

INDEX

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

ANTITERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT OF 1996. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2, 3, 5.

APPEAL OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT DENIAL. See **Civil Procedure.**

ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2, 7.

BANKRUPTCY.

Chapter 13—Disposable income—Car-ownership costs—Loan or lease payments.—A Chapter 13 debtor may not deduct car-ownership costs from his disposable income if he is not making loan or lease payments. *Ransom v. FIA Card Services, N. A.*, p. 61.

CALIFORNIA. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1, 6.

CALIFORNIA PAROLE STATUTE. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

CHAPTER 13 DEBTORS. See **Bankruptcy.**

CHILDHOOD VACCINE PRODUCT LIABILITY. See **National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986.**

CIVIL PROCEDURE.

Denial of summary judgment—Trial on merits—Appeal.—A party may not appeal a denial of summary judgment after a federal district court has conducted a full trial on merits. *Ortiz v. Jordan*, p. 180.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871.

1. *DNA testing of crime-scene evidence.*—A convicted state prisoner seeking DNA testing of crime-scene evidence may assert that claim in a 42 U. S. C. § 1983 civil rights action. *Skinner v. Switzer*, p. 521.

2. *Section 1983—Municipal liability—Policy or custom inflicting injury—Monetary or prospective relief.*—Requirement making municipalities liable under 42 U. S. C. § 1983 only “when execution of [their] policy or custom . . . inflicts the injury,” *Monell v. New York City Dept. of Social Servs.*, 436 U. S. 658, 694, applies irrespective of whether relief sought is monetary or prospective. *Los Angeles County v. Humphries*, p. 29.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

Title VII—Employment discrimination—Retaliatory discharge for fiancée’s employment discrimination charge.—If respondent fired Thompson to retaliate against his fiancée for filing an employment discrimination charge against respondent, Thompson’s firing constituted unlawful retaliation under Title VII; thus, Title VII grants Thompson a cause of action. *Thompson v. North American Stainless, LP*, p. 170.

COLLATERAL REVIEW APPLICATIONS. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

CONFRONTATION CLAUSE. See **Constitutional Law**, I.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.**I. Confrontation of Witnesses.**

Testimonial versus nontestimonial statements—Victim’s identification and description of shooter and shooting location—Enabling police assistance to meet ongoing emergency.—Victim’s identification and description of shooter and location of shooting were not testimonial statements, because their “primary purpose” was “to enable police assistance to meet an ongoing emergency,” *Davis v. Washington*, 547 U. S. 813, 822; thus, their admission at Bryant’s trial did not violate Confrontation Clause. *Michigan v. Bryant*, p. 344.

II. Freedom of Speech.

Picketing near soldier’s funeral—Tort liability.—First Amendment shields respondents (Westboro) from tort liability for picketing near a soldier’s funeral service to express Westboro’s views on United States’ tolerance of homosexuality, particularly in America’s military, and on clergy scandals in Catholic Church. *Snyder v. Phelps*, p. 443.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES. See **Sentences**, 2.

CORPORATIONS. See **Freedom of Information Act**, 2.

COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS.

Deadline for filing notice of appeal—Jurisdictional consequences.—Deadline for filing a notice of appeal with Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims does not have jurisdictional consequences. *Henderson v. Shinseki*, p. 428.

CREDIT CARD INTEREST RATES. See **Debtors and Creditors**.

CREDITORS AND DEBTORS. See **Bankruptcy; Debtors and Creditors**.

CRIMINAL LAW. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 1; **Constitutional Law**, I; **Sentences; Habeas Corpus**.

DEADLY WEAPONS. See **Sentences**, 2.

DEBTORS AND CREDITORS. See also **Bankruptcy.**

Federal Reserve Board Regulation Z—Credit card agreement—Notice of interest-rate increase—Delinquency or default.—At time of transactions at issue, Regulation Z did not require Chase to notify McCoy of an interest-rate increase instituted pursuant to their credit card agreement, which permitted Chase to raise interest rate, up to a pre-set maximum, following delinquency or default. *Chase Bank USA, N. A. v. McCoy*, p. 195.

DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964.****DISPOSABLE INCOME OF CHAPTER 13 DEBTORS.** See **Bankruptcy.****DNA TESTING OF CRIME-SCENE EVIDENCE.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1871, 1.****DRUG TRAFFICKING.** See **Sentences, 2.****EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** See **Habeas Corpus, 2, 7.****EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION.** See **Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994.****FEDERAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS ACT STUDENT EXEMPTION.** See **Taxes, 1.****FEDERAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARD 208.** See **Product Liability.****FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD REGULATION Z.** See **Debtors and Creditors.****FIREARMS.** See **Sentences, 2.****FIRST AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law, II.****FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.**

1. *Employee relations and human resources records exemption—Navy explosives maps and data.*—Explosives maps and data requested from respondent are not materials exempt from release under FOIA Exemption 2, which encompasses only records relating to employee relations and human resources issues. *Milner v. Department of Navy*, p. 562.

