

INDEX

ABSOLUTE IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 1.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRISONS. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. See **Immigration Law**, 1; **Social Security**.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT. See **Clean Water Act**.

ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE. See **Patent Act of 1952**.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

AGENCY RECORDS. See **Privacy Act of 1974**.

ARRESTEES. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

ARRESTS. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 3.

ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1; **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

BANKRUPTCY.

1. *Chapter 11—Confirmation of “cramdown” plan over bank’s objection.*—Petitioner Chapter 11 bankruptcy debtors may not obtain confirmation of a “cramdown” plan over respondent Bank’s objection, see 11 U. S. C. § 1129(b)(2)(A), when plan provides for sale of collateral free and clear of Bank’s lien, but does not permit Bank to “credit-bid” at sale. *RadLAX Gateway Hotel, LLC v. Amalgamated Bank*, p. 639.

2. *Chapter 12—Postpetition farm sale—Federal income tax liability—Reorganization plan.*—Federal income tax liability resulting from a Chapter 12 bankruptcy petitioner’s postpetition farm sale is not “incurred by the estate” under 11 U. S. C. § 503(b) and is neither collectible nor dischargeable in reorganization plan. *Hall v. United States*, p. 506.

BURDEN OF PROOF. See **Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act**.

CAPITAL GAINS TAXES. See **Bankruptcy**, 2.

CHAPTER 11 REORGANIZATION. See **Bankruptcy**, 1.

CHAPTER 12 BANKRUPTCY. See **Bankruptcy**, 2.

CHILDREN’S SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS. See **Social Security**.

CITIZENSHIP. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871.

1. *Grand jury witness—Absolute immunity from suit.*—A witness in a grand jury proceeding is entitled to same absolute immunity from suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as a witness who testifies at trial. *Rehberg v. Paulk*, p. 356.

2. *Private attorney temporarily retained by city—Qualified immunity from suit.*—A private individual temporarily retained by government to carry out its work—here, a private attorney engaged by a city—is entitled to seek qualified immunity from suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Filarsky v. Delia*, p. 377.

3. *Secret Service agents—Qualified immunity claim of retaliatory arrest for political speech.*—Petitioner Secret Service agents are entitled to qualified immunity from this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 suit with respect to respondent's claim that he was arrested in retaliation for his political speech, when law at time of arrest did not clearly establish that an arrest supported by probable cause could violate First Amendment. *Reichle v. Howards*, p. 658.

CLEAN WATER ACT.

Environmental Protection Agency compliance order—Clean Water Act violation—Administrative Procedure Act challenge.—Sacketts may bring a civil action under APA to challenge an EPA compliance order asserting that their residential lot is subject to Clean Water Act and that they have violated provisions of that Act. *Sackett v. EPA*, p. 120.

COLLATERAL REVIEW. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

COLOR OF LAW. See **Torture Victim Protection Act of 1991**.

CONCURRENT SENTENCES. See **Sentencing**.

CONSECUTIVE SENTENCES. See **Sentencing**.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 3; **Habeas Corpus**, 2, 3.

I. Double Jeopardy.

Jury instruction on capital murder, first-degree murder, manslaughter, and negligent homicide—Mistrial after jury deadlock—Reprosecution for capital and first-degree murder.—Where a jury was instructed that it could either convict Blueford of capital murder, first-degree murder, manslaughter, or negligent homicide or acquit him of all, and where a mistrial was declared after jury reported that it was deadlocked on manslaughter but had voted against guilt on capital and first-degree murder, Double Jeopardy Clause did not bar reprosecution of Blueford on capital and first-degree murder charges. *Blueford v. Arkansas*, p. 599.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.**II. Equal Protection of the Laws.**

Financing public improvement projects—Rational basis for forgiving unpaid assessments while issuing no refunds.—Where Indianapolis adopted a new method for financing public improvement projects, enacted a resolution forgiving assessment amounts still owed by some homeowners for past projects, and refused to issue refunds to homeowners who had already paid their full assessments, city's administrative concerns provided a rational basis for distinguishing between two groups and thus did not violate Equal Protection Clause. *Armour v. Indianapolis*, p. 673.

III. Right to Counsel.

1. *Effective assistance—Counsel's duty to communicate plea offer.*—Sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of counsel extends to consideration of plea offers that lapse or are rejected; defense counsel has duty to communicate formal plea offers with favorable terms and conditions; defendants must demonstrate a reasonable probability that they would have accepted a lapsed or rejected offer and that plea would have been entered even if prosecution had discretion to cancel it or trial court had discretion to refuse to accept it. *Missouri v. Frye*, p. 133.

