

## INDEX

---

**ABUSE OF DISCRETION.** See **Courts of Appeals.**

**ADOPTION PROCEEDINGS.** See **Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978.**

**AGENCY.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964**, 1.

**ANTITRUST.**

*Reverse payment settlement agreement—Patent infringement suit—Generic drug manufacturers.*—Eleventh Circuit erred in affirming dismissal of Federal Trade Commission’s antitrust complaint against drug manufacturers who entered into a reverse payment settlement agreement in a patent infringement suit in which generic drug manufacturers agreed to delay drug marketing and to help promote brand-name drug in exchange for millions of dollars. *FTC v. Actavis, Inc.*, p. 136.

**ARIZONA.** See **National Voter Registration Act of 1993.**

**ARMED CAREER CRIMINAL ACT.**

*Sentence enhancement—Predicate offenses—Modified categorical approach.*—In determining whether a prior conviction qualifies as a predicate offense for sentence enhancement purposes under Act, modified categorical approach—which permits a sentencing court to compare elements of a divisible statutory offense—may not be applied when prior crime has a single, indivisible set of elements. *Descamps v. United States*, p. 254.

**ATTORNEY ADVERTISING.** See **Driver’s Privacy Protection Act of 1994.**

**CALIFORNIA.** See **Standing.**

**CITIZENSHIP.** See **National Voter Registration Act of 1993.**

**CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.**

1. *“Supervisor”—Vicarious liability under Title VII—Tangible employment actions.*—An employee is a “supervisor” for purposes of vicarious liability under Title VII only if he or she is empowered by employer to take tangible employment actions against victim. *Vance v. Ball State Univ.*, p. 421.

2. *Title VII retaliation claims—Test for causation.*—Retaliation claims filed pursuant to Title VII must be proved according to traditional principles of but-for causation, not lessened causation test stated in 42 U. S. C. § 2000e–2(m). *University of Tex. Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar*, p. 338.

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

**COLLEGE ADMISSIONS POLICIES.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 2.

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

**CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.

**CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.** See also **Standing.**

**I. Congressional Authority.**

*Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act—Sentence served prior to Act's passage.*—Act's registration requirements as applied to petitioner—who had already served his sentence for a federal sex offense when Act was passed but who was subject to registration requirements of an earlier federal registration Act—fall within scope of Congress' authority under Necessary and Proper Clause. *United States v. Kebodeaux*, p. 387.

**II. Eminent Domain.**

*Land-use permit approval—"Nexus" and "rough proportionality" requirements.*—Respondent's denial of petitioner's land-use permit is subject to *Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n*, 483 U. S. 825, and *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 U. S. 374—which require that a unit of government may not condition approval of a land-use permit on owner's relinquishment of a portion of his property unless there is a "nexus" and "rough proportionality" between government's demand and effects of proposed land use. *Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Management Dist.*, p. 595.

**III. Equality Among States.**

*Voting Rights Act of 1965—Preclearance formula.*—Section 4 of Act, which provides coverage formula used to determine which jurisdictions must, pursuant to §5, obtain federal permission before enacting any law related to voting, is unconstitutional; and its formula can no longer be used as a basis for subjecting jurisdictions to §5 preclearance. *Shelby County v. Holder*, p. 529.

**IV. Equal Protection of the Laws.**

1. *Defense of Marriage Act—Equal liberty of persons.*—Act is unconstitutional as a deprivation of equal liberty of persons that is protected by the Fifth Amendment. *United States v. Windsor*, p. 744.

2. *Equal protection of the laws—University admissions policy—Educational benefits of diversity.*—Because Fifth Circuit did not hold university to demanding burden of strict scrutiny articulated in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U. S. 306, and *Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Bakke*, 438 U. S. 265, when assessing whether university's admissions program is narrowly

**CONSTITUTIONAL LAW**—Continued.

tailored to obtain educational benefits of diversity, its decision affirming District Court's grant of summary judgment to university was incorrect. *Fisher v. University of Tex. at Austin*, p. 297.

**V. Freedom of Speech.**

*United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003—Funding condition.*—Act's condition on federal funding grants—no funds may be used by an organization “that does not have a policy explicitly opposing prostitution and sex trafficking,” 22 U. S. C. § 7631(f)—violates First Amendment by compelling affirmation of a belief that by its nature cannot be confined within scope of Government program. *Agency for Int'l Development v. Alliance for Open Society Int'l, Inc.*, p. 205.