2. *Law enforcement records exemption for unwarranted invasions of personal privacy—Corporations.*—Corporations do not have “personal privacy” for purposes of Exemption 7(C) of FOIA. *FCC v. AT&T Inc.*, p. 397.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH. See **Constitutional Law, II.****GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS.** See **Privacy Act.**

GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968. See **Sentences**, 1.

HABEAS CORPUS.

1. *California parole statute*—“Some evidence” of unsuitability for parole.—Ninth Circuit erred in granting habeas relief based on its conclusion that California courts had misapplied State’s “some evidence” rule in determining respondents’ suitability for parole. *Swarthout v. Cooke*, p. 216.

2. *Claims previously “adjudicated on the merits” in state court*—*State-court summary denials*—*Ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim*.—Title 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)—which limits federal habeas relief for claims previously “adjudicated on the merits” in state court—applies to Richter’s petition, even though California Supreme Court issued only a summary denial; Richter was not entitled to habeas relief based on an ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim. *Harrington v. Richter*, p. 86.

3. *Collateral review applications*—*Tolling of 1-year filing period*—“*Collateral review*”—*Motion to reduce sentence*.—In determining whether a motion is “a properly filed application for . . . collateral review,” 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2), that tolls Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996’s 1-year filing period for federal habeas claims, phrase “collateral review” means judicial review of a judgment in a proceeding that is not part of direct review; motion to reduce sentence under Rhode Island law that was filed here is an application for “collateral review” under § 2244(d)(2). *Wall v. Kholi*, p. 545.

4. *Deferential review of state-court decisions*—*Peremptory challenges*—*Race-neutral explanations*.—Because Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 imposes a highly deferential standard for federal habeas review of state-court decisions, there was no basis for Ninth Circuit to reach a conclusion opposite one reached by state trial court, which credited prosecutor’s race-neutral explanations for dismissing two of three African-American jurors, and by California Court of Appeal, which carefully reviewed record in upholding trial court’s findings. *Felkner v. Jackson*, p. 594.

5. *Federal-law violations*.—A federal court may issue a writ of habeas corpus to a state prisoner only for a violation of federal law not, as the Seventh Circuit held, for a violation of state law. *Wilson v. Corcoran*, p. 1.

6. *Independent state ground barring relief*—*California’s time limitation on habeas petitions*.—California’s time limitation on applications for habeas corpus relief qualifies as an independent state ground adequate to bar habeas relief in federal court. *Walker v. Martin*, p. 307.

7. *Ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim*.—Moore was not entitled to habeas relief based on his ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim. *Premo v. Moore*, p. 115.

INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2, 7.

INFORMATIONAL PRIVACY. See **Freedom of Information Act**, 2; **Privacy Act**.

INJUNCTIONS. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 2.

JURY SELECTION. See **Habeas Corpus**, 4.

LAW OF THE CASE DOCTRINE. See **Sentences**, 1.

LIMITATIONS PERIODS. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES. See **Sentences**, 2.

MEDICAL RESIDENTS. See **Taxes**, 1.

MUNICIPAL LIABILITY. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 2.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD VACCINE INJURY ACT OF 1986.

Injury or death caused by side effects—Pre-emption of design-defect claims.—Act pre-empts all design-defect claims against vaccine manufacturers brought by plaintiffs seeking compensation for injury or death caused by a vaccine's side effects. *Bruesewitz v. Wyeth LLC*, p. 223.

NAVAL EXPLOSIVES MAPS AND DATA. See **Freedom of Information Act**, 1.

NOTICES OF APPEAL IN COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS. See **Court of Appeals for Veteran Claims**.

PAROLE. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

PASSENGER VEHICLE SEAT BELTS. See **Product Liability**.

PAYROLL TAXES. See **Taxes**, 1.

PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES. See **Habeas Corpus**, 4.

PICKETING NEAR SOLDIER'S FUNERAL. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

POSTCONVICTION DNA TESTING OF CRIME-SCENE EVIDENCE. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 1.

PRIVACY ACT.

Government employment background investigations.—Assuming, without deciding, that Government's inquiries in this case implicate a privacy interest of constitutional significance, that interest does not prevent Government from asking reasonable questions in an employment background investigation that is subject to Privacy Act's safeguards against public disclosure. *NASA v. Nelson*, p. 134.

PRODUCT LIABILITY. See also **National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986.**

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 208—State tort suits against motor vehicle manufacturers—Failure to install lap-and-shoulder belts on rear inner seats.—Safety Standard does not pre-empt state tort suits claiming that manufacturers should have installed lap-and-shoulder belts, instead of lap belts, on rear inner seats of passenger vehicles. *Williamson v. Mazda Motor of America, Inc.*, p. 323.

RACE-NEUTRAL EXPLANATIONS FOR PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES. See **Habeas Corpus**, 4.

RAILROAD REVITALIZATION AND REGULATORY REFORM ACT OF 1976.

Alabama sales and use taxes on rail carriers—Challenge under Act.—CSX may invoke Act to challenge Alabama's sales and use taxes as discriminatory. *CSX Transp., Inc. v. Alabama Dept. of Revenue*, p. 277.

REAL PROPERTY TAXES. See **Taxes**, 2.

RESENTENCING. See **Sentences**, 1.

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

RHODE ISLAND. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

RIGHT TO COUNSEL. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2, 7.

SENTENCES.

1. *Resentencing after appeal—Consideration of postsentencing rehabilitation—Variance from Sentencing Guidelines.*—When a defendant's sentence has been set aside on appeal, a district court at resentencing may consider evidence of defendant's postsentencing rehabilitation, and such evidence may support a downward variance from now-advisory Federal Sentencing Guidelines range; because Eighth Circuit had set aside Pepper's entire sentence and remanded for *de novo* resentencing, District Court was not bound by law of the case doctrine to apply same departure from the Federal Sentencing Guidelines range applied by original sentencing judge. *Pepper v. United States*, p. 476.

2. *Use or possession of deadly weapon or firearm during drug-trafficking crime—Highest mandatory minimum sentence.*—A defendant is subject to highest mandatory minimum specified for his conduct by 18 U. S. C. § 924(c)—which makes it an offense to use, carry, or possess a deadly weapon in connection with a violent or drug-trafficking crime—unless another provision of law directed to conduct proscribed by § 924(c) imposes an even greater mandatory minimum. *Abbott v. United States*, p. 8.

SIXTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law, I; Habeas Corpus, 2, 7.**

STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS. See **Habeas Corpus, 3.**

SUMMARY JUDGMENTS. See **Civil Procedure.**

SUPREME COURT.

Appointment of Christine Luchok Fallon as Reporter of Decisions, p. 1267.

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

1. *Federal Insurance Contributions Act—Full-time employee rule—Medical residents not categorized as exempt students.*—Treasury Department's full-time employee rule—which does not categorize medical residents as students exempt from FICA taxes—is a reasonable construction of 26 U.S.C. § 3121(b)(10). *Mayo Foundation for Medical Ed. and Research v. United States*, p. 44.

2. *State, county, and local property taxes—Foreclosures—Waiver of tribal sovereign immunity.*—Judgment vacated and case remanded for Second Circuit to address whether to revisit its ruling in light of respondent's recently passed declaration and ordinance waiving tribal sovereign immunity to enforcement of real property taxation through foreclosure by state, county, and local governments. *Madison County v. Oneida Indian Nation of N. Y.*, p. 42.

TRIBAL SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY. See **Taxes, 2.**

UNIFORMED SERVICES EMPLOYMENT AND REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS ACT OF 1994.

Adverse employment actions—Antimilitary animus—Employer liability.—If a supervisor performs an act motivated by antimilitary animus that is intended by supervisor to cause an adverse employment action, and if that act is a proximate cause of ultimate employment action, then employer is liable under Act. *Staub v. Proctor Hospital*, p. 411.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING GUIDELINES. See **Sentences, 1.**

WEAPONS. See **Sentences, 2.**

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

WORDS AND PHRASES.

“Adjudicated on the merits.” Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d). *Harrington v. Richter*, p. 86.

“Collateral review.” Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2). *Wall v. Kholi*, p. 545.

WORDS AND PHRASES—Continued.

“Motivating factor in the employer’s action.” Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act, 38 U. S. C. § 4311(c). Staub v. Proctor Hospital, p. 411.

“Personal privacy.” Freedom of Information Act, 5 U. S. C. § 552(b)(7)(C). FCC v. AT&T Inc., p. 397.

“Personnel rules and practices.” Freedom of Information Act, 5 U. S. C. § 552(b)(2). Milner v. Department of Navy, p. 562.

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