

INDEX

ACTUAL INNOCENCE STANDARD. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW.

Agency authority under Communication Act of 1934—Chevron deference.—Courts must apply deference under *Chevron U. S. A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U. S. 837, to an agency's interpretation of an ambiguity in Act that concerns scope of agency's statutory authority (*i. e.*, its jurisdiction). *Arlington v. FCC*, p. 290.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES. See **Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.**

AGGRAVATED FELONY CONVICTIONS. See **Immigration and Nationality Act.**

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937.

Enforcement actions—Takings claims as affirmative defense.—Takings claims raised by California raisin handlers as an affirmative defense to Department of Agriculture's enforcement action was properly before Ninth Circuit because Act—which is intended to stabilize agricultural commodity prices—provides a comprehensive remedial scheme that withdraws Court of Claims Tucker Act jurisdiction over such claims. *Horne v. Department of Agriculture*, p. 513.

ALIEN TORT STATUTE.

Presumption against extraterritorial application.—Nothing in statute rebuts presumption against extraterritorial application to claims under the statute. *Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Co.*, p. 108.

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

ANTITRUST LAW. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**, 2.

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

ARBITRATION. See **Federal Arbitration Act.**

ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Habeas Corpus**, 2, 4.

ATTORNEY'S FEES. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986.**

BANKRUPTCY.

Nondischargeable debt—Defalcation while acting in fiduciary capacity.—Term “defalcation,” as used in 11 U. S. C. § 523(a)(4)—which provides that an individual cannot obtain a bankruptcy discharge from a debt for “defalcation while acting in a fiduciary capacity”—includes a culpable “state of mind” requirement involving knowledge of, or gross recklessness in respect to, improper nature of fiduciary behavior. *Bullock v. Bank-Champaign, N. A.*, p. 267.

BLOOD-ALCOHOL TESTS. See **Constitutional Law, IV, 2.**

CALIFORNIA. See **Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; Habeas Corpus, 2.**

CLASS CERTIFICATION. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 2.**

COLLECTION OF DNA EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law, IV, 1.**

COLLECTIVE ACTIONS. See **Jurisdiction.**

COMMON-FUND DOCTRINE. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934. See **Administrative Law.**

COMPACTS BETWEEN STATES. See **Constitutional Law, I, 1.**

CONFRONTATION OF WITNESSES. See **Habeas Corpus, 3.**

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; Habeas Corpus, 2, 3, 4, 5.**

I. Commerce Clause.

1. *Oklahoma water restriction statutes—Impact on interstate commerce.*—Oklahoma laws that restrict out-of-state diversions of its water are not unconstitutional restrictions on interstate commerce; nor are they pre-empted by Red River Compact. *Tarrant Regional Water Dist. v. Herrmann*, p. 614.

2. *Virginia’s Freedom of Information Act—Public-records access.*—Act, which provides access to all public records by any Virginia citizen, but grants no such right to noncitizens, does not violate dormant Commerce Clause. *McBurney v. Young*, p. 221.

II. Ex post facto laws.

Federal Sentencing Guidelines—Range promulgated after commission of crime.—*Ex Post Facto* Clause is violated when a defendant is sentenced under Federal Sentencing Guidelines promulgated after he committed his

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.

criminal acts and new version provides a higher sentencing range than version in place at time of offense. *Peugh v. United States*, p. 530.

III. Privileges and Immunities Clause.

Virginia's Freedom of Information Act—Public-records access.—Act, which provides access to all public records by any Virginia citizen, but grants no such right to noncitizens, does not violate Privileges and Immunities Clause. *McBurney v. Young*, p. 221.

IV. Searches and seizures.

1. *DNA cheek swab of arrestee detained at police station.*—When officers make an arrest supported by probable cause to hold for a serious offense and bring suspect to station to be detained in custody, taking and analyzing a cheek swab of arrestee's DNA is, like fingerprinting and photographing, a legitimate police booking procedure that is reasonable under Fourth Amendment. *Maryland v. King*, p. 435.

2. *Using drug-sniffing dog on homeowner's porch.*—Use of a drug-sniffing dog on a homeowner's porch to investigate home's contents is a Fourth Amendment "search." *Florida v. Jardines*, p. 1.

