

INDEX

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. See **Telecommunications Act of 1996.**

ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986.

Mandatory minimum sentence—“Cocaine base.”—“[C]ocaine base” as used in 21 U. S. C. § 841(b)(1)(A)(iii)—which provides a mandatory 10-year minimum sentence for offenses involving “50 grams or more of a mixture or substance . . . which contains cocaine base”—means not just “crack cocaine,” but cocaine in its chemically basic form. *DePierre v. United States*, p. 70.

ANTI-INJUNCTION ACT.

“Relitigation exception”—*State court consideration of class certification.*—In enjoining a state court from considering Smith’s class certification request, Federal District Court exceeded its authority under “relitigation exception” to federal Anti-Injunction Act, which generally prohibits federal courts from enjoining state court proceedings. *Smith v. Bayer Corp.*, p. 299.

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

ARMED CAREER CRIMINAL ACT.

Mandatory minimum sentence for firearms possession—Prior “violent felony” convictions—Indiana felony vehicle flight.—Felony vehicle flight, as proscribed by Indiana law, is a “violent felony” for purposes of 18 U. S. C. § 924(e), which provides a 15-year mandatory minimum prison term for a defendant, convicted of firearms possession, who has three prior “violent felony” convictions. *Sykes v. United States*, p. 1.

ARTICLE III COURTS. See **Bankruptcy.**

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE.

Fiduciary exception—General trust relationship between United States and Indian tribes.—Fiduciary exception to attorney-client privilege does not apply to general trust relationship between United States and Indian tribes. *United States v. Jicarilla Apache Nation*, p. 162.

BANKRUPTCY.

Bankruptcy court authority—State-law counterclaim.—Although 28 U. S. C. § 157(b)(2)(C) authorized Bankruptcy Court to enter judgment on

BANKRUPTCY—Continued.

state-law counterclaim filed by petitioner estate against respondent estate in petitioner estate's bankruptcy proceedings, Article III of Constitution did not. *Stern v. Marshall*, p. 462.

CALIFORNIA. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 3.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

Employment discrimination—Class certification.—In this Title VII employment discrimination case, certification of a nationwide class of 1.5 million women was not consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)'s commonality requirement, and respondents' backpay claims—which were for individualized monetary relief—were improperly certified under Rule 23(b)(2). *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, p. 338.

CLASS ACTIONS. See **Anti-Injunction Act; Civil Rights Act of 1964.**

CLEAN AIR ACT.

Carbon-dioxide emissions from power plants—Displacement of federal common-law right of abatement.—Act and Environmental Protection Agency action authorized by Act displace any federal common-law right to seek abatement of carbon-dioxide emissions from fossil-fuel fired power plants. *American Elec. Power Co. v. Connecticut*, p. 410.

COMPULSORY SELF-INCRIMINATION. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Bankruptcy; Jurisdiction**, 2; **Standing.**

I. Confrontation of Witnesses.

Forensic evidence—Testimonial certification of laboratory report.—Sixth Amendment's Confrontation Clause does not permit prosecution to introduce forensic laboratory report containing a testimonial certification, made to prove a fact at a criminal trial, through in-court testimony of analyst who did not sign certification or personally perform or observe performance of test reported in certification. Accused has right to be confronted with analyst who performed test and made certification, unless that analyst is unavailable at trial and accused had pretrial cross-examination opportunity. *Bullcoming v. New Mexico*, p. 647.

II. Due Process.

Indigent noncustodial parent—Child support order—Counsel for civil contempt proceedings.—Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

does not automatically require State to provide counsel at civil contempt proceedings to an indigent noncustodial parent who is subject to a child support order, even if that individual faces incarceration for up to a year. In particular, that Clause does not require that counsel be provided where opposing parent or other custodian (to whom support funds are owed) is not represented by counsel and State provides alternative procedural safeguards equivalent to adequate notice of importance of ability to pay, a fair opportunity to present, and to dispute, relevant information, and express court findings as to supporting parent's ability to comply with support order. *Turner v. Rogers*, p. 431.

III. Freedom of Speech.

1. *Arizona Citizens Clean Elections Act—Public funding of campaigns—Matching funds scheme.*—Act's matching funds scheme—which permits candidates opting to take public funding for their campaigns to receive additional funds when privately funded candidates' expenditures, combined with expenditures of specified independent groups, exceed publicly financed candidate's allotment—substantially burdens political speech and is not sufficiently justified by a compelling state interest to survive First Amendment scrutiny. *Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom Club PAC v. Bennett*, p. 721.

