INDEX

(Vol. 581 U. S.)

ABUSE-OF-DISCRETION STANDARD OF REVIEW. See **Judicial Review.**

AGGRAVATED FELONIES. See Immigration and Nationality Act.

APPEALS. See also **Judicial Review.**

Imposition of restitution at time of sentencing—Challenge to restitution order.—Defendant wishing to appeal an order imposing restitution in a deferred restitution case must file a notice of appeal from that order; if he fails to do so and Government objects, he may not challenge restitution order in his appeal from an initial judgment imposing other aspects of his sentence, such as a term of imprisonment. Manrique v. United States, p. 116.

ARBITRATION. See **Federal Arbitration Act.**

ARTICLE III STANDING. See Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

ASSETS FROM DRUG TRAFFICKING AS FORFEITABLE. See Comprehensive Forfeiture Act of 1984.

ATTORNEY'S FEES.

Limit on legal fees awarded to sanction bad-faith conduct..—When a federal court exercises its inherent authority to sanction bad-faith conduct by ordering a litigant to pay other side's legal fees, award is limited to fees innocent party incurred solely because of misconduct. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Haeger, p. 101.

BAD-FAITH CONDUCT OF LITIGANTS. See **Attorney's Fees.**

BANKRUPTCY. See **Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.**

CHURCH EMPLOYEES. See Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

CIVIL FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY. See **Constitutional Law.**

CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE STANDARD. See **Constitutional Law.**

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

COMMERCIAL SPEECH. See **Constitutional Law.**

COMPREHENSIVE FORFEITURE ACT OF 1984.

Forfeiture of profits from illegal sales of methamphetamine precursor—Joint and severable liability.—Title 21 U. S. C. § 853(a)(1)—which limits forfeiture to property defendant himself actually acquired as result of drug law violations—does not permit forfeiture with regard to petitioner, who had no ownership interest in his brother's store and did not personally benefit from store's illegal sales. Honeycutt v. United States, p. 443.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING.

1. *Additional relief provided by District Court following elections—Failure of court to undertake equitable weighing process.*—In ordering North Carolina's General Assembly to redraw state legislative districts, District Court erred when it provided additional relief without undertaking an equitable weighing process. North Carolina v. Covington, p. 486.

2. *State redrawing of congressional districts—Race as predominant factor.*—District Court did not clearly err in concluding that race furnished predominant rationale for North Carolina's redesign of Congressional Districts 1 and 12. Cooper v. Harris, p. 285.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. See also **Federal Employers' Liability Act.**

I. Cruel and unusual punishment.

Death penalty—Medical standard for intellectual disability.—Texas Court of Criminal Appeals' (CCA) decision that petitioner was not an intellectually disabled person exempt from death penalty does not comport with Eighth Amendment and this Court's precedents where CCA rejected habeas court's application of current medical guidance in favor of a standard set out in one of CCA's prior opinions. Moore v. Texas, p. 1.

II. Due process.

Retention of restitution-related assets following exoneration—Separate civil proceeding.—Colorado's scheme—which permits State to retain assessments tied to a conviction later overturned unless and until defendant institutes a discrete civil refund proceeding and proves her innocence by clear and convincing evidence—does not comport with Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of due process. Nelson v. Colorado, p. 128.

III. Freedom of speech.

Commercial speech regulation—Credit-card-use surcharges.—By prohibiting petitioner merchants from employing a single-sticker pricing regime to impose credit-card-use surcharges, New York General Business Law § 518 regulates speech, and thus it should be evaluated as a speech

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Continued.
regulation by Court of Appeals on remand. Expressions Hair Design v. Schneiderman, p. 37.

IV. Search and seizure.

Excessive force claim against arresting officers—Ninth Circuit's "provocation rule."—Ninth Circuit rule—which makes an officer's otherwise reasonable use of force unreasonable if (1) officer "intentionally or recklessly provokes a violent confrontation" and (2) "provocation is an independent Fourth Amendment violation," *Billington* v. *Smith*, 292 F. 3d 1177, 1189—is incompatible with Fourth Amendment. County of Los Angeles v. Mendez, p. 420.

CREDIT CARD SURCHARGES. See **Constitutional Law.**

CRIMINAL LAW. See also **Constitutional Law; Immigration and Nationality Act.**

Calculation of mandatory minimum criminal sentence—Firearm possession during crime of violence.—A sentencing court may consider fact that a defendant will serve 18 U. S. C. § 924(c)'s mandatory minimum when calculating an appropriate sentence for predicate offense. Dean v. United States, p. 62.

CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT. See **Constitutional Law.**

DEATH PENALTY. See **Constitutional Law.**

DEBT COLLECTION. See **Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.**

***DE NOVO* STANDARD OF REVIEW.** See **Judicial Review.**

DISGORGEMENT OF PROFITS. See **Statutes of Limitations.**

DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS. See **Venue.**

DUE PROCESS. See **Constitutional Law; Federal Employers' Liability Act.**

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

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.

Benefits plan for church employees—Establishment of plan by qualifying church-affiliated nonprofit.—ERISA's church-plan exemption applies to an employee benefit plan maintained by a qualifying church-affiliated organization, regardless of whether a church initially established plan. Advocate Health Care Network v. Stapleton, p. 468.

