

Recommended citation form:

[case name], 4 RAPP [page number] ([date])

Copyright © 2011 by  
The Green Bag, Inc.,  
except where otherwise indicated  
and for original United States government works.  
All rights reserved.

*First Edition*

Green Bag Press  
6600 Barnaby Street NW  
Washington, DC 20015

Green Bag Press is a division of  
The Green Bag, Inc., publisher of the  
*Green Bag, Second Series, an Entertaining Journal of Law.*

For more information, please email  
[editors@greenbag.org](mailto:editors@greenbag.org) or visit  
<http://www.greenbag.org>.

ISSN: 1933-5806  
ISBN 13: 978-1-933658-12-4  
ISBN 10: 1-933658-12-6  
Library of Congress Control Number: 2010923664



GREEN BAG PRESS  
WASHINGTON, DC  
2011

GB

## CONTENTS — VOLUME 4, PART 6

Preface .....	v
Cumulative Tables and Indexes	
Cumulative Table of Cases Reported .....	vii
Cumulative Table of Cases by Date .....	xvi
Cumulative Table of Cases by Justice .....	xxi
Cumulative Table of Cases Orally Argued .....	xxvi
Cumulative Index of Cases by Disposition .....	xxviii
Cumulative Index of Cases by Topic .....	xxxiii
In Chambers Opinions	
<i>United States v. Patterson</i> (1887) .....	1593
<i>In re Heath</i> (1892) .....	1599
<i>In re Richardson</i> (1896) .....	1600
<i>Haack v. Brooklyn Labor Lyceum Association</i> (1906) .....	1602
<i>Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. Wills</i> (1914) .....	1603
<i>Stanley v. United States</i> (1956) .....	1605
<i>United States v. Portell</i> (1956) .....	1606
<i>Oerlikon Machine Tool Works Buehrle &amp; Co. v.</i> <i>United States</i> (1957) .....	1608
<i>Pabon v. Board of Personnel of Puerto Rico</i> (1958) .....	1609
<i>County School Board of Arlington v. Deskins</i> (1959) .....	1610
<i>Shelton v. McKinley</i> (1959) .....	1612
<i>Keith v. New York</i> (1959) .....	1613
<i>Deere v. United States</i> (1959) .....	1614
<i>Eveleigh v. United States</i> (1960) .....	1615
<i>In re Harvey</i> (1960) .....	1616
<i>Long Island R.R. Co. v. New York Central R.R.</i> (1960) .....	1617
<i>Hirsch v. United States Court of Appeals for the</i> <i>Second Circuit</i> (1960) .....	1618
<i>Local 1545, United Brotherhood of Carpenters v.</i> <i>Vincent</i> (1961) .....	1619
October Term 2009	
<i>Jackson v. District of Columbia Board of Elections</i> <i>&amp; Ethics</i> (2010) .....	1620
<i>Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Scott</i> (2010) .....	1622
<i>Lux v. Rodrigues</i> (2010) .....	1626

GB

## PREFACE

Surely the year will come when we will not stumble across a single old and previously unpublished in-chambers opinion. Based on our experience so far, however, I am inclined to suspect that our first barren year may still be pretty far in the future. This volume, for example, includes both (a) *In re Heath*, the first opinion we have seen from Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller, and (b) *In re Richardson*, a strikingly blunt, even brutal, rejection by the first Justice John Marshall Harlan of an early attempt by a habeas corpus applicant to challenge the validity of his murder conviction on grounds related to the racial composition of the convicting jury. And members of the current Court continue to opine in chambers. During the 2009 Term, Chief Justice John G. Roberts issued two opinions, and Justice Antonin Scalia issued one.

And, unfortunately, we must continue our longstanding appeal for help with *Hooper v. Goldstein* (1929). It is the only opinion we have yet to track down — not for lack of trying — from the 21 missing opinions listed in Cynthia Rapp’s introduction to the first volume in this series.

We continue to follow the conventions we’ve used in the other in-chambers volumes: (1) brackets not accompanied by a “Publisher’s note” are in the original; (2) running heads are preserved where they appear in the originals, and added to those that lack them; (3) a caption misdesignating the Term in which an opinion was issued is in the original; and (4) party designations (“applicant”, “movant”, “petitioner”, “plaintiff”, etc.) are sometimes used more loosely than is the Court’s wont, but in each case the identity and posture of the parties are clear, and so they remain unchanged. Also bear in mind that those who would cite for its legal authority an opinion in *In Chambers Opinions* should check for the existence of a version in the *United States Reports*, and, if there is one, read it and cite to it as the primary authority, with a parallel citation if appropriate to the *In Chambers Opinions* version. The relevant *U.S. Reports* citation appears in a “Publisher’s note” above each opinion.

The page numbers here are the same as they will be in the bound volume 4 of *In Chambers Opinions*, thus making the *permanent* citations available upon publication of this *Supplement*. If you find any errors — or any in-chambers opinions that we have missed — please let us know at [editors@greenbag.org](mailto:editors@greenbag.org). We will give credit where credit is due.

Thanks as always to Cynthia Rapp for performing such a useful public service by collecting and indexing the Justices’ solo efforts; to William Suter, Clerk of the Court, for his support of this project; to the George Mason University School of Law and its Law & Economics Center for supporting the *Green Bag*; to Green Bag Fellow Liz Heaps; and to the indefatigable Ira Matetsky.

Ross E. Davies  
January 24, 2011

GB

# CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

TITLE	PAGE	OTHER CITATION
<i>A.B. Chance Co. v. Atlantic City Elec. Co.</i> .....	1 Rapp 320 (1963)	83 S. Ct. 964
<i>Aberdeen &amp; Rockfish R. Co. v. SCRAP</i> .....	2 Rapp 533 (1972)	409 U.S. 1207
<i>Akel v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 251 (1960)	81 S. Ct. 25
<i>Alabama G.S.R. Co. v. R.R. &amp; P.U.C. of Tennessee</i> .....	4 Rapp 1477 (1950)	.....none
<i>Albanese v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 121 (1954)	75 S. Ct. 211
<i>Alexander v. Holmes Cty. Board of Education</i> .....	2 Rapp 440 (1969)	396 U.S. 1218
<i>Alexis I. Du Pont School Dist. v. Evans</i> .....	2 Rapp 874 (1978)	439 U.S. 1375
<i>American Mfrs. Mut. Ins. v. Am. Broadcasting</i> .....	1 Rapp 381 (1966)	87 S. Ct. 1
<i>American Trading &amp; Prod. Corp. v. Railroad Comm'n</i> .....	4 Rapp 1560 (1959)	.....none
<i>American Trucking Assn., Inc. v. Gray</i> .....	3 Rapp 1280 (1987)	483 U.S. 1306
<i>Appalachian Power Co. v. AICPA</i> .....	1 Rapp 219 (1959)	80 S. Ct. 16
<i>Araneta v. United States</i> .....	3 Rapp 1243 (1986)	478 U.S. 1301
<i>Aronson v. May</i> .....	1 Rapp 346 (1964)	85 S. Ct. 3
<i>Arrow Transportation Co. v. Southern Ry.</i> .....	1 Rapp 307 (1962)	83 S. Ct. 1
<i>Arrow Transportation Co. v. Southern Ry.</i> .....	1 Rapp 314 (1962)	83 S. Ct. 3
<i>Associated Gas &amp; Electric Co., In re</i> .....	4 Rapp 1527 (1936)	.....none
<i>Associated Press v. District Court</i> .....	4 Rapp 1455 (2004)	542 U.S. 1301
<i>Atiyeh v. Capps</i> .....	3 Rapp 1027 (1981)	449 U.S. 1312
<i>Atlantic Coast Line R.R. v. BLE</i> .....	2 Rapp 423 (1969)	396 U.S. 1201
<i>Autry v. Estelle</i> .....	3 Rapp 1157 (1983)	464 U.S. 1301
<i>Bagley v. Byrd</i> .....	4 Rapp 1430 (2001)	534 U.S. 1301
<i>Baltimore City Dept. of Soc. Servs. v. Bouknight</i> .....	3 Rapp 1294 (1988)	488 U.S. 1301
<i>Bandy v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 252 (1960)	81 S. Ct. 25
<i>Bandy v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 253 (1960)	81 S. Ct. 197
<i>Bandy v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 261 (1961)	82 S. Ct. 11
<i>Barnes v. E-Systems, Inc.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1325 (1991)	501 U.S. 1301
<i>Barnstone v. University of Houston</i> .....	3 Rapp 961 (1980)	446 U.S. 1318
<i>Bart, In re</i> .....	1 Rapp 286 (1962)	82 S. Ct. 675
<i>Barthuli v. Board of Trustees of Jefferson Sch. Dist.</i> .....	2 Rapp 776 (1977)	434 U.S. 1337
<i>Bartlett v. Stephenson</i> .....	4 Rapp 1432 (2002)	535 U.S. 1301
<i>Bateman v. Arizona</i> .....	2 Rapp 699 (1976)	429 U.S. 1302
<i>Baytops v. New Jersey</i> .....	1 Rapp 391 (1967)	88 S. Ct. 8
<i>Beame v. Friends of the Earth</i> .....	2 Rapp 753 (1977)	434 U.S. 1310
<i>Becker v. United States</i> .....	3 Rapp 1045 (1981)	451 U.S. 1306
<i>Bellotti v. Latino Political Action Comm.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1131 (1983)	463 U.S. 1319
<i>Beltran v. Smith</i> .....	3 Rapp 1089 (1982)	458 U.S. 1303
<i>Berg, In re</i> .....	2 Rapp 579 (1972)	409 U.S. 1238
<i>Beyer v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 457 (1970)	396 U.S. 1235
<i>Bidwell v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 311 (1962)	.....none
<i>Bircher Corp. v. Diapulse Corp.</i> .....	1 Rapp 387 (1966)	87 S. Ct. 6
<i>Bletterman v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 208 (1958)	.....none
<i>Bloch v. North Side Lumber Co.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1217 (1985)	473 U.S. 1307
<i>Blodgett v. Campbell</i> .....	3 Rapp 1339 (1993)	508 U.S. 1301
<i>Bloeth v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 288 (1962)	82 S. Ct. 661
<i>Blum v. Caldwell</i> .....	3 Rapp 954 (1980)	446 U.S. 1311
<i>Board of Ed. of L.A. v. Superior Court of Cal.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1010 (1980)	448 U.S. 1343
<i>Board of Education v. Taylor</i> .....	1 Rapp 265 (1961)	82 S. Ct. 10
<i>Board of School Comm'rs v. Davis</i> .....	1 Rapp 332 (1963)	84 S. Ct. 10
<i>Bonura v. CBS Inc.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1106 (1983)	459 U.S. 1313
<i>Boston v. Anderson</i> .....	2 Rapp 880 (1978)	439 U.S. 1389
<i>Boumediene v. Bush</i> .....	4 Rapp 1563 (2007)	550 U.S. 1301
<i>Bowen v. Kendrick</i> .....	3 Rapp 1278 (1987)	483 U.S. 1304
<i>Bowman v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 359 (1964)	85 S. Ct. 232
<i>Bracy v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 795 (1978)	435 U.S. 1301
<i>Bradley v. Lundig</i> .....	2 Rapp 692 (1976)	424 U.S. 1309
<i>Brennan v. United States Postal Service</i> .....	2 Rapp 848 (1978)	439 U.S. 1345
<i>Breswick &amp; Co. v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 144 (1955)	75 S. Ct. 912
<i>Brody v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 198 (1957)	77 S. Ct. 910

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

TITLE	PAGE	OTHER CITATION
<i>Brotherhood of R.R. Signalmen v. S.E. Pa. Trans. Auth.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1309 (1989)	489 U.S. 1301
<i>Brown v. Gilmore</i> .....	4 Rapp 1426 (2001)	533 U.S. 1301
<i>Brussel v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 451 (1969)	396 U.S. 1229
<i>Buchanan v. Evans</i> .....	2 Rapp 864 (1978)	439 U.S. 1360
<i>Bureau of Economic Analysis v. Long</i> .....	3 Rapp 1038 (1981)	450 U.S. 1301
<i>Burgess v. Pere Marquette Railroad Co.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1586 (1915)	none
<i>Burgess v. Pere Marquette Railroad Co.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1587 (1915)	none
<i>Burwell v. California</i> .....	1 Rapp 153 (1955)	76 S. Ct. 31
<i>Bustop, Inc. v. Board of Ed. of Los Angeles</i> .....	2 Rapp 870 (1978)	439 U.S. 1380
<i>Bustop, Inc. v. Board of Ed. of Los Angeles</i> .....	2 Rapp 879 (1978)	439 U.S. 1384
<i>Califano v. McRae</i> .....	2 Rapp 744 (1977)	434 U.S. 1301
<i>California v. Alcorcha</i> .....	1 Rapp 377 (1966)	86 S. Ct. 1359
<i>California v. American Stores Co.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1310 (1989)	492 U.S. 1301
<i>California v. Braeseke</i> .....	3 Rapp 938 (1980)	444 U.S. 1309
<i>California v. Brown</i> .....	3 Rapp 1236 (1986)	475 U.S. 1301
<i>California v. Freeman</i> .....	3 Rapp 1304 (1989)	488 U.S. 1311
<i>California v. Hamilton</i> .....	3 Rapp 1241 (1986)	476 U.S. 1301
<i>California v. Harris</i> .....	3 Rapp 1175 (1984)	468 U.S. 1303
<i>California v. Prysock</i> .....	3 Rapp 1041 (1981)	451 U.S. 1301
<i>California v. Ramos</i> .....	3 Rapp 1094 (1982)	459 U.S. 1301
<i>California v. Riegler</i> .....	3 Rapp 1034 (1981)	449 U.S. 1319
<i>California v. Velasquez</i> .....	3 Rapp 943 (1980)	445 U.S. 1301
<i>California v. Winson</i> .....	3 Rapp 1069 (1981)	none
<i>Campos v. Houston</i> .....	3 Rapp 1330 (1991)	502 U.S. 1301
<i>Capital Cities Media, Inc. v. Toole</i> .....	3 Rapp 1119 (1983)	463 U.S. 1303
<i>Capitol Square Review and Adv. Bd. v. Pinette</i> .....	3 Rapp 1352 (1993)	510 U.S. 1307
<i>Carbo v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 292 (1962)	82 S. Ct. 662
<i>Carlisle v. Landon</i> .....	1 Rapp 97 (1953)	73 S. Ct. 1179
<i>Carter v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 142 (1955)	75 S. Ct. 911
<i>Catholic League v. Feminist Women's Health Ctr.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1199 (1984)	469 U.S. 1303
<i>CBS Inc. v. Davis</i> .....	3 Rapp 1360 (1994)	510 U.S. 1315
<i>Certain Named and Unnamed Children v. Texas</i> .....	3 Rapp 993 (1980)	448 U.S. 1327
<i>Chabad of Southern Ohio v. City of Cincinnati</i> .....	4 Rapp 1435 (2002)	537 U.S. 1501
<i>Chamber of Commerce v. Legal Aid Society</i> .....	2 Rapp 658 (1975)	423 U.S. 1309
<i>Chambers v. Mississippi</i> .....	2 Rapp 525 (1972)	405 U.S. 1205
<i>Cheney v. United States District Court</i> .....	4 Rapp 1441 (2004)	541 U.S. 913
<i>Chesapeake Western Co. v. Murray</i> .....	4 Rapp 1584 (1913)	none
<i>Chestnut v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 375 (1966)	86 S. Ct. 940
<i>Chin Gum v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1415 (1945)	none
<i>City-Wide Comm. for Integration v. Bd. of Educ. of N.Y.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1488 (1965)	none
<i>Claiborne v. United States</i> .....	3 Rapp 1168 (1984)	465 U.S. 1305
<i>Clark, Ex parte</i> .....	4 Rapp 1519 (1888)	9 S. Ct. 2
<i>Clark v. California</i> .....	3 Rapp 1159 (1983)	464 U.S. 1304
<i>Clark v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 108 (1953)	74 S. Ct. 357
<i>Clements v. Logan</i> .....	3 Rapp 1074 (1981)	454 U.S. 1304
<i>Cohen v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 268 (1961)	82 S. Ct. 8
<i>Cohen v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 279 (1962)	82 S. Ct. 518
<i>Cohen v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 281 (1962)	82 S. Ct. 526
<i>Cole v. Texas</i> .....	3 Rapp 1324 (1991)	499 U.S. 1301
<i>Coleman v. Paccar, Inc.</i> .....	2 Rapp 684 (1976)	424 U.S. 1301
<i>Columbus Bd. of Ed. v. Penick</i> .....	2 Rapp 842 (1978)	439 U.S. 1348
<i>CFTC v. British Am. Commodity Options</i> .....	2 Rapp 758 (1977)	434 U.S. 1316
<i>Commonwealth Oil Ref. Co. v. Lummus Co.</i> .....	1 Rapp 274 (1961)	82 S. Ct. 348
<i>Communist Party of Indiana v. Whitcomb</i> .....	2 Rapp 559 (1972)	409 U.S. 1235
<i>Conforte v. Commissioner</i> .....	3 Rapp 1102 (1983)	459 U.S. 1309
<i>Conkright v. Frommert</i> .....	4 Rapp 1589 (2009)	556 U.S. _____
<i>Cooper v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 137 (1955)	75 S. Ct. 908
<i>Cooper v. New York</i> .....	4 Rapp 1482 (1955)	none
<i>Corpus Christi School Dist. v. Cisneros</i> .....	2 Rapp 488 (1971)	404 U.S. 1211
<i>Corsetti v. Massachusetts</i> .....	3 Rapp 1092 (1982)	458 U.S. 1306
<i>Costello v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 118 (1954)	74 S. Ct. 847



## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

TITLE	PAGE	OTHER CITATION
<i>Cote v. New Hampshire</i> .....	4 Rapp 1548 (1948)	none
<i>County School Board of Arlington v. Deskins</i> .....	4 Rapp 1610 (1959)	none
<i>Cousins v. Wigoda</i> .....	2 Rapp 527 (1972)	409 U.S. 1201
<i>Cunningham v. English</i> .....	1 Rapp 200 (1957)	78 S. Ct. 3
<i>Curry v. Baker</i> .....	3 Rapp 1252 (1986)	479 U.S. 1301
<i>D'Aquino v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 33 (1950)	180 F.2d 271
<i>Davis v. Adams</i> .....	2 Rapp 463 (1970)	400 U.S. 1203
<i>Day v. Louisiana Western Railroad Co.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1581 (1910)	none
<i>Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman</i> .....	2 Rapp 854 (1978)	439 U.S. 1357
<i>Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman</i> .....	2 Rapp 855 (1978)	439 U.S. 1358
<i>Deaver v. United States</i> .....	3 Rapp 1276 (1987)	483 U.S. 1301
<i>DeBoer v. DeBoer</i> .....	3 Rapp 1343 (1993)	509 U.S. 1301
<i>Deere v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1614 (1959)	none
<i>Delli Paoli v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1483 (1955)	none
<i>Democratic Nat'l Comm. v. Republican Nat'l Comm.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1498 (2004)	543 U.S. 1304
<i>Dennis v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 57 (1951)	none
<i>Dexter v. Schrunk</i> .....	1 Rapp xvi & 2 Rapp 467 (1970)	400 U.S. 1207
<i>Di Candia v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 204 (1958)	78 S. Ct. 361
<i>Divans v. California</i> .....	2 Rapp 746 (1977)	434 U.S. 1303
<i>Divans v. California</i> .....	2 Rapp 857 (1978)	439 U.S. 1367
<i>Doe v. Gonzales</i> .....	4 Rapp 1533 (2005)	546 U.S. 1301
<i>Doe v. Smith</i> .....	3 Rapp 1290 (1988)	486 U.S. 1308
<i>Dolman v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 891 (1978)	439 U.S. 1395
<i>Dow Jones &amp; Co. Inc., In re</i> .....	3 Rapp 1370 (1994)	513 U.S. 1301
<i>Drifka v. Brainard</i> .....	2 Rapp 416 (1968)	89 S. Ct. 434
<i>Drummond v. Acree</i> .....	2 Rapp 553 (1972)	409 U.S. 1228
<i>Durant, Ex parte</i> .....	4 Rapp 1416 (1946)	none
<i>East Coast Lumber Terminal, Inc. v. Town of Babylon</i> .....	4 Rapp 1552 (1949)	none
<i>Eckwerth v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 216 (1959)	79 S. Ct. 755
<i>Eckwerth v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 217 (1959)	79 S. Ct. 894
<i>Edelman v. Jordan</i> .....	2 Rapp 587 (1973)	414 U.S. 1301
<i>Edwards v. Hope Medical Group</i> .....	3 Rapp 1367 (1994)	512 U.S. 1301
<i>Edwards v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 163 (1956)	76 S. Ct. 538
<i>Edwards v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 171 (1956)	76 S. Ct. 1058
<i>Ehrlichman v. Sirica</i> .....	2 Rapp 639 (1974)	419 U.S. 1310
<i>Ellis v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 215 (1959)	79 S. Ct. 428
<i>English v. Cunningham</i> .....	1 Rapp 234 (1959)	80 S. Ct. 18
<i>Equitable Office Bldg. Corp., In re</i> .....	1 Rapp 24 (1946)	72 S. Ct. 1086
<i>Evans v. Alabama</i> .....	3 Rapp 1110 (1983)	461 U.S. 1301
<i>Evans v. Atlantic Richfield Co.</i> .....	2 Rapp 730 (1976)	429 U.S. 1334
<i>Evans v. Bennett</i> .....	2 Rapp 896 (1979)	440 U.S. 1301
<i>Eveleigh v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1615 (1960)	none
<i>Ewing v. Gill</i> .....	4 Rapp 1472 (1945)	none
<i>Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. Wills</i> .....	4 Rapp 1603 (1914)	none
<i>Fare v. Michael C.</i> .....	2 Rapp 810 (1978)	439 U.S. 1310
<i>Farr v. Pitchess</i> .....	2 Rapp 583 (1973)	409 U.S. 1243
<i>Febre v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 447 (1969)	396 U.S. 1225
<i>Federal Communications Comm'n. v. Radiofone</i> .....	3 Rapp 1385 (1995)	516 U.S. 1301
<i>Fernandez v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 256 (1961)	81 S. Ct. 642
<i>Field v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 58 (1951)	193 F.2d 86
<i>Finance Comm. to Re-elect the Pres. v. Waddy</i> .....	2 Rapp 577 (1972)	none
<i>Fishman v. Schaffer</i> .....	2 Rapp 721 (1976)	429 U.S. 1325
<i>Flamm v. Real-BLT Inc.</i> .....	2 Rapp 696 (1976)	424 U.S. 1313
<i>Flynn v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 128 (1955)	75 S. Ct. 285
<i>Foster v. Gilliam</i> .....	3 Rapp 1374 (1995)	515 U.S. 1301
<i>Fowler v. Adams</i> .....	2 Rapp 465 (1970)	400 U.S. 1205
<i>Frank v. Georgia</i> .....	4 Rapp 1521 (1914)	none
<i>Frank v. Georgia</i> .....	4 Rapp 1523 (1914)	none
<i>Frank, In re</i> .....	4 Rapp 1524 (1914)	none
<i>Garcia-Mir v. Smith</i> .....	3 Rapp 1207 (1985)	469 U.S. 1311
<i>Garrison v. Hudson</i> .....	3 Rapp 1173 (1984)	468 U.S. 1301