2. *Nevada's Ethics in Government Law—Public officials' conflicts of interest.*—Nevada's Ethics in Government Law—which requires public officials who have a conflict of interest to recuse themselves from voting on a proposal or advocating its passage or failure—does not violate First Amendment. *Nevada Comm'n on Ethics v. Carrigan*, p. 117.

3. *Sale or rental of violent video games to minors.*—California law restricting sale or rental of violent video games to minors does not comport with First Amendment. *Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Assn.*, p. 786.

4. *Vermont's Prescription Confidentiality Law—Sale, disclosure, and use of prescriber-identifying information.*—Vermont law—which restricts sale, disclosure, and use of prescriber-identifying information by pharmacies and similar entities—imposes content- and speaker-based burdens on expression protected by First Amendment and is thus subject to heightened judicial scrutiny, which State's justifications do not withstand. *Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*, p. 552.

IV. Privilege Against Self-incrimination.

Custodial interrogation of a child—Relevance of child's age.—A child's age is relevant to determination whether child was in police custody for purposes of *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436. *J. D. B. v. North Carolina*, p. 261.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.**V. Right to Petition Government.**

Government's retaliatory actions against employee—Petition Clause liability—Matter of public concern.—A government employer's allegedly retaliatory actions against an employee do not give rise to liability under First Amendment's Petition Clause unless employee's petition related to a matter of public concern. *Borough of Duryea v. Guarnieri*, p. 379.

VI. Searches and Seizures.

Reliance on binding appellate precedent—Exclusionary rule.—Searches conducted in objectively reasonable reliance on binding appellate precedent are not subject to exclusionary rule. *Davis v. United States*, p. 229.

CREDITORS AND DEBTORS. See **Bankruptcy**.

CRIMINAL LAW. See **Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986**; **Armed Career Criminal Act**; **Constitutional Law I, IV, VI**; **Sentencing Reform Act of 1984**; **Standing**; **Stays**.

DEBTORS AND CREDITORS. See **Bankruptcy**.

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEX. See **Civil Rights of 1964**.

DRUG LABELING. See **Pre-Emption**.

DUE PROCESS. See **Constitutional Law, II**; **Jurisdiction, 2**.

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**.

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW. See **Clean Air Act**.

EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law I, VI**; **Patent Act of 1952**.

FEDERAL COURTS. See **Anti-Injunction Act**.

FEDERAL EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT.

Railroad negligence—Proximate-cause standard—Jury instruction.—Act does not incorporate “proximate cause” standards developed in non-statutory common-law tort actions; rather, proper charge in FELA case tracks Act's language, informing jury that defendant railroad “caused or contributed to” railroad worker's injury “if [railroad's] negligence played a part—no matter how small—in bringing about the injury.” *CSX Transp., Inc. v. McBride*, p. 685.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. See **Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, 1**.

FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES. See **Sentencing Reform Act of 1984.**

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Anti-Injunction Act; Pre-emption; Standing.**

FIFTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law, IV.**

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

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

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

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

HABEAS CORPUS. See **Stays.**

INDIANA. See **Armed Career Criminal Act.**

INDIANS. See **Attorney-Client Privilege.**

JURISDICTION.

1. *Foreign corporations—Minimum contacts.*—Petitioners, three foreign subsidiaries of Goodyear USA, were not amenable to suit in North Carolina on claims unrelated to any activity of petitioners in forum State. *Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S. A. v. Brown*, p. 915.

2. *Products liability—Foreign manufacturer—Minimum contacts—Stream-of-commerce doctrine.*—Judgment of New Jersey Supreme Court—which held that Federal Constitution permits state courts to assert jurisdiction over foreign manufacturer in products-liability suit as long as manufacturer knew, or reasonably should have known, that its products are distributed through a nationwide distribution system that *might* lead to their being sold in any State—is reversed. *J. McIntyre Machinery, Ltd. v. Nicastro*, p. 873.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS. See **Mootness.**

LABELING REQUIREMENTS. See **Pre-emption.**

MOOTNESS.

Expired juvenile supervision order—Sex offender registration.—Because at time of Ninth Circuit decision, District Court's juvenile supervision order had expired and respondent was no longer subject to sex-offender-registration conditions that he sought to challenge on appeal, and because he cannot show that a decision invalidating District Court's order would likely redress some collateral consequence of registration conditions, his appeal was moot and Ninth Circuit lacked authority to decide his case on merits. *United States v. Juvenile Male*, p. 932.

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

NEW JERSEY. See **Jurisdiction**, 2.