3. *Warrantless blood test—Exigency in drunk-driving investigation.*—Natural dissipation of alcohol in bloodstream does not constitute an exigency in every drunk-driving investigation sufficient to justify conducting a warrantless blood test. *Missouri v. McNeely*, p. 141.

CRIMINAL LAW. See **Constitutional Law**, II; IV; **Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure**, 2; **Habeas Corpus**; **Immigration and Nationality Act**.

DEFALCATION. See **Bankruptcy**.

DISCHARGE OF DEBT. See **Bankruptcy**.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INTERSTATE COMMERCE. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 2.

DNA. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1; **Patents**, 1.

DORMANT COMMERCE CLAUSE. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 2.

DRUG-DETECTION DOGS. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2.

DUE PROCESS. See **Habeas Corpus**, 5.

EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Habeas Corpus**, 4.

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.

Reimbursement action—Equitable common-fund doctrine—Allocation of attorney's fees.—Where ERISA §502(a)(3) reimbursement action is

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974—

Continued.

based on an equitable lien by agreement, ERISA plan's terms govern, and neither general unjust enrichment principles nor specific doctrines reflecting those principles can override applicable contract; but where, as here, an equitable common-fund doctrine provides appropriate default rule to fill gap left by health benefits plan's silence on allocation of attorney's fees, such equitable rules may aid in properly construing agreement. *US Airways, Inc. v. McCutchen*, p. 88.

ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS. See **Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.**

EQUITABLE LIENS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

EXCESS PROFITS TAX. See **Taxes.**

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

EXIGENCY FINDINGS AND WARRANT REQUIREMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 3.

EX POST FACTO LAWS. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

EXTRATERRITORIALITY. See **Alien Tort Statute.**

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

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938. See **Jurisdiction.**

FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT.

Judicial review—Arbitrator's class arbitration decision.—Where parties agreed that arbitrator should decide whether their contract authorized class arbitration, that decision survives judicial review under § 10(a)(4) of Act, which permits an arbitrator's decision to be set aside only where arbitrator "exceeded [his] powers." *Oxford Health Plans LLC v. Sutter*, p. 564.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1994.

1. *Pre-emption clause—Port of Los Angeles' truck placard and parking requirements.*—Act's clause prohibiting enforcement of a state "law, regulation, or other provision having the force and effect of law related to a price, route, or service of any motor carrier . . . with respect to the transportation of property," 49 U. S. C. § 14501(c)(1), pre-empts truck placard and parking requirements in an agreement that trucking companies must sign before they can transport cargo at the Port of Los Angeles. *American Trucking Assns., Inc. v. Los Angeles*, p. 641.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1994—Continued.

2. *Pre-emption clause—State-law damages claims.*—Act’s pre-emption clause—which prohibits enforcement of state laws “related to a price, route, or service of any motor carrier . . . with respect to the transportation of property,” 49 U.S.C. § 14501(c)(1)—does not pre-empt state-law claims for damages stemming from storage and disposal of a towed vehicle. *Dan’s City Used Cars, Inc. v. Pelkey*, p. 251.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES’ GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1954.

Former spouses as beneficiaries—Pre-emption of conflicting Virginia law.—Where petitioner’s decedent spouse divorced and remarried but left respondent, his former spouse, as beneficiary on a life insurance policy governed by FEGLIA, a Virginia statute that would have rendered respondent liable for FEGLI proceeds to whoever would have received them but for beneficiary designation is pre-empted by federal law. *Hillman v. Maretta*, p. 483.

FEDERAL INCOME TAXES. See **Taxes.**

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1125.

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1141.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

1. Amendments to Rules, p. 1149.

2. *Rule 23(b)(3)—Antitrust suit—Class certification.*—Class in respondents’ antitrust suit against petitioner cable companies was improperly certified under Rule 23(b)(3), which requires that “questions of law or fact common to class members predominate over any questions affecting only individual members.” *Comcast Corp. v. Behrend*, p. 27.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.

1. Amendments to Rules, p. 1161.

2. *Rule 11(h)—Vacatur of guilty plea.*—Under Rule, vacatur of respondent’s plea is not in order if record shows no prejudice to his decision to plead guilty. *United States v. Davila*, p. 597.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Amendment to Rules, p. 1167.

FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES. See **Constitutional Law, II.**

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Compacts Between States; Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994; Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.**

FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT.

Intentional torts by law enforcement officers—Immunity from suit.—Title 28 U. S. C. § 2680(h)'s “law enforcement proviso” waives Government's sovereign immunity for certain intentional torts committed by law enforcement officers when officers' acts or omissions arise within scope of their employment, regardless of whether officers are engaged in investigative or law enforcement activity or are executing a search, seizing evidence, or making an arrest. *Millbrook v. United States*, p. 50.

FIDUCIARY DUTIES. See **Bankruptcy.**

FIFTH AMENDMENT. See **Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.**

FOREIGN TAX CREDIT. See **Taxes.**

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

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

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT. See **Constitutional Law, I, 2; III.**

GENETICALLY ENGINEERED PLANTS. See **Patents, 2.**

GUILTY PLEAS. See **Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, 2.**

HABEAS CORPUS.

1. *Actual innocence gateway—Unjustifiable delay as factor in actual-innocence determination.*—Actual innocence, if proved, serves as a gateway through which a habeas petitioner may pass whether impediment is a procedural bar or expiration of Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996's statute of limitations; when facing such a claim, a federal court should count unjustifiable delay on a habeas petitioner's part as a factor in determining whether actual innocence has been reliably shown; here, District Court's appraisal of respondent's petition as insufficient to meet actual-innocence standard of *Schlup v. Delo*, 513 U. S. 298, should be dispositive, absent cause for Sixth Circuit to upset that evaluation. *McQuiggin v. Perkins*, p. 383.

2. *Appointed counsel for new-trial motion—Previous waivers of right to counsel.*—Ninth Circuit erred in granting respondent habeas relief on ground that his Sixth Amendment claim—that California courts wrongly declined to appoint counsel to assist with his motion for a new trial notwithstanding his three previous right-to-counsel waivers—is supported by

HABEAS CORPUS—Continued.

“clearly established Federal law,” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1). *Marshall v. Rodgers*, p. 58.

3. *Exclusion of extrinsic evidence for witness impeachment*.—Ninth Circuit’s grant of habeas relief was unreasonable here, where Nevada Supreme Court held that evidence of a rape victim’s previously reported, but unsubstantiated, assault allegations against respondent were properly excluded at his trial, and where no prior decision of this Court clearly established that Confrontation Clause entitles a defendant to introduce extrinsic evidence for impeachment purposes. *Nevada v. Jackson*, p. 505.

4. *Ineffective assistance of trial counsel—Lack of meaningful opportunity to raise claim on direct appeal—Procedural default*.—Where a State’s procedural framework makes it highly unlikely that a defendant will typically have a meaningful opportunity to raise an ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim on direct appeal, exception recognized in *Martinez v. Ryan*, 566 U.S. 1, 17—that “a procedural default will not bar” federal habeas review of a substantial ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim “if, in [State’s] initial-review collateral proceeding, there was no counsel or counsel in that proceeding was ineffective”—applies. *Trevino v. Thaler*, p. 413.

5. *Retrial for murder—Diminished-capacity defense—Retroactive application of state appellate decision—Due process*.—Respondent is not entitled to federal habeas relief on claim that judge at retrial for first-degree murder violated due process by retroactively applying Michigan Supreme Court case rejecting diminished-capacity defense. *Metrish v. Lancaster*, p. 351.

HEALTH BENEFITS PLANS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

HOME SEARCHES. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.

Marijuana distribution conviction—Removal for aggravated felony offense.—If a noncitizen’s conviction for a marijuana distribution offense fails to establish that offense involved either remuneration or more than a small amount of marijuana, it is not an aggravated felony under Act, which prohibits Attorney General from granting discretionary relief from removal to an aggravated felon. *Moncrieffe v. Holder*, p. 184.

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Federal Tort Claims Act.**

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

INTERNATIONAL LAW. See **Alien Tort Statute.**

INTERSTATE COMPACTS. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 1.

JUDICIAL DEFERENCE. See **Administrative Law.**

JURISDICTION. See also **Administrative Law; Alien Tort Statute.**

Subject-matter jurisdiction—Dismissal of collective action—Mootness.—Respondent's collective action under Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was appropriately dismissed for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction where her individual claim became moot and she had no personal interest in representing unnamed claimants, nor any other continuing interest that would preserve her suit from mootness. *Genesis HealthCare Corp. v. Symczyk*, p. 66.

