

## INDEX

---

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

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

**ARIZONA.** See **Pre-emption**.

**ARMED CAREER CRIMINAL ACT.**

*Mandatory minimum sentence—Prior “serious drug offense.”*—In sentencing a felon for unlawfully possessing a firearm in violation of ACCA, where one of predicate offenses is for a “serious drug offense”—*i. e.*, “an offense under State law . . . for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed by law,” 18 U. S. C. § 924(e)(2)(A)(ii)—a federal court must look to maximum term applicable to defendant’s prior drug offense at time of his state conviction, not to state prison term applicable to offense at time of federal sentencing. *McNeill v. United States*, p. 816.

**ATTORNEY’S FEES.** See **Civil Rights Attorney’s Fees Awards Act of 1976**.

**BAYH-DOLE ACT.** See **University and Small Business Patent Procedure Act of 1980**.

**CALIFORNIA.** See **Constitutional Law**, II; **Pre-emption**, 1.

**CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871.** See also **Supreme Court**, 5.

*Section 1983—Failure to train prosecutors—Single Brady violation.*—A district attorney’s office may not be held liable under 42 U. S. C. § 1983 for failure to train its prosecutors based on a single violation of *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U. S. 83. *Connick v. Thompson*, p. 51.

**CIVIL RIGHTS ATTORNEY’S FEES AWARDS ACT OF 1976.**

*Suit involving frivolous and non-frivolous claims.*—When a plaintiff’s suit involves both frivolous and non-frivolous claims, a court may grant reasonable attorney’s fees to defendant under 42 U. S. C. § 1988, but only for costs that defendant would not have incurred but for frivolous claims; here, lower courts applied wrong standard in awarding fees to defendant-respondents. *Fox v. Vice*, p. 826.

**CLASS ACTIONS.** See **Securities Exchange Act of 1934**, 2.

**COMPACTS BETWEEN STATES.** See **Yellowstone River Compact.**

**CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.**

**I. Case or Controversy.**

*Taxpayers' standing to sue—Establishment Clause tax credit challenge.*—Because respondent taxpayers' Establishment Clause challenge is to a tax credit—for contributions to organizations that provide scholarships to students in private schools, including religious schools—as opposed to a governmental expenditure, they lack Article III standing under *Flast v. Cohen*, 392 U. S. 83. *Arizona Christian School Tuition Organization v. Winn*, p. 125.

**II. Cruel and Unusual Punishment.**

*California prison population limit—Right to adequate medical and mental health care.*—Three-judge court's mandate limiting California's prison population is necessary to remedy violation of prisoners' Eighth Amendment rights to adequate medical and mental health care and is authorized by Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995. *Brown v. Plata*, p. 493.

**III. Searches and Seizures.**

1. *Arrest and detention of material witness—Attorney General's entitlement to qualified immunity.*—Objectively reasonable arrest and detention of a material witness pursuant to a validly obtained warrant cannot be challenged as unconstitutional based on allegations of arresting authority's improper motive; because former Attorney General Ashcroft did not violate clearly established law in allegedly authorizing federal officials to obtain valid material-witness warrants to detain terrorism suspects, he is entitled to qualified immunity. *Ashcroft v. al-Kidd*, p. 731.

2. *Warrantless entry—Exigent circumstances.*—Rule that exigent circumstances justify a warrantless entry applies when police do not create exigency by engaging, or threatening to engage, in conduct that violates Fourth Amendment; assuming that an exigency existed here, there is no evidence that police officers either violated Fourth Amendment or threatened to do so before entering respondent's apartment. *Kentucky v. King*, p. 452.

**IV. States' Immunity from Suit.**

*Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000—Private suits for damages.*—States, in accepting federal funding, do not consent to waive their sovereign immunity to private suits for money damages under Act. *Sossamon v. Texas*, p. 277.

**CONTRACTS.**

*Government allegations of contractual breach—Dismissal of prima facie affirmative defense in order to protect state secrets—Remedy.*—

**CONTRACTS—Continued.**

When, to protect state secrets, a court dismisses a Government contractor's prima facie valid affirmative defense to Government's allegations of contractual breach, proper remedy is to leave parties where they were on day suit was filed. *General Dynamics Corp. v. United States*, p. 478.

**CRIMINAL LAW.** See also **Constitutional Law**, II, III; **Armed Career Criminal Act**; **Speedy Trial Act of 1974**; **Civil Rights Act of 1871**; **Habeas Corpus**.

*Witness tampering—Killing to prevent communication to federal law enforcement officer of information relating to federal offense.*—Where a defendant killed someone to prevent him from communicating with law enforcement officers, but did not have federal officers particularly in mind, Government must show a reasonable likelihood that communication would have been made to a federal officer in order to establish a violation of federal witness tampering statute, which criminalizes “kill[ing] another to . . . prevent the communication to . . . a law enforcement officer . . . of the United States” of “information relating to the . . . possible commission of a Federal offense,” 18 U. S. C. § 1512(a)(1)(C). *Fowler v. United States*, p. 668.

**CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, II.**EIGHTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, II.**EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.**

*Equitable relief—Violations of Act or pension plan terms.*—Although § 502(a)(1)(B) of Act did not give District Court authority to reform CIGNA's pension plan, relief is authorized by § 502(a)(3), which allows a participant, beneficiary, or fiduciary “to obtain other appropriate equitable relief” to redress violations of ERISA “or the [plan's] terms.” *CIGNA Corp. v. Amara*, p. 421.

**EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION.** See **Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938**.**ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.**FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938.**

*Antiretaliation suit—Discharge for filing complaint.*—In an antiretaliation suit under Act, which forbids employers “to discharge . . . any employee because such employee has filed any complaint” alleging a violation of Act, 29 U. S. C. § 215(a)(3), scope of statutory term “filed any complaint” includes oral, as well as written, complaints. *Kasten v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Corp.*, p. 1.

**FALSE CLAIMS ACT.**

*Public disclosure bar—Qui tam suit—Public disclosure bar—Written response to Freedom of Information Act request.*—A federal agency's written response to a Freedom of Information Act request for records constitutes a "report" within meaning of public disclosure bar of False Claims Act, which generally forecloses private parties from bringing *qui tam* suits to recover falsely or fraudulently obtained federal payments where those suits are "based upon the public disclosure of allegations or transactions in [an] administrative . . . report" or "investigation," 31 U. S. C. § 3730(e)(4)(A). *Schindler Elevator Corp. v. United States ex rel. Kirk*, p. 401.

**FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT.** See **Pre-emption**, 1.

**FEDERAL COURTS.**

1. *State agency's suit against officials of another state agency—Prospective relief.*—*Ex parte Young*, 209 U. S. 123, allows a federal court to hear a lawsuit for prospective relief against state officials brought by another agency of same State. *Virginia Office for Protection and Advocacy v. Stewart*, p. 247.

2. *Suits "for or in respect to" same claim against United States or its agents—Court of Federal Claims jurisdiction.*—Under 28 U. S. C. § 1500, two suits are "for or in respect to" same claim against United States or its agents, thus precluding Court of Federal Claims (CFC) jurisdiction, if they are based on substantially same operative facts, regardless of relief sought in each suit; substantial overlap in operative facts between respondent's District Court and CFC suits precluded CFC jurisdiction here. *United States v. Tohono O'odham Nation*, p. 307.

**FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE.**

Amendments to Rules, p. 1045.

**FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE.**

Amendments to Rules, p. 1051.

**FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.** See **Securities Exchange Act of 1934**, 2.

**FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.**

Amendments to Rules, p. 1063.

**FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.**

Amendments to Rules, p. 1075.

**FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS.** See **Constitutional Law**, II; **Federal Arbitration Act**; **Pre-emption**.

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

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

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.** See **False Claims Act**.

**HABEAS CORPUS.**

1. *Capital jury instructions—Penalty phase—Consideration of mandatory death sentence before life-imprisonment sentence.*—Instructions requiring a capital jury to consider a mandatory death sentence before considering a sentence of life imprisonment were not, under 28 U. S. C. § 2254(d)(1), “contrary to” *Beck v. Alabama*, 447 U. S. 625, which concerned guilt, not penalty, proceedings. *Bobby v. Mitts*, p. 395.

2. *State-court decision contrary to, or involving unreasonable application of, federal law—Scope of review.*—In determining whether a federal habeas claim that has been “adjudicated on the merits in State court” can be granted on ground that “the adjudication” “resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal law,” 28 U. S. C. § 2254(d)(1), review is limited to record that was before state court that adjudicated claim on merits; on that record, Pinholster was not entitled to federal habeas relief. *Cullen v. Pinholster*, p. 170.

**ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT.** See **Pre-emption**, 2.

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

**JURISDICTION.** See **Federal Courts**.

**MONTANA.** See **Yellowstone River Compact**.

**MOOTNESS.** See **Supreme Court**, 5.

**PATENTS.**

*Induced infringement—Knowledge of infringement—Willful-blindness doctrine.*—Induced infringement of a patent under 35 U. S. C. § 271(b) requires knowledge that induced acts constitute patent infringement, not simply deliberate indifference to a known risk that a patent exists; although Federal Circuit applied a deliberate indifference test in this case, its judgment must be affirmed because evidence was plainly sufficient to support a finding of petitioners’ culpability under doctrine of willful blindness. *Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S. A.*, p. 754.

**PRE-EMPTION.**

1. *Federal Arbitration Act—California’s Discover Bank rule.*—California’s *Discover Bank* rule—which permits certain class waivers in consumer arbitration agreements to be found unconscionable—is pre-empted by Act. *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, p. 333.

**PRE-EMPTION—Continued.**

2. *Illegal Immigration Reform and Control Act—Arizona licensing law—Suspension or revocation of state employers' licenses for employing unauthorized aliens.*—Arizona Act, which provides for suspension or revocation of licenses of state employers that knowingly or intentionally employ unauthorized aliens, is not pre-empted by federal Illegal Immigration Reform and Control Act, which invalidates “any State or local law imposing civil or criminal sanctions (other than through licensing and similar laws) upon those who employ . . . unauthorized aliens,” 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(h)(2). *Chamber of Commerce of United States of America v. Whiting*, p. 582.

**PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACT OF 1995.** See **Constitutional Law**, II.

**PROPERTY RIGHTS.** See **University and Small Business Patent Procedure Act of 1980.**

**PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES ACT.**

*Price-ceiling contracts between drug manufacturers and Health and Human Services Secretary—Suits by health care facilities as third party beneficiaries.*—Where § 340B of Act imposes ceilings on prices drug manufacturers may charge for medications sold to specified health care facilities, those facilities may not sue allegedly overcharging manufacturers as third-party beneficiaries of ceiling-price contracts that run between drug manufacturers and Secretary of Health and Human Services. *Astra USA, Inc. v. Santa Clara County*, p. 110.

**QUALIFIED IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.** See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1; **Supreme Court**, 5.

**RELIGIOUS LAND USE AND INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT OF 2000.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

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

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

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

**SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.**

1. *Fraud cause of action—Failure to disclose possible link between medication and loss of smell.*—Respondents stated a claim in this securities fraud action, when they alleged that petitioners violated § 10(b) of Act and Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 10b–5 by failing to disclose reports of a possible link between company's Zicam Cold Remedy and loss of smell (anosmia), rendering statements made by them misleading. *Matrixx Initiatives, Inc. v. Siracusano*, p. 27.

**SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**—Continued.

2. *Fraud cause of action*—“*Loss causation*” requirement—*Class certification*.—Although securities fraud plaintiffs must demonstrate that a defendant’s deceptive conduct caused their claimed economic loss (“loss causation” requirement) to prevail in a private securities fraud action, they need not prove loss causation in order to obtain class certification under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. *Erica P. John Fund, Inc. v. Halliburton Co.*, p. 804.

**SENTENCING.** See **Armed Career Criminal Act**; **Habeas Corpus**.

**SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.** See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

**SPEEDY TRIAL ACT OF 1974.**

*Requirement that trial begin within 70 days after arraignment*—*Exclusion for delay resulting from pretrial motions*.—Act—which provides that in “any case in which a plea of not guilty is entered, the trial . . . shall commence within seventy days” after arraignment, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(c)(1), but lists a number of exclusions from 70-day period, including “delay resulting from any pretrial motion,” § 3161(h)(1)(D)—contains no requirement that filing of a pretrial motion actually caused, or was expected to cause, a trial’s delay; rather, subparagraph (D) stops clock from running automatically upon filing of such a motion irrespective of whether motion has any impact on when trial begins. *United States v. Tinklenberg*, p. 647.

**STANDING.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.

**STATES’ IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

**SUPREME COURT.**

1. Amendments to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, p. 1045.
2. Amendments to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, p. 1051.
3. Amendments to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, p. 1063.
4. Amendments to Federal Rules of Evidence, p. 1075.

5. *Power to grant certiorari*—*Government officials prevailing on qualified immunity grounds*—*Mootness*.—This Court generally may review a lower court’s constitutional ruling at behest of government officials who have prevailed on qualified immunity grounds; because mootness of this case has frustrated *Camreta*’s ability to challenge Ninth Circuit’s ruling that he must obtain a warrant before interviewing a suspected child abuse victim at school, that part of Ninth Circuit’s decision must be vacated. *Camreta v. Greene*, p. 692.

**TAXES.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.

**UNIVERSITY AND SMALL BUSINESS PATENT PROCEDURES ACT OF 1980.**

*Title to federally funded inventions—Federal contractors.*—Act does not automatically vest title to federally funded inventions in federal contractors or authorize contractors to unilaterally take title to such inventions. Board of Trustees of Leland Stanford Junior Univ. v. Roche Molecular Systems, Inc., p. 776.

**WITNESSES.** See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1; **Criminal Law**.

**WORDS AND PHRASES.**

*“Filed any complaint.”* Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U. S. C. § 215(a)(3). Kasten v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Corp., p. 1.

*“Report.”* False Claims Act, 31 U. S. C. § 3730(e)(4)(A). Schindler Elevator Corp. v. United States ex rel. Kirk, p. 401.

*“[Suits] for or in respect to [the same claim] against the United States [or its agents].”* 28 U. S. C. § 1500. United States v. Tohono O’odham Nation, p. 307.

**WYOMING.** See **Yellowstone River Compact**.

**YELLOWSTONE RIVER COMPACT.**

*Appropriation doctrine—Irrigation system improvements—Detrimental effect on downstream appropriators.*—Because Article V(A) of Compact incorporates ordinary doctrine of appropriation, and because in Wyoming and Montana that doctrine allows appropriators to improve their irrigation systems, even to detriment of downstream appropriators, Montana’s allegation that Wyoming has allowed its upstream users to switch to a more efficient irrigation system with less return flow fails to state a claim for breach of Compact under Article V(A). Montana v. Wyoming, p. 368.