

INDEX

AIDING AND ABETTING. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

AIR TRANSPORTATION. See **Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989**.

ANTITRUST LAW.

State regulatory board—Active market participants—State-action antitrust immunity.—Because a controlling number of North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners' decisionmakers are active market participants in occupation that board regulates, board can invoke state-action antitrust immunity only if it was subject to active supervision by State; here that requirement is not met. *North Carolina State Bd. of Dental Examiners v. FTC*, p. 494.

APPEALS.

1. *Single case in multidistrict litigation dismissed in its entirety—Right to appeal.*—District Court's order dismissing petitioners' case in its entirety removed petitioners from multidistrict litigation they had been part of, thereby triggering their right to appeal under 28 U. S. C. § 1291. *Gelboim v. Bank of America Corp.*, p. 405.

2. *Spisak theory of ineffective assistance of counsel—Notice of cross-appeal requirement.*—Jennings' *Smith v. Spisak*, 558 U. S. 139, theory was a defense of his favorable habeas judgment on alternative grounds, and thus he was not required to take a cross-appeal or obtain a certificate of appealability to argue it on appeal. *Jennings v. Stephens*, p. 271.

ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Appeals**, 2; **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

BANK ROBBERY. See **Criminal Law**, 2.

BENEFIT PLANS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

CELL PHONE TOWERS. See **Telecommunications Act of 1996**.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**; **Immunity from Suit**.

COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

COLORADO. See **Compacts Between States**.

COMMERCIAL FISHING. See **Criminal Law**, 1.

COMPACTS BETWEEN STATES.

Republican River Compact—Equitable remedies.—Special Master’s determination that Nebraska violated Compact and 2002 Final Settlement Stipulation and his recommendation that Nebraska’s requested modification of 2002 agreement be granted are adopted; parties’ exceptions to Special Master’s Report are overruled. *Kansas v. Nebraska*, p. 445.

COMPENSATION FOR TIME SPENT UNDERGOING SECURITY SCREENINGS. See **Labor**.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. See **Habeas Corpus**, 3.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Appeals; Immunity from Suit**.

Searches and seizures—Mistake of law—Objectively reasonable suspicion justifying vehicle stop.—Because it was objectively reasonable for an officer in Sergeant Darisse’s position to think that North Carolina law required vehicles to have two functioning brake lights instead of one, Darisse’s stop of Heien’s vehicle was lawful under Fourth Amendment. *Heien v. North Carolina*, p. 54.

CONSUMER RIGHTS. See **Truth in Lending Act**.

CRIMINAL LAW.

1. *Destruction of “tangible object” to impede federal investigation—Possession of undersized fish.*—Under 18 U. S. C. § 1519—which provides that a person may be fined or imprisoned for up to 20 years if he “knowingly alters, destroys, mutilates, conceals, covers up, falsifies, or makes a false entry in any record, document, or tangible object with the intent to impede, obstruct, or influence” a federal investigation—a “tangible object” is one used to record or preserve information, not an object like undersized fish that petitioner Yates disposed of in order to avoid civil penalties for violating federal conservation regulations. *Yates v. United States*, p. 528.

2. *Enhanced penalties—Forced accompaniment in bank robbery.*—Title 18 U. S. C. § 2113(e)—which establishes enhanced penalties for anyone who “forces [a] person to accompany him” while committing or fleeing from a bank robbery—is violated when a bank robber forces a person to go somewhere with him, even if movement occurs entirely within a single building or over a short distance, as occurred here. *Whitfield v. United States*, p. 265.

CROSS-APPEAL RULE. See **Appeals**, 2.

DENTISTS. See **Antitrust Law**.

DUE PROCESS. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; Habeas Corpus**, 1.

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.

