

I N D E X
(Vol. 577 U. S.)

ADOPTION. See **Constitutional Law**, III.

AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING FACTOR DETERMINATIONS.
See **Constitutional Law**, I, 1.

ALABAMA. See **Constitutional Law**, III.

ALASKA NATIONAL INTEREST LANDS CONSERVATION ACT.

Alaska's "conservation system units" boundaries—Public and non-public lands.—Ninth Circuit's interpretation of 16 U. S. C. § 3103(c), which addresses scope of National Park Service's authority over "non-public" lands that fall within boundaries of Alaska's federally preserved "conservation system units," is inconsistent with both Act's text and its context. *Sturgeon v. Frost*, p. 424.

ARBITRATION. See **Federal Arbitration Act**.

ARTIFICIAL ENTITIES AS PERSONS. See **Jurisdiction**, 2.

ATTORNEY'S FEES. See **Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976**.

AUSTRIA. See **Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976**.

BALLISTICS ANALYSIS. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

BOUNDARIES. See **Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act**.

BRADY CLAIMS. See **Constitutional Law**, II.

BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY. See **Employee Retirement and Income Security Act of 1974**, 1.

CALIFORNIA. See **Pre-emption of State Law**.

CAPITAL MURDER. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 1.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY. See **Criminal Law**, 1.

CHOICE OF LAW. See **Federal Arbitration Act**.

CITIZENSHIP AND DIVERSITY JURISDICTION. See **Jurisdiction**, 2.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871. See **Immunity from Suit**.

CIVIL RIGHTS ATTORNEY'S FEES AWARDS ACT OF 1976.

Award to prevailing defendant—Interpretation of federal law.—Idaho Supreme Court, which like any other state or federal court, is bound by this Court's interpretation of federal law, erred in awarding attorney's fees under 42 U. S. C. § 1988 to a prevailing defendant without first determining that plaintiff's action was frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation. *James v. Boise*, p. 306.

CLASS ACTIONS. See also **Jurisdiction**.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3)—Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938—Donning and doffing protective gear.—District Court did not err in certifying and maintaining a class under Rule or a collective action under Act in respondents' suit seeking overtime for time that employees spent donning and doffing protective gear at petitioner's pork processing plant. *Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Bouaphakeo*, p. 442.

COLLATERAL REVIEW. See **Constitutional Law**.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING. See **Jurisdiction**, 1.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Jurisdiction**.

I. Cruel and Unusual Punishment.

1. *Jury instructions—Mitigating circumstances—Reasonable-doubt standard—Severance of joint sentencing proceedings.*—Eighth Amendment does not require capital-sentencing courts to instruct a jury that mitigating circumstances need not be proved beyond a reasonable doubt; nor did Constitution require severance of joint sentencing proceedings for two brothers whose convictions arose out of a single chain of events. *Kansas v. Carr*, p. 108.

2. *Mandatory life without parole for juvenile offenders—Retroactive effect on collateral review.*—Prohibition on mandatory life without parole for juvenile offenders announced in *Miller v. Alabama*, 567 U. S. 460, is a new substantive rule that is retroactive in cases on state collateral review. *Montgomery v. Louisiana*, p. 190.

II. Due Process.

Failure to disclose material evidence.—Prosecution's failure to disclose material evidence at petitioner's capital murder trial violated his due process rights under *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U. S. 83. *Wearry v. Cain*, p. 385.

III. Full Faith and Credit.

State court judgment granting adoption and recognizing parental rights.—Alabama courts are required to accord full faith and credit to a

Constitutional Law—Continued.

Georgia judgment that granted petitioner adoption rights while still recognizing respondent's parental rights, where Georgia judgment appears on its face to have been issued by a court with jurisdiction and there is no established, contrary Georgia law. *V. L. v. E. L.*, p. 404.

IV. Right to Bear Arms.

Ban on stun gun possession.—Explanation offered by Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court for its holding that Second Amendment does not extend to stun guns contradicts *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570. *Caetano v. Massachusetts*, p. 411.

V. Right to Counsel.

Effective assistance of counsel—Ballistics analysis—Deficient performance.—Under this Court's "rule of contemporary assessment of counsel's conduct," *Lockhart v. Fretwell*, 506 U.S. 364, 372, Kulbicki's counsel's failure to unearth a 1991 report on a then-uncontroversial mode of ballistics analysis, identify its methodological flaw, and use that flaw against State's expert witness did not constitute deficient performance. *Maryland v. Kulbicki*, p. 1.

VI. Right to Jury Trial.

Capital murder—State sentencing scheme.—Florida scheme, which requires a judge to find and weigh any aggravating and mitigating circumstances independently of jury's advisory sentence, violates Sixth Amendment in light of *Ring v. Arizona*, 536 U.S. 584. *Hurst v. Florida*, p. 92.

CRIMINAL LAW. See also **Constitutional Law.**

1. *Prior state-law conviction for first-degree sexual abuse—Mandatory sentence enhancement—Possession of child pornography.*—Petitioner's conviction for first-degree sexual abuse of his adult girlfriend is a prior state-law conviction that triggers 18 U.S.C. § 2252(b)(2)'s mandatory sentence enhancement for federal crime of possessing child pornography. *Lockhart v. United States*, p. 347.