2. *Effective assistance—Counsel's ineffective plea offer advice.*—Where counsel's ineffective advice led to a plea offer's rejection, and where prejudice alleged is having to stand trial, a defendant must show that but for that advice, there is a reasonable probability that an offer would have been presented to court, that court would have accepted its terms, and that conviction, sentence, or both would have been less severe than under actual judgment and sentence imposed; any remedy must neutralize taint of a constitutional violation, but must not grant a windfall to defendant or needlessly squander resources State properly invested in prosecution. *Lafler v. Cooper*, p. 156.

IV. Searches and Seizures.

Search of newly jailed arrestees for contraband—Close visual inspection while undressed.—County jails' policy that newly admitted arrestees undergo a close visual inspection while undressed struck a reasonable balance between inmate privacy and institutions' needs; thus, Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments do not require an exception for persons who have been arrested for minor offenses and have given corrections officers no reason to suspect that they are concealing contraband. *Florence v. Board of Chosen Freeholders of County of Burlington*, p. 318.

V. Separation of Powers.

Political question doctrine—Judicial review—Secretary of State's statutory discretion—United States citizen born in Jerusalem.—Political question doctrine does not bar judicial review of constitutionality of

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

§ 214(d) of Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003, which directs Secretary of State, upon request by or for a United States citizen born in Jerusalem, to record place of birth as Israel for purposes of registration of birth, certification of nationality, or issuance of a passport. *Zivotofsky v. Clinton*, p. 189.

VI. States' Immunity from Suit.

Self-care provision of Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.—Fourth Circuit's judgment that self-care provision of Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 2612(a)(1)(D), did not abrogate States' immunity from suits alleging violations of that provision is affirmed. *Coleman v. Court of Appeals of Md.*, p. 30.

CONSUMER PROTECTION. See **Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act.**

CONTRABAND SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

COUNTERCLAIMS. See **Patents**, 1.

COURT INTERPRETERS ACT.

"[C]ompensation of interpreters"—Costs awardable to prevailing parties—Document translation costs.—Because "interpreter" ordinarily means someone who translates orally from one language to another, category "compensation of interpreters," which is among costs that may be awarded under 28 U.S.C. § 1920 to prevailing parties in federal-court lawsuits, does not include cost of document translation. *Taniguchi v. Kan Pacific Saipan, Ltd.*, p. 560.

"CRAMDOWN" PLANS. See **Bankruptcy**, 1.

CREDITORS AND DEBTORS. See **Bankruptcy**.

CRIMINAL LAW. See **Constitutional Law**, I, III, IV; **Habeas Corpus**; **Immigration Law**, 2; **Sentencing**.

DE NOVO STANDARD OF REVIEW. See **Patent Act of 1952**.

DEBTORS AND CREDITORS. See **Bankruptcy**.

DEFERENCE TO AGENCY'S REGULATORY INTERPRETATIONS.
See **Social Security**.

DEPORTATION. See **Immigration Law**, 2.

DISABILITY BENEFITS. See **Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act**.

DRUGS. See **Patents**, 1.

DUE PROCESS. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, III, 1; **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW. See **Clean Water Act**.

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

EQUITABLE TOLLING OF LIMITATIONS PERIODS. See **Securities Exchange Act of 1934**.

EVIDENCE. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT OF 1993. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1045.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE. See **Court Interpreters Act**; **Patent Act of 1952**.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1053.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE. See **Patent Act of 1952**.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2; **Sentencing**.

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

FIRST AMENDMENT. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 3.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 2; **Constitutional Law**, I, II, IV.

FOURTH AMENDMENT. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 2; **Constitutional Law**, IV.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 3.

GENERIC DRUGS. See **Patents**, 1.

GRAND JURY WITNESSES. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 1.

HABEAS CORPUS.

1. *Forfeited timeliness defense—Courts of appeals’ authority to raise on own initiative—State’s waiver of statute of limitations defense.*—Federal courts of appeals, like district courts, have authority—though not obligation—to raise a forfeited timeliness defense to a habeas petition on

HABEAS CORPUS—Continued.

their own initiative in exceptional cases; but Tenth Circuit abused its discretion when it dismissed Wood's petition as untimely after State deliberately waived its statute of limitations defense. *Wood v. Milyard*, p. 463.

2. *Ineffective assistance of trial counsel—State-law limitation to initial-review collateral proceeding—Procedural default.*—Where, under state law, ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claims may only be raised in an initial-review collateral proceeding, not on direct review, a procedural default will not bar a federal habeas court from hearing those claims if, in initial-review collateral proceeding, there was no counsel or counsel in that proceeding was ineffective. *Martinez v. Ryan*, p. 1.