Collectively bargained health care benefit plans—Contract law principles.—Sixth Circuit’s conclusion that a collective-bargaining agreement created a vested right to lifetime contribution-free health care benefits rested on principles that are incompatible with ordinary principles of contract law. *M&G Polymers USA, LLC v. Tackett*, p. 427.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; Labor.**

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

FEDERAL AIR MARSHALS. See **Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989.**

FEDERAL CONSERVATION REGULATIONS. See **Criminal Law, 1.**

FEDERAL EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES. See **Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989.**

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

Pleading standards—Statement of claim.—Federal pleading rules, see Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 8(a)(2), did not require petitioners to invoke 42 U. S. C. § 1983 expressly in order to state a claim that respondent city terminated their employment in violation of due process. *Johnson v. City of Shelby*, p. 10.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Inadmissibility of certain juror testimony—Evidence of voir dire dishonesty—New trial motion—“Extraneous prejudicial information” exception.—Federal Rule of Evidence 606(b), which makes inadmissible certain juror testimony regarding what occurred in a jury room, precludes a party seeking a new trial from using one juror’s affidavit of what another juror said in deliberations to demonstrate other juror’s dishonesty during *voir dire*; because dishonesty alleged in Warger’s new trial motion relates to juror’s personal experience and not to specific knowledge of case, Rule’s exception for evidence of “extraneous prejudicial information,” Rule 606(b)(2)(A), does not apply. *Warger v. Shauers*, p. 40.

FORCED ACCOMPANIMENT. See **Criminal Law, 2.**

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.**

FOURTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law; Immunity from Suit.**

HABEAS CORPUS. See also **Appeals, 2.**

HABEAS CORPUS—Continued.

1. *Clearly established federal law—Deprivation of adequate notice of aiding-and-abetting theory of liability.*—Ninth Circuit erred in granting habeas relief based on its own precedent, where this Court's case law had not "clearly establish[ed]" that a defendant adequately apprised of possibility of conviction on an aiding-and-abetting theory can nevertheless be deprived of adequate notice by a prosecutorial decision to focus on another theory at trial, see 28 U. S. C. § 2254(d)(1). *Lopez v. Smith*, p. 1.

2. *Prohibition on simultaneously contesting criminal liability and arguing duress—Structural error.*—Respondent was not entitled to habeas relief on ground that Washington Supreme Court unreasonably applied clearly established federal law by failing to classify trial court's closing-argument restriction as structural error, since none of this Court's cases clearly requires including such an improper restriction in structural error category. *Glebe v. Frost*, p. 21.

3. *Substitution of counsel—Conflict of interest—"Interests of justice" standard.*—In denying habeas petitioner Christeson's request for substitute counsel who would not be laboring under a conflict of interest, courts below contravened this Court's decision in *Martel v. Clair*, 565 U.S. 684, which sets out factors for courts to consider when evaluating motions for substitution under applicable "interests of justice" standard. *Christeson v. Roper*, p. 373.

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

HOME LOANS. See **Truth in Lending Act.**

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.

Qualified immunity—"Knock and talk" exception to warrant requirement.—Third Circuit erred in denying petitioner qualified immunity here, where no clearly established statutory or constitutional right established that "knock and talk" exception to warrant requirement requires an officer to knock at a front door, not at a door located on backyard deck. *Carroll v. Carman*, p. 13.

JURISDICTION.

Notice of removal—Pleading requirements—Plausible allegation.—As specified in 28 U. S. C. § 1446(a), a defendant's notice of removal need include only a plausible allegation that amount in controversy exceeds jurisdictional threshold; District Court erred in remanding this case to state court for want of an evidentiary submission in notice of removal, and Tenth Circuit abused its discretion in denying review of that decision. *Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co. v. Owens*, p. 81.

JURY DELIBERATIONS. See **Federal Rules of Evidence; Habeas Corpus**, 1.

KANSAS. See **Compacts Between States.**

KNOCK-AND-TALK RULE. See **Immunity from Suit.**

LABOR.

Postshift security screenings—Noncompensable activities.—Because petitioner’s postshift security screenings are postliminary activities under Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, time that respondents spent waiting to undergo, and undergoing, those screenings is noncompensable under Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. *Integrity Staffing Solutions, Inc. v. Busk*, p. 27.