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

TITLE	PAGE	OTHER CITATION
<i>General Council on Finance &amp; Admin. v. Superior Ct.</i> .....	2 Rapp 852 (1978)	439 U.S. 1355
<i>General Council on Finance &amp; Admin. v. Superior Ct.</i> .....	2 Rapp 859 (1978)	439 U.S. 1369
<i>General Dynamics v. Anderson</i> .....	2 Rapp 895 (1979)	none
<i>George F. Alger Co. v. Peck</i> .....	1 Rapp 110 (1954)	74 S. Ct. 605
<i>Goldman v. Fogarty</i> .....	1 Rapp 123 (1954)	75 S. Ct. 257
<i>Goldsmith v. Zerbst</i> .....	1 Rapp 18 (1932)	none
<i>Gomperts v. Chase</i> .....	2 Rapp 514 (1971)	404 U.S. 1237
<i>Graddick v. Newman</i> .....	3 Rapp 1058 (1981)	none
<i>Graves v. Barnes</i> .....	2 Rapp 521 (1972)	405 U.S. 1201
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> .....	2 Rapp 698 (1976)	429 U.S. 1301
<i>Gregory-Portland Indep. Sch. Dist. v. United States</i> .....	3 Rapp 1008 (1980)	448 U.S. 1342
<i>Grinnell Corp. v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 373 (1965)	86 S. Ct. 231
<i>Grubbs v. Delo</i> .....	3 Rapp 1334 (1992)	506 U.S. 1301
<i>Gruener v. Superior Court of Cal.</i> .....	2 Rapp 711 (1976)	429 U.S. 1314
<i>Guiteau, In re</i> .....	1 Rapp ix (1882)	12 D.C. 498, 560
<i>Guterman v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 245 (1960)	80 S. Ct. 666
<i>Haack v. Brooklyn Labor Lyceum Association</i> .....	4 Rapp 1602 (1906)	none
<i>Haner v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 903 (1979)	440 U.S. 1308
<i>Hanrahan v. Hampton</i> .....	3 Rapp 945 (1980)	446 U.S. 1301
<i>Harris v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 471 (1970)	400 U.S. 1211
<i>Harris v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 508 (1971)	404 U.S. 1232
<i>Harvey, In re</i> .....	4 Rapp 1616 (1960)	none
<i>Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff</i> .....	3 Rapp 1135 (1983)	463 U.S. 1323
<i>Hayakawa v. Brown</i> .....	2 Rapp 619 (1974)	415 U.S. 1304
<i>Hayes, Ex parte</i> .....	2 Rapp 614 (1973)	414 U.S. 1327
<i>Haywood v. National Basketball Assn.</i> .....	2 Rapp 477 (1971)	401 U.S. 1204
<i>Heart of Atlanta Motel v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 351 (1964)	85 S. Ct. 1
<i>Heath, In re</i> .....	4 Rapp 1599 (1892)	none
<i>Heckler v. Blankenship</i> .....	3 Rapp 1164 (1984)	465 U.S. 1301
<i>Heckler v. Lopez</i> .....	3 Rapp 1139 (1983)	463 U.S. 1328
<i>Heckler v. Redbud Hospital District</i> .....	3 Rapp 1218 (1985)	473 U.S. 1308
<i>Heckler v. Turner</i> .....	3 Rapp 1177 (1984)	468 U.S. 1305
<i>Henry v. Warner</i> .....	2 Rapp 586 (1973)	412 U.S. 1201
<i>Herzog v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 130 (1955)	75 S. Ct. 349
<i>Hicks v. Feiock</i> .....	3 Rapp 1256 (1986)	479 U.S. 1305
<i>Hile v. Baker</i> .....	4 Rapp 1588 (1915)	none
<i>Hirsch v. U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit</i> .....	4 Rapp 1618 (1960)	none
<i>Holtzman v. Schlesinger</i> .....	2 Rapp 590 (1973)	414 U.S. 1304
<i>Holtzman v. Schlesinger</i> .....	2 Rapp 602 (1973)	414 U.S. 1316
<i>Hortonville Joint School Dist. v. Hortonville Ed. Assn.</i> .....	2 Rapp 652 (1975)	423 U.S. 1301
<i>Houchins v. KQED Inc.</i> .....	2 Rapp 736 (1977)	429 U.S. 1341
<i>Hubbard v. Wayne County Election Commission</i> .....	4 Rapp 1480 (1955)	none
<i>Hughes v. Thompson</i> .....	2 Rapp 616 (1974)	415 U.S. 1301
<i>Hung v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 831 (1978)	439 U.S. 1326
<i>Hurst v. West Virginia</i> .....	4 Rapp 1554 (1951)	none
<i>Hutchinson v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 372 (1965)	86 S. Ct. 5
<i>Hysler v. Florida</i> .....	4 Rapp 1531 (1942)	none
<i>INS v. Legalization Assistance Project of L.A. County</i> .....	3 Rapp 1346 (1993)	510 U.S. 1301
<i>International Boxing Club v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 201 (1957)	78 S. Ct. 4
<i>Jackson v. District of Columbia Bd. of Elections &amp; Ethics</i> .....	4 Rapp 1620 (2010)	559 U.S. _____
<i>Jackson v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 285 (1962)	82 S. Ct. 541
<i>Jaffree v. Board of School Comm'rs of Mobile County</i> .....	3 Rapp 1107 (1983)	459 U.S. 1314
<i>Jefferson Parish School Bd. v. Dandridge</i> .....	2 Rapp 496 (1971)	404 U.S. 1219
<i>Jimenez v. United States District Court</i> .....	1 Rapp 336 (1963)	84 S. Ct. 14
<i>John Doe Agency v. John Doe Corp.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1299 (1989)	488 U.S. 1306
<i>Johnson, In re</i> .....	1 Rapp 67 (1952)	72 S. Ct. 1028
<i>Jones v. Lemond</i> .....	2 Rapp 449 (1969)	396 U.S. 1227
<i>Jordan v. Clemmer</i> .....	4 Rapp 1547 (1947)	none
<i>Julian v. United States</i> .....	3 Rapp 1116 (1983)	463 U.S. 1308
<i>Kadans v. Collins</i> .....	2 Rapp 520 (1972)	404 U.S. 1244
<i>Kaine, In re</i> .....	4 Rapp 1503 (1852)	14 F. Cas. 82

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

TITLE	PAGE	OTHER CITATION
<i>Kaine, Ex parte</i> .....	4 Rapp 1393 (1853)	3 Blatch. 1; 14 F. Cas. 78
<i>Kake v. Egan</i> .....	1 Rapp 222 (1959)	80 S. Ct. 33
<i>Karcher v. Dagget</i> .....	3 Rapp 1083 (1982)	455 U.S. 1303
<i>Karr v. Schmidt</i> .....	2 Rapp 474 (1971)	401 U.S. 1201
<i>Katzenbach v. McClung</i> .....	1 Rapp 354 (1964)	85 S. Ct. 6
<i>Keith v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 218 (1959)	79 S. Ct. 938
<i>Keith v. New York</i> .....	4 Rapp 1613 (1959)	none
<i>Kemp v. Smith</i> .....	3 Rapp 1133 (1983)	463 U.S. 1321
<i>Kemp v. Smith</i> .....	3 Rapp 1155 (1983)	463 U.S. 1344
<i>Kentucky v. Stincer</i> .....	3 Rapp 1254 (1986)	479 U.S. 1303
<i>Kenyeres v. Ashcroft</i> .....	4 Rapp 1436 (2003)	538 U.S. 1301
<i>Keys v. School Dist. No. 1, Denver</i> .....	2 Rapp 437 (1969)	396 U.S. 1215
<i>Kimble v. Swackhamer</i> .....	2 Rapp 882 (1978)	439 U.S. 1385
<i>King v. Smith</i> .....	2 Rapp 393 (1968)	88 S. Ct. 842
<i>Kleem v. INS</i> .....	3 Rapp 1259 (1986)	479 U.S. 1308
<i>Knickerbocker Printing Corp. v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 119 (1954)	75 S. Ct. 212
<i>KPNX Broadcasting Co. v. Arizona Superior Court</i> .....	3 Rapp 1095 (1982)	459 U.S. 1302
<i>Krause v. Rhodes</i> .....	2 Rapp 775 (1977)	434 U.S. 1335
<i>La Marca v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 203 (1957)	78 S. Ct. 106
<i>Laird v. Tatum</i> .....	2 Rapp 560 (1972)	409 U.S. 824
<i>Land v. Dollar</i> .....	1 Rapp 48 (1951)	none
<i>Ledbetter v. Baldwin</i> .....	3 Rapp 1260 (1986)	479 U.S. 1309
<i>Lee v. Johnson</i> .....	2 Rapp 492 (1971)	404 U.S. 1215
<i>Leigh v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 303 (1962)	82 S. Ct. 994
<i>Lenhard v. Wolff</i> .....	2 Rapp 924 (1979)	443 U.S. 1306
<i>Lenhard v. Wolff</i> .....	3 Rapp 931 (1979)	444 U.S. 1301
<i>Levy v. Parker</i> .....	2 Rapp 426 (1969)	396 U.S. 1204
<i>Lewis, In re</i> .....	2 Rapp 630 (1974)	418 U.S. 1301
<i>Liles v. Nebraska</i> .....	3 Rapp 1167 (1984)	465 U.S. 1304
<i>Little v. Ciuros</i> .....	2 Rapp 802 (1978)	436 U.S. 1301
<i>Local 1545, United Brotherhood of Carpenters v. Vincent</i> .....	4 Rapp 1619 (1961)	none
<i>Locks v. Commanding General, Sixth Army</i> .....	2 Rapp 408 (1968)	89 S. Ct. 31
<i>Long Beach Fed. S&amp;L v. Fed. Home Loan Bank</i> .....	1 Rapp 154 (1955)	76 S. Ct. 32
<i>Long Island R.R. Co. v. New York Central R.R.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1617 (1960)	none
<i>Lopez v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 490 (1971)	404 U.S. 1213
<i>Los Angeles NAACP v. L.A. Unified Sch. Dist</i> .....	3 Rapp 1040 (1981)	101 S. Ct. 1965
<i>Los Angeles v. Lyons</i> .....	3 Rapp 1064 (1981)	453 U.S. 1308
<i>Louisiana v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 386 (1966)	none
<i>Lucas v. Townsend</i> .....	3 Rapp 1284 (1988)	486 U.S. 1301
<i>Ludecke v. Watkins</i> .....	4 Rapp 1475 (1947)	none
<i>Lux v. Rodrigues</i> .....	4 Rapp 1626 (2010)	561 U.S. _____
<i>Lynch v. Watson</i> .....	4 Rapp 1544 (1947)	none
<i>M.I.C. Ltd. v. Bedford Township</i> .....	3 Rapp 1152 (1983)	463 U.S. 1341
<i>MacKay v. Boyd</i> .....	4 Rapp 1481 (1955)	none
<i>Madden v. Texas</i> .....	3 Rapp 1318 (1991)	498 U.S. 1301
<i>Mahan v. Howell</i> .....	2 Rapp 482 (1971)	404 U.S. 1201
<i>Mallonee v. Fahey</i> .....	1 Rapp 78 (1952)	97 L. Ed. 1635
<i>Marcello v. Brownell</i> .....	4 Rapp 1486 (1955)	none
<i>Marcello v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 468 (1970)	400 U.S. 1208
<i>Marks v. Davis</i> .....	4 Rapp 1413 (1912)	4 Green Bag 2d 179, 186 (2001)
<i>Marshall v. Barlow's, Inc.</i> .....	2 Rapp 742 (1977)	429 U.S. 1347
<i>Marten v. Thies</i> .....	3 Rapp 963 (1980)	446 U.S. 1320
<i>Mathis v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 392 (1967)	88 S. Ct. 8
<i>Matthews v. Little</i> .....	2 Rapp 445 (1969)	396 U.S. 1223
<i>McCarthy v. Briscoe</i> .....	2 Rapp 713 (1976)	429 U.S. 1316
<i>McCarthy v. Briscoe</i> .....	2 Rapp 714 (1976)	429 U.S. 1317
<i>McCarthy v. Harper</i> .....	3 Rapp 1024 (1981)	449 U.S. 1309
<i>McDaniel v. Sanchez</i> .....	3 Rapp 985 (1980)	448 U.S. 1318
<i>McDonald v. Missouri</i> .....	3 Rapp 1161 (1984)	464 U.S. 1306

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

TITLE	PAGE	OTHER CITATION
<i>McGee v. Alaska</i> .....	3 Rapp 1150 (1983)	463 U.S. 1339
<i>McGee v. Eyman</i> .....	1 Rapp 318 (1962)	83 S. Ct. 230
<i>McGraw-Hill Cos. v. Proctor &amp; Gamble Co.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1382 (1995)	515 U.S. 1309
<i>McLeod v. General Elec. Co.</i> .....	1 Rapp 389 (1966)	87 S. Ct. 5
<i>Mecom v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 779 (1977)	434 U.S. 1340
<i>Meeropol v. Nizer</i> .....	2 Rapp 733 (1977)	429 U.S. 1337
<i>Meredith v. Fair</i> .....	1 Rapp 312 (1962)	83 S. Ct. 10
<i>Merrifield v. Kentucky</i> .....	4 Rapp 1558 (1955)	none
<i>Merryman, Ex parte</i> .....	4 Rapp 1400 (1861)	<i>Decision of Chief Justice Taney, in the Merryman Case</i> (John Campbell 1862); 17 F. Cas. 144
<i>Metropolitan County Bd. of Ed. v. Kelley</i> .....	3 Rapp 1062 (1981)	453 U.S. 1306
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1424 (2000)	530 U.S. 1301
<i>Mikutaitis v. United States</i> .....	3 Rapp 1247 (1986)	478 U.S. 1306
<i>Mincey v. Arizona</i> .....	2 Rapp 782 (1977)	434 U.S. 1343
<i>Miroyan v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 836 (1978)	439 U.S. 1338
<i>Mississippi v. Turner</i> .....	3 Rapp 1323 (1991)	498 U.S. 1306
<i>Mitchell v. California</i> .....	1 Rapp 380 (1966)	86 S. Ct. 1411
<i>Montanans for Balanced Fed. Budget v. Harper</i> .....	3 Rapp 1197 (1984)	469 U.S. 1301
<i>Montgomery v. Jefferson</i> .....	3 Rapp 1193 (1984)	468 U.S. 1313
<i>Moore v. Brown</i> .....	3 Rapp 1001 (1980)	448 U.S. 1335
<i>Mori v. Boilermakers</i> .....	3 Rapp 1071 (1981)	454 U.S. 1301
<i>Morison v. United States</i> .....	3 Rapp 1289 (1988)	486 U.S. 1306
<i>Motlow v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 1 (1926)	10 F.2d 657
<i>Multimedia Holdings Corp. v. Circuit Ct. of Fla.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1499 (2005)	544 U.S. 1301
<i>Murdaugh v. Livingston</i> .....	3 Rapp 1391 (1998)	525 U.S. 1301
<i>National Broadcasting Co. v. Niemi</i> .....	2 Rapp 792 (1978)	434 U.S. 1354
<i>National Coll. Athl. Assn. v. Bd. of Regents</i> .....	3 Rapp 1124 (1983)	463 U.S. 1311
<i>National Farmers Union Ins. Co. v. Crow Tribe</i> .....	3 Rapp 1185 (1984)	468 U.S. 1315
<i>National Farmers Union Ins. Co. v. Crow Tribe</i> .....	3 Rapp 1211 (1985)	471 U.S. 1301
<i>National Labor Relations Board v. Getman</i> .....	2 Rapp 481 (1971)	404 U.S. 1204
<i>National League of Cities v. Brennan</i> .....	2 Rapp 648 (1974)	419 U.S. 1321
<i>National Socialist Party of America v. Skokie</i> .....	2 Rapp 767 (1977)	434 U.S. 1327
<i>Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart</i> .....	2 Rapp 668 (1975)	423 U.S. 1319
<i>Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart</i> .....	2 Rapp 675 (1975)	423 U.S. 1327
<i>Netherland v. Gray</i> .....	3 Rapp 1387 (1996)	519 U.S. 1301
<i>Netherland v. Tuggle</i> .....	3 Rapp 1386 (1996)	517 U.S. 1301
<i>New England Water Works Co. v. Farmers' Loan &amp; Trust</i> .....	4 Rapp 1576 (1906)	none
<i>New England Water Works Co. v. Farmers' Loan &amp; Trust</i> .....	4 Rapp 1577 (1906)	none
<i>New Jersey v. Auld</i> .....	4 Rapp 1553 (1950)	none
<i>New Motor Veh. Bd. of Cal. v. Orrin W. Fox Co.</i> .....	2 Rapp 784 (1977)	434 U.S. 1345
<i>New York Times Co. v. Jascavevich</i> .....	2 Rapp 803 (1978)	439 U.S. 1301
<i>New York Times Co. v. Jascavevich</i> .....	2 Rapp 805 (1978)	439 U.S. 1304
<i>New York Times Co. v. Jascavevich</i> .....	2 Rapp 816 (1978)	439 U.S. 1317
<i>New York Times Co. v. Jascavevich</i> .....	2 Rapp 824 (1978)	439 U.S. 1331
<i>New York v. Kleppe</i> .....	2 Rapp 704 (1976)	429 U.S. 1307
<i>Northern Cal. Power Ag'y v. Grace Geothermal</i> .....	3 Rapp 1202 (1984)	469 U.S. 1306
<i>Noto v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 156 (1955)	76 S. Ct. 255
<i>Noyd v. Bond</i> .....	2 Rapp 418 (1968)	89 S. Ct. 478
<i>Nukk v. Shaughnessy</i> .....	1 Rapp 126 (1955)	75 S. Ct. 255
<i>Numer v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1550 (1948)	none
<i>O'Brien v. O'Laughlin</i> .....	4 Rapp 1591 (2009)	557 U.S. _____
<i>O'Brien v. Skinner</i> .....	2 Rapp 580 (1972)	409 U.S. 1240
<i>O'Connell v. Kirchner</i> .....	3 Rapp 1372 (1995)	513 U.S. 1303
<i>O'Connor v. Board of Ed. of School Dist. 23</i> .....	3 Rapp 1017 (1980)	449 U.S. 1301
<i>O'Rourke v. Levine</i> .....	1 Rapp 243 (1960)	80 S. Ct. 623
<i>Oden v. Brittain</i> .....	2 Rapp 432 (1969)	396 U.S. 1210
<i>Oerlikon Machine Tool Works Buehrle &amp; Co. v. U.S.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1608 (1957)	none
<i>Office of Personnel Management v. Gov't Employees</i> .....	3 Rapp 1212 (1985)	473 U.S. 1301

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

TITLE	PAGE	OTHER CITATION
<i>Ohio Citizens for Responsible Energy v. NRC</i> .....	3 Rapp 1262 (1986)	479 U.S. 1312
<i>Orloff v. Willoughby</i> .....	1 Rapp 76 (1952)	72 S. Ct. 998
<i>Overfield v. Pennroad Corp.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1473 (1946)	none
<i>Owen v. Kennedy</i> .....	1 Rapp 323 (1963)	84 S. Ct. 12
<i>Pabon v. Board of Personnel of Puerto Rico</i> .....	4 Rapp 1609 (1958)	none
<i>Pacific Tel. &amp; Tel. v. Public Util. Comm'n of Cal.</i> .....	2 Rapp 919 (1979)	443 U.S. 1301
<i>Pacific Un. of Seventh-Day Adventists v. Marshall</i> .....	2 Rapp 748 (1977)	434 U.S. 1305
<i>Pacileo v. Walker</i> .....	3 Rapp 946 (1980)	446 U.S. 1307
<i>Packwood v. Senate Select Comm. on Ethics</i> .....	3 Rapp 1364 (1994)	510 U.S. 1319
<i>Panama Canal Co. v. Grace Lines, Inc.</i> .....	1 Rapp 195 (1957)	77 S. Ct. 854
<i>Parisi v. Davidson</i> .....	2 Rapp 455 (1969)	396 U.S. 1233
<i>Pasadena City Bd. of Ed. v. Spangler</i> .....	2 Rapp 682 (1975)	423 U.S. 1335
<i>Patterson v. Superior Court of Cal.</i> .....	2 Rapp 650 (1975)	420 U.S. 1301
<i>Patterson v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 125 (1954)	75 S. Ct. 256
<i>Peeples v. Brown</i> .....	3 Rapp 933 (1979)	444 U.S. 1303
<i>Pennsylvania v. Wheeling &amp; Belmont Bridge Co.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1565 (1854)	59 U.S. 421
<i>Perry v. Texas</i> .....	3 Rapp 1377 (1995)	515 U.S. 1304
<i>Perez v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 461 (1970)	none
<i>Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Scott</i> .....	4 Rapp 1622 (2010)	561 U.S. _____
<i>Pirinsky, In re</i> .....	1 Rapp 30 (1949)	70 S. Ct. 232
<i>Planned Parenthood v. Casey</i> .....	3 Rapp 1354 (1994)	510 U.S. 1309
<i>Pon v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1549 (1948)	none
<i>Portley v. Grossman</i> .....	3 Rapp 940 (1980)	444 U.S. 1311
<i>Prato v. Vallas</i> .....	4 Rapp 1440 (2003)	539 U.S. 1301
<i>Prudential Fed. Sav. &amp; Loan Assn. v. Flanigan</i> .....	3 Rapp 1251 (1986)	478 U.S. 1311
<i>Pryor v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 518 (1971)	404 U.S. 1242
<i>Public Service Board v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 384 (1966)	87 S. Ct. 3
<i>Public Utilities Comm'n of D.C. v. Pollak</i> .....	4 Rapp 1423 (1952)	343 U.S. 451, 466
<i>Quinn v. Laird</i> .....	2 Rapp 421 (1969)	89 S. Ct. 1491
<i>Railway Express Agency, Inc. v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 275 (1962)	82 S. Ct. 466
<i>Railway Labor Executives' Assn. v. Gibbons</i> .....	3 Rapp 969 (1980)	448 U.S. 1301
<i>Rehman v. California</i> .....	1 Rapp 356 (1964)	85 S. Ct. 8
<i>Renaissance Arcade &amp; Bookstore v. Cook Cty.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1232 (1985)	473 U.S. 1322
<i>Reproductive Services, Inc. v. Walker</i> .....	2 Rapp 808 (1978)	439 U.S. 1307
<i>Reproductive Services, Inc. v. Walker</i> .....	2 Rapp 851 (1978)	439 U.S. 1354
<i>Republican National Committee v. Burton</i> .....	3 Rapp 1081 (1982)	455 U.S. 1301
<i>Republican Party of Hawaii v. Mink</i> .....	3 Rapp 1234 (1985)	474 U.S. 1301
<i>Repub. State Central Comm. v. Ripon Soc'y</i> .....	2 Rapp 547 (1972)	409 U.S. 1222
<i>Reynolds v. Int'l Amateur Athletic Fed'n</i> .....	3 Rapp 1332 (1992)	505 U.S. 1301
<i>Reynolds v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 239 (1959)	80 S. Ct. 30
<i>Richardson, In re</i> .....	4 Rapp 1600 (1896)	none
<i>Richardson v. New York</i> .....	1 Rapp 206 (1958)	78 S. Ct. 1188
<i>Richmond v. Arizona</i> .....	2 Rapp 764 (1977)	434 U.S. 1323
<i>Riverside v. Rivera</i> .....	3 Rapp 1225 (1985)	473 U.S. 1315
<i>Roche, In re</i> .....	3 Rapp 979 (1980)	448 U.S. 1312
<i>Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party</i> .....	2 Rapp 459 (1970)	400 U.S. 1201
<i>Rodriguez v. Texas</i> .....	3 Rapp 1380 (1995)	515 U.S. 1307
<i>Roller v. Murray</i> .....	4 Rapp 1579 (1909)	none
<i>Roller v. Murray</i> .....	4 Rapp 1582 (1912)	none
<i>Roller v. Murray</i> .....	4 Rapp 1583 (1913)	none
<i>Rosado v. Wyman</i> .....	2 Rapp 435 (1969)	396 U.S. 1213
<i>Rosenberg v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 89 (1953)	346 U.S. 313
<i>Rosenblatt v. American Cyanamid Co.</i> .....	1 Rapp 360 (1965)	86 S. Ct. 1
<i>Rosoto v. Warden</i> .....	1 Rapp 321 (1963)	83 S. Ct. 1788
<i>Rostker v. Goldberg</i> .....	3 Rapp 974 (1980)	448 U.S. 1306
<i>Roth v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 192 (1956)	77 S. Ct. 17
<i>Rubin v. United States Independent Counsel</i> .....	3 Rapp 1389 (1998)	524 U.S. 1301
<i>Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.</i> .....	3 Rapp 1128 (1983)	463 U.S. 1315
<i>Russo v. Byrne</i> .....	2 Rapp 544 (1972)	409 U.S. 1219
<i>Russo v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 486 (1971)	404 U.S. 1209