3. *Sufficiency of evidence—Due process—Jury's inferences from trial evidence.*—Evidence at Johnson's trial was not nearly sparse enough to sustain a due process challenge under *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 319, which leaves juries broad discretion in deciding what inferences to draw from trial evidence and does not permit type of fine-grained factual parsing in which Third Circuit engaged. *Coleman v. Johnson*, p. 650.

HOMEOWNERS. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM AND IMMIGRANT RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996. See **Immigration Law**, 2.

IMMIGRATION LAW.

1. *Board of Immigration Appeals—Refusal to impute parent's years of continuous residence or lawful permanent residence status to child—Cancellation of removal.*—Board of Immigration Appeals' refusal to impute a parent's years of continuous residence or lawful permanent residence (LPR) status to his or her child for purposes of 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(a)—which authorizes Attorney General to cancel removal of an alien who meets a 5-year LPR status requirement or a 7-year continuous-residency requirement—is based on a permissible construction of § 1229b(a). *Holder v. Martinez Gutierrez*, p. 583.

2. *Permanent resident status—Felony conviction.*—Impact of Vartelas' brief travel abroad on his permanent resident status is determined not by Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, but by legal regime in force at time of Vartelas' 1994 felony conviction. *Vartelas v. Holder*, p. 257.

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Privacy Act of 1974**.

INCOME TAXES. See **Bankruptcy**, 2; **Taxes**.

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

INFRINGEMENT OF PATENTS. See **Patents**, 1.

INSIDER TRADING. See **Securities Exchange Act of 1934**.

JERUSALEM. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

JOB-RELATED INJURIES. See **Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act**.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS. See **Clean Water Act**.

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

JURY'S DISCRETION. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

JUSTICIABILITY. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

LIENS. See **Bankruptcy**, 1.

LONGSHORE AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT.

Benefits cap—"Newly awarded compensation."—For purposes of Act's benefits cap—which is twice national average weekly wage for fiscal year in which compensation is newly awarded, 33 U. S. C. § 906(c)—an employee is "newly awarded compensation" when he first becomes disabled and thereby becomes statutorily entitled to benefits, no matter whether, or when, a compensation order issues on his behalf. *Roberts v. Sea-Land Services, Inc.*, p. 93.

METHOD-OF-USE PATENTS. See **Patents**, 1.

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

NATIONALITY. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

NATURAL PERSONS. See **Torture Victim Protection Act of 1991**.

NAVIGABLE WATERS. See **Clean Water Act**.

ORGANIZATIONAL LIABILITY. See **Torture Victim Protection Act of 1991**.

PATENT ACT OF 1952.

Section 145 action—Introduction of new evidence—De novo findings required.—There are no limitations on a patent applicant's ability to introduce new evidence in a 35 U. S. C. § 145 action against Director of Patent and Trademark Office beyond those already present in Federal Rules of Evidence and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; if new evidence is presented on a disputed question of fact, district court must make *de novo* findings that take account of both new evidence and administrative record. *Kappos v. Hyatt*, p. 431.

PATENTS.

1. *Drug patent—Infringement suit—Counterclaim for correction of “use code.”*—Manufacturer of a generic drug “may assert a counterclaim” in a patent infringement suit, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(5)(C)(ii)(I), in order to force correction of a “use code”—a description of a patent’s scope that brand manufacturers are required to submit to Federal Drug Administration—on ground that such code inaccurately describes brand’s patent as covering a particular method of using drug. *Caraco Pharmaceutical Laboratories, Ltd. v. Novo Nordisk A/S*, p. 399.

2. *Metabolite levels—Autoimmune-disorder drugs—Patent eligibility.*—Respondent’s process for identifying correlations between metabolite levels and likely harm or ineffectiveness of drugs used to treat autoimmune disorders is not patent eligible. *Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc.*, p. 66.

PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS. See **Immigration Law**.

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

POLITICAL QUESTION DOCTRINE. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

POLITICAL SPEECH. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 3.

PRIVACY ACT OF 1974.

Executive Branch records—Damages for mental or emotional distress—Sovereign immunity.—Act, which contains a detailed set of requirements for management of records held by Executive Branch agencies, does not unequivocally authorize damages for mental or emotional distress and therefore does not waive Government’s sovereign immunity from liability for such harms. *FAA v. Cooper*, p. 284.

PROBABLE CAUSE. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 3.

PROCEDURAL DEFAULT. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

PROCESS PATENTS. See **Patents**, 2.

QUALIFIED IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 2, 3.

RATIONAL-BASIS STANDARD OF REVIEW. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES ACT.