**VI. Privilege Against Self-incrimination.**

*Prearrest silence as evidence of guilt.*—Texas Court of Criminal Appeals' judgment—affirming petitioner's murder conviction and rejecting his claim that Fifth Amendment was violated when prosecution used his silence during a precustodial interview as evidence of guilt—is affirmed. *Salinas v. Texas*, p. 178.

**VII. Right to Jury Trial.**

*Facts that increase mandatory minimum sentences.*—Because mandatory minimum sentences increase penalty for a crime, any fact that increases mandatory minimum is an “element” that must be submitted to jury; accordingly, *Harris v. United States*, 536 U. S. 545, is overruled. *Alleyne v. United States*, p. 99.

**COURTS OF APPEALS.**

*Failure to issue mandate in capital case—Abuse of discretion.*—Ninth Circuit's failure to issue its mandate in this capital case as normally required by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 41(d)(2)(D) constituted an abuse of discretion. *Ryan v. Schad*, p. 521.

**CRIMINAL LAW.** See **Armed Career Criminal Act; Constitutional Law VI; VII; Hobbs Act.**

**CUSTODY PROCEEDINGS.** See **Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978.**

**DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT.** See **Constitutional Law IV, 1.**

**DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964, 1; Constitutional Law III; IV, 2.**

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

**DRIVER'S PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT OF 1994.**

*Personal information disclosure—Litigation exception—Attorney solicitation of clients.*—Where Act prohibits disclosure of personal information contained in state motor vehicle department records unless for a purpose permitted by one of Act's exceptions, an attorney's solicitation of clients for a lawsuit does not fall within scope of Act's litigation exception for personal information sought "in connection with" judicial and administrative proceedings, including "investigation in anticipation of litigation," 18 U. S. C. § 2721(b)(4). *Maracich v. Spears*, p. 48.

**DRUG LABELING.** See **Pre-emption.**

**DUE PROCESS.** See **Constitutional Law** IV, 1; VII.

**EMINENT DOMAIN.** See **Constitutional Law**, II.

**EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964.**

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

**ENHANCED SENTENCES.** See **Armed Career Criminal Act.**

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

**EXTORTION.** See **Hobbs Act.**

**FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT.**

*Invalidation of contractual class-arbitration waiver.*—Act does not permit courts to invalidate a contractual waiver of class arbitration on ground that plaintiff's cost of individually arbitrating a federal statutory claim exceeds potential recovery. *American Express Co. v. Italian Colors Restaurant*, p. 228.

**FEDERAL GRANTS.** See **Constitutional Law**, V.

**FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE.** See **Courts of Appeals.**

**FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS.** See **National Voter Registration Act of 1993; Pre-emption.**

**FIFTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV, 1.

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

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

**GENERIC DRUGS.** See **Antitrust.**

**HOBBS ACT.**

*Extortion—"Obtaining of property from another."*—Attempting to compel a person to recommend that his employer approve an investment

**HOBBS ACT**—Continued.

does not constitute “the obtaining of property from another” under 18 U. S. C. §1951(b)(2), which is definition of “extortion” for purposes of Hobbs Act violation. *Sekhar v. United States*, p. 729.

**INDIAN CHILD WELFARE ACT OF 1978.**

*Involuntary termination of parental rights—Adoption placement preferences for Indian children.*—Neither 25 U. S. C. §1912(f)—which bars involuntary termination of a parent’s rights in absence of a heightened showing that serious harm to Indian child is likely to result from parent’s “continued custody” of child—nor §1912(d)—which conditions involuntary termination of parental rights with respect to an Indian child on a showing that remedial efforts have been made to prevent “breakup of the Indian family”—bars termination of respondent’s biological father’s parental rights; and §1915(a)—which provides placement preferences for adoption of Indian children—does not bar non-Indian petitioners from adopting an Indian child when no other eligible candidates have sought to adopt child. *Adoptive Couple v. Baby Girl*, p. 637.