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

TITLE	PAGE	OTHER CITATION
<i>Sacco v. Hendry</i> .....	1 Rapp 15 (1927)	5 <i>The Sacco-Vanzetti Case</i> 5532 (2d ed. 1969)
<i>Sacco v. Massachusetts</i> .....	1 Rapp 16 (1927)	5 <i>The Sacco-Vanzetti Case</i> 5516 (2d ed. 1969)
<i>Sacher v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 55 (1951)	none
<i>San Diegans for Mt. Soledad Nat. War Mem. v. Paulson</i> .....	4 Rapp 1538 (2006)	548 U.S. 1301
<i>Satterfield v. Smyth</i> .....	4 Rapp 1543 (1945)	none
<i>Sawyer v. Dollar</i> .....	1 Rapp 52 (1951)	none
<i>Scaggs v. Larsen</i> .....	2 Rapp 428 (1969)	396 U.S. 1206
<i>Schlesinger v. Holtzman</i> .....	2 Rapp 607 (1973)	414 U.S. 1321
<i>Schlesinger v. Holtzman</i> .....	2 Rapp 609 (1973)	414 U.S. 1322
<i>Schweiker v. McClure</i> .....	3 Rapp 1051 (1981)	452 U.S. 1301
<i>Seagram &amp; Sons v. Hostetter</i> .....	1 Rapp 371 (1965)	86 S. Ct. 10
<i>Seals, Ex parte</i> .....	4 Rapp 1466 (1943)	none
<i>Seals, Ex parte</i> .....	4 Rapp 1468 (1943)	none
<i>Sellers v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 395 (1968)	89 S. Ct. 36
<i>Shearer v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1545 (1947)	none
<i>Shelton v. McKinley</i> .....	4 Rapp 1612 (1959)	none
<i>Sica v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 290 (1962)	82 S. Ct. 669
<i>Simon, In re</i> .....	4 Rapp 1556 (1953)	none
<i>Simon v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1461 (1941)	none
<i>Sklaroff v. Skeadas</i> .....	1 Rapp 164 (1956)	76 S. Ct. 736
<i>Smith v. Ritchey</i> .....	2 Rapp 407 (1968)	89 S. Ct. 54
<i>Smith v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 653 (1975)	423 U.S. 1303
<i>Smith v. Yeager</i> .....	2 Rapp 513 (1971)	none
<i>Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes</i> .....	2 Rapp 402 (1968)	89 S. Ct. 3
<i>Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes</i> .....	2 Rapp 406 (1968)	89 S. Ct. 4
<i>Socialist Workers Party v. Attorney General</i> .....	2 Rapp 642 (1974)	419 U.S. 1314
<i>South Park Indep. School Dist. v. United States</i> .....	3 Rapp 1054 (1981)	453 U.S. 1301
<i>Spencer v. Pugh</i> .....	4 Rapp 1496 (2004)	543 U.S. 1301
<i>Spenkelink v. Wainwright</i> .....	2 Rapp 905 (1979)	442 U.S. 1301
<i>Spenkelink v. Wainwright</i> .....	2 Rapp 911 (1979)	442 U.S. 1308
<i>Spies v. Illinois</i> .....	4 Rapp 1567 (1887)	123 U.S. 131
<i>Stanard v. Olesen</i> .....	1 Rapp 112 (1954)	74 S. Ct. 768
<i>Stanley v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1605 (1956)	none
<i>Steinberg v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 168 (1956)	76 S. Ct. 822
<i>Stevens, Ex parte</i> .....	4 Rapp 1508 (1861)	none
<i>Stickel v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 188 (1956)	76 S. Ct. 1067
<i>Stickney, Ex parte</i> .....	1 Rapp 278 (1962)	82 S. Ct. 465
<i>Strickland Transportation Co. v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 420 (1969)	89 S. Ct. 732
<i>Stroup v. Willcox</i> .....	4 Rapp 1562 (2006)	549 U.S. 1501
<i>Sulzer v. Sohmer</i> .....	4 Rapp 1585 (1914)	none
<i>Sumner v. Mata</i> .....	3 Rapp 950 (1980)	446 U.S. 1302
<i>Synanon Foundation Inc. v. California</i> .....	3 Rapp 936 (1979)	444 U.S. 1307
<i>Tate v. Rose</i> .....	3 Rapp 1170 (1984)	466 U.S. 1301
<i>Thomas v. Sierra Club</i> .....	3 Rapp 1205 (1985)	469 U.S. 1309
<i>Thomas v. South Side Elevated Railroad Co.</i> .....	4 Rapp 1578 (1906)	none
<i>Thompson v. United States</i> .....	4 Rapp 1551 (1948)	none
<i>Tierney v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 557 (1972)	409 U.S. 1232
<i>Times-Picayune Pub. Corp. v. Schulingkamp</i> .....	2 Rapp 631 (1974)	419 U.S. 1301
<i>Tomaialo v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 271 (1961)	none
<i>Travia v. Lomenzo</i> .....	1 Rapp 367 (1965)	86 S. Ct. 7
<i>Tri-Continental Financial Corp. v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 242 (1960)	80 S. Ct. 659
<i>Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC</i> .....	3 Rapp 1335 (1993)	507 U.S. 1301
<i>Tuscarora Nation of Indians v. Power Auth.</i> .....	1 Rapp 211 (1958)	79 S. Ct. 4
<i>Twentieth Century Airlines Inc. v. Ryan</i> .....	1 Rapp 102 (1953)	74 S. Ct. 8
<i>Uhler v. AFL-CIO</i> .....	3 Rapp 1182 (1984)	468 U.S. 1310
<i>United States ex rel. Cerullo v. Follette</i> .....	2 Rapp 454 (1969)	396 U.S. 1232
<i>United States ex rel. Knauff v. McGrath</i> .....	1 Rapp 36 (1950)	96 Cong. Rec. A3750
<i>United States ex rel. Norris v. Swope</i> .....	1 Rapp 73 (1952)	72 S. Ct. 1020
<i>United States v. Allied Stevedoring Corp.</i> .....	1 Rapp 179 (1956)	76 S. Ct. 1068

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

TITLE	PAGE	OTHER CITATION
<i>United States v. Edgar</i> .....	2 Rapp 484 (1971) .....	404 U.S. 1206
<i>United States v. Cooper</i> .....	4 Rapp 1568 (1891) .....	none
<i>United States v. FMC Corp.</i> .....	1 Rapp 325 (1963) .....	84 S. Ct. 4
<i>United States v. Gates</i> .....	4 Rapp 1476 (1949) .....	none
<i>United States v. Klopp</i> .....	4 Rapp 1469 (1944) .....	none
<i>United States v. Patterson</i> .....	4 Rapp 1593 (1887) .....	29 F. 775
<i>United States v. Portell</i> .....	4 Rapp 1606 (1956) .....	none
<i>United States v. United Liquors Corp.</i> .....	1 Rapp 190 (1956) .....	77 S. Ct. 208
<i>United States Postal Service v. Letter Carriers</i> .....	3 Rapp 1274 (1987) .....	481 U.S. 1301
<i>Uphaus v. Wyman</i> .....	1 Rapp 247 (1960) .....	81 S. Ct. 22
<i>Valenti v. Spector</i> .....	1 Rapp 209 (1958) .....	79 S. Ct. 7
<i>Van Newkirk v. McLain</i> .....	1 Rapp 20 (1940) .....	34 F. Supp. 404
<i>Vetterli v. United States District Court</i> .....	2 Rapp 797 (1978) .....	435 U.S. 1304
<i>Volkswagenwerk A.G. v. Falzon</i> .....	3 Rapp 1112 (1983) .....	461 U.S. 1303
<i>Volvo of America Corp. v. Schwarzer</i> .....	2 Rapp 727 (1976) .....	429 U.S. 1331
<i>Waller, Ex parte</i> .....	1 Rapp 22 (1942) .....	62 S. Ct. 1313
<i>Walters v. Nat'l Assn. of Radiation Survivors</i> .....	3 Rapp 1195 (1984) .....	468 U.S. 1323
<i>Ward v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 181 (1956) .....	76 S. Ct. 1063
<i>Warm Springs Dam Task Force v. Gribble</i> .....	2 Rapp 621 (1974) .....	417 U.S. 1301
<i>Warm Springs Dam Task Force v. Gribble</i> .....	2 Rapp 885 (1978) .....	439 U.S. 1392
<i>Wasmuth v. Allen</i> .....	1 Rapp 350 (1964) .....	85 S. Ct. 5
<i>Westermann v. Nelson</i> .....	2 Rapp 576 (1972) .....	409 U.S. 1236
<i>Western Airlines, Inc. v. Teamsters</i> .....	3 Rapp 1264 (1987) .....	480 U.S. 1301
<i>Whalen v. Roe</i> .....	2 Rapp 662 (1975) .....	423 U.S. 1313
<i>White v. Florida</i> .....	3 Rapp 1087 (1982) .....	458 U.S. 1301
<i>Willhauck v. Flanagan</i> .....	3 Rapp 990 (1980) .....	448 U.S. 1323
<i>Williams v. Missouri</i> .....	3 Rapp 1115 (1983) .....	463 U.S. 1301
<i>Williams v. Rhodes</i> .....	2 Rapp 399 (1968) .....	89 S. Ct. 1
<i>Williams v. Zbaraz</i> .....	2 Rapp 912 (1979) .....	442 U.S. 1309
<i>Williamson v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 40 (1950) .....	184 F.2d 280
<i>Wilson v. O'Malley</i> .....	4 Rapp 1529 (1937) .....	none
<i>Winston-Salem/Forsyth Cty. Bd. of Ed. v. Scott</i> .....	2 Rapp 498 (1971) .....	404 U.S. 1221
<i>Winters v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 404 (1968) .....	89 S. Ct. 34
<i>Winters v. United States</i> .....	2 Rapp 410 (1968) .....	89 S. Ct. 57
<i>Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc. v. FEC</i> .....	4 Rapp 1458 (2004) .....	542 U.S. 1305
<i>Wise v. Lipscomb</i> .....	2 Rapp 769 (1977) .....	434 U.S. 1329
<i>Wise v. New Jersey</i> .....	4 Rapp 1487 (1955) .....	none
<i>Wolcher v. United States</i> .....	1 Rapp 161 (1955) .....	76 S. Ct. 254
<i>Wyckoff, In re</i> .....	4 Rapp 1561 (1961) .....	6 Race R. L. Rptr. 794
<i>Yanish v. Barber</i> .....	1 Rapp 82 (1953) .....	73 S. Ct. 1105
<i>Yasa v. Esperdy</i> .....	1 Rapp 246 (1960) .....	80 S. Ct. 1366

# CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES BY DATE

## 19TH CENTURY

8/3/52 *Kaine, In re*  
 4/25/53 *Kaine, Ex parte*  
 6/26/54 *Penn. v. Wheeling & Belmont Bridge Co.*  
 6/1/61 *Merryman, Ex parte*  
 8/??/61 *Stevens, Ex parte*  
 6/19/82 *Guiteau, In re*  
 1/31/87 *U.S. v. Patterson*  
 10/21/87 *Spies v. Illinois*  
 8/7/88 *Clark, Ex parte*  
 8/10/91 *United States v. Cooper*  
 1/18/92 *In re Heath*  
 8/24/96 *In re Richardson*

## 20TH CENTURY

2/5/06 *N.E. Water v. Farmers', 4 Rapp 1576*  
 2/20/06 *N.E. Water v. Farmers', 4 Rapp 1577*  
 3/5/06 *Thomas v. South Side Elevated R. Co.*  
 6/29/06 *Haack v. Brooklyn Labor Lyceum Assn.*  
 11/17/09 *Roller v. Murray, 4 Rapp 1579*  
 1/25/10 *Day v. Louisiana Western Railroad Co.*  
 1/31/12 *Roller v. Murray, 4 Rapp 1582*  
 8/1/12 *Marks v. Davis*  
 12/3/13 *Roller v. Murray, 4 Rapp 1583*  
 12/15/13 *Chesapeake Western Co. v. Murray*  
 2/23/14 *Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. Wills*  
 11/23/14 *Frank v. Georgia, 4 Rapp 1521*  
 11/24/14 *Sulzer v. Sohmer*  
 11/25/14 *Frank v. Georgia, 4 Rapp 1523*  
 12/28/14 *Frank, In re*  
 5/28/15 *Burgess v. Pere Marq. R., 4 Rapp 1586*  
 5/31/15 *Burgess v. Pere Marq. R., 4 Rapp 1587*  
 12/15/15 *Hile v. Baker*  
 2/14/26 *Motlow v. United States*  
 8/10/27 *Sacco v. Hendry*  
 8/20/27 *Sacco v. Massachusetts*  
 11/18/32 *Goldsmith v. Zerbst*  
 7/2/36 *Associated Gas & Electric Co., In re*  
 6/16/37 *Wilson v. O'Malley*  
 6/20/40 *Van Newkirk v. McLain*  
 7/22/41 *Simon v. United States*  
 6/13/42 *Hysler v. Florida*  
 6/27/42 *Waller, Ex parte*  
 9/4/43 *Seals, Ex parte, 4 Rapp 1466*  
 11/23/43 *Seals, Ex parte, 4 Rapp 1468*  
 7/17/44 *United States v. Klopp*  
 3/31/45 *Chin Gum v. United States*  
 6/20/45 *Ewing v. Gill*  
 11/5/45 *Satterfield v. Smyth*  
 8/6/46 *Equitable Office Bldg. Corp., In re*  
 9/6/46 *Ex parte Durant*  
 9/18/46 *Overfield v. Pennroad Corp.*  
 7/30/47 *Lynch v. Watson*  
 8/23/47 *Shearer v. United States*  
 8/25/47 *Jordan v. Clemmer*  
 9/4/47 *Ludecke v. Watkins*  
 5/17/48 *Cote v. New Hampshire*  
 7/17/48 *Pon v. United States*  
 11/27/48 *Numer v. United States*

12/3/48 *Thompson v. United States*  
 4/15/49 *East Coast Lumber v. Town of Babylon*  
 6/16/49 *United States v. Gates*  
 9/10/49 *Pirinsky, In re*  
 1/17/50 *New Jersey v. Auld*  
 2/6/50 *D'Aquino v. United States*  
 5/17/50 *U.S. ex rel. Knauff v. McGrath*  
 5/18/50 *Ala. G.S.R. v. R.R. & P.U.C. of Tenn.*  
 9/25/50 *Williamson v. United States*  
 4/17/51 *Land v. Dollar*  
 5/22/51 *Sawyer v. Dollar*  
 6/22/51 *Sacher v. United States*  
 6/22/51 *Dennis v. United States*  
 7/25/51 *Field v. United States*  
 8/29/51 *Hurst v. West Virginia*  
 4/25/52 *Johnson, In re*  
 4/29/52 *United States ex rel. Norris v. Swope*  
 5/3/52 *Orloff v. Willoughby*  
 5/26/52 *Public Utilities Comm'n v. Pollak*  
 11/20/52 *Mallonee v. Fahey*  
 2/25/53 *In re Simon*  
 5/16/53 *Yanish v. Barber*  
 6/17/53 *Rosenberg v. United States*  
 8/5/53 *Carlisle v. Landon*  
 9/24/53 *Twentieth Century Airlines v. Ryan*  
 12/10/53 *Clark v. United States*  
 3/29/54 *George F. Alger Co. v. Peck*  
 5/22/54 *Stanard v. Olesen*  
 6/18/54 *Costello v. United States*  
 9/3/54 *Knickerbocker Printing Corp. v. U.S.*  
 12/9/54 *Albanese v. United States*  
 12/20/54 *Goldman v. Fogarty*  
 12/23/54 *Patterson v. United States*  
 1/3/55 *Nukk v. Shaughnessy*  
 1/12/55 *Flynn v. United States*  
 2/11/55 *Herzog v. United States*  
 3/14/55 *Hubbard v. Wayne Cty. Elect. Comm'n*  
 7/5/55 *MacKay v. Boyd*  
 7/7/55 *Cooper v. New York, 1 Rapp 137*  
 7/8/55 *Cooper v. New York, 4 Rapp 1482*  
 7/13/55 *Carter v. United States*  
 7/13/55 *Delli Paoli v. United States*  
 8/3/55 *Breswick & Co. v. United States*  
 8/19/55 *Marcello v. Brownell*  
 8/25/55 *Wise v. New Jersey*  
 9/2/55 *Wise v. New Jersey*  
 9/27/55 *Burwell v. California*  
 10/31/55 *Long Beach Fed. S&L v. FHLB*  
 11/21/55 *Noto v. United States*  
 12/21/55 *Merrifield v. Kentucky*  
 12/31/55 *Wolcher v. United States*  
 3/30/56 *Edwards v. New York, 1 Rapp 163*  
 5/4/56 *Sklaroff v. Skeadas*  
 5/28/56 *Steinberg v. United States*  
 6/25/56 *Edwards v. New York, 1 Rapp 171*  
 7/13/56 *United States v. Allied Stevedoring Corp.*  
 8/8/56 *Ward v. United States*  
 8/14/56 *Stickel v. United States*  
 8/29/56 *Stanley v. United States*



## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES BY DATE

### 20TH CENTURY (cont'd)

9/19/56	<i>United States v. United Liquors Corp.</i>	11/29/62	<i>McGee v. Eyma</i>
10/8/56	<i>Roth v. United States</i>	4/10/63	<i>A.B. Chance Co. v. Atlantic City Elec.</i>
12/22/56	<i>United States v. Portell</i>	6/26/63	<i>Rosoto v. Warden</i>
5/7/57	<i>Panama Canal Co. v. Grace Lines</i>	7/19/63	<i>Owen v. Kennedy</i>
5/24/57	<i>Brody v. United States</i>	8/9/63	<i>United States v. FMC Corp.</i>
8/7/57	<i>Oerlikon Machine Tools Works v. U.S.</i>	8/16/63	<i>Board of School Comm'rs v. Davis</i>
10/1/57	<i>Cunningham v. English</i>	8/23/63	<i>Jimenez v. U.S. District Court</i>
10/29/57	<i>International Boxing Club v. U.S.</i>	7/24/64	<i>Aronson v. May</i>
11/6/57	<i>La Marca v. New York</i>	7/25/64	<i>Wasmuth v. Allen</i>
1/20/58	<i>Di Candia v. United States</i>	8/10/64	<i>Heart of Atlanta Motel v. U.S.</i>
6/17/58	<i>Richardson v. New York</i>	9/23/64	<i>Katzenbach v. McClung</i>
7/16/58	<i>Pabon v. Bd. of Personnel of Puerto Rico</i>	10/7/64	<i>Rehman v. California</i>
8/29/58	<i>Bletterman v. United States</i>	11/18/64	<i>Bowman v. United States</i>
9/3/58	<i>Valenti v. Spectator</i>	3/1/65	<i>City-Wide Comm. v. Bd. of Educ. of N.Y.</i>
9/8/58	<i>Tuscarora Nation v. Power Authority</i>	3/8/65	<i>City-Wide Comm. v. Bd. of Educ. of N.Y.</i>
1/31/59	<i>County Sch. Bd. of Arlington v. Deskins</i>	7/13/65	<i>Rosenblatt v. American Cyanamid Co.</i>
2/7/59	<i>Ellis v. United States</i>	7/16/65	<i>Travia v. Lomenzo</i>
4/7/59	<i>Eckwerth v. New York, 1 Rapp 216</i>	8/5/65	<i>Seagram &amp; Sons v. Hostetter</i>
4/20/59	<i>Eckwerth v. New York, 1 Rapp 217</i>	9/20/65	<i>Hutchinson v. New York</i>
5/11/59	<i>Keith v. New York, 1 Rapp 218</i>	11/8/65	<i>Grinnell Corp. v. United States</i>
6/29/59	<i>Shelton v. McKinley</i>	3/4/66	<i>Chestnut v. New York</i>
7/7/59	<i>Appalachian Power Co. v. AICPA</i>	4/22/66	<i>Alcorcha v. California</i>
7/11/59	<i>Kake v. Egan</i>	5/5/66	<i>Mitchell v. California</i>
7/20/59	<i>Keith v. New York, 4 Rapp 1613</i>	8/1/66	<i>Am. Mfrs. Mut. Ins. v. Am. Broadcasting</i>
8/4/59	<i>English v. Cunningham</i>	8/8/66	<i>Public Service Board v. United States</i>
9/25/59	<i>Deere v. United States</i>	8/12/66	<i>Louisiana v. United States</i>
10/8/59	<i>Am. Trading Corp. v. Railroad Comm'n</i>	8/19/66	<i>Birchler Corp. v. Diapulse Corp.</i>
11/2/59	<i>Reynolds v. United States</i>	9/21/66	<i>McLeod v. General Elec. Co.</i>
3/2/60	<i>Tri-Continental Fin. Corp. v. U.S.</i>	8/15/67	<i>Baytops v. New Jersey</i>
3/5/60	<i>O'Rourke v. Levine</i>	8/15/67	<i>Mathis v. United States</i>
3/18/60	<i>Guterma v. United States</i>	1/29/68	<i>King v. Smith</i>
4/4/60	<i>Eveleigh v. United States</i>	8/17/68	<i>Sellers v. United States</i>
6/23/60	<i>Yasa v. Esperdy</i>	9/10/68	<i>Williams v. Rhodes</i>
7/5/60	<i>In re Harvey</i>	9/16/68	<i>Socialist Labor v. Rhodes, 2 Rapp 402</i>
7/7/60	<i>Uphaus v. Wyman</i>	9/23/68	<i>Winters v. United States, 2 Rapp 404</i>
7/19/60	<i>Akel v. New York</i>	9/23/68	<i>Socialist Labor v. Rhodes, 2 Rapp 406</i>
8/1/60	<i>Long Island R.R. v. N.Y. Central R.R.</i>	9/29/68	<i>Smith v. Ritchey</i>
8/31/60	<i>Bandy v. United States, 1 Rapp 252</i>	10/12/68	<i>Locks v. Commanding General</i>
12/5/60	<i>Bandy v. United States, 1 Rapp 253</i>	10/21/68	<i>Winters v. United States, 2 Rapp 410</i>
12/12/60	<i>Hirsch v. U.S. Ct. App. for the 2d Cir.</i>	12/5/68	<i>Drifka v. Brainard; Allen v. Brainard</i>
1/31/61	<i>Local 1545, Carpenters v. Vincent</i>	12/24/68	<i>Noyd v. Bond</i>
2/27/61	<i>Fernandez v. United States</i>	2/4/69	<i>Strickland Transportation Co. v. U.S.</i>
6/28/61	<i>Bandy v. United States, 1 Rapp 261</i>	5/1/69	<i>Quinn v. Laird</i>
7/26/61	<i>In re Wyckoff</i>	7/16/69	<i>Atlantic Coast Line R.R. v. BLE</i>
8/30/61	<i>Board of Education v. Taylor</i>	8/2/69	<i>Levy v. Parker</i>
10/11/61	<i>Cohen v. United States, 1 Rapp 268</i>	8/5/69	<i>Scaggs v. Larsen</i>
11/21/61	<i>Tomaio v. United States</i>	8/13/69	<i>Oden v. Brittain</i>
12/14/61	<i>Commonwealth Oil Ref. v. Lummus Co.</i>	8/20/69	<i>Rosado v. Wyman</i>
1/17/62	<i>Railway Express Agency, Inc. v. U.S.</i>	8/29/69	<i>Keyes v. School Dist. No. 1, Denver</i>
1/18/62	<i>Stickney, Ex parte</i>	9/5/69	<i>Alexander v. Board of Education</i>
1/30/62	<i>Cohen v. United States, 1 Rapp 279</i>	9/9/69	<i>Matthews v. Little</i>
2/14/62	<i>Cohen v. United States, 1 Rapp 281</i>	9/10/69	<i>Febre v. United States</i>
3/6/62	<i>Jackson v. New York</i>	9/15/69	<i>Jones v. Lemond</i>
3/13/62	<i>Bart, In re</i>	10/10/69	<i>Brussel v. United States</i>
3/19/62	<i>Bloeth v. New York</i>	10/16/69	<i>U.S. ex rel. Cerullo v. Follette</i>
3/19/62	<i>Sica v. United States</i>	12/29/69	<i>Parisi v. Davidson</i>
3/19/62	<i>Carbo v. United States</i>	1/30/70	<i>Beyer v. United States</i>
5/11/62	<i>Leigh v. United States</i>	7/11/70	<i>Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party</i>
8/17/62	<i>Arrow Trans. v. Southern Ry., 1 Rapp 307</i>	7/22/70	<i>Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party</i>
8/23/62	<i>Bidwell v. United States</i>	7/30/70	<i>Perez v. United States</i>
9/10/62	<i>Meredith v. Fair</i>	8/5/70	<i>Davis v. Adams</i>
9/26/62	<i>Arrow Trans. v. Southern Ry., 1 Rapp 314</i>	8/11/70	<i>Fowler v. Adams</i>
		8/29/70	<i>Dexter v. Schunk</i>