Prohibition on splitting settlement service charge.—In order to establish a violation of Act provision 12 U.S.C. § 2607(b)—which prohibits giving and accepting “any portion, split, or percentage of any charge made or received for the rendering of a real estate settlement service . . . other than for services actually performed”—a plaintiff must demonstrate that allegedly unearned fee was divided between two or more persons. *Freeman v. Quicken Loans, Inc.*, p. 624.

REMOVAL. See **Immigration Law**, 1.

REMOVAL OF DEPORTABLE ALIENS. See **Immigration Law**, 2.

REORGANIZATION PLANS. See **Bankruptcy**, 2.

RESIDENT ALIENS. See **Immigration Law**.

RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF NEW LAWS. See **Immigration Law**, 2.

REVIEW OF AGENCY FINDINGS. See **Patent Act of 1952**.

RIGHT TO COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, III; **Habeas Corpus**, 2.

SECRET SERVICE AGENTS. See **Civil Rights Act of 1871**, 3.

SECURED LOANS. See **Bankruptcy**, 1.

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.

Section 16(b) suit against corporate insider—Tolling of limitations period—Disclosure statement required by § 16(a).—Even assuming that 2-year period to file suit against a corporate insider under § 16(b) of Act can be extended, Ninth Circuit erred in determining that period is tolled until insider files a disclosure statement required by § 16(a). *Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC v. Simmonds*, p. 221.

SECURITIES REGULATIONS. See **Securities Exchange Act of 1934**.

SENTENCING.

Federal sentencing—Pending state charges—Federal-court discretion—Concurrent and consecutive sentences.—Where Setser was sentenced on federal drug charges while he had state charges pending, Federal District Court had discretion to order that federal sentence run consecutively to an anticipated state sentence and concurrently with another; state court's subsequent decision to make Setser's state sentences run concurrently did not establish that federal court imposed an unreasonable sentence. *Setser v. United States*, p. 231.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY.

Child's eligibility for survivors benefits—Agency construction entitled to Chevron deference.—In determining whether a child is eligible for Social Security survivors benefits, Social Security Administration's interpretation—which is that 42 U. S. C. §§ 416(h)(2) and (h)(3)(C) entitle biological children to benefits only if they qualify for inheritance from decedent

SOCIAL SECURITY—Continued.

under state intestacy law or satisfy one of statutory alternatives to that requirement—is better attuned to statute’s text and design to benefit primarily those supported by deceased wage earner in his or her lifetime, and is at least a permissible construction entitled to deference under *Chevron U. S. A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837. *Astrue v. Capato*, p. 541.

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY. See **Privacy Act of 1974.**

STANDARDS OF REVIEW FOR AGENCY FINDINGS. See **Patent Act of 1952.**

STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS. See **Habeas Corpus, 1; Taxes; Securities Exchange Act of 1934.**

STRIP SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law, IV.**

SUPREME COURT.

1. Amendments to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, p. 1045.
2. Amendments to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, p. 1053.

SURVIVORS’ SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS. See **Social Security.**

TAX ASSESSMENTS. See **Constitutional Law, II.**

TAXATION OF COSTS. See **Court Interpreters Act.**

TAX DEFICIENCY. See **Taxes.**

TAXES. See also **Bankruptcy, 2.**

Income tax—Deficiency-assessment period—Overstatement of basis.—Title 26 U.S.C. §6501(e)(1)(A), which extends, from three to six years, period in which Government must assess a deficiency against a taxpayer when a taxpayer “omits from gross income an amount . . . in excess of 25 percent” of stated income, does not apply to an overstatement of basis. *United States v. Home Concrete & Supply, LLC*, p. 478.

TIMELINESS OF PETITION. See **Habeas Corpus, 1.**

TORTURE VICTIM PROTECTION ACT OF 1991.

Torture and extrajudicial killing under color of foreign law—Organization’s liability.—Term “individual” as used in Act encompasses only natural persons and thus does not impose liability against organizations for acts of torture and extrajudicial killing committed under authority or color of law of any foreign nation. *Mohamad v. Palestinian Authority*, p. 449.

WORDS AND PHRASES.

"[C]ompensation of interpreters." 28 U.S.C. §1920. *Taniguchi v. Kan Pacific Saipan*, p. 560.

"[I]ncurred by the estate." 11 U.S.C. §503(b)(1)(B)(i). *Hall v. United States*, p. 506.

"[I]ndividual." Torture Victim Protection Act of 1991. *Mohamad v. Palestinian Authority*, p. 449.

"[I]nterpreter." 28 U.S.C. §1920. *Taniguchi v. Kan Pacific Saipan*, p. 560.

"[N]ewly awarded compensation." Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, 33 U.S.C. §906(c). *Roberts v. Sea-Land Services, Inc.*, p. 93.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION. See **Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.**