EQUITABLE CONSIDERATIONS. See **Congressional Redistricting.**

EXCESSIVE FORCE. See **Constitutional Law.**

EXHAUSTION OF PATENTS. See **Patent Law.**

FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT.

Proof of claim of time-barred debit in bankruptcy proceeding.—Filing of a proof of claim for an obviously time-barred debt in a bankruptcy proceeding is not a false, deceptive, misleading, unfair, or unconscionable debt collection practice within meaning of Act. Midland Funding, LLC v. Johnson, p. 224.

FAIR HOUSING ACT.

Standing of city in suit for alleged Act violations—Financial injury claims—FHA's proximate-cause requirement.—City of Miami is an "aggrieved person" authorized to bring suit under FHA, but Eleventh Circuit erred in concluding that City's complaints met FHA's proximate-cause requirement based solely on finding that City's alleged financial injuries were foreseeable results of Banks' misconduct. Bank of America Corp. v. Miami, p. 189.

FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT.

Kentucky rule requiring explicit statement for principal to enter into arbitration agreement on agent's behalf.— Kentucky Supreme Court's clear-statement rule—that a legal representative may enter into an arbitration agreement for his principal only where a power of attorney specifically authorizes him to waive the principal's rights of access to courts and trial by jury—violates FAA. Kindred Nursing Centers L. P. v. Clark, p. 246.

FEDERAL DISTRICT COURTS. See **Congressional Redistricting.**

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959. See **Pre-emption of State Law.**

FEDERAL EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT.

Personal jurisdiction over out-of-state corporation—Suit for injuries sustained by railroad employees.—Title 45 U. S. C. § 56, a provision of FELA, does not address personal jurisdiction over railroads; Montana courts' exercise of personal jurisdiction over petitioner under Montana law does not comport with Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause. BNSF R. Co. v. Tyrrell, p. 402.

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1029.

FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1035.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

1. Amendments to Rules, p. 1049.

2. *Intervenors of right—Article III standing requirement.*—Litigant seeking to intervene as of right under Rule 24(a)(2) must meet requirements of Article III standing if intervenor wishes to pursue relief not requested by a plaintiff. Town of Chester v. Laroe Estates, Inc., p. 433.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Amendments to Rules, p. 1055.

FIREARMS POSSESSION. See **Criminal Law.**

FIRST AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law.**

FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT OF 1976.

Foreign sovereign immunity—Nonfrivolous argument alone insufficient to raise expropriation exception.—Act's expropriation exception grants jurisdiction only where there is a legally valid claim that property rights are at issue and that relevant property was taken in violation of international law; simply making a nonfrivolous argument to that effect is not sufficient. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela v. Helmerich & Payne Int'l Drilling Co., p. 170.

FORFEITURE OF ASSETS RESULTING FROM DRUG-LAW VIOLATIONS. See **Comprehensive Forfeiture Act of 1984.**

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law; Federal Employers' Liability Act.**

FOURTH AMENDMENT. See **Constitutional Law.**

FREEDOM OF SPEECH. See **Constitutional Law.**

HAGUE CONVENTION ON THE SERVICE ABROAD OF JUDICIAL AND EXTRAJUDICIAL DOCUMENTS IN CIVIL AND COMMERCIAL MATTERS.

Permissible method of service under Convention.—Convention does not prohibit service of process by mail. Water Splash, Inc. v. Menon, p. 271.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.

State statutory rape offense—Question whether state offense qualifies as "sexual abuse of a minor" under the Act—Age of victim.—For purpose of determining whether a statutory rape offense criminalizing sexual intercourse based solely on participants' ages qualifies as an aggravated felony under INA, generic federal definition of "sexual abuse of a minor" requires age of victim to be less than 16. Esquivel-Quintana v. Sessions, p. 385.

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT. See **Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976; Indian Sovereign Immunity.**

INDIAN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.

Tribal sovereign immunity—Real party in interest—Indemnification of individual employees.—Tribal employee sued in his individual capacity, not tribe, is real party in interest, and tribe's sovereign immunity is not implicated; an indemnification provision cannot, as a matter of law, extend sovereign immunity to individual employees who would otherwise not fall under its protective cloak. Lewis v. Clarke, p. 155.

INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY STANDARD. See **Constitutional Law.**

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

JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Proper standard of appellate review.—District court's decision whether to enforce or quash an EEOC subpoena should be reviewed for abuse of discretion, not *de novo.* McLane Co. v. EEOC, p. 72.

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

KENTUCKY. See **Federal Arbitration Act.**

LITIGANTS' BAD-FAITH CONDUCT. See **Attorney's Fees.**

MANUFACTURING OF ILLEGAL DRUGS. See **Comprehensive Forfeiture Act of 1984.**

MENTALLY DISABLED CRIMINALS. See **Constitutional Law.**

MONTANA. See **Federal Employers' Liability Act.**

NORTH CAROLINA. See **Congressional Redistricting.**

POWERS OF ATTORNEY. See **Federal Arbitration Act.**

PATENT LAW. See also **Venue.**

Exhaustion of patent rights—Contractual restriction on customers' use of product.—Lexmark exhausted all of its patent rights in toner cartridges it sold domestically as part of its Return Program as well as in toner cartridges it sold abroad. Impression Products, Inc. v. Lexmark Int'l, Inc., p. 360.