**INFORMATIONAL PRIVACY.** See **Driver’s Privacy Protection Act of 1994.**

**JURY TRIALS.** See **Constitutional Law**, VII.

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

**LAND-USE ORDINANCES.** See **Constitutional Law**, II.

**MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES.** See **Constitutional Law**, VII.

**NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993.**

*State voter registration evidence-of-citizenship requirement—Pre-emption.*—An Arizona law that requires voter-registration officials to “reject” any application that is not accompanied by documentary evidence of citizenship is pre-empted by Act’s mandate that States “accept and use” a federal form for registering voters for federal elections, which form requires only that an applicant aver, under penalty of perjury, that he is a citizen. *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Ariz., Inc.*, p. 1.

**NECESSARY AND PROPER CLAUSE.** See **Constitutional Law**, I.

**NEW HAMPSHIRE.** See **Pre-emption.**

**PARENT AND CHILD.** See **Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978.**

**PAY-FOR-DELAY PATENT SETTLEMENTS.** See **Antitrust.**

**PREARREST SILENCE.** See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

**PRECLEARANCE OF ELECTION CONDITIONS.** See **Constitutional Law, III.**

**PRE-EMPTION.** See **National Voter Registration Act of 1993.**

*Design-defect cause of action—Prescription drug warnings.*—A New Hampshire design-defect cause of action that turns on adequacy of a prescription drug's warnings is pre-empted by federal law under *PLIVA, Inc. v. Mensing*, 564 U.S. 604. *Mutual Pharmaceutical Co. v. Bartlett*, p. 472.

**PRIOR CONVICTIONS.** See **Armed Career Criminal Act.**

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

**PRODUCT LIABILITY.** See **Pre-emption.**

**PROPERTY RIGHTS.** See **Constitutional Law, II.**

**PROSTITUTION.** See **Constitutional Law, V.**

**RACIAL DISCRIMINATION.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964, 1; Constitutional Law, IV, 2.**

**REGISTRY OF SEX OFFENDERS.** See **Constitutional Law, I.**

**RETRALIATION CLAIMS.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964, 2.**

**REVERSE PAYMENT PATENT SETTLEMENTS.** See **Antitrust.**

**RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL.** See **Constitutional Law, VII.**

**RIGHT TO VOTE.** See **Constitutional Law, III.**

**SAME-SEX MARRIAGE.** See **Constitutional Law, IV, 2; Standing.**

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

**SENTENCE ENHANCEMENTS.** See **Armed Career Criminal Act.**

**SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION AND NOTIFICATION ACT.** See **Constitutional Law, I.**

**SEX TRAFFICKING.** See **Constitutional Law, V.**

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

**STANDING.**

*State constitutional amendment defining marriage—Appeal of order declaring amendment unconstitutional.*—Petitioners, official proponents of Proposition 8—which amended California Constitution to define marriage as a union between a man and a woman—did not have standing to appeal District Court's order declaring it unconstitutional. *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, p. 693.

**STATE MOTOR VEHICLE RECORDS.** See **Driver's Privacy Protection Act of 1994.**

**SUPREME COURT.**

1. Retirement of William K. Suter as Clerk, p. vii.
2. Appointment of Scott S. Harris as Clerk, p. 935.
3. Term Statistics, p. 949.

**TAKING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY FOR PUBLIC USE.** See **Constitutional Law, II.**

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

**TRIAL BY JURY.** See **Constitutional Law, VII.**

**UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP AGAINST HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA ACT OF 2003.** See **Constitutional Law, V.**

**UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS POLICIES.** See **Constitutional Law, IV, 2.**

**VICARIOUS LIABILITY FOR DISCRIMINATORY CONDUCT.** See **Civil Rights Act of 1964, 1.**

**VOTING RIGHTS.** See **Constitutional Law, III; National Voter Registration Act of 1993.**

**WAIVER OF ARBITRATION.** See **Federal Arbitration Act.**

**WORDS AND PHRASES.**

1. “[T]he obtaining of property from another.” Hobbs Act, 18 U. S. C. § 1951(b)(2). *Sekhar v. United States*, p. 729.
2. “[I]n connection with any . . . investigation in anticipation of litigation.” Driver’s Privacy Protection Act of 1994, 18 U. S. C. § 2721(b)(4). *Maracich v. Spears*, p. 48.