LAW OF NATIONS. See **Alien Tort Statute.**

LIFE INSURANCE BENEFICIARIES. See **Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.**

MICHIGAN. See **Habeas Corpus**, 5.

MOOTNESS. See **Jurisdiction.**

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD VACCINE INJURY ACT OF 1986.

Untimely petitions for compensation—Attorney's fees.—A petition under Act found to be untimely may qualify for an award of attorney's fees if it is filed in good faith and there is a reasonable basis for its claim. *Sebelius v. Cloer*, p. 369.

NEVADA. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

OKLAHOMA. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 1.

PATENTS.

1. *Naturally occurring DNA segment—Synthetically created complementary DNA.*—A naturally occurring DNA segment is a product of nature and not patent eligible merely because it has been isolated, but synthetically created complementary DNA (cDNA) is patent eligible because it is not naturally occurring. *Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.*, p. 576.

2. *Patent exhaustion doctrine—Reproduction of patented seed.*—Where petitioner farmer used soybeans harvested for consumption from patented Roundup Ready seeds to produce more Roundup Ready soybeans for planting, patent exhaustion doctrine—which gives purchaser, or any subsequent owner, of a patented article right to use or resell that article—did not permit him to reproduce patented seeds without patent holder's permission. *Bowman v. Monsanto Co.*, p. 278.

POLICE BOOKING PROCEDURES. See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.

PORT AUTHORITY REGULATION. See **Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994**, 1.

PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW. See **Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994; Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.**

PRESUMPTION AGAINST EXTRATERRITORIAL APPLICATION. See **Alien Tort Statute.**

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF STATE CITIZENS. See **Constitutional Law, III.**

PROBABLE CAUSE. See **Constitutional Law, IV, 1.**

PROCEDURAL DEFAULT. See **Habeas Corpus, 1.**

PUBLIC RECORDS. See **Constitutional Law, I, 2; III.**

RED RIVER COMPACT. See **Constitutional Law, I, 1.**

REIMBURSEMENT FOR MEDICAL EXPENSES. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

REMOVAL OF ALIENS. See **Immigration and Nationality Act.**

RIGHT TO COUNSEL. See **Habeas Corpus, 2, 4.**

SIXTH AMENDMENT. See **Habeas Corpus, 2, 3, 4.**

STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS. See **Habeas Corpus, 1; National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986.**

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

SUPREME COURT.

1. Rules of the Supreme Court, p. 1045.
2. Amendments to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, p. 1125.
3. Amendments to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, p. 1141.
4. Amendments to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, p. 1149.
5. Amendments to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, p. 1161.
6. Amendment to Federal Rules of Evidence, p. 1167.

TAKING OF PROPERTY. See **Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.**

TAXES.

Federal income tax—Credit for United Kingdom “windfall tax.”— United Kingdom’s one-time “windfall tax” on specified U. K. companies is creditable on PPL’s federal income taxes pursuant to 26 U. S. C. § 901(b)(1), which permits a credit for “income, war profits, and excess profits taxes” paid overseas. *PPL Corp. v. Commissioner*, p. 329.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS. See **Administrative Law; Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 2.**

TEXAS. See **Habeas Corpus, 4.**

TRANSPORTATION. See **Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994.**

TUCKER ACT. See **Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.**

UNITED STATES SENTENCING GUIDELINES. See **Constitutional Law, II.**

UNJUST ENRICHMENT. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

VACATUR OF GUILTY PLEA. See **Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, 2.**

VIRGINIA. See **Constitutional Law, I, 2; III; Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.**

WAIVER OF IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Federal Tort Claims Act.**

WAIVER OF RIGHT TO COUNSEL. See **Habeas Corpus, 2.**

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

WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS. See **Administrative Law.**

WORDS AND PHRASES.

"[D]efalcation." Bankruptcy Code, 11 U. S. C. § 523(a)(4). *Bullock v. BankChampaign, N. A.*, p. 267.

"[E]xcess profits taxes." Internal Revenue Code, 26 U. S. C. § 901(b)(1). *PPL Corp. v. Commissioner*, p. 329.