2. *Sufficiency of evidence challenge—Statute-of-limitations bar—Non-jurisdictional defense.*—A sufficiency of evidence challenge supporting a conviction should be assessed against elements of charged crime, not against elements set forth in an erroneous jury instruction; in addition, 18 U.S.C. § 3282(a)'s statute-of-limitations bar is a nonjurisdictional defense that cannot successfully be raised for first time on appeal. *Musacchio v. United States*, p. 237.

CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT. See **Constitutional Law.****DATA COLLECTION.** See **Employee Retirement and Income Security Act of 1974.**

DEATH PENALTY. See **Constitutional Law; Habeas Corpus.**

DISCLOSURE OF EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law, I.**

DIVERSITY JURISDICTION. See **Jurisdiction, 2.**

DONNING AND DOFFING PROTECTIVE GEAR. See **Class Actions.**

EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law, V.**

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

ELECTRICITY RATES. See **Federal Power Act.**

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

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.

1. *Fifth Third standards—Breach of duty of prudence.*—Ninth Circuit did not correctly apply standards of *Fifth Third Bancorp v. Dudenhoeffer*, 573 U. S. 409, in evaluating respondents' complaint for breach of duty of prudence against ERISA fiduciaries. *Amgen Inc. v. Harris*, p. 308.

2. *Pre-emption of state law.*—ERISA pre-empts Vermont's health care data-collection law as applied to ERISA plans. *Gobeille v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.*, p. 312.

3. *Third-party personal injury settlement—Reimbursement under plan's subrogation clause.*—When a participant in an employee benefit plan governed by ERISA wholly dissipates a third-party personal injury settlement on nontraceable assets, a plan fiduciary seeking reimbursement under plan's subrogation clause may not file suit under ERISA § 502(a)(3) "to obtain . . . equitable relief" by attaching participant's general assets. *Montanile v. Board of Trustees of Nat. Elevator Industry Health Benefit Plan*, p. 136.

EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES. See **Class Actions.**

ENHANCED SENTENCES. See **Criminal Law, 1.**

EQUITABLE TOLLING OF LIMITATIONS PERIODS. See **Indians, 1.**

EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE. See **Constitutional Law, 3.**

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938. See **Class Actions.**

FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT.

Pre-emption of state appellate court interpretation—Arbitration agreement choice of law provision.—Act pre-empts California Court of

FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT—Continued.

Appeal's interpretation of an arbitration agreement's choice of law provision—that binding arbitration was unenforceable where parties intended a pre-empted California law to govern—so state court must enforce agreement. *DIRECTV, Inc. v. Imburgia*, p. 47.

FEDERAL COURTS. See **Jurisdiction**, 3.

FEDERAL POWER ACT.

Wholesale electricity rate regulation—Peak power demand periods.—Act authorizes FERC to regulate compensation that wholesale market operators pay to electricity consumers for commitments *not* to use power during peak demand periods; FERC's compensation formula is not arbitrary and capricious. *FERC v. Electric Power Supply Assn.*, p. 260.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE. See **Class Actions**.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. See **Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act**; **Federal Arbitration Act**.

FEES. See *In Forma Pauperis*.

FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITIES. See **Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974**, 1.

FIRST AMENDMENT. See **Jurisdiction**, 1.

FLORIDA. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT OF 1976.

Injuries suffered boarding train—Commercial activity exception.—Respondent's federal suit against Austrian state-owned railway, which arose from injuries she suffered while attempting to board a train in Austria, was not "based upon" U.S. sale of a Eurail pass for purposes of 28 U.S.C. §1605(a)(2)'s "commercial activity" exception to FSIA and is therefore barred by sovereign immunity. *OBB Personenverkehr AG v. Sachs*, p. 27.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law**, II; **Habeas Corpus**.

FOURTH AMENDMENT. See **Immunity from Suit**.

FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION. See **Jurisdiction**, 1.

GEORGIA. See **Constitutional Law**, III.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS. See **Jurisdiction**, 3.

HABEAS CORPUS.

Clearly established federal law—Death penalty—Juror exclusion.—Sixth Circuit erred in overturning respondent's death sentence on habeas review, because Kentucky Supreme Court did not unreasonably apply clearly established federal law in affirming trial court's exclusion of a juror who could not give sufficient assurance of neutrality or impartiality in considering whether to impose death penalty. *White v. Wheeler*, p. 73.

HEALTH INSURANCE. See **Employee Retirement and Income Security Act of 1974**, 2.

IDAHO. See **Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976**.

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See also **Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976**.

Qualified immunity—Police officer's conduct.—Fifth Circuit erred in denying qualified immunity to Trooper Mullenix, because existing precedent does not clearly establish that he acted unreasonably when he shot and killed a fleeing suspect in an attempt to disable suspect's vehicle. *Mullenix v. Luna*, p. 7.

INDIANS.

1. *Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act claims.*—Equitable tolling does not apply to presentment of Menominee Tribe's claims under Act. *Menominee Tribe of Wis. v. United States*, p. 250.

2. *Omaha Tribe—Sale of reservation land for Tribe's benefit.*—An 1882 Act that authorized Interior Secretary to survey and sell more than 50,000 acres of Omaha Indian Reservation land for Tribe's benefit did not diminish reservation's boundaries. *Nebraska v. Parker*, p. 481.

INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. See **Constitutional Law**, V.

IN FORMA PAUPERIS.

Prisoner's federal-court filing fees—Monthly installment payments.—Where an *in forma pauperis* prisoner is required to pay federal-court filing fees in more than one civil action, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2) calls for simultaneous, not sequential, recoupment of multiple monthly installment payments. *Bruce v. Samuels*, p. 82.

JURISDICTION. See also **Criminal Law**, 2.

1. *Congressional redistricting plan—Right of political association—Three-judge court.*—Title 28 U.S.C. § 2284 entitles petitioners to make their case—that Maryland's 2011 congressional redistricting plan burdens their First Amendment right of political association—before a three-judge court. *Shapiro v. McManus*, p. 39.

JURISDICTION—Continued.

2. *Real estate investment trust—Federal diversity jurisdiction—Citizenship of members.*—Because a “real estate investment trust” under Maryland law is a distinct, unincorporated entity with capacity to sue or be sued, Americold’s citizenship for federal diversity jurisdiction purposes is based on citizenship of its members, including its shareholders. *Americold Realty Trust v. ConAgra Foods, Inc.*, p. 378.

3. *Telephone Consumer Protection Act—Class action—Offer of judgment—Immunity from suit.*—Because an unaccepted settlement offer or offer of judgment does not moot a plaintiff’s case, District Court retained jurisdiction to adjudicate respondent’s complaint in this TCPA case; petitioner’s status as a federal contractor does not entitle it to immunity from suit under TCPA. *Campbell-Ewald Co. v. Gomez*, p. 153.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 1; **Criminal Law**, 2.

JURY SELECTION. See **Habeas Corpus**.

JURY TRIAL RIGHT. See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 2.

KENTUCKY. See **Habeas Corpus**.

LIFE-IMPRISONMENT SENTENCES. See **Constitutional Law**, I, 2.

MARYLAND. See **Constitutional Law**; **Jurisdiction**, 2.

MASSACHUSETTS. See **Constitutional Law**, IV.

MOOTNESS. See **Jurisdiction**, 3.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. See **Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act**.

PARENTAL RIGHTS. See **Constitutional Law**, III.

PERSONAL INJURY LAWSUITS. See **Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976**.

POLICE CONDUCT. See **Immunity from Suit**.

POLITICAL ASSOCIATION. See **Jurisdiction**, 1.

POWER RATES. See **Federal Power Act**.

PRE-EMPTION. See **Employee Retirement and Income Security Act of 1974**, 2; **Federal Arbitration Act**.

PREVAILING PARTIES. See **Civil Rights Attorney’s Fees Awards Act of 1976**.

- PRISONERS.** See *In Forma Pauperis*.
- PROTECTIVE GEAR DONNING AND DOFFING.** See **Class Actions**.
- QUALIFIED IMMUNITY.** See **Immunity from Suit**.
- RAILROADS.** See **Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976**.
- REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.** See **Jurisdiction**, 2.
- REASONABLE-DOUBT STANDARD.** See **Constitutional Law**, I, 1.
- RESERVATIONS.** See **Indians**, 2.
- RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS.**
See **Constitutional Law**, I, 2.
- RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV.
- RIGHT TO COUNSEL.** See **Constitutional Law**, V.
- RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL.** See **Constitutional Law**, VI.
- SEARCHES AND SEIZURES.** See **Immunity from Suit**.
- SECOND AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV.
- SENTENCING.** See **Constitutional Law**, VI.
- SEXUAL OFFENSES.** See **Criminal Law**, 1.
- SHAREHOLDERS.** See **Jurisdiction**, 2.
- SIXTH AMENDMENT.** See **Constitutional Law**, VI; **Habeas Corpus**.
- SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.** See **Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976**.
- STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS.** See **Criminal Law**, 2; **Indians**, 1.
- STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS.** See **Employee Retirement and Income Security Act of 1974**, 1.
- STUN GUNS.** See **Constitutional Law**, IV.
- SUFFICIENCY OF EVIDENCE.** See **Criminal Law**, 2.
- SUPREME COURT.**
Notation of death of JUSTICE SCALIA, p. VII.
- TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT.** See **Jurisdiction**, 3.
- TRIAL BY JURY.** See **Constitutional Law**, VI.

UTILITY RATES. See **Federal Power Act.**

UTILITY REGULATION. See **Federal Power Act.**

VERMONT. See **Employee Retirement and Income Security Act of 1974, 2.**

WAIVER OF FEES. See *In Forma Pauperis.*

WHOLESALE ENERGY RATES. See **Federal Power Act.**

WORDS AND PHRASES.

“*[B]ased upon a commercial activity.*” Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976, 28 U. S. C. § 1605(a)(2). OBB Personenverkehr AG v. Sachs, p. 27.