MORTGAGES. See **Truth in Lending Act.**

MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION. See **Appeals, 1.**

MUNICIPALITIES. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.**

MUSLIM RELIGIOUS BELIEFS. See **Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2008.**

NEBRASKA. See **Compacts Between States.**

NEW TRIAL MOTIONS. See **Federal Rules of Evidence.**

NORTH CAROLINA. See **Antitrust Law.**

PATENTS.

Patent claim construction—Subsidiary factual matters—Standard of review.—When reviewing a district court’s resolution of subsidiary factual matters made in course of its construction of a patent claim, Federal Circuit must apply a “clear error,” not a *de novo*, standard of review. *Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*, p. 318.

PLEADING STANDARDS. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; Jurisdiction.**

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL ACT OF 1947. See **Labor.**

POSTLIMINARY ACTIVITIES. See **Labor.**

PRISONER’S RIGHTS. See **Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2008.**

QUALIFIED IMMUNITY. See **Immunity from Suit.**

REASONABLE SUSPICION. See **Constitutional Law.**

RELIGIOUS LAND USE AND INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT OF 2000.

Prison grooming policy—Muslim religious beliefs.—Arkansas Department of Correction’s grooming policy, which generally prohibits inmates

RELIGIOUS LAND USE AND INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT OF 2000—Continued.

from growing beards, violates Act insofar as it prevents petitioner, a devout Muslim, from growing a ½-inch beard in accordance with his religious beliefs. *Holt v. Hobbs*, p. 352.

REMOVAL TO FEDERAL COURT. See **Jurisdiction**.

RESCISSION RIGHTS. See **Truth in Lending Act**.

RETIREES' HEALTH CARE BENEFITS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**.

RIGHT TO APPEAL. See **Appeals**.

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

RIPARIAN RIGHTS. See **Compacts Between States**.

SEARCHES AND SEIZURES. See **Constitutional Law; Immunity from Suit**.

SEARCH WARRANTS. See **Immunity from Suit**.

SECTION 1983. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; Immunity from Suit**.

SECURITY SCREENINGS. See **Labor**.

SIXTH AMENDMENT. See **Habeas Corpus**, 1.

STANDARD OF REVIEW. See **Patents**.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

Cell phone tower siting applications—Reason-for-denial requirements.—Under Act, state and local governments must provide reasons for denying cell tower siting applications, but they may do so in a document other than denial notice itself, provided that reasons are clearly stated and issued essentially contemporaneously with denial; respondent failed to comply with these requirements when it issued its reasons for denying petitioner's siting application 26 days after issuing denial notice. *T-Mobile South, LLC v. City of Roswell*, p. 293.

TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT. See **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**.

TRADEMARKS.

Tacking doctrine—Trademark priority.—Whether two trademarks may be “tacked” for purposes of determining priority of trademark use is a matter for a jury, not a judge, to decide. *Hana Financial, Inc. v. Hana Bank*, p. 418.

TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.

Right to rescind loan—Written notice.—In order to exercise his right to rescind a loan under Act, a borrower need only provide written notice to his lender within three years after transaction is consummated, not file suit within that period. *Jesinoski v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, p. 259.

VEHICLE STOPS. See **Constitutional Law.**

VOIR DIRE. See **Federal Rules of Evidence.**

WELFARE BENEFIT PLANS. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.**

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 1989.

Federal whistleblower—Exclusion for disclosures “specifically prohibited by law.”—Respondent’s communication to a reporter about canceled air marshal missions is not excluded from federal whistleblower protection as a disclosure “specifically prohibited by law,” 5 U. S. C. § 2302(b)(8)(A), because Transportation Security Administration regulation prohibiting his disclosure does not qualify as “law,” and because law authorizing regulation, 49 U. S. C. § 114(r)(1), does not specifically prohibit his disclosure. *Department of Homeland Security v. MacLean*, p. 383.

WORDS AND PHRASES.

“[S]pecifically prohibited by law.” Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, 5 U. S. C. § 2302(b)(8)(A). *Department of Homeland Security v. MacLean*, p. 383.

“[T]angible object.” 18 U. S. C. § 1519. *Yates v. United States*, p. 528.

WORK TIME. See **Labor.**

ZONING LAWS. See **Telecommunications Act of 1996.**