PERSONAL JURISDICTION. See **Federal Employers' Liability Act.**

PRECURSOR CHEMICALS USED IN ILLEGAL DRUG MANUFACTURE. See **Comprehensive Forfeiture Act of 1984.**

PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW.

Pre-emption of state laws barring contractual subrogation and reimbursement prescriptions under Federal Employees Health Benefits Act

PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW—Continued.

of 1959—Supremacy clause.—Because subrogation and reimbursement prescriptions in federal employees' health insurance contracts that Office of Personnel Management negotiates with private carriers plainly "relate to . . . payments with respect to benefits" under 5 U. S. C. § 8902(m)(1)—FEHBA's express preemption provision—they override state laws barring subrogation and reimbursement; congressionally enacted regime is compatible with Supremacy Clause. Coventry Health Care of Mo., Inc. v. Nevils, p. 87.

PRINCIPAL/AGENCY RELATIONSHIPS. See **Federal Arbitration Act.**

PROXIMATE CAUSE. See **Fair Housing Act.**

RACIAL CLASSIFICATIONS. See **Congressional Redistricting.**

RAILROAD EMPLOYEES. See **Federal Employers' Liability Act.**

REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST. See **Indian Sovereign Immunity.**

REDISTRICTING. See **Congressional Redistricting.**

RESIDENCE. See **Venue.**

RESTITUTION AWARDS. See **Appeals.**

RETIREMENT BENEFITS. See **Uniformed Services Former Spouses' Protection Act.**

SANCTIONS FOR LITIGANTS' BAD-FAITH CONDUCT. See **Attorney's Fees.**

SEARCH AND SEIZURE. See **Constitutional Law.**

SECURITIES LAWS. See **Statutes of Limitations.**

SENTENCING. See **Appeals; Criminal Law.**

SERVICE OF PROCESS. See **Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters.**

SEXUAL OFFENSES. See **Immigration and Nationality Act.**

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY. See **Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976; Indian Sovereign Immunity.**

STANDING. See **Fair Housing Act.**

STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS. See also **Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.**

Disgorgement claim in SEC enforcement action—Imposition as a "penalty"—Applicability of limitations period for bringing claim.—Be-

STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS—Continued.
cause SEC disgorgement operates as a penalty under 28 U. S. C. § 2462, any claim for disgorgement in an SEC enforcement action must be commenced within five years of date claim accrued. Kokesh v. SEC, p. 455.

STATUTORY RAPE. See **Immigration and Nationality Act.**

SUBPOENAS. See **Judicial Review.**

SUPREMACY CLAUSE. See **Pre-emption of State Law.**

SUPREME COURT.

1. Amendments to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, p. 1029.
2. Amendments to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, p. 1035.
3. Amendments to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, p. 1049.
4. Amendments to Federal Rules of Evidence, p. 1055.

SURCHARGES. See **Constitutional Law.**

TRIBAL SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY. See **Indian Sovereign Immunity.**

UNIFORMED SERVICES FORMER SPOUSES' PROTECTION ACT.

Indemnification of divorced spouse for loss in benefits—Waiver of retirement pay in favor of disability benefits.—Act does not permit state courts to order a veteran to indemnify a divorced spouse for loss in divorced spouse's portion of veteran's retirement pay caused by veteran's waiver of retirement pay to receive service-related disability benefits. Howell v. Howell, p. 214.

VENUE.

Venue in patent infringement suits—Domestic corporations' place of residence.—For purposes of patent venue statute, 28 U. S. C. § 1400(b)—which provides that "[a]ny civil action for patent infringement may be brought in the judicial district where the defendant resides . . . "—a domestic corporation "resides" only in its State of incorporation. TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC, p. 258.

VETERANS' DISABILITY BENEFITS. See **Uniformed Services Former Spouses' Protection Act.**

VICTIMS' COMPENSATION. See **Appeals.**

WORDS AND PHRASES.

"[A]ggrieved person." Fair Housing Act, 42 U. S. C. §§ 3613(a)(1)(A), (c)(1). Bank of America Corp. v. Miami, p. 189.

"Any civil action for patent infringement may be brought in the judicial district where the defendant resides . . . ." Federal Employees Health

WORDS AND PHRASES—Continued.

Benefits Act of 1959, 28 U. S. C. § 1400(b). TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC, p. 258.

"[P]enalty." 28 U. S. C. § 2462. Kokesh v. SEC, p. 455.

"[R]elate to . . . payments with respect to benefits." 5 U. S. C. § 8902(m)(1). Coventry Health Care of Mo., Inc. v. Nevils, p. 87.

"*[S]exual abuse of a minor*." Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U. S. C. § 1101(a)(43)(A). Esquivel-Quintana v. Sessions, p. 385.

WORKPLACE INJURIES. See **Federal Employers' Liability Act.**