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES BY DATE

### 20TH CENTURY (cont'd)

9/18/70	<i>Marcello v. United States</i>	9/3/76	<i>Gruner v. Superior Court of Cal.</i>
10/10/70	<i>Harris v. United States</i> , 2 Rapp 471	9/14/76	<i>McCarthy v. Briscoe</i> , 2 Rapp 713
2/11/71	<i>Karr v. Schmidt</i>	9/30/76	<i>McCarthy v. Briscoe</i> , 2 Rapp 714
3/1/71	<i>Haywood v. National Basketball Assn.</i>	10/1/76	<i>Fishman v. Schaffer</i>
7/27/71	<i>Labor Board v. Getman</i>	11/15/76	<i>Volvo of America Corp. v. Schwarzer</i>
7/27/71	<i>Mahan v. Howell</i>	12/9/76	<i>Evans v. Atlantic Richfield Co.</i>
7/29/71	<i>Edgar v. United States</i>	1/18/77	<i>Meeropol v. Nizer</i>
8/16/71	<i>Russo v. United States</i>	2/1/77	<i>Houchins v. KQED Inc.</i>
8/19/71	<i>Corpus Christi Sch. Dist. v. Cisneros</i>	2/3/77	<i>Marshall v. Barlow's, Inc.</i>
8/23/71	<i>Lopez v. United States</i>	7/20/77	<i>Califano v. McRae</i>
8/25/71	<i>Guey Heung Lee v. Johnson</i>	7/28/77	<i>Divans v. California</i> , 2 Rapp 746
8/30/71	<i>Jefferson Parish Sch. Bd. v. Dandridge</i>	8/2/77	<i>Seventh-Day Adventists v. Marshall</i>
8/31/71	<i>Winston-Salem Board of Ed. v. Scott</i>	8/5/77	<i>Beame v. Friends of the Earth</i>
8/31/71	<i>Harris v. United States</i> , 2 Rapp 508	8/8/77	<i>CFTC v. British Am. Commodity Options</i>
9/3/71	<i>Smith v. Yeager</i>	8/8/77	<i>Richmond v. Arizona</i>
9/10/71	<i>Gomperts v. Chase</i>	8/26/77	<i>National Socialist Party v. Skokie</i>
10/29/71	<i>Pryor v. United States</i>	8/30/77	<i>Wise v. Lipscomb</i>
1/31/72	<i>Kadans v. Collins</i>	9/16/77	<i>Krause v. Rhodes</i>
2/7/72	<i>Graves v. Barnes</i>	9/20/77	<i>Barthuli v. Jefferson Sch. Dist.</i>
2/14/72	<i>Chambers v. Mississippi</i>	9/20/77	<i>Mecom v. United States</i>
7/1/72	<i>Cousins v. Wigoda</i>	10/6/77	<i>Mincey v. Arizona</i>
7/19/72	<i>Aberdeen &amp; Rockfish R. Co. v. SCRAP</i>	12/6/77	<i>New Motor Veh. Bd. v. Orrin W. Fox Co.</i>
7/29/72	<i>Russo v. Byrne</i>	2/10/78	<i>National Broadcasting Co. v. Niemi</i>
8/16/72	<i>Repub. State Cent. Comm. v. Ripon Soc'y</i>	3/29/78	<i>Bracy v. United States</i>
9/1/72	<i>Drummond v. Acree</i>	4/10/78	<i>Veterli v. U.S. District Court</i>
9/12/72	<i>Tierney v. United States</i>	6/7/78	<i>Little v. Ciuros</i>
10/6/72	<i>Communist Party of Ind. v. Whitcomb</i>	7/1/78	<i>N.Y. Times v. Jascavevich</i> , 2 Rapp 803
10/10/72	<i>Laird v. Tatum</i>	7/12/78	<i>N.Y. Times v. Jascavevich</i> , 2 Rapp 805
10/20/72	<i>Westermann v. Nelson</i>	7/17/78	<i>Reproductive Serv. v. Walker</i> , 2 Rapp 808
10/31/72	<i>Comm. to Re-elect the Pres. v. Waddy</i>	7/28/78	<i>Fare v. Michael C.</i>
11/2/72	<i>Berg, In re</i>	8/1/78	<i>N.Y. Times v. Jascavevich</i> , 2 Rapp 816
11/6/72	<i>O'Brien v. Skinner</i>	8/4/78	<i>N.Y. Times v. Jascavevich</i> , 2 Rapp 824
1/11/73	<i>Farr v. Pitchess</i>	8/4/78	<i>Truong Dinh Hung v. United States</i>
5/18/73	<i>Henry v. Warner</i>	8/8/78	<i>Miroyan v. United States</i>
7/19/73	<i>Edelman v. Jordan</i>	8/11/78	<i>Columbus Bd. of Ed. v. Penick</i>
8/1/73	<i>Holtzman v. Schlesinger</i> , 2 Rapp 590	8/11/78	<i>Brennan v. U.S. Postal Service</i>
8/4/73	<i>Holtzman v. Schlesinger</i> , 2 Rapp 602	8/21/78	<i>Reproductive Serv. v. Walker</i> , 2 Rapp 851
8/4/73	<i>Schlesinger v. Holtzman</i> , 2 Rapp 607	8/24/78	<i>Gen'l Council v. Super. Ct.</i> , 2 Rapp 852
8/4/73	<i>Schlesinger v. Holtzman</i> , 2 Rapp 609	8/28/78	<i>Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman</i>
10/26/73	<i>Hayes, Ex parte</i>	8/30/78	<i>Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman</i>
1/25/74	<i>Hughes v. Thompson</i>	9/1/78	<i>Divans v. California</i> , 2 Rapp 857
3/4/74	<i>Hayakawa v. Brown</i>	9/1/78	<i>Gen'l Council v. Super. Ct.</i> , 2 Rapp 859
6/17/74	<i>Warm Springs v. Gribble</i> , 2 Rapp 621	9/1/78	<i>Buchanan v. Evans</i>
7/4/74	<i>Lewis, In re</i>	9/8/78	<i>Bustop, Inc. v. Board of Ed.</i> , 2 Rapp 870
7/29/74	<i>Times-Picayune v. Schulingkamp</i>	9/8/78	<i>Alexis I. Du Pont Sch. Dist. v. Evans</i>
8/28/74	<i>Ehrlichman v. Sirica</i>	9/9/78	<i>Bustop, Inc. v. Board of Ed.</i> , 2 Rapp 879
12/27/74	<i>Socialist Workers Party v. Att'y General</i>	10/20/78	<i>Boston v. Anderson</i>
12/31/74	<i>National League of Cities v. Brennan</i>	10/20/78	<i>Kimble v. Swackhamer</i>
3/21/75	<i>Patterson v. Superior Court of Cal.</i>	10/20/78	<i>Warm Springs v. Gribble</i> , 2 Rapp 885
8/18/75	<i>Hortonville Sch. Dist. v. H'ville Ed. Assn.</i>	12/21/78	<i>Dolman v. United States</i>
9/11/75	<i>Smith v. United States</i>	3/20/79	<i>General Dynamics v. Anderson</i>
9/29/75	<i>Chamber of Comm. v. Legal Aid Soc'y</i>	4/5/79	<i>Evans v. Bennett</i>
10/28/75	<i>Whalen v. Roe</i>	4/6/79	<i>Haner v. United States</i>
11/13/75	<i>Nebraska Press v. Stuart</i> , 2 Rapp 668	5/22/79	<i>Spenkelink v. Wainwright</i> , 2 Rapp 905
11/20/75	<i>Nebraska Press v. Stuart</i> , 2 Rapp 675	5/23/79	<i>Spenkelink v. Wainwright</i> , 2 Rapp 911
12/22/75	<i>Pasadena City Bd. of Ed. v. Spangler</i>	5/24/79	<i>Williams v. Zbaraz</i>
2/2/76	<i>Coleman v. Paccar, Inc.</i>	8/13/79	<i>Pacific Tel. &amp; Tel. Co. v. PUC of Cal.</i>
2/17/76	<i>Bradley v. Lunding</i>	9/7/79	<i>Lenhard v. Wolff</i> , 2 Rapp 924
2/25/76	<i>Flamm v. Real-BLT Inc.</i>	10/18/79	<i>Lenhard v. Wolff</i> , 3 Rapp 931
7/22/76	<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i>	11/29/79	<i>Peeples v. Brown</i>
8/16/76	<i>Bateman v. Arizona</i>	12/28/79	<i>Synanon Foundation v. California</i>
8/19/76	<i>New York v. Kleppe</i>	1/31/80	<i>California v. Braeseke</i>
		2/1/80	<i>Portley v. Grossman</i>

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES BY DATE

### 20th CENTURY (cont'd)

3/24/80	<i>California v. Velasquez</i>	5/19/84	<i>Tate v. Rose</i>
4/30/80	<i>Hanrahan v. Hampton</i>	7/6/84	<i>Garrison v. Hudson</i>
5/1/80	<i>Pacileo v. Walker</i>	7/23/84	<i>California v. Harris</i>
5/1/80	<i>Sumner v. Mata</i>	8/10/84	<i>Heckler v. Turner</i>
5/6/80	<i>Blum v. Caldwell</i>	9/7/84	<i>Uhler v. AFL-CIO</i>
5/12/80	<i>Barnstone v. University of Houston</i>	9/10/84	<i>Nat'l Farmers v. Crow, 3 Rapp 1185</i>
5/16/80	<i>Marten v. Thies</i>	9/10/84	<i>Montgomery v. Jefferson</i>
6/28/80	<i>RLEA v. Gibbons</i>	9/27/84	<i>Walters v. Nat'l Assn. Radiation Surv.</i>
7/19/80	<i>Rostker v. Goldberg</i>	10/10/84	<i>Montanans for Balanced Budg. v. Harper</i>
7/23/80	<i>Roche, In re</i>	10/11/84	<i>Catholic League v. Women's Health Ctr.</i>
8/14/80	<i>McDaniel v. Sanchez</i>	12/7/84	<i>N. Cal. Power Ag'y v. Grace Geothermal</i>
8/28/80	<i>Willhauck v. Flanagan</i>	1/17/85	<i>Thomas v. Sierra Club</i>
9/4/80	<i>Named and Unnamed Children v. Texas</i>	2/1/85	<i>Garcia-Mir v. Smith</i>
9/5/80	<i>Moore v. Brown</i>	4/24/85	<i>Nat'l Farmers v. Crow, 3 Rapp 1211</i>
9/8/80	<i>Gregory-Portland Sch. Dist. v. U.S.</i>	7/5/85	<i>OPM v. Government Employees</i>
9/12/80	<i>Board of Ed. of L.A. v. Superior Court</i>	7/24/85	<i>Block v. North Side Lumber Co.</i>
11/4/80	<i>O'Connor v. School Dist. 23</i>	7/24/85	<i>Heckler v. Redbud Hospital Dist.</i>
2/3/81	<i>McCarthy v. Harper</i>	8/28/85	<i>Riverside v. Rivera</i>
2/4/81	<i>Atiyeh v. Capps</i>	9/5/85	<i>Renaissance Arcade v. Cook County</i>
2/5/81	<i>California v. Riegler</i>	11/29/85	<i>Republican Party of Hawaii v. Mink</i>
3/3/81	<i>Bureau of Economic Analysis v. Long</i>	3/27/86	<i>California v. Brown</i>
4/19/81	<i>NAACP v. L.A. Unified School Dist.</i>	5/6/86	<i>California v. Hamilton</i>
4/24/81	<i>California v. Prysock</i>	7/19/86	<i>Araneta v. United States</i>
5/29/81	<i>Becker v. United States</i>	9/17/86	<i>Mikutaitis v. United States</i>
6/12/81	<i>Schweiker v. McClure</i>	9/25/86	<i>Prudential Fed. S&amp;L Assn. v. Flanigan</i>
7/21/81	<i>South Park Indep. Sch. Dist. v. U.S.</i>	10/7/86	<i>Curry v. Baker</i>
7/25/81	<i>Graddick v. Newman</i>	10/15/86	<i>Kentucky v. Stincer</i>
8/20/81	<i>Metropolitan Cty. Bd. of Ed. v. Kelley</i>	10/23/86	<i>Hicks v. Feiock</i>
9/29/81	<i>Los Angeles v. Lyons</i>	12/4/86	<i>Kleem v. INS</i>
10/2/81	<i>California v. Winson</i>	12/18/86	<i>Ledbetter v. Baldwin</i>
11/23/81	<i>Mori v. Boilermakers</i>	12/31/86	<i>Ohio Citizens for Resp. Energy v. NRC</i>
12/9/81	<i>Clements v. Logan</i>	4/2/87	<i>Western Airlines, Inc. v. Teamsters</i>
3/11/82	<i>Republican National Comm. v. Burton</i>	5/21/87	<i>U.S. Postal Service v. Letter Carriers</i>
3/15/82	<i>Karcher v. Dagget</i>	7/1/87	<i>Deaver v. United States</i>
8/13/82	<i>White v. Florida</i>	8/10/87	<i>Bowen v. Kendrick</i>
8/26/82	<i>Beltran v. Smith</i>	8/14/87	<i>American Trucking Assns. v. Gray</i>
9/1/82	<i>Corsetti v. Massachusetts</i>	5/30/88	<i>Lucas v. Townsend</i>
10/26/82	<i>California v. Ramos</i>	6/2/88	<i>Morison v. United States</i>
12/23/82	<i>KPNX v. Arizona Superior Court</i>	6/15/88	<i>Doe v. Smith</i>
1/12/83	<i>Conforte v. Commissioner</i>	12/21/88	<i>Baltimore Dept. Soc. Servs. v. Bouknicht</i>
1/16/83	<i>Bonura v. CBS Inc.</i>	1/30/89	<i>John Doe Agency v. John Doe Corp.</i>
2/11/83	<i>Jaffree v. School Comm'rs of Mobile</i>	2/1/89	<i>California v. Freeman</i>
4/21/83	<i>Evans v. Alabama</i>	3/14/89	<i>R.R. Signalmen v. S.E. Pa. Transp. Auth.</i>
4/29/83	<i>Volkswagenwerk A.G. v. Falzon</i>	8/22/89	<i>California v. American Stores Co.</i>
7/6/83	<i>Williams v. Missouri</i>	2/20/91	<i>Madden v. Texas</i>
7/13/83	<i>Julian v. United States</i>	3/2/91	<i>Mississippi v. Turner</i>
7/13/83	<i>Capital Cities Media, Inc. v. Toole</i>	3/18/91	<i>Cole v. Texas</i>
7/21/83	<i>NCAA v. Bd. of Regents U. of Okla.</i>	8/2/91	<i>Barnes v. E-Systems, Inc.</i>
7/27/83	<i>Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.</i>	10/29/91	<i>Campos v. Houston</i>
8/11/83	<i>Bellotti v. Latino PAC</i>	6/20/92	<i>Reynolds v. Int'l Amateur Athletic Fed'n</i>
8/24/83	<i>Kemp v. Smith, 3 Rapp 1133</i>	10/20/92	<i>Grubbs v. Delo</i>
9/2/83	<i>Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff</i>	4/29/93	<i>Turner Broadcasting Sys., Inc. v. FCC</i>
9/9/83	<i>Heckler v. Lopez</i>	5/14/93	<i>Blodgett v. Campbell</i>
9/9/83	<i>McGee v. Alaska</i>	7/26/93	<i>DeBoer v. DeBoer</i>
9/13/83	<i>M.I.C. Ltd. v. Bedford Township</i>	11/26/93	<i>INS v. Legalization Assistance Project</i>
9/17/83	<i>Kemp v. Smith, 3 Rapp 1155</i>	12/23/93	<i>Capitol Sq. Rev. &amp; Adv. Bd. v. Pinette</i>
10/5/83	<i>Autry v. Estelle</i>	2/7/94	<i>Planned Parenthood v. Casey</i>
12/20/83	<i>Clark v. California</i>	2/9/94	<i>CBS Inc. v. Davis</i>
1/3/84	<i>McDonald v. Missouri</i>	3/2/94	<i>Packwood v. Senate Select Comm.</i>
1/26/84	<i>Heckler v. Blankenship</i>	8/17/94	<i>Edwards v. Hope Medical Group</i>
2/13/84	<i>Liles v. Nebraska</i>	12/5/94	<i>Dow Jones &amp; Co. Inc., In re</i>
3/12/84	<i>Claiborne v. United States</i>	1/28/95	<i>O'Connell v. Kirchner</i>
		8/17/95	<i>Foster v. Gilliam</i>

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES BY DATE

### 20TH CENTURY (cont'd)

8/28/95 *Penry v. Texas*  
8/31/95 *Rodriguez v. Texas*  
9/21/95 *McGraw-Hill v. Proctor & Gamble*  
10/25/95 *FCC v. Radiofone Inc.*  
5/16/96 *Netherland v. Tuggle*  
12/23/96 *Netherland v. Gray*  
7/17/98 *Rubin v. U.S. Independent Counsel*  
11/18/98 *Murdaugh v. Livingston*  
9/26/00 *Microsoft Corp. v. United States*

### 21ST CENTURY

9/12/01 *Brown v. Gilmore*  
11/6/01 *Bagley v. Byrd*  
5/17/02 *Bartlett v. Stephenson*  
11/29/02 *Chabad of Southern Ohio v. Cincinnati*  
3/21/03 *Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*

6/9/03 *Prato v. Vallas*  
3/18/04 *Cheney v. United States District Court*  
7/26/04 *Associated Press v. District Court*  
9/14/04 *Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC*  
11/2/04 *Spencer v. Pugh*  
11/2/04 *Dem. Nat'l Comm. v. Rep. Nat'l Comm.*  
4/15/05 *Multimedia Holdings v. Cir. Ct. of Fla.*  
10/7/05 *Doe v. Gonzales*  
7/7/06 *San Diegans for Mt. Soledad v. Paulson*  
12/18/06 *Stroup v. Willcox*  
4/26/07 *Boumediene v. Bush*  
4/30/09 *Conkright v. Frommert*  
8/26/09 *O'Brien v. O'Laughlin*  
3/2/10 *Jackson v. D.C. Bd. of Elections & Ethics*  
9/24/10 *Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Scott*  
9/30/10 *Lux v. Rodrigues*

# CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES BY JUSTICE

## **Black, Hugo L.**

*Alexander v. Board of Education*  
*American Trading & Prod. v. Railroad Comm'n*  
*Arrow Transp. Co. v. Southern Ry.*, 1 Rapp 307  
*Arrow Transp. Co. v. Southern Ry.*, 1 Rapp 314  
*Atlantic Coast Line R.R. v. BLE*  
*Board of School Comm'rs v. Davis*  
*Corpus Christi School Dist. v. Cisernos*  
*Davis v. Adams*  
*Deere v. United States*  
*Edgar v. United States*  
*Fowler v. Adams*  
*Heart of Atlanta Motel v. United States*  
*Hysler v. Florida*  
*Karr v. Schmidt*  
*Katzenbach v. McClung*  
*Keith v. New York*, 4 Rapp 1613  
*King v. Smith*  
*Labor Board v. Getman*  
*Louisiana v. United States*  
*Mahan v. Howell*  
*Marcello v. United States*  
*Matthews v. Little*  
*Meredith v. Fair*  
*Oden v. Brittain*  
*Owen v. Kennedy*  
*Sellers v. United States*  
*Simon v. United States*  
*Wyckoff, In re*

## **Blackmun, Harry A.**

*American Trucking Assns., Inc. v. Gray*  
*CBS Inc. v. Davis*  
*Grubbs v. Delo*  
*Liles v. Nebraska*  
*McDonald v. Missouri*  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 668  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 675  
*Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*  
*Williams v. Missouri*

## **Bradley, Joseph P.**

*Guiteau, In re*  
*United States v. Patterson*

## **Brennan, William J., Jr.**

*Appalachian Power Co. v. AICPA*  
*Bellotti v. Latino Political Action Comm.*  
*Board of Education v. Taylor*  
*Boston v. Anderson*  
*Brotherhood of R.R. Signalmen v. S.E. Pa. Trans.*  
*Buchanan v. Evans*  
*Capital Cities Media, Inc. v. Toole*  
*Corsetti v. Massachusetts*  
*Hung v. United States*  
*Kake v. Egan*  
*Karcher v. Dagget*  
*Keyes v. School Dist. No. 1, Denver*  
*M.I.C. Ltd. v. Bedford Township*

*Reproductive Services v. Walker*, 2 Rapp 808  
*Reproductive Services v. Walker*, 2 Rapp 851  
*Roche, In re*  
*Rostker v. Goldberg*  
*Smith v. Yeager*  
*Willhauck v. Flanagan*

## **Breyer, Stephen**

*Associated Press v. District Court*  
*O'Brien v. O'Laughlin*

## **Burger, Warren E.**

*Aberdeen & Rockfish R. Co. v. SCRAP*  
*Araneta v. United States*  
*Ehrlichman v. Sirica*  
*Finance Comm. to Re-elect the President v. Waddy*  
*Garrison v. Hudson*  
*National League of Cities v. Brennan*  
*Office of Personnel Mgmt. v. Gov't Employees*  
*Winston-Salem/Forsyth Cty. Bd. of Ed. v. Scott*

## **Burton, Harold H.**

*Durant, Ex parte*  
*New Jersey v. Auld*  
*Overfield v. Pennroad Corp.*  
*Simon, In re*  
*United States v. Portell*  
*Wise v. New Jersey*

## **Butler, Pierce**

*Motlow v. United States*

## **Cardozo, Benjamin N.**

*Associated Gas & Electric Co., In re*  
*Goldsmith v. Zerbst*  
*Wilson v. O'Malley*

## **Day, William R.**

*Burgess v. Pere Marquette R. Co.*, 4 Rapp 1586  
*Burgess v. Pere Marquette R. Co.*, 4 Rapp 1587  
*Chesapeake Western Co. v. Murray*  
*Day v. Louisiana Western Railroad Co.*  
*Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. Wills*  
*Haack v. Brooklyn Labor Lyceum Association*  
*Hile v. Baker*  
*N.E. Water Works v. Farmers' Loan*, 4 Rapp 1576  
*N.E. Water Works v. Farmers' Loan*, 4 Rapp 1577  
*Roller v. Murray*, 4 Rapp 1579  
*Roller v. Murray*, 4 Rapp 1582  
*Roller v. Murray*, 4 Rapp 1583  
*Sulzer v. Sohmer*  
*Thomas v. South Side Elevated Railroad Co.*

## **Douglas, William O.**

*Alcorcha v. California*  
*Aronson v. May*  
*Bandy v. United States*, 1 Rapp 252  
*Bandy v. United States*, 1 Rapp 253  
*Bandy v. United States*, 1 Rapp 261

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES BY JUSTICE

### **Douglas, William O. (cont'd)**

*Berg, In re*  
*Bowman v. United States*  
*Carbo v. United States*  
*Carlisle v. Landon*  
*Chamber of Commerce v. Legal Aid Society*  
*Clark v. United States*  
*Cohen v. United States*, 1 Rapp 268  
*Cohen v. United States*, 1 Rapp 279  
*Cohen v. United States*, 1 Rapp 281  
*D'Aquino v. United States*  
*Dexter v. Schruink*  
*Drifka v. Brainard; Allen v. Brainard*  
*Farr v. Pitchess*  
*Gomperts v. Chase*  
*Harris v. United States*, 2 Rapp 471  
*Harris v. United States*, 2 Rapp 508  
*Hayakawa v. Brown*  
*Hayes, Ex parte*  
*Haywood v. National Basketball Assn.*  
*Henry v. Warner, Secretary of the Navy*  
*Herzog v. United States*  
*Holtzman v. Schlesinger*, 2 Rapp 602  
*Hughes v. Thompson*  
*Johnson, In re*  
*Jones v. Lemond*  
*Kadans v. Collins*  
*Guey Heung Lee v. Johnson*  
*Levy v. Parker*  
*Lewis, In re*  
*Locks v. Commanding General, Sixth Army*  
*Long Beach Fed. S&L v. Fed. Home Loan Bank*  
*Lopez v. United States*  
*Mallonee v. Fahey*  
*McGee v. Eyman*  
*Mitchell v. California*  
*Noyd v. Bond*  
*Orloff v. Willoughby*  
*Parisi v. Davidson*  
*Patterson v. Superior Court of Cal.*  
*Pryor v. United States*  
*Quinn v. Laird*  
*Rehman v. California*  
*Reynolds v. United States*  
*Rosenberg v. United States*  
*Russo v. Byrne*  
*Russo v. United States*  
*Scaggs v. Larsen*  
*Schlesinger v. Holtzman*, 2 Rapp 609  
*Sica v. United States*  
*Smith v. Ritchey*  
*Smith v. United States*  
*Stanard v. Olesen*  
*Steinberg v. United States*  
*Stickney, Ex parte*  
*Thompson v. United States*  
*Tierney v. United States*  
*United States ex rel. Norris v. Swope*  
*Warm Springs Dam v. Gribble*, 2 Rapp 621  
*Westermann v. Nelson*  
*Winters v. United States*, 2 Rapp 410  
*Wolcher v. United States*  
*Yanish v. Barber*

### **Fortas, Abe**

*Baytops v. New Jersey*  
*Grinnell Corp. v. United States*  
*Mathis v. United States*

### **Frankfurter, Felix**

*Akel v. New York*  
*Albanese v. United States*  
*Brody v. United States*  
*Burwell v. California*  
*Carter v. United States*  
*Chin Gum v. United States*  
*Cooper v. New York*, 4 Rapp 1482  
*Cote v. New Hampshire*  
*English v. Cunningham*  
*Flynn v. United States*  
*Goldman v. Fogarty*  
*Harvey, In re*  
*Local 1545, U. Bhd. of Carpenters v. Vincent*  
*Long Island R.R. v. N.Y. Central R.R.*  
*Lynch v. Watson*  
*MacKay v. Boyd*  
*Marcello v. Brownell*  
*Nukk v. Shaughnessy*  
*Oerlikon Machine Tools Works Buehrle Co. v. U.S.*  
*Pabon v. Board of Personnel of Puerto Rico*  
*Patterson v. United States*  
*Pon v. United States*  
*Public Utilities Comm'n of D.C. v. Pollak*  
*Sklaroff v. Skeadas*  
*United States v. Allied Stevedoring Corp.*  
*Uphaus v. Wyman*  
*Van Newkirk v. McLain*  
*Waller, Ex parte*  
*Ward v. United States*  
*Wise v. New Jersey*

### **Fuller, Melville W.**

*Heath, In re*

### **Ginsburg, Ruth Bader**

*Conkright v. Frommert*  
*Doe v. Gonzales*

### **Goldberg, Arthur J.**

*Jimenez v. United States District Court*  
*Rosenblatt v. American Cyanamid Co.*  
*United States v. FMC Corp.*

### **Grier, Robert C.**

*Pennsylvania v. Wheeling & Belmont Bridge Co.*

### **Harlan, John M.**

*Clark, Ex parte*  
*Richardson, In re*  
*Spies v. Illinois*  
*United States v. Cooper*

### **Harlan, John M. (II)**

*A.B. Chance Co. v. Atlantic City Elec. Co.*  
*American Mfrs. Mut. Ins. v. Am. Broadcasting*  
*Beyer v. United States*  
*Bidwell v. United States*

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES BY JUSTICE

### **Harlan, John M. (II) (cont'd)**

*Birtcher Corp. v. Diapulse Corp.*  
*Bletterman v. United States*  
*Bloeth v. New York*  
*Breswick & Co. v. United States*  
*Chestnut v. New York*  
*City-Wide Comm. v. Board of Educ. of N.Y.*  
*Commonwealth Oil Ref. Co. v. Lummus Co.*  
*Cooper v. New York*, 1 Rapp 137  
*Delli Paoli v. United States*  
*Di Candia v. United States*  
*Eckwerth v. New York*, 1 Rapp 216  
*Eckwerth v. New York*, 1 Rapp 217  
*Edwards v. New York*, 1 Rapp 163  
*Edwards v. New York*, 1 Rapp 171  
*Eveleigh v. United States*  
*Febre v. United States*  
*Fernandez v. United States*  
*Guterma v. United States*  
*Hirsch v. U.S. Ct. App. for the 2d Cir.*  
*Hutchinson v. New York*  
*International Boxing Club v. United States*  
*Jackson v. New York*  
*Keith v. New York*, 1 Rapp 218  
*La Marca v. New York*  
*McLeod v. General Elec. Co.*  
*Noto v. United States*  
*O'Rourke v. Levine*  
*Panama Canal Co. v. Grace Lines, Inc.*  
*Perez v. United States*  
*Public Service Board v. United States*  
*Railway Express Agency, Inc. v. United States*  
*Richardson v. New York*  
*Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party*  
*Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party*  
*Rosado v. Wyman*  
*Rosoto v. Warden*  
*Roth v. United States*  
*Seagram & Sons v. Hostetter*  
*Stickel v. United States*  
*Strickland Transportation Co. v. United States*  
*Tomaiolo v. United States*  
*Travia v. Lomenzo*  
*Tri-Continental Financial Corp. v. United States*  
*Tuscarora Nation of Indians v. Power Authority*  
*United States ex rel. Cerullo v. Follette*  
*Valenti v. Spector*  
*Wasmuth v. Allen*  
*Winters v. United States*, 2 Rapp 404  
*Wise v. New Jersey*  
*Yasa v. Esperdy*

### **Holmes, Oliver Wendell, Jr.**

*Frank v. Georgia*, 4 Rapp 1523  
*Sacco v. Hendry*  
*Sacco v. Massachusetts*

### **Jackson, Robert H.**

*Costello v. United States*  
*Dennis v. United States*  
*East Coast Lumber Terminal v. Town of Babylon*  
*Knickerbocker Printing Corp. v. United States*  
*Ludecke v. Watkins*

### *Pirinsky, In re*

*Sacher v. United States*  
*United States v. Gates*  
*United States ex rel. Knauff v. McGrath*  
*Williamson v. United States*

### **Kennedy, Anthony M.**

*Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*  
*Lucas v. Townsend*  
*Multimedia Holdings v. Cir. Ct. of Fla.*  
*San Diegans for Mt. Soledad v. Paulson*

### **Lamar, Joseph R.**

*Frank v. Georgia*, 4 Rapp 1521  
*Frank, In re*

### **Marshall, Thurgood**

*Beame v. Friends of the Earth*  
*Blum v. Caldwell*  
*Brennan v. United States Postal Service*  
*Brussel v. United States*  
*Califano v. McRae*  
*CFTC v. British Am. Commodity Options*  
*Fishman v. Schaffer*  
*Holtzman v. Schlesinger*, 2 Rapp 590  
*Jefferson Parish School Bd. v. Dandridge*  
*John Doe Agency v. John Doe Corp.*  
*Little v. Ciuros*  
*Meeropol v. Nizer*  
*Montgomery v. Jefferson*  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 805  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 824  
*New York v. Kleppe*  
*O'Brien v. Skinner*  
*Schlesinger v. Holtzman*, 2 Rapp 607  
*Socialist Workers Party v. Attorney General*  
*Spengelink v. Wainwright*, 2 Rapp 911  
*Whalen v. Roe*

### **Nelson, Samuel**

*Kaine, In re*  
*Kaine, Ex parte*

### **O'Connor, Sandra Day**

*Blodgett v. Campbell*  
*California v. American Stores Co.*  
*California v. Freeman*  
*Heckler v. Blankenship*  
*Hicks v. Feiock*  
*INS v. Legalization Assistance Project of L.A. Cty.*  
*Tate v. Rose*  
*Volkswagenwerk A.G. v. Falzon*  
*Western Airlines, Inc. v. Teamsters*

### **Pitney, Mahlon**

*Marks v. Davis*

### **Powell, Lewis F., Jr.**

*Barnstone v. University of Houston*  
*Bustop, Inc. v. Board of Ed. of L.A.*, 2 Rapp 879  
*Certain Named and Unnamed Children v. Texas*  
*Chambers v. Mississippi*  
*Curry v. Baker*

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES BY JUSTICE

### **Powell, Lewis F., Jr. (cont'd)**

*Drummond v. Acree*  
*Evans v. Alabama*  
*Graddick v. Newman*  
*Graves v. Barnes*  
*Gregg v. Georgia*  
*Jaffree v. Board of Sch. Comm'rs of Mobile Cty.*  
*Kemp v. Smith*, 3 Rapp 1133  
*Kemp v. Smith*, 3 Rapp 1155  
*Ledbetter v. Baldwin*  
*McCarthy v. Briscoe*, 2 Rapp 713  
*McCarthy v. Briscoe*, 2 Rapp 714  
*McDaniel v. Sanchez*  
*Mecom v. United States*  
*Moore v. Brown*  
*South Park Indep. School Dist. v. United States*  
*Times-Picayune Pub. Corp. v. Schulingkamp*  
*White v. Florida*  
*Wise v. Lipscomb*

### **Reed, Stanley F.**

*Alabama G.S.R. Co. v. R.R. & P.U.C. of Tennessee*  
*Equitable Office Bldg. Corp., In re*  
*Field v. United States*  
*George F. Alger Co. v. Peck*  
*Hubbard v. Wayne County Election Commission*  
*Merrifield v. Kentucky*  
*Numer v. United States*  
*Seals, Ex parte*, 4 Rapp 1466  
*Seals, Ex parte*, 4 Rapp 1468  
*Stanley v. United States*  
*Twentieth Century Airlines Inc. v. Ryan*  
*United States v. Klopp*  
*United States v. United Liquors Corp.*

### **Rehnquist, William H.**

*Alexis I. Du Pont School Dist. v. Evans*  
*Atiyeh v. Capps*  
*Baltimore City Dept. of Social Servs. v. Bouknight*  
*Barthuli v. Bd. of Trustees of Jefferson Sch. Dist.*  
*Bartlett v. Stephenson*  
*Bateman v. Arizona*  
*Becker v. United States*  
*Beltran v. Smith*  
*Block v. North Side Lumber Co.*  
*Board of Ed. of L.A. v. Superior Court of Cal.*  
*Bowen v. Kendrick*  
*Bracy v. United States*  
*Brown v. Gilmore*  
*Bureau of Economic Analysis v. Long*  
*Bustop, Inc. v. Board of Ed. of L.A.*, 2 Rapp 870  
*California v. Brown*  
*California v. Braeseke*  
*California v. Hamilton*  
*California v. Harris*  
*California v. Prysock*  
*California v. Ramos*  
*California v. Riegler*  
*California v. Velasquez*  
*California v. Winson*  
*Catholic League v. Feminist Women's Health Ctr.*  
*Claiborne v. United States*  
*Clark v. California*

*Clements v. Logan*  
*Coleman v. Paccar, Inc.*  
*Columbus Bd. of Ed. v. Penick*  
*Communist Party of Indiana v. Whitcomb*  
*Conforte v. Commissioner*  
*Cousins v. Wigoda*  
*Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman*, 2 Rapp 855  
*Deaver v. United States*  
*Divans v. California*, 2 Rapp 746  
*Divans v. California*, 2 Rapp 857  
*Dolman v. United States*  
*Dow Jones & Co. Inc., In re*  
*Edelman v. Jordan*  
*Evans v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*  
*Evans v. Bennett*  
*Fare v. Michael C.*  
*Flamm v. Real-BLT Inc.*  
*Foster v. Gilliam*  
*Garcia-Mir v. Smith*  
*General Council v. Superior Ct.*, 2 Rapp 852  
*General Council v. Superior Ct.*, 2 Rapp 859  
*General Dynamics v. Anderson*  
*Gregory-Portland Indep. School Dist. v. U.S.*  
*Gruner v. Superior Court of Cal.*  
*Haner v. United States*  
*Hanrahan v. Hampton*  
*Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff*  
*Heckler v. Lopez*  
*Heckler v. Redbud Hospital Dist.*  
*Heckler v. Turner*  
*Hortonville Joint Sch. Dist. v. Hortonville Ed. Assn.*  
*Houchins v. KOED Inc.*  
*Julian v. United States*  
*Kimble v. Swackhamer*  
*KPNX Broadcasting Co. v. Arizona Superior Ct.*  
*Laird v. Tatum*  
*Lenhard v. Wolff*, 2 Rapp 924  
*Lenhard v. Wolff*, 3 Rapp 931  
*Los Angeles NAACP v. L.A. Unified Sch. Dist.*  
*Los Angeles v. Lyons*  
*Marshall v. Barlow's, Inc.*  
*Marten v. Thies*  
*McCarthy v. Harper*  
*McGee v. Alaska*  
*Microsoft Corp. v. United States*  
*Mincey v. Arizona*  
*Miroyan v. United States*  
*Montanans for Balanced Fed. Budget v. Harper*  
*Mori v. Boilermakers*  
*Morison v. United States*  
*Murdaugh v. Livingston*  
*National Broadcasting Co. v. Niemi*  
*Nat'l Farmers Ins. v. Crow Tribe*, 3 Rapp 1185  
*Nat'l Farmers Ins. v. Crow Tribe*, 3 Rapp 1211  
*Netherland v. Gray*  
*Netherland v. Tuggle*  
*New Motor Vehicle Bd. v. Orrin W. Fox Co.*  
*Northern Cal. Power Ag'y v. Grace Geothermal*  
*Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Public Util. Comm'n*  
*Pacific Un. of Seventh-Day Adventists v. Marshall*  
*Pacileo v. Walker*  
*Packwood v. Senate Select Comm. on Ethics*  
*Pasadena City Bd. of Ed. v. Spangler*



## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES BY JUSTICE

### **Rehnquist, William H. (cont'd)**

*Peebles v. Brown*  
*Portley v. Grossman*  
*Prudential Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Flanigan*  
*Republican National Committee v. Burton*  
*Republican Party of Hawaii v. Mink*  
*Republican State Central Comm. v. Ripon Soc'y*  
*Richmond v. Arizona*  
*Riverside v. Rivera*  
*Rubin v. United States Independent Counsel*  
*Schweiker v. McClure*  
*Spengelink v. Wainwright*, 2 Rapp 905  
*Sumner v. Mata*  
*Synanon Foundation, Inc. v. California*  
*Thomas v. Sierra Club*  
*Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC*  
*United States Postal Service v. Letter Carriers*  
*Uhler v. AFL-CIO*  
*Vetterli v. United States District Court*  
*Volvo of America Corp. v. Schwarzer*  
*Walters v. National Assn. of Radiation Survivors*  
*Warm Springs Dam v. Gribble*, 2 Rapp 885  
*Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC*

### **Roberts, John G., Jr.**

*Boumediene v. Bush*  
*Jackson v. D. C. Board of Elections and Ethics*  
*Lux v. Rodrigues*  
*Stroup v. Willcox*

### **Rutledge, Wiley B.**

*Shearer v. United States*

### **Scalia, Antonin**

*Barnes v. E-Systems, Inc.*  
*Campos v. Houston*  
*Cheney v. United States District Court*  
*Cole v. Texas*  
*Edwards v. Hope Medical Group*  
*Goodwin v. Texas*  
*Kentucky v. Stincer*  
*Kleem v. INS*  
*Madden v. Texas*  
*Mississippi v. Turner*  
*Ohio Citizens for Responsible Energy Inc. v. NRC*  
*Penry v. Texas*  
*Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Scott*  
*Rodriguez v. Texas*

### **Souter, David H.**

*Dem. Nat'l Comm. v. Rep. Nat'l Comm.*  
*Planned Parenthood v. Casey*

### **Stevens, John Paul**

*Bagley v. Byrd*  
*Bradley v. Lunding*  
*Capitol Square Review and Advisory Bd. v. Pinette*  
*Chabad of Southern Ohio v. Cincinnati*

*DeBoer v. DeBoer*

*Doe v. Smith*  
*FCC v. Radiofone Inc.*  
*McGraw-Hill Cos. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.*  
*Metropolitan County Bd. of Ed. v. Kelley*  
*Mikutaitis v. United States*  
*National Socialist Party of America v. Skokie*  
*O'Connell v. Kirchner*  
*O'Connor v. Board of Ed. of School Dist.*  
*Prato v. Vallas*  
*Railway Labor Executives' Assn. v. Gibbons*  
*Renaissance Arcade & Bookstore v. Cook County*  
*Reynolds v. International Amateur Athletic Fed'n*  
*Spencer v. Pugh*  
*Williams v. Zbaraz*

### **Stewart, Potter**

*Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman*, 2 Rapp 854  
*Krause v. Rhodes*  
*Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes*, 2 Rapp 402  
*Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes*, 2 Rapp 406  
*Williams v. Rhodes*

### **Stone, Harlan Fiske**

*Ewing v. Gill*  
*Satterfield v. Smyth*

### **Taney, Roger B.**

*Merryman, Ex parte*

### **Van Devanter, Willis**

*Marks v. Davis*

### **Vinson, Fred M.**

*Hurst v. West Virginia*  
*Jordan v. Clemmer*  
*Land v. Dollar*  
*Sawyer v. Dollar*

### **Warren, Earl**

*Bart, In re*  
*Country School Board of Arlington v. Deskins*  
*Cunningham v. English*  
*Ellis v. United States*  
*Leigh v. United States*

### **Wayne, James M.**

*Stevens, Ex parte*

### **White, Byron R.**

*Autry v. Estelle*  
*Bonura v. CBS Inc.*  
*NCAA v. Bd. of Regents U. of Okla.*  
*New York Times v. Jасalevich*, 2 Rapp 803  
*New York Times v. Jасalevich*, 2 Rapp 816

### **Whittaker, Charles E.**

*Shelton v. McKinley*

# CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES ORALLY ARGUED

## 19TH CENTURY

<i>Kaine, Ex parte</i> .....	4/4/53 .....	Nelson
<i>Merryman, Ex parte</i> .....	5/27 & 28/61 .....	Taney
<i>Stevens, Ex parte</i> .....	8/??/61 .....	Wayne
<i>United States v. Patterson</i> .....	1/7/87 .....	Bradley
<i>United States v. Cooper</i> .....	7/30/92 .....	Harlan

## 20TH CENTURY

<i>Patrick v. New York</i> .....	6/12/06 .....	Day
<i>Marks v. Davis</i> .....	8/1/12 .....	Van Devanter, Pitney
<i>Frank v. Georgia, 4 Rapp 1523</i> .....	12/??/14 .....	Holmes
<i>Frank, In re</i> .....	12/24/14 .....	Lamar
<i>Motlow v. United States</i> .....	2/3/26 .....	Butler
<i>Sacco v. Hendry</i> .....	8/10/27 .....	Holmes
<i>Associated Gas &amp; Electric Co., In re</i> .....	7/2/36 .....	Cardozo
<i>Van Newkirk v. McLain</i> .....	6/20/40 .....	Frankfurter
<i>Waller, Ex Parte</i> .....	6/27/42 .....	Frankfurter
<i>Equitable Office Bldg. Corp., In re</i> .....	8/2/46 .....	Reed
<i>Durant, Ex parte</i> .....	9/6/46 .....	Burton
<i>Overfield v. Pennroad Corp.</i> .....	9/??/46 .....	Burton
<i>Shearer v. United States</i> .....	8/18/1947 .....	Rutledge
<i>Tuthill v. California</i> .....	1/19/1949 .....	Douglas
<i>Alabama G.S.R. Co. v. R.R. &amp; P.U.C. of Tennessee</i> .....	5/4/1950 .....	Reed
<i>Mallonee v. Fahey</i> .....	11/20/52 .....	Douglas
<i>Yanish v. Barber</i> .....	5/16/53 .....	Douglas
<i>Rosenberg v. United States</i> .....	6/15 & 16/53 .....	Douglas
<i>Carlisle v. Landon</i> .....	8/5/53 .....	Douglas
<i>Stanard v. Olesen</i> .....	5/22/54 .....	Douglas
<i>Herzog v. United States</i> .....	2/11/55 .....	Douglas
<i>Cooper v. New York, 1 Rapp 137</i> .....	7/7/55 .....	Harlan
<i>Breswick &amp; Co. v. United States</i> .....	8/1/55 .....	Harlan
<i>Marcello v. Brownell</i> .....	8/19/55 .....	Frankfurter
<i>Wise v. New Jersey</i> .....	9/1 or 2/55 .....	Burton
<i>Long Beach Fed Sav. &amp; Loan Assn. v. Federal Home Loan Bank</i> .....	10/31/55 .....	Douglas
<i>Noto v. United States</i> .....	11/21/55 .....	Harlan
<i>Wolcher v. United States</i> .....	12/31/55 .....	Douglas
<i>Edwards v. New York, 1 Rapp 171</i> .....	6/25/56 .....	Harlan
<i>Panama Canal Co. v. Grace Lines, Inc.</i> .....	5/7/57 .....	Harlan
<i>Di Candia v. United States</i> .....	1/20/58 .....	Harlan
<i>Tuscarora Nation of Indians v. Power Authority</i> .....	9/8/58 .....	Harlan
<i>Appalachian Power Co. v. AICPA</i> .....	7/7/59 .....	Brennan
<i>Kake v. Egan</i> .....	7/11/59 .....	Brennan
<i>English v. Cunningham</i> .....	8/4/59 .....	Frankfurter
<i>Fernandez v. United States</i> .....	2/25/61 .....	Harlan
<i>Board of Education v. Taylor</i> .....	8/30/61 .....	Brennan
<i>Carbo v. United States</i> .....	3/19/62 .....	Douglas
<i>Sica v. United States</i> .....	3/19/62 .....	Douglas
<i>Arrow Transportation Co. v. Southern Ry., 1 Rapp 307</i> .....	8/17/62 .....	Black
<i>United States v. FMC Corp.</i> .....	8/9/63 .....	Goldberg
<i>Williams v. Rhodes</i> .....	9/10/68 .....	Stewart
<i>Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party</i> .....	7/22/70 .....	Harlan
<i>Dexter v. Schrunck</i> .....	8/28/70 .....	Douglas
<i>Gomperts v. Chase</i> .....	9/10/71 .....	Douglas
<i>Cousins v. Wigoda</i> .....	7/1/72 .....	Rehnquist
<i>Russo v. Byrne</i> .....	7/29/72 .....	Douglas
<i>Holtzman v. Schlesinger, 2 Rapp 590</i> .....	8/1/73 .....	Marshall
<i>Holtzman v. Schlesinger, 2 Rapp 602</i> .....	8/4/73 .....	Douglas
<i>Smith v. United States</i> .....	9/11/75 .....	Douglas
<i>Chamber of Commerce v. Legal Aid Society</i> .....	9/29/75 .....	Douglas
<i>Coleman v. Paccar, Inc.</i> .....	2/2/76 .....	Rehnquist

CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES ORALLY ARGUED

**20TH CENTURY (cont'd)**

<i>New York v. Kleppe</i> .....	8/19/76.....	Marshall
<i>Beame v. Friends of the Earth</i> .....	8/5/77.....	Marshall
<i>Blum v. Caldwell</i> .....	5/6/80.....	Marshall

**21ST CENTURY**

none that we know of

# CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY DISPOSITION

## ABSTAIN

*Califano v. McRae*

## DENIED

*A.B. Chance Co. v. Atlantic City Elec. Co.*

*Aberdeen & Rockfish R. Co. v. SCRAP*

*Akel v. New York*

*Albanese v. United States*

*Alcorcha v. California*

*Alexander v. Board of Education*

*Alexis I. Du Pont School Dist. v. Evans*

*Am. Trading Corp. v. Railroad Comm'n*

*Appalachian Power Co. v. AICPA*

*Aronson v. May*

*Associated Gas & Electric Co., In re*

*Associated Press v. District Court*

*Bagley v. Byrd*

*Bandy v. United States*, 1 Rapp 253

*Bandy v. United States*, 1 Rapp 261

*Barnstone v. University of Houston*

*Barthuli v. Bd. of Trustees of Jefferson Sch. Dist.*

*Bartlett v. Stephenson*

*Bateman v. Arizona*

*Baytops v. New Jersey*

*Beame v. Friends of the Earth*

*Bellotti v. Latino Political Action Comm.*

*Beltran v. Smith*

*Bidwell v. United States*

*Birtcher Corp. v. Diapulse Corp.*

*Bletterman v. United States*

*Bloch v. North Side Lumber Co.*

*Blodgett v. Campbell*

*Bloeth v. New York*

*Blum v. Caldwell*

*Board of Ed. of L.A. v. Superior Court of Cal.*

*Board of Education v. Taylor*

*Board of School Comm'rs v. Davis*

*Bonura v. CBS Inc.*

*Boumediene v. Bush*

*Bowman v. United States*

*Bracy v. United States*

*Bradley v. Lunding*

*Brennan v. United States Postal Service*

*Brotherhood of R.R. Signalmen v. S.E. Pa. Trans.*

*Brown v. Gilmore*

*Buchanan v. Evans*

*Bureau of Economic Analysis v. Long*

*Burgess v. Pere Marquette R. Co.*, 4 Rapp 1586

*Burgess v. Pere Marquette R. Co.*, 4 Rapp 1587

*Bustop, Inc. v. Board of Ed. of L.A.*, 2 Rapp 870

*Bustop, Inc. v. Board of Ed. of L.A.*, 2 Rapp 879

*California v. Freeman*

*California v. Harris*

*California v. Winson*

*Campos v. Houston*

*Capitol Square Review and Adv. Bd. v. Pinette*

*Carbo v. United States*

*Carter v. United States*

*Catholic League v. Feminist Women's Health Ctr.*

*Chamber of Commerce v. Legal Aid Society*

*Chambers v. Mississippi*

*Cheney v. United States District Court*

*Chin Gum v. United States*

*City-Wide Comm. v. Board of Educ. of N.Y.*

*Claiborne v. United States*

*Clark, Ex parte*

*CFTC v. British Am. Commodity Options*

*Chesapeake Western Co. v. Murray*

*Commonwealth Oil Ref. Co. v. Lummus Co.*

*Communist Party of Indiana v. Whitcomb*

*Conforte v. Commissioner*

*Conkright v. Frommert*

*Cooper v. New York*, 1 Rapp 137

*Cooper v. New York*, 4 Rapp 1482

*Corsetti v. Massachusetts*

*Cote v. New Hampshire*

*County Sch. Bd. of Arlington v. Deskins*

*Cousins v. Wigoda*

*Cunningham v. English*

*Curry v. Baker*

*Day v. Louisiana Western Railroad Co.*

*Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman*

*Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman*

*Deaver v. United States*

*DeBoer v. DeBoer*

*Deere v. United States*

*Delli Paoli v. United States*

*Dem. Nat'l Comm. v. Rep. Nat'l Comm.*

*Dennis v. United States*

*Dexter v. Schruink*

*Di Candia v. United States*

*Divans v. California*, 2 Rapp 746

*Divans v. California*, 2 Rapp 857

*Doe v. Gonzales*

*Doe v. Smith*

*Dolman v. United States*

*Dow Jones & Co. Inc., In re*

*Drifka v. Brainard; Allen v. Brainard*

*Drummond v. Acree*

*Durant, Ex parte*

*East Coast Lumber v. Town of Babylon*

*Edgar v. United States*

*Edwards v. Hope Medical Group*

*Edwards v. New York*, 1 Rapp 171

*Ehrlichman v. Sirica*

*English v. Cunningham*

*Evans v. Alabama*

*Eveleigh v. United States*

*Ewing v. Gill*

*Fernandez v. United States*

*Field v. United States*

*Finance Comm. to Re-elect the President v. Waddy*

*Fishman v. Schaffer*

*Flamm v. Real-BLT Inc.*

*Frank v. Georgia*, 4 Rapp 1521

*Garcia-Mir v. Smith*

*Gen'l Council v. Superior Ct.*, 2 Rapp 859

*General Dynamics v. Anderson*

*George F. Alger Co. v. Peck*

*Goldman v. Fogarty*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY DISPOSITION

### DENIED (cont'd)

*Goldsmith v. Zerbst*  
*Gomperts v. Chase*  
*Graddick v. Newman*  
*Graves v. Barnes*  
*Gregory-Portland Indep. Sch. Dist. v. United States*  
*Grinnell Corp. v. United States*  
*Gruner v. Superior Court of Cal.*  
*Guterma v. United States*  
*Haack v. Brooklyn Labor Lyceum Assn.*  
*Haner v. United States*  
*Hanrahan v. Hampton*  
*Harvey, In re*  
*Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff*  
*Hayakawa v. Brown*  
*Heart of Atlanta Motel v. United States*  
*Henry v. Warner*  
*Hile v. Baker*  
*Hirsch v. U.S. Ct. App. for the 2d Cir.*  
*Holtzman v. Schlesinger, 2 Rapp 590*  
*Hortonville Joint Sch. Dist. v. Hortonville Ed. Assn.*  
*Hubbard v. Wayne Cty. Election Comm'n*  
*Hughes v. Thompson*  
*Hurst v. West Virginia*  
*Hutchinson v. New York*  
*Hysler v. Florida*  
*Jackson v. New York*  
*Jefferson Parish School Bd. v. Dandridge*  
*Jimenez v. United States District Court*  
*Johnson, In re*  
*Jordan v. Clemmer*  
*Julian v. United States*  
*Kadans v. Collins*  
*Karr v. Schmidt*  
*Keith v. New York, 4 Rapp 1613*  
*Kemp v. Smith, 3 Rapp 1133*  
*Kemp v. Smith, 3 Rapp 1155*  
*Kentucky v. Stincer*  
*Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*  
*Kimble v. Swackhamer*  
*Kleem v. INS*  
*KPNX Broadcasting Co. v. Arizona Sup. Ct.*  
*Krause v. Rhodes*  
*Labor Board v. Getman*  
*Laird v. Tatum*  
*Guey Heung Lee v. Johnson*  
*Lenhard v. Wolff, 3 Rapp 931*  
*Liles v. Nebraska*  
*Little v. Ciuros*  
*Local 1545, U. Bhd. of Carpenters v. Vincent*  
*Locks v. Commanding General, Sixth Army*  
*Long Beach Fed. S&L v. Fed. Home Loan Bank*  
*Long Island R.R. v. N.Y. Central R.R.*  
*Los Angeles NAACP v. L.A. Unified Sch. Dist.*  
*Louisiana v. United States*  
*Lux v. Rodrigues*  
*Lynch v. Watson*  
*MacKay v. Boyd*  
*Madden v. Texas*  
*Mahan v. Howell*  
*Mallonee v. Fahey*  
*Marks v. Davis*  
*Marten v. Thies*  
*McCarthy v. Briscoe, 2 Rapp 713*  
*McGee v. Alaska*  
*McGee v. Eymann*  
*McGraw-Hill Cos. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.*  
*Mecom v. United States*  
*Meeropol v. Nizer*  
*Metropolitan County Bd. of Ed. v. Kelley*  
*Mincey v. Arizona*  
*Miroyan v. United States*  
*Mississippi v. Turner*  
*Mitchell v. California*  
*Montanans for Balanced Fed. Budget v. Harper*  
*Montgomery v. Jefferson*  
*Moore v. Brown*  
*Morison v. United States*  
*Multimedia Holdings v. Circuit Ct. of Fla.*  
*Murdaugh v. Livingston*  
*National Broadcasting Co. v. Niemi*  
*Nat'l Farmers Ins. v. Crow Tribe, 3 Rapp 1211*  
*National Socialist Party of America v. Skokie*  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart, 2 Rapp 668*  
*Netherland v. Gray*  
*Netherland v. Tuggle*  
*N.E. Water Works v. Farmers' Loan, 4 Rapp 1576*  
*N.E. Water Works v. Farmers' Loan, 4 Rapp 1577*  
*New Jersey v. Auld*  
*New York Times Co. v. Jascalevich, 2 Rapp 803*  
*New York Times Co. v. Jascalevich, 2 Rapp 805*  
*New York Times Co. v. Jascalevich, 2 Rapp 816*  
*New York Times Co. v. Jascalevich, 2 Rapp 824*  
*New York v. Kleppe*  
*Northern Cal. Power Ag'ry. v. Grace Geothermal*  
*Nukk v. Shaughnessy*  
*Numer v. United States*  
*O'Brien v. O'Laughlin*  
*O'Brien v. Skinner*  
*O'Connell v. Kirchner*  
*O'Connor v. Board of Ed. of School Dist.*  
*O'Rourke v. Levine*  
*Oden v. Brittain*  
*Oerlikon Machine Tools Works v. U.S.*  
*Ohio Citizens for Responsible Energy v. NRC*  
*Owen v. Kennedy*  
*Pabon v. Bd. of Personnel of Puerto Rico*  
*Pacific Tel. & Tel. v. Public Util. Comm'n.*  
*Pacific Un. Seventh-Day Adventists v. Marshall*  
*Packwood v. Senate Select Comm. on Ethics*  
*Parisi v. Davidson*  
*Patterson v. United States*  
*Peeples v. Brown*  
*Penry v. Texas*  
*Perez v. United States*  
*Pirinsky, In re*  
*Planned Parenthood v. Casey*  
*Pon v. United States*  
*Portley v. Grossman*  
*Prato v. Vallas*  
*Prudential Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Flanigan*  
*Public Service Board v. United States*  
*Railway Express Agency, Inc. v. United States*  
*Railway Labor Executives' Assn. v. Gibbons*  
*Rehman v. California*  
*Renaissance Arcade and Bookstore v. Cook County*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY DISPOSITION

### DENIED (cont'd)

*Reproductive Services, Inc. v. Walker*, 2 Rapp 808  
*Republican National Committee v. Burton*  
*Republican Party of Hawaii v. Mink*  
*Richardson, In re*  
*Richmond v. Arizona*  
*Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party*  
*Rodriguez v. Texas*  
*Roller v. Murray*, 4 Rapp 1579  
*Roller v. Murray*, 4 Rapp 1582  
*Roller v. Murray*, 4 Rapp 1583  
*Rosenblatt v. American Cyanamid Co.*  
*Rosoto v. Warden*  
*Rubin v. United States Independent Counsel*  
*Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*  
*Russo v. United States*  
*Sacco v. Hendry*  
*Sacco v. Massachusetts*  
*Satterfield v. Smyth*  
*Seals, Ex parte*, 4 Rapp 1466  
*Seals, Ex parte*, 4 Rapp 1468  
*Shearer v. United States*  
*Shelton v. McKinley*  
*Simon, In re*  
*Smith v. Yeager*  
*Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes*, 2 Rapp 402  
*Socialist Workers Party v. Attorney General*  
*South Park Independent Sch. Dist. v. United States*  
*Spencer v. Pugh*  
*Spenkelink v. Wainwright*, 2 Rapp 905  
*Stanard v. Olesen*  
*Stanley v. United States*  
*Stickel v. United States*  
*Stroup v. Willcox*  
*Sulzer v. Sohmer*  
*Synanon Foundation, Inc. v. California*  
*Thomas v. Sierra Club*  
*Thomas v. South Side Elevated Railroad Co.*  
*Thompson v. United States*  
*Tomaiole v. United States*  
*Travia v. Lomenzo*  
*Tri-Continental Financial Corp. v. United States*  
*Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC*  
*Twentieth Century Airlines Inc. v. Ryan*  
*Uhler v. AFL-CIO*  
*United States ex rel. Cerullo v. Follette*  
*United States ex rel. Norris v. Swope*  
*United States v. Cooper*  
*United States v. FMC Corp.*  
*United States v. Gates*  
*United States v. Klopp*  
*United States v. Portell*  
*United States v. United Liquors Corp.*  
*Uphaus v. Wyman*  
*Valenti v. Specter*  
*Van Newkirk v. McLain*  
*Vetterli v. United States District Court*  
*Volvo of America Corp. v. Schwarzer*  
*Waller, Ex parte*  
*Ward v. United States*  
*Warm Springs Dam v. Gribble*, 2 Rapp 885  
*Wasmuth v. Allen*  
*Westermann v. Nelson*

*Whalen v. Roe*  
*White v. Florida*  
*Willhauck v. Flanagan*  
*Williams v. Zbaraz*  
*Wilson v. O'Malley*  
*Winston-Salem/Forsyth Cty. Bd. of Ed. v. Scott*  
*Winters v. United States*, 2 Rapp 404  
*Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC*  
*Wise v. New Jersey*  
*Wyckoff, In re*

### DISCHARGED

*Stevens, Ex parte*

### GRANTED

*American Mfrs. Mut. Ins. v. Am. Broadcasting*  
*American Trucking Assns., Inc. v. Gray*  
*Araneta v. United States*  
*Arrow Transp. Co. v. Southern Ry. Co.*, 1 Rapp 307  
*Arrow Transp. Co. v. Southern Ry. Co.*, 1 Rapp 314  
*Atiyeh v. Capps*  
*Atlantic Coast Line R.R. v. BLE*  
*Autry v. Estelle*  
*Baltimore City Dept. of Soc. Servs. v. Bouknight*  
*Bandy v. United States*, 1 Rapp 252  
*Barnes v. E-Systems, Inc.*  
*Bart, In re*  
*Becker v. United States*  
*Berg, In re*  
*Beyer v. United States*  
*Boston v. Anderson*  
*Bowen v. Kendrick*  
*Brody v. United States*  
*Brussel v. United States*  
*Burwell v. California*  
*California v. Brown*  
*California v. American Stores Co.*  
*California v. Braeseke*  
*California v. Hamilton*  
*California v. Prysock*  
*California v. Ramos*  
*California v. Riegler*  
*California v. Velasquez*  
*Capital Cities Media, Inc. v. Toole*  
*Carlisle v. Landon*  
*CBS Inc. v. Davis*  
*Certain Named and Unnamed Children v. Texas*  
*Chabad of Southern Ohio v. Cincinnati*  
*Chestnut v. New York*  
*Clark v. California*  
*Clark v. United States*  
*Clements v. Logan*  
*Cohen v. United States*, 1 Rapp 268  
*Cohen v. United States*, 1 Rapp 279  
*Cohen v. United States*, 1 Rapp 281  
*Cole v. Texas*  
*Coleman v. Paccar, Inc.*  
*Columbus Bd. of Ed. v. Penick*  
*Corpus Christi School Dist. v. Cisernos*  
*Costello v. United States*  
*D'Aquino v. United States*  
*Davis v. Adams*  
*Eckwerth v. New York*, 1 Rapp 216

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY DISPOSITION

### GRANTED (cont'd)

*Eckwerth v. New York*, 1 Rapp 217  
*Edelman v. Jordan*  
*Edwards v. New York*, 1 Rapp 163  
*Ellis v. United States*  
*Equitable Office Bldg. Corp., In re*  
*Evans v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*  
*Evans v. Bennett*  
*Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. Wills*  
*Fare v. Michael C.*  
*Farr v. Pitchess*  
*FCC v. Radiofone Inc.*  
*Flynn v. United States*  
*Foster v. Gilliam*  
*Fowler v. Adams*  
*Frank, In re*  
*Garrison v. Hudson*  
*Gen'l Council Fin. & Ad. v. Sup. Ct.*, 2 Rapp 852  
*Gregg v. Georgia*  
*Grubbs v. Delo*  
*Harris v. United States*, 2 Rapp 471  
*Harris v. United States*, 2 Rapp 508  
*Hayes, Ex parte*  
*Haywood v. National Basketball Assn.*  
*Heckler v. Blankenship*  
*Heckler v. Lopez*  
*Heckler v. Redbud Hospital Dist.*  
*Heckler v. Turner*  
*Herzog v. United States*  
*Hicks v. Feiock*  
*Holtzman v. Schlesinger*, 2 Rapp 602  
*Houchins v. KOED Inc.*  
*Hung v. United States*  
*INS v. Legalization Assistance Project of L.A. Cty.*  
*International Boxing Club v. United States*  
*Jaffree v. Board of Sch. Comm'rs of Mobile County*  
*John Doe Agency v. John Doe Corp.*  
*Jones v. Lemond*  
*Kaine, Ex parte*  
*Kaine, In re*  
*Kake v. Egan*  
*Karcher v. Dagget*  
*Katzenbach v. McClung*  
*Keith v. New York*, 1 Rapp 218  
*Keyes v. School Dist. No. 1, Denver*  
*King v. Smith*  
*Knickerbocker Printing Corp. v. United States*  
*La Marca v. New York*  
*Land v. Dollar*  
*Ledbetter v. Baldwin*  
*Leigh v. United States*  
*Lenhard v. Wolff*, 2 Rapp 924  
*Levy v. Parker*  
*Lewis, In re*  
*Lopez v. United States*  
*Los Angeles v. Lyons*  
*Lucas v. Townsend*  
*Ludecke v. Watkins*  
*M.I.C. Ltd. v. Bedford Township*  
*Marcello v. Brownell*  
*Marks v. Davis*  
*Marshall v. Barlow's, Inc.*  
*Mathis v. United States*  
*Matthews v. Little*  
*McCarthy v. Briscoe*, 2 Rapp 714  
*McCarthy v. Harper*  
*McDaniel v. Sanchez*  
*McDonald v. Missouri*  
*McLeod v. General Elec. Co.*  
*Meredith v. Fair*  
*Merryman, Ex parte*  
*Mikutaitis v. United States*  
*Mori v. Boilermakers*  
*Motlow v. United States*  
*NCAA v. Bd. of Regents U. of Okla.*  
*Nat'l Farmers Ins. v. Crow Tribe*, 3 Rapp 1185  
*National League of Cities v. Brennan*  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 675  
*New Motor Vehicle Bd. of Cal. v. Orrin W. Fox Co.*  
*Noto v. United States*  
*Noyd v. Bond*  
*Office of Personnel Mgmt. v. Gov't Employees*  
*Orloff v. Willoughby*  
*Overfield v. Pennroad Corp.*  
*Pacileo v. Walker*  
*Panama Canal Co. v. Grace Lines, Inc.*  
*Pasadena City Bd. of Ed. v. Spangler*  
*Patterson v. Superior Court of California*  
*Pennsylvania v. Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Co.*  
*Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Scott*  
*Pryor v. United States*  
*Quinn v. Laird*  
*Reproductive Servs., Inc. v. Walker*, 2 Rapp 851  
*Republican State Central Comm. v. Ripon Soc'y.*  
*Reynolds v. Int'l Amateur Athletic Fed.*  
*Reynolds v. United States*  
*Richardson v. New York*  
*Riverside v. Rivera*  
*Roche, In re*  
*Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party*  
*Rosenberg v. United States*  
*Rostker v. Goldberg*  
*Roth v. United States*  
*Russo v. Byrne*  
*Sacher v. United States*  
*San Diegans for Mt. Soledad v. Paulson*  
*Sawyer v. Dollar*  
*Scaggs v. Larsen*  
*Schlesinger v. Holtzman*, 2 Rapp 607  
*Schweiker v. McClure*  
*Seagram & Sons v. Hostetter*  
*Sellers v. United States*  
*Sica v. United States*  
*Simon v. United States*  
*Sklaroff v. Skeadas*  
*Smith v. Ritchey*  
*Smith v. United States*  
*Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes*, 2 Rapp 406  
*Spengelink v. Wainwright*, 2 Rapp 911  
*Steinberg v. United States*  
*Stickney, Ex parte*  
*Strickland Transp. Co. v. United States*  
*Sumner v. Mata*  
*Tate v. Rose*  
*Tierney v. United States*  
*Times-Picayune Publishing Corp. v. Schulingkamp*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY DISPOSITION

### **GRANTED (cont'd)**

*Tuscarora Nation of Indians v. Power Authority*  
*United States ex rel. Knauff v. McGrath*  
*United States v. Patterson*  
*United States Postal Service v. Letter Carriers*  
*Volkswagenwerk A.G. v. Falzon*  
*Walters v. National Assn. of Radiation Survivors*  
*Warm Springs Dam v. Gribble*, 2 Rapp 621  
*Western Airlines, Inc. v. Teamsters*  
*Williams v. Missouri*  
*Williams v. Rhodes*  
*Williamson v. United States*  
*Winters v. United States*, 2 Rapp 410  
*Wise v. Lipscomb*  
*Wolcher v. United States*  
*Yanish v. Barber*  
*Yasa v. Esperdy*

### **GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART**

*Alabama G.S.R. Co. v. R.R. & P.U.C. of Tennessee*  
*Breswick & Co. v. United States*  
*O'Brien v. O'Laughlin*

### **NO ACTION TAKEN**

*United States v. Allied Stevedoring Corp.*

### **REMANDED AND HELD IN ABEYANCE**

*Febre v. United States*

### **REFERRED TO COURT**

*Heath, In re*  
*Kaine, Ex parte*  
*Marcello v. United States*  
*Rosado v. Wyman*  
*Spies v. Illinois*



# CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

## **ABORTION**

*Califano v. McRae*  
*Doe v. Smith*  
*Edwards v. Hope Medical Group*  
*Planned Parenthood v. Casey*  
*Reproductive Servs., Inc. v. Walker*, 2 Rapp 808  
*Williams v. Zbaraz*

## **ABUSE OF DISCRETION**

*Albanese v. United States*  
*Associated Gas & Electric, In re*  
*Kemp v. Smith*, 3 Rapp 1133  
*Kemp v. Smith*, 3 Rapp 1155  
*Patterson v. United States*  
*Railway Express Agency, Inc. v. United States*

## **ACTS OF CONGRESS**

### **Administrative Procedure Act**

*Cheney v. United States District Court*  
*Stanard v. Olesen*

### **Adolescent Family Life Act**

*Bowen v. Kendrick*

### **Alaska Statehood Act**

*Kake v. Egan*

### **All Writs Act**

*Atiyeh v. Capps*  
*Brown v. Gilmore*  
*Northern Cal. Power Ag'y. v. Grace Geothermal*  
*Ohio Citizens for Responsible Energy v. NRC*  
*Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC*

### **Articles of War**

*Durant, Ex parte*

### **Atomic Energy Act**

*Rosenberg v. United States*

### **Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002**

*Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC*

### **Civil Rights Act of 1964**

*Heart of Atlanta Motel v. United States*  
*Katzenbach v. McClung*

### **Civilian Aeronautics Act of 1938**

*Twentieth Century Airlines Inc. v. Ryan*

### **Clayton Act**

*California v. American Stores Co.*  
*United States v. FMC Corp.*

### **Clean Air Act**

*Beame v. Friends of the Earth*  
*Thomas v. Sierra Club*

### **Coastal Zone Management Act**

*Clark v. California*

### **CFTA**

*CFTC v. British Am. Commodity Options*

### **ERISA**

*Barnes v. E-Systems, Inc*

### **Ethics in Government Act**

*Cheney v. United States District Court*

### **Fair Labor Standards Act**

*National League of Cities v. Brennan*

### **Federal Advisory Committee Act**

*Cheney v. United States District Court*

### **Freedom of Information Act**

*Bureau of Economic Analysis v. Long*  
*Chamber of Commerce v. Legal Aid Society*  
*John Doe Agency v. John Doe Corp.*  
*Labor Board v. Getman*

### **Harrison Narcotic Act**

*Chin Gum v. United States*

### **Immigration Reform & Control Act of 1986**

*INS v. Legalization Assistance Project L.A. Cty.*

### **Immunity Act of 1954**

*Bart, In re*

### **Indian Civil Rights Act**

*Nat'l Farmers. Ins. v. Crow Tribe*, 3 Rapp 1185

### **Interstate Commerce Act**

*Aberdeen & Rockfish R. Co. v. SCRAP*  
*Arrow Transp. Co. v. Southern Ry.*, 1 Rapp 307  
*Arrow Transp. Co. v. Southern Ry.*, 1 Rapp 314

### **Judiciary Act of 1789**

*Merryman, Ex parte*

### **Medicare Act**

*Schweiker v. McClure*

### **National Labor Relations Act**

*McLeod v. General Elec. Co.*

### **Patriot Act**

*Doe v. Gonzales*

### **Presumed Constitutional**

*Bowen v. Kendrick*  
*Brennan v. United States Postal Service*  
*Marshall v. Barlow's, Inc.*  
*Schweiker v. McClure*  
*Walters v. National Assn. of Radiation Survivors*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **Railway Labor Act**

*Western Airlines, Inc. v. Teamsters*

### **Ready Reserve Act**

*Smith v. Ritchey*

### **Rock Creek Park Act**

*United States v. Cooper*

### **Selective Service Act**

*Rostker v. Goldberg*

### **Tax Injunction Act**

*Barnes v. E-Systems Inc.*

### **Voting Rights Act**

*Bartlett v. Stephenson*

*Campos v. Houston*

*Lucas v. Townsend*

*McDaniel v. Sanchez*

### **ADOPTION**

*DeBoer v. DeBoer*

*Goldman v. Fogarty*

*Marten v. Thies*

*O'Connell v. Kirchner*

*Sklaroff v. Skeadas*

### **ANTITRUST**

*American Mfrs. Mut. Ins. v. Am. Broadcasting*

*Haywood v. National Basketball Assn.*

*International Boxing Club v. United States*

*NCAA v. Bd. of Regents of U. of Okla.*

*United States v. FMC Corp.*

*United States v. United Liquors Corp.*

### **APPEAL, LEAVE TO**

*Alabama G.S.R. Co. v. R.R. & P.U.C. of Tenn.*

*Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. Wills*

*Frank, In re*

*Lynch v. Watson*

*Wilson v. O'Malley*

### **APPEAL PENDING BELOW**

*Atiyeh v. Capps*

*Becker v. United States*

*Beltran v. Smith*

*Bureau of Economic Analysis v. Long*

*Certain Named and Unnamed Children v. Texas*

*Chestnut v. New York*

*Chin Gum v. United States*

*Coleman v. Paccar, Inc.*

*Doe v. Gonzales*

*Drifka v. Brainard*

*Farr v. Pitchess*

*Harris v. United States, 2 Rapp 471*

*Heckler v. Lopez*

*Heckler v. Redbud Hospital Dist.*

*Henry v. Warner*

*INS v. Legalization Assistance Project L.A. Cty.*

*Jaffree v. Board of Sch. Comm'rs of Mobile Cty.*

*Guey Heung Lee v. Johnson*

*Lopez v. United States*

*Mecum v. United States*

*Metropolitan County Bd. of Ed. v. Kelley*

*Montgomery v. Jefferson*

*Moore v. Brown*

*Northern Cal. Power Ag'y v. Grace Geothermal*

*O'Connor v. Board of Ed. of School Dist. 23*

*Packwood v. Senate Select Comm. on Ethics*

*Parisi v. Davidson*

*Pasadena City Bd. of Ed. v. Spangler*

*Renaissance Arcade and Bookstore v. Cook Cty.*

*Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*

*San Diegans for Mt. Soledad v. Paulson*

*Scaggs v. Larsen*

*Shearer v. United States*

*Smith v. Ritchey*

*Smith v. United States*

*Stanard v. Olesen*

*Thomas v. Sierra Club*

*Warm Springs Dam v. Gribble, 2 Rapp 621*

*Warm Springs Dam v. Gribble, 2 Rapp 885*

*Willhauck v. Flanagan*

*Winters v. United States, 2 Rapp 410*

### **ARMED FORCES**

#### **Cambodia**

*Holtzman v. Schlesinger, 2 Rapp 590*

*Holtzman v. Schlesinger, 2 Rapp 602*

#### **Civil War**

*Merryman, Ex parte*

*Stevens, Ex parte*

#### **Conscientious Objectors**

*Clark v. United States*

*Jones v. Lemond*

*Lopez v. United States*

*Quinn v. Laird*

*Parisi v. Davidson*

#### **Court Martial**

*Durant, Ex parte*

#### **Discharge**

*Durant, Ex parte*

*Peebles v. Brown*

#### **Draft**

*Pryor v. United States*

*Sellers v. United States*

#### **Exhaustion Doctrine**

*Noyd v. Bond*

#### **Habeas Corpus**

*Durant, Ex parte*

*Levy v. Parker*

*Locks v. Commanding General, Sixth Army*

*Scaggs v. Larsen*

*Stevens, Ex parte*

#### **Retention**

*Hayes, Ex parte*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **Shipment Overseas**

*Drifka v. Brainard*  
*Orloff v. Willoughby*  
*Parisi v. Davidson*  
*Smith v. Ritchey*  
*Winters v. United States*, 2 Rapp 404  
*Winters v. United States*, 2 Rapp 410

### **World War II**

*Durant, Ex parte*

### **ATTORNEY'S FEES**

*Riverside v. Rivera*

### **BAIL**

#### **Application for**

*Akel v. New York*  
*Albanese v. United States*  
*Alcorcha v. California*  
*Aronson v. May*  
*Bandy v. U.S.*, 1 Rapp 252  
*Bandy v. U.S.*, 1 Rapp 253  
*Bandy v. U.S.*, 1 Rapp 261  
*Bateman v. Arizona*  
*Baytops v. New Jersey*  
*Beyer v. United States*  
*Bletterman v. United States*  
*Bowman v. United States*  
*Brussel v. United States*  
*Carbo v. United States*  
*Carlisle v. Landon*  
*Chambers v. Mississippi*  
*Chin Gum v. United States*  
*Clark v. United States*  
*Cohen v. U.S.*, 1 Rapp 268  
*Cohen v. U.S.*, 1 Rapp 279  
*Costello v. United States*  
*D'Aquino v. United States*  
*Delli Paoli v. United States*  
*Dennis v. United States*  
*Di Candia v. United States*  
*Ellis v. United States*  
*Eveleigh v. United States*  
*Farr v. Pitchess*  
*Febre v. United States*  
*Fernandez v. United States*  
*Field v. United States*  
*Guterma v. United States*  
*Harris v. United States*, 2 Rapp 508  
*Herzog v. United States*  
*Hung v. United States*  
*Hurst v. West Virginia*  
*Johnson, In re*  
*Julian v. United States*  
*Leigh v. United States*  
*Levy v. Parker*  
*Lewis, In re*  
*Lopez v. United States*  
*Marcello v. United States*  
*Mathis v. United States*  
*McGee v. Alaska*  
*Mecom v. United States*  
*Morison v. United States*

*Motlow v. United States*  
*Noto v. United States*  
*O'Brien v. O'Laughlin*  
*Patterson v. United States*  
*Perez v. United States*  
*Pirinsky, In re*  
*Rehman v. California*  
*Reynolds v. United States*  
*Roth v. United States*  
*Sellers v. United States*  
*Shearer v. United States*  
*Sica v. United States*  
*Smith v. Yeager*  
*Stanley v. United States*  
*Stickel v. United States*  
*Tierney v. United States*  
*Tomaiolo v. United States*  
*United States ex rel. Cerullo v. Follette*  
*United States v. Allied Stevedoring Corp.*  
*United States v. Gates*  
*United States v. Klopp*  
*United States v. Portell*  
*Uphaus v. Wyman*  
*Valenti v. Specter*  
*Ward v. United States*  
*Williamson v. United States*  
*Wolcher v. United States*  
*Yanish v. Barber*

#### **Authority to Grant**

*Alcorcha v. California*  
*Bandy v. U.S.*, 1 Rapp 261  
*Johnson, In re*  
*Merryman, Ex parte*  
*Pirinsky, In re*  
*Simon v. United States*

#### **Reasons/Standards for Granting**

*Aronson v. May*  
*Carbo v. United States*  
*D'Aquino v. United States*  
*Harris v. United States*, 2 Rapp 508  
*Herzog v. United States*  
*Leigh v. United States*  
*Merryman, Ex parte*  
*Motlow v. United States*  
*Reynolds v. United States*  
*Sellers v. United States*  
*Sica v. United States*  
*Ward v. United States*

#### **BOND REQUIRED**

*Arrow Transp. Co. v. Southern Ry.*, 1 Rapp 314  
*Bart, In re*  
*Bandy v. U.S.*, 1 Rapp 252  
*Breswick & Co. v. United States*  
*California v. American Stores Co.*  
*Twentieth Century Airlines Inc. v. Ryan*  
*Carlisle v. Landon*  
*Cohen v. United States*, 1 Rapp 279  
*Cohen v. United States*, 1 Rapp 281  
*Costello v. United States*  
*Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. Wills*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **BOND REQUIRED (cont'd)**

*Herzog v. United States*  
*Noto v. United States*  
*O'Brien v. O'Laughlin*  
*Roth v. United States*  
*Sica v. United States*  
*Steinberg v. United States*  
*Simon v. United States*

### **CAPITAL CASE**

*Autry v. Estelle*  
*Bagley v. Byrd*  
*Blodgett v. Campbell*  
*Bloeth v. New York*  
*Burwell v. California*  
*California v. Ramos*  
*California v. Brown*  
*California v. Hamilton*  
*California v. Harris*  
*California v. Ramos*  
*Cooper v. New York*, 1 Rapp 137  
*Eckwerth v. New York*, 1 Rapp 216  
*Eckwerth v. New York*, 1 Rapp 217  
*Edwards v. New York*, 1 Rapp 163  
*Edwards v. New York*, 1 Rapp 171  
*Evans v. Alabama*  
*Gregg v. Georgia*  
*Grubbs v. Delo*  
*Jackson v. New York*  
*Keith v. New York*, 1 Rapp 218  
*Keith v. New York*, 4 Rapp 1613  
*Kemp v. Smith*, 3 Rapp 1133  
*Kemp v. Smith*, 3 Rapp 1155  
*La Marca v. New York*  
*Madden v. Texas*  
*McDonald v. Missouri*  
*McGee v. Eymann*  
*Merrifield v. Kentucky*  
*Mitchell v. California*  
*Netherland v. Tuggle*  
*Netherland v. Gray*  
*Penry v. Texas*  
*Richardson v. New York*  
*Richmond v. Arizona*  
*Rodriguez v. Texas*  
*Rosenberg v. United States*  
*Spengelink v. Wainwright*, 2 Rapp 905  
*Spengelink v. Wainwright*, 2 Rapp 911  
*Spies v. Illinois*  
*Stickney v. Texas*  
*Thompson v. United States*  
*White v. Florida*  
*Wise v. New Jersey*

### **Automatic Stay Rejected**

*Netherland v. Gray*

### **Direct Review**

*Cole v. Texas*  
*McDonald v. Missouri*  
*Rodriguez v. Texas*  
*Williams v. Missouri*

### **Next Friend Status**

*Evans v. Bennett*  
*Lenhard v. Wolff*, 2 Rapp 924  
*Lenhard v. Wolff*, 3 Rapp 931

### **CERTIFICATE OF NECESSITY**

*Meeropol v. Nizer*

### **CERTIFICATE OF PROBABLE CAUSE**

*Autry v. Estelle*  
*Burwell v. California*  
*Frank, In re*  
*McCarthy v. Harper*  
*Rosoto v. Warden*

### **CERTIORARI**

#### **Denied**

*Jimenez v. United States District Court*  
*Kadans v. Collins*  
*Keith v. New York*, 4 Rapp 1613  
*Pacific Tel. & Tel. v. Public Util. Comm'n of Cal.*  
*Rosoto v. Warden*

#### **Denied in Similar Case**

*General Dynamics v. Anderson*  
*Drifka v. Brainard*

#### **Granted**

*California v. Ramos*  
*Clark v. California*  
*Edelman v. Jordan*  
*Heckler v. Turner*

#### **Granted in Similar Case**

*Berg, In re*  
*California v. Velasquez*  
*Chestnut v. New York*  
*City-Wide Comm. v. Board of Educ. of N.Y.*  
*Costello v. United States*  
*Pasadena City Bd. of Ed. v. Spangler*

#### **In Forma Pauperis**

*Prato v. Vallas*

#### **Pending**

*Am. Trading Corp. v. Railroad Comm'n*  
*Bagley v. Byrd*  
*Brown v. Gilmore*  
*Conkright v. Frommert*  
*Eckwerth v. New York*, 1 Rapp 217  
*Evans v. Alabama*  
*Keith v. New York*, 1 Rapp 218  
*Mincey v. Arizona*  
*Noto v. United States*  
*Richardson v. New York*

#### **Suspension of Order Denying**

*Boumediene v. Bush*  
*Flynn v. United States*  
*Richmond v. Arizona*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **Unlikely to Be Granted**

*Appalachian Power Co. v. AICPA*  
*Bartlett v. Stephenson*  
*Curry v. Baker*  
*Harvey, In re*  
*Jackson v. D.C. Bd. of Elections & Ethics*  
*Kentucky v. Stincer*  
*Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*  
*Long Island R.R. v. N.Y. Central R.R.*

### **CIRCUIT COURT**

#### **Split**

*Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*

### **CIRCUIT JUSTICE**

#### **Abstention**

*Califano v. McRae*

#### **Authority to Act**

*Blodgett v. Campbell*  
*Breswick & Co. v. United States*  
*CFTC v. British Am. Commodity Options*  
*Cousins v. Wigoda*  
*Durant, Ex parte*  
*Equitable Office Bldg. Corp., In re*  
*Grinnell Corp. v. United States*  
*Hawaii Housing Auth. v. Midkiff*  
*Johnson, In re*  
*Kimble v. Swackhamer*  
*Locks v. Commanding General, Sixth Army*  
*Meeropol v. Nizer*  
*New York Times v. Jascalevich, 2 Rapp 816*  
*New York Times v. Jascalevich, 2 Rapp 824*  
*Sacco v. Massachusetts*  
*Smith v. Yeager*  
*Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes, 2 Rapp 406*  
*U.S. ex rel. Norris v. Swope*  
*Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC*  
*Wasmuth v. Allen*

#### **Conferred with Other Justices**

*Barnstone v. University of Houston*  
*City-Wide Comm. v. Board of Educ. of N.Y.*  
*Evans v. Alabama*  
*Graves v. Barnes*  
*Hughes v. Thompson*  
*Katzenbach v. McClung*  
*McCarthy v. Briscoe, 2 Rapp 713*  
*McCarthy v. Briscoe, 2 Rapp 714*  
*McGee v. Eyman*  
*Meredith v. Fair*  
*Microsoft Corp. v. United States*  
*Noto v. United States*  
*Richmond v. Arizona*  
*Schlesinger v. Holtzman, 2 Rapp 607*  
*Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes, 2 Rapp 406*  
*Spengelink v. Wainwright, 2 Rapp 905*  
*Thompson v. United States*  
*Williams v. Rhodes*  
*Wyckoff, In re*

### **Jurisdiction of**

*Barthuli v. Bd. of Trustees of Jefferson Sch. Dist.*  
*Durant, Ex parte*  
*M.I.C. Ltd. v. Bedford Township*  
*Pac. Union Seventh-Day Adventists v. Marshall*  
*Prudential Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Flanigan*  
*Rosado v. Wyman*

### **Reasons for Granting Relief**

*Aberdeen & Rockfish R. Co. v. SCRAP*  
*American Trucking Assns., Inc. v. Gray*  
*Araneta v. United States*  
*Barnes v. E-Systems, Inc.*  
*Bellotti v. Latino Political Action Comm.*  
*Boston v. Anderson*  
*Brennan v. United States Postal Service*  
*Buchanan v. Evans*  
*California v. Riegler*  
*Capital Cities Media, Inc. v. Toole*  
*Cohen v. U.S., 1 Rapp 268*  
*Conkright v. Frommert*  
*Corsetti v. Massachusetts*  
*Curry v. Baker*  
*Edwards v. Hope Medical Group*  
*Fare v. Michael C.*  
*General Dynamics v. Anderson*  
*Graves v. Barnes*  
*Heckler v. Lopez*  
*Heckler v. Blankenship*  
*Hicks v. Feiock*  
*Houchins v. KQED Inc.*  
*INS v. Legalization Assistance Project L.A. Cty.*  
*John Doe Agency v. John Doe Corp.*  
*Julian v. United States*  
*Karcher v. Daggett*  
*Ledbetter v. Baldwin*  
*Lucas v. Townsend*  
*Mahan v. Howell*  
*McDaniel v. Sanchez*  
*McGraw-Hill Cos. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.*  
*Miroyan v. United States*  
*NCAA v. Bd. of Regents of U. of Okla.*  
*Packwood v. Senate Select Comm. on Ethics*  
*Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Scott*  
*Planned Parenthood v. Casey*  
*Republican State Central Comm. v. Ripon Society*  
*Roche, In re*  
*Rostker v. Goldberg*  
*Rubin v. United States Independent Counsel*  
*Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*  
*United States Postal Service v. Letter Carriers*  
*Whalen v. Roe*  
*Williams v. Zbaraz*  
*Wise v. Lipscomb*

### **Role of**

*Alexander v. Board of Education*  
*Board of Ed. of L.A. v. Superior Court of Cal.*  
*Corsetti v. Massachusetts*  
*Doe v. Gonzales*  
*Durant, Ex parte*  
*Ehrlichman v. Sirica*  
*Evans v. Bennett*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **Role of (cont'd)**

*Gregory-Portland Indep. Sch. Dist. v. U.S.*  
*Holtzman v. Schlesinger*, 2 Rapp 590  
*Hortonville Jt. Sch. Dist. v. Hortonville Ed. Assn.*  
*San Diegans for Mt. Soledad v. Paulson*  
*South Park Indep. Sch. Dist. v. United States*

### **COMMERCE CLAUSE**

*American Trucking Assns., Inc. v. Gray*

### **CONDITIONAL STAY**

*Albanese v. United States*  
*Edwards v. New York*, 1 Rapp 163  
*La Marca v. New York*  
*Seagram & Sons v. Hostetter*  
*Sklaroff v. Skeadas*  
*Tuscarora Nation of Indians v. Power Authority*

### **CONFESSIONS**

*Durant, Ex parte*

### **CONTEMPT**

#### **Civil**

*Araneta v. United States*  
*Baltimore City Dept. of Soc. Servs. v. Bouknight*  
*Brussel v. United States*  
*Farr v. Pitchess*  
*Haner v. United States*  
*Hicks v. Feiock*  
*Mikutaitis v. United States*  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 816  
*Patterson v. Superior Court of Cal.*  
*Roche, In re*  
*Russo v. United States*  
*Sawyer v. Dollar*  
*Tierney v. United States*  
*United States v. Portell*  
*Uphaus v. Wyman*

#### **Criminal**

*Dolman v. United States*  
*Field v. United States*  
*Gruner v. Superior Court of Cal.*  
*Lewis, In re*  
*Patterson v. United States*  
*Sacher v. United States*

### **CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, STAY OF**

*Claiborne v. United States*  
*Divans v. California*, 2 Rapp 746  
*Mincey v. Arizona*  
*O'Rourke v. Levine*

### **DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE**

*Merryman, Ex parte*

### **DEFERENCE TO LOWER COURT**

*Bletterman v. United States*  
*D'Aquino v. United States*  
*Di Candia v. United States*  
*Garcia-Mir v. Smith*  
*Jackson v. D.C. Bd. of Elections & Ethics*  
*Julian v. United States*

*Marten v. Thies*  
*Mecom v. United States*

### **DELAY**

#### **In Filing**

*Alexis I. Du Pont Sch. Dist. v. Evans*  
*Beame v. Friends of the Earth*  
*Brody v. United States*  
*Conforte v. Commissioner*  
*Cooper v. New York*, 1 Rapp 137  
*Cunningham v. English*  
*Evans v. Bennett*  
*Fishman v. Schaffer*  
*General Council v. Superior Ct.*, 2 Rapp 852  
*O'Brien v. Skinner*  
*Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*  
*Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes*, 2 Rapp 402  
*Westermann v. Nelson*  
*Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Bd. of Ed. v. Scott*

### **Unreasonable**

*Bureau of Econ. Analysis v. Long*

### **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

*Am. Trading Corp. v. Railroad Comm'n*  
*Associated Press v. District Court*  
*Bandy v. U.S.*, 1 Rapp 253  
*Baytops v. New Jersey*  
*East Coast Lumber v. Town of Babylon*  
*Grinnell Corp. v. United States*  
*Hawaii Housing Auth. v. Midkiff*  
*Jordan v. Clemmer*  
*Krause v. Rhodes*  
*Labor Board v. Getman*  
*Lynch v. Watson*  
*McCarthy v. Briscoe*, 2 Rapp 713  
*Murdaugh v. Livingston*  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 668  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 803  
*Oden v. Brittain*  
*Rodriguez v. Texas*  
*Shearer v. United States*

### **DEPORTATION**

*Garcia-Mir v. Smith*  
*Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*  
*Nukk v. Shaughnessy*  
*U.S. ex rel. Knauff v. McGrath*  
*Yasa v. Esperdy*

### **DESIGNATION OF CIRCUIT JUDGE**

*Van Newkirk v. McLain*

### **DISSENT TO CHAMBERS OPINION**

*Schlesinger v. Holtzman*, 2 Rapp 607

### **DOUBLE JEOPARDY CLAUSE**

*Cohen v. United States*, 1 Rapp 279  
*Divans v. California*, 2 Rapp 746  
*Divans v. California*, 2 Rapp 857  
*Julian v. United States*  
*Willhauck v. Flanagan*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **EIGHTH AMENDMENT**

*Atiyeh v. Capps*  
*Hung v. United States*  
*Graddick v. Newman*

### **ELECTIONS**

*Campos v. Houston*  
*Louisiana v. United States*  
*Marks v. Davis*  
*Moore v. Brown*  
*Owen v. Kennedy*  
*Spencer v. Pugh*

### **Ballot Access**

*Bradley v. Lunding*  
*Communist Party of Indiana v. Whitcomb*  
*Davis v. Adams*  
*Dem. Nat'l Comm. v. Rep. Nat'l Comm.*  
*Fishman v. Schaffer*  
*Fowler v. Adams*  
*Hayakawa v. Brown*  
*Lux v. Rodrigues*  
*McCarthy v. Briscoe*, 2 Rapp 714  
*Montgomery v. Jefferson*  
*Republican Party of Hawaii v. Mink*  
*Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party*  
*Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes*, 2 Rapp 402  
*Westermann v. Nelson*  
*Williams v. Rhodes*

### **Ballot Initiative**

*Montanans for Balanced Fed. Budget v. Harper*  
*Uhler v. AFL-CIO*

### **Election Enjoined**

*Bellotti v. Latino Political Action Comm.*  
*Lucas v. Townsend*  
*Oden v. Brittain*

### **Filing Fees**

*Matthews v. Little*

### **Reapportionment/Redistricting**

*Bartlett v. Stephenson*  
*Graves v. Barnes*  
*Karcher v. Daggett*  
*Mahan v. Howell*  
*McDaniel v. Sanchez*  
*Republican Nat'l Comm. v. Burton*  
*Travia v. Lomenzo*  
*Wise v. Lipscomb*

### **Referendum**

*Boston v. Anderson*  
*Kimble v. Swackhamer*

### **State Laws**

*Bartlett v. Stephenson*  
*California v. Freeman*  
*Curry v. Baker*  
*Hayakawa v. Brown*  
*Hubbard v. Wayne County Election Commission*  
*Sacco v. Massachusetts*

### **Voting Rights**

*O'Brien v. Skinner*

### **ENLARGEMENT OF DEFENDANT**

*Foster v. Gilliam*

### **ERROR, WRIT OF**

*Burgess v. Pere Marquette R. Co.*, 4 Rapp 1586  
*Burgess v. Pere Marquette R. Co.*, 4 Rapp 1587  
*Day v. Louisiana Western Railroad Co.*  
*Frank v. Georgia*, 4 Rapp 1521  
*Haack v. Brooklyn Labor Lyceum Assn.*  
*Hile v. Baker*  
*Roller v. Murray*, 4 Rapp 1579  
*Spies v. Illinois*  
*Thomas v. South Side Elevated Railroad Co.*  
*United States v. Cooper*

### **EX POST FACTO**

*Portley v. Grossman*

### **EXECUTION, STAY OF**

*Autry v. Estelle*  
*Bloeth v. New York*  
*Burwell v. California*  
*Cole v. Texas*  
*Cooper v. New York*, 1 Rapp 137  
*Cooper v. New York*, 4 Rapp 1482  
*Deere v. United States*  
*Eckwerth v. New York*, 1 Rapp 216  
*Eckwerth v. New York*, 1 Rapp 217  
*Edwards v. New York*, 1 Rapp 163  
*Edwards v. New York*, 1 Rapp 171  
*Evans v. Alabama*  
*Evans v. Bennett*  
*Grubbs v. Delo*  
*Jackson v. New York*  
*Keith v. New York*, 1 Rapp 218  
*La Marca v. New York*  
*Lenhard v. Wolff*, 2 Rapp 924  
*Lenhard v. Wolff*, 3 Rapp 931  
*McDonald v. Missouri*  
*McGee v. Eymann*  
*Merrifield v. Kentucky*  
*Mitchell v. California*  
*Richardson v. New York*  
*Richmond v. Arizona*  
*Rosenberg v. United States*  
*Spenkelink v. Wainwright*, 2 Rapp 905  
*Thompson v. United States*  
*Waller, Ex parte*  
*Williams v. Missouri*

### **EXHAUSTION BELOW**

*Jordan v. Clemmer*  
*Satterfield v. Smyth*  
*Wyckoff, In re*

### **EXTENSION OF TIME**

*Boumediene v. Bush*  
*Brody v. United States*  
*Carter v. United States*  
*Goldman v. Fogarty*

# CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

## **EXTENSION OF TIME (cont'd)**

*Kleem v. INS*  
*Knickerbocker Printing Corp. v. United States*  
*Mackay v. Boyd*  
*Madden v. Texas*  
*Mississippi v. Turner*  
*New Jersey v. Auld*  
*Numer v. United States*  
*Oerlikon Machine Tools Works v. U.S.*  
*Overfield v. Pennroad Corp.*  
*Pabon v. Bd. of Personnel of Puerto Rico*  
*Penry v. Texas*  
*Pon v. United States*  
*Prato v. Vallas*  
*U.S. ex rel. Cerullo v. Follette*

## **EXTRADITION**

*Jimenez v. United States District Court*  
*Kaine, Ex parte*  
*Little v. Ciuros*  
*Pacileo v. Walker*

## **EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES, RELIEF NOT SOUGHT BELOW**

*Brussel v. United States*  
*Heckler v. Turner*  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 675  
*Volkswagenwerk A.G. v. Falzon*  
*Western Airlines, Inc. v. Teamsters*

## **FIFTH AMENDMENT**

*Araneta v. United States*  
*Baltimore City Dept. of Soc. Servs. v. Bouknight*  
*Fare v. Michael C.*  
*Haner v. United States*  
*Merryman, Ex parte*  
*Mikutaitis v. United States*  
*Rostker v. Goldberg*

## **FINAL DECISION REQUIRED**

*Bateman v. Arizona*  
*Deaver v. United States*  
*Doe v. Smith*  
*Gen'l Council Fin. & Ad. v. Sup. Ct.*, 2 Rapp 859  
*Hortonville Jt. Sch. Dist. v. Hortonville Ed. Assn.*  
*Liles v. Nebraska*  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 816  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 824  
*Ohio Citizens for Responsible Energy Inc. v. NRC*  
*Pacific Un. Seventh-Day Adventists v. Marshall*  
*Rosenblatt v. American Cyanamid Co.*  
*Twentieth Century Airlines Inc. v. Ryan*  
*United States v. Cooper*  
*Valenti v. Spector*

## **FIRST AMENDMENT**

*Bonura v. CBS Inc.*  
*Brown v. Gilmore*  
*Chabad of Southern Ohio v. Cincinnati*  
*Dexter v. Schrunck*  
*Doe v. Gonzales*  
*Farr v. Pitchess*  
*Gruner v. Superior Court of Cal.*

*Houchins v. KQED Inc.*

*Lewis, In re*  
*M.I.C. Ltd. v. Bedford Township*  
*McGraw-Hill Cos. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.*  
*National Socialist Party of America v. Skokie*  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 816  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 824  
*Pacific Un. Seventh-Day Adventists v. Marshall*  
*Patterson v. Superior Court of Cal.*  
*Roche, In re*  
*Socialist Workers Party v. Attorney General*  
*Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC*  
*Williamson v. United States*  
*Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC*

## **Establishment Clause**

*Brown v. Gilmore*  
*Cath. League v. Feminist Women's Health Ctr.*  
*Jaffree v. Board of Sch. Comm'rs of Mobile Cty.*

## **Prior Restraint**

*Associated Press v. District Court*  
*Capital Cities Media, Inc. v. Toole*  
*CBS Inc. v. Davis*  
*KPNX Broadcasting Co. v. Arizona Superior Ct.*  
*Multimedia Holdings Corp. v. Circuit Ct. of Fla.*  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 668  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 675  
*Times-Picayune Pub. Corp. v. Schulingkamp*

## **FOREIGN LAW**

### **England, Common Law**

*Kaine, Ex parte*  
*Merryman, Ex parte*

### **England, Habeas Corpus Act**

*Merryman, Ex parte*

### **England, Magna Carta**

*Merryman, Ex parte*

### **Hungary**

*Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*

## **FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT**

*Certain Named and Unnamed Children v. Texas*  
*Karr v. Schmidt*  
*New Motor Vehicle Bd. v. Orrin W. Fox Co.*  
*O'Connor v. Board of Ed. of School Dist. 23*  
*Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Scott*

## **FOURTH AMENDMENT**

*Berg, In re*  
*California v. Riegler*  
*Clements v. Logan*  
*Harris v. United States*, 2 Rapp 471  
*Merryman, Ex parte*  
*Miroyan v. United States*  
*Russo v. Byrne*  
*Steinberg v. United States*  
*Tierney v. United States*



## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **GOOD CAUSE, EXTENSIONS OF TIME**

*Kleem v. INS*  
*Madden v. Texas*  
*Mississippi v. Turner*  
*Penry v. Texas*

### **HABEAS CORPUS, WRIT OF**

*Clark, Ex parte*  
*Durant, Ex parte*  
*Ewing v. Gill*  
*Goldsmith v. Zerbst*  
*Jordan v. Clemmer*  
*Kaine, Ex parte*  
*Kaine, In re*  
*Locks v. Commanding General, Sixth Army*  
*Richardson, In re*  
*Sacco v. Hendry*  
*Satterfield v. Smyth*  
*Seals, Ex parte, 4 Rapp 1466*  
*Seals, Ex parte, 4 Rapp 1468*  
*Stevens, Ex parte*  
*United States v. Patterson*  
*United States ex rel. Norris v. Swope*  
*Wyckoff, In re*

### **Stay, Issuance of**

*Foster v. Gilliam*  
*Garrison v. Hudson*  
*O'Connell v. Kirchner*  
*Tate v. Rose*

### **Suspension of**

*Merryman, Ex parte*

### **Transfer**

*Hayes, Ex parte*

### **IMMIGRATION**

#### **Asylum**

*Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*

### **INDEPENDENT COUNSEL**

*Deaver v. United States*  
*Dow Jones & Co. Inc., In re*  
*Rubin v. United States Independent Counsel*

### **INJUNCTION**

#### **Application for**

*American Trucking Assns., Inc. v. Gray*  
*Brotherhood of R.R. Signalmen v. S.E. Pa. Trans.*  
*Brown v. Gilmore*  
*Campos v. Houston*  
*Communist Party of Indiana v. Whitcomb*  
*Fishman v. Schaffer*  
*George F. Alger Co. v. Peck*  
*Gomperts v. Chase*  
*Hubbard v. Wayne County Election Commission*  
*Krause v. Rhodes*  
*Lenhard v. Wolff, 2 Rapp 924*  
*McCarthy v. Briscoe, 2 Rapp 714*  
*Oden v. Brittain*  
*Ohio Citizens for Responsible Energy Inc. v. NRC*  
*Peoples v. Brown*

*Penn. v. Wheeling & Belmont Bridge Co.*  
*Renaissance Arcade and Bookstore v. Cook Cty.*  
*Shelton v. McKinley*  
*Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes, 2 Rapp 402*  
*Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC*  
*Westermann v. Nelson*  
*Williams v. Rhodes*  
*Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC*

### **Denied Below**

*Synanon Foundation, Inc. v. California*  
*Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC*

### **Pending Appeal**

*Alabama G.S.R. Co. v. R.R. & P.U.C. of Tenn.*  
*Lux v. Rodrigues*  
*Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC*

### **Stay of**

*Aberdeen & Rockfish R. Co. v. SCRAP*  
*Atiyeh v. Capps*  
*Atlantic Coast Line R.R. v. BLE*  
*Breswick & Co. v. United States*  
*Capitol Square Review & Advisory Bd. v. Pinette*  
*CBS Inc. v. Davis*  
*Chabad of Southern Ohio v. Cincinnati Clark v. California*  
*Heckler v. Lopez*  
*Heckler v. Redbud Hospital Dist.*  
*Houchins v. KQED Inc.*  
*Long Beach Fed. S&L v. Fed. Home Loan Bank*  
*Los Angeles v. Lyons*  
*Marshall v. Barlow's, Inc.*  
*M.I.C. Ltd. v. Bedford Township*  
*Moore v. Brown*  
*New Motor Vehicle Bd. v. Orrin W. Fox Co.*  
*Republican State Central Comm. v. Ripon Society*  
*Reynolds v. Int'l Amateur Athletic Federation*  
*Walters v. National Assn. of Radiation Survivors*

### **INTERNATIONAL LAW**

*Kaine, Ex parte*

### **IRREPARABLE HARM/INJURY**

*Associated Gas & Electric Co., In re*  
*Bagley v. Byrd*  
*Breswick & Co. v. United States*  
*California v. American Stores Co.*  
*California v. Winson*  
*Capitol Square Review & Advisory Bd. v. Pinette*  
*Davis v. Adams*  
*FCC v. Radiofone Inc.*  
*Finance Comm. to Re-elect the Pres. v. Waddy*  
*Fowler v. Adams*  
*Heckler v. Turner*  
*Garcia-Mir v. Smith*  
*George F. Alger Co. v. Peck*  
*Graddick v. Newman*  
*Kake v. Egan*  
*Ledbetter v. Baldwin*  
*Long Beach Fed. S&L v. Fed. Home Loan Bank*  
*National Broadcasting Co. v. Niemi*  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart, 2 Rapp 675*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **IRREPARABLE HARM/INJURY (cont'd)**

*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 803  
*Railway Labor Executives' Assn. v. Gibbons*  
*Reynolds v. Int'l Amateur Athletic Federation*  
*San Diegans for Mt. Soledad v. Paulson*  
*Schweiker v. McClure*  
*Twentieth Century Airlines Inc. v. Ryan*  
*United States v. United Liquors Corp.*  
*Wasmuth v. Allen*  
*White v. Florida*

### **JURIES**

#### **Grand Jury Proceedings**

*Bracy v. United States*  
*Patterson v. Superior Court of Cal.*  
*Russo v. United States*  
*Smith v. United States*

#### **Grand Jury Testimony**

*A.B. Chance Co. v. Atlantic City Elec. Co.*  
*Bart, In re*

#### **Instructions**

*California v. Brown*  
*California v. Hamilton*

#### **Jurors**

*California v. Harris*  
*Capital Cities Media, Inc. v. Toole*  
*Richardson, In re*

### **JURISDICTION**

*Durant, Ex parte*

#### **Final Order Required**

*Bateman v. Arizona*  
*Deaver v. United States*  
*Doe v. Smith*  
*Gen'l Council Fin. & Ad. v. Sup. Ct.*, 2 Rapp 859  
*Hortonville Jt. Sch. Dist. v. Hortonville Ed. Assn.*  
*Liles v. Nebraska*  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 816  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 824  
*Ohio Citizens for Responsible Energy Inc. v. NRC*  
*Pacific Un. Seventh-Day Adventists v. Marshall*  
*Rosenblatt v. American Cyanamid Co.*  
*Twentieth Century Airlines Inc. v. Ryan*  
*Valenti v. Spector*

#### **Lack of by Lower Court**

*Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff*  
*Heckler v. Redbud Hospital Dist.*  
*McCarthy v. Harper*  
*Nat'l Farmers Ins. v. Crow Tribe*, 3 Rapp 1185  
*Nat'l Farmers Ins. v. Crow Tribe*, 3 Rapp 1211  
*Office of Personnel Mgmt. v. Gov't Employees*  
*Public Service Board v. United States*

#### **Lack of by Supreme Court**

*Board of Ed. of Los Angeles v. Superior Ct.*  
*Durant, Ex parte*  
*Harris v. United States*, 2 Rapp 471  
*Heath, In re*

*Kaine, Ex parte*  
*McCarthy v. Briscoe*, 2 Rapp 713  
*Renaissance Arcade and Bookstore v. Cook Cty.*  
*Simon, In re*  
*Sulzer v. Sohmer*  
*Volvo of America Corp. v. Schwarzer*

#### **Preservation of Court's**

*Bart, In re*  
*Becker v. United States*  
*Garrison v. Hudson*  
*National Socialist Party of America v. Skokie*  
*Orloff v. Willoughby*  
*Tate v. Rose*  
*Sawyer v. Dollar*  
*United States ex rel. Knauff v. McGrath*

#### **Relief Must Be Sought Below**

*Dolman v. United States*  
*Drummond v. Acree*  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 668  
*Oden v. Brittain*  
*United States ex rel. Cerullo v. Follette*  
*United States ex rel. Norris v. Swope*  
*Warm Spgs. Dam v. Gribble*, 2 Rapp 885  
*Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Bd. of Ed. v. Scott*

### **LABOR LAW**

*Atlantic Coast Line R.R. v. BLE*  
*Commonwealth Oil Ref. Co. v. Lummus Co.*  
*Cunningham v. English*  
*English v. Cunningham*  
*McLeod v. General Elec. Co.*  
*Mori v. Boilermakers*  
*Railway Labor Executives' Assn. v. Gibbons*  
*United States Postal Service v. Letter Carriers*  
*Western Airlines, Inc. v. Teamsters*

### **LOWER COURT**

#### **Application for Relief Pending Below**

*KPNX Broadcasting Co. v. Arizona Superior Ct.*

#### **Argument Not Raised Below**

*Stroup v. Willcox*

#### **Explanation for Decision not Given**

*Febre v. United States*

#### **Extraordinary Circumstances no Lower Court Ruling on Stay**

*Brussel v. United States*  
*Heckler v. Turner*  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 675  
*Volkswagenwerk A.G. v. Falzon*  
*Western Airlines, Inc. v. Teamsters*

#### **Relief Not Sought Below**

*Dolman v. United States*  
*Drummond v. Acree*  
*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 668  
*Oden v. Brittain*  
*United States ex rel. Cerullo v. Follette*  
*United States ex rel. Norris v. Swope*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **Relief Not Sought Below (cont'd)**

*Warm Spgs. Dam v. Gribble*, 2 Rapp 885  
*Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Bd. of Ed. v. Scott*

### **MANDATE**

#### **Recall**

*County Sch. Bd. of Arlington v. Deskins*  
*Wise v. Lipscomb*

#### **Stay of**

*Appalachian Power Co. v. AICPA*  
*Bircher Corp. v. Diapulse Corp.*  
*Blum v. Caldwell*  
*Board of Education v. Taylor*  
*California v. American Stores Co.*  
*Curry v. Baker*  
*Dennis v. United States*  
*Edelman. v. Jordan*  
*Gregg v. Georgia*  
*Ludecke v. Watkins*  
*McDaniel v. Sanchez*  
*Mikutaitis v. United States*  
*Miroyan v. United States*  
*Montanans for Balanced Fed. Budget v. Harper*  
*Nat'l Farmers Ins. v. Crow Tribe*, 3 Rapp 1185  
*Panama Canal Co. v. Grace Lines, Inc.*  
*Pryor v. United States*  
*Sacher v. United States*  
*Sumner v. Mata*  
*Tri-Continental Financial Corp. v. United States*  
*Tuscarora Nation of Indians v. Power Authority*

### **MIRANDA WARNINGS**

*California v. Braeseke*  
*California v. Prysock*  
*Fare v. Michael C.*

### **ORIGINAL ACTION**

#### **Injunction**

*Penn. v. Wheeling & Belmont Bridge Co.*

### **POLITICAL QUESTIONS**

*Kaine, Ex parte*

### **PRESIDENTIAL POWER**

*Kaine, Ex parte*  
*Merryman, Ex parte*

### **PRIVACY RIGHTS**

*Whalen v. Roe*

### **REAPPLICATION**

#### **Previously Denied**

*Alexis I. Du Pont Sch. Dist. v. Evans*  
*Bandy v. United States*, 1 Rapp 252  
*Bustop, Inc. v. Board of Ed. of L.A.*, 2 Rapp 879  
*Clements v. Logan*  
*Columbus Bd. of Ed. v. Penick*  
*Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman*, 2 Rapp 855  
*Drummond v. Acree*  
*Waller, Ex parte*  
*Gregory-Portland Independent School Dist. v. United States*

*Holtzman v. Schlesinger*, 2 Rapp 602

*Lenhard v. Wolff*, 3 Rapp 931

*Levy v. Parker*

*Little v. Ciuros*

*Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart*, 2 Rapp 675

*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 816

*New York Times v. Jascavevich*, 2 Rapp 824

*Noyd v. Bond*

*Reproductive Services v. Walker*, 2 Rapp 808

*Reproductive Services v. Walker*, 2 Rapp 851

*Republican State Central Comm. v. Ripon Soc'y.*

*Richardson, In re*

*Spenkelink v. Wainwright*, 2 Rapp 911

*Stickney v. Texas*

*Tierney v. United States*

*Travia v. Lomenzo*

### **Previously Granted**

*Chambers v. Mississippi*

### **RECUSAL**

*Cheney v. United States District Court*

*Hanrahan v. Hampton*

*Laird v. Tatum*

*Microsoft Corp. v. United States*

*Public Utilities Comm'n of D.C. v. Pollak*

### **REFER TO FULL COURT**

*Marcello v. United States*

*Spies v. Illinois*

### **REHEARING**

*Boumediene v. Bush*

### **Stay Pending**

*Dennis v. United States*

*Flynn v. United States*

*Gregg v. Georgia*

*Kadans v. Collins*

*Richmond v. Arizona*

*Sacher v. United States*

### **RESTRAINING ORDER, STAY OF**

*Land v. Dollar*

### **REVERSED PREVIOUS JUSTICE**

*Schlesinger v. Holtzman*, 2 Rapp 607

### **SCHOOL DESEGREGATION/ SEGREGATION**

*Alexander v. Board of Education*

*Alexis I. Du Pont Sch. Dist. v. Evans*

*Board of Ed. of L.A. v. Superior Court of Cal.*

*Board of School Comm'rs v. Davis*

*Board of Education v. Taylor*

*Buchanan v. Evans*

*Bustop, Inc. v. Board of Ed. of L.A.*, 2 Rapp 870

*Columbus Bd. of Ed. v. Penick*

*Corpus Christi School Dist. v. Cisneros*

*County Sch. Bd. of Arlington v. Deskins*

*Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman*

*Dayton Bd. of Ed. v. Brinkman*

*Drummond v. Acree*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **SCHOOL DESEGREGATION/ SEGREGATION (cont'd)**

*Edgar v. United States*  
*Gomperts v. Chase*  
*Gregory-Portland Indep. Sch. Dist. v. U.S.*  
*Jefferson Parish School Bd. v. Dandridge*  
*Keyes v. School Dist. No. 1, Denver*  
*Guey Heung Lee v. Johnson*  
*Metropolitan County Bd. of Ed. v. Kelley*  
*Pasadena City Bd. of Ed. v. Spangler*  
*South Park Indep. Sch. Dist. v. U.S.*  
*Vetterli v. United States District Court*  
*Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Bd. of Ed. v. Scott*

### **SEALED MATERIAL**

*Doe v. Gonzales*

### **SIXTH AMENDMENT**

*Berg, In re*  
*Kentucky v. Stincer*  
*Merryman, Ex parte*  
*Russo v. Byrne*  
*Tierney v. United States*

### **STATE LAW**

*Associated Press v. District Court*  
*Clark, Ex parte*  
*Cote v. New Hampshire*  
*Frank v. Georgia, 4 Rapp 1521*  
*Hurst v. West Virginia*  
*Hysler v. Florida*  
*Simon, In re*  
*Wilson v. O'Malley*

### **Presumptively Valid**

*Brown v. Gilmore*

### **State Law Question**

*Akel v. New York*  
*Bircher Corp. v. Diapulse Corp.*