NORTH CAROLINA. See **Jurisdiction**, 1.

PATENT ACT OF 1952.

Presumption of patent validity—Burden of establishing invalidity—Clear and convincing evidence.—Section 282 of Act, which provides that “[a] patent shall be presumed valid” and that “burden of establishing invalidity of a patent or any claim thereof shall rest on party asserting such invalidity,” requires an invalidity defense to be proved by clear and convincing evidence. *Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. Partnership*, p. 91.

PERSONAL JURISDICTION. See **Jurisdiction**, 1.

PRE-EMPTION.

Federal regulation of generic drug manufacturers—State tort suits for inadequate warning labels.—Federal drug regulations applicable to generic drug manufacturers directly conflict with, and thus pre-empt, respondents’ state tort-law suits against petitioner drug manufacturers for their alleged failure to provide adequate warning labels for generic metoprolol. *PLIVA, Inc. v. Mensing*, p. 604.

PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

PRODUCTS LIABILITY. See **Jurisdiction**, 2.

PUBLIC EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

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

REGISTRATION OF SEX OFFENDERS. See **Mootness**.

RIGHT TO PETITION GOVERNMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

SECURITIES LAW.

Private right of action—False statements in mutual fund prospectuses.—Petitioners Janus Capital Group, Inc., and its wholly owned subsidiary Janus Capital Management LLC—a mutual fund investment adviser—cannot be held liable in a private action under Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 10b–5 for false statements made in prospectuses of their client Janus Investment Fund. *Janus Capital Group, Inc. v. First Derivative Traders*, p. 135.

SELF-INCRIMINATION. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

SENTENCES. See **Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986**; **Armed Career Criminal Act**; **Sentencing Reform Act of 1984**; **Stays**, 2.

SENTENCING REFORM ACT OF 1984.

1. *Binding plea agreement—Reduction of Sentencing Guidelines prison term.*—Sixth Circuit's judgment—which held that, barring a miscarriage of justice or mutual mistake, defendant who enters into binding plea bargain under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c)(1)(C) cannot benefit from retroactive reduction of Sentencing Guidelines prison term under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)—is reversed. *Freeman v. United States*, p. 522.

2. *Imposing or lengthening prison term for rehabilitation.*—Title 18 U.S.C. § 3582(a) does not permit a sentencing court to impose or lengthen a prison term in order to foster a defendant's rehabilitation. *Tapia v. United States*, p. 319.

SEX DISCRIMINATION. See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**.

SEX OFFENDER REGISTRY. See **Mootness**.

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

STANDING.

Constitutional challenge to federal statute criminalizing possession or use of specified chemicals.—Bond, who was charged with violating 18 U.S.C. § 229—which forbids knowing possession or use, for nonpeaceful purposes, of a chemical that “can cause death, temporary incapacitation or permanent harm to humans”—for injuring someone with chemicals during a domestic dispute, has standing to challenge § 229 on grounds that measure interferes with powers reserved to States. *Bond v. United States*, p. 211.

STATES' POWERS. See **Standing**.

STAYS.

1. *Federal habeas briefing schedule.*—Gray's application to stay a Federal District Court order setting a federal habeas briefing schedule pending this Court's disposition of his petition for a writ of certiorari to Virginia Supreme Court is denied. *Gray v. Kelly* (ROBERTS, C. J., in chambers), p. 1301.

2. *Stay of execution—Vienna Convention on Consular Relations—Habeas corpus.*—Petitioner's applications for stay of execution on ground that his conviction was obtained in violation of Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, as well as his petition for a writ of habeas corpus, are denied. *Leal Garcia v. Texas*, p. 940.

SUPREME COURT.

1. Presentation of Solicitor General, p. vii.
2. Retirement of Judith A. Gaskell as Librarian, p. ix.
3. Term Statistics, p. 1304.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

Federal Communications Commission interpretation of regulations—Incumbent local telephone service provider’s “entrance facilities”—Availability to competitor for interconnection.—This Court defers to FCC’s reasonable interpretation of its regulations: To satisfy its duty under 47 U. S. C. § 251(c)(2), an incumbent local telephone service provider must make its existing “entrance facilities,” *i. e.*, connective transmission cables, available to a competitor at cost-based rates if facilities are to be used for interconnection of two providers’ networks. *Talk America, Inc. v. Michigan Bell Telephone Co.*, p. 50.

TENTH AMENDMENT. See **Standing**.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING GUIDELINES. See **Sentencing Reform Act of 1984**.

VERMONT. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 4.

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