. § 1028(a)(1). *Flores-Figueroa v. United States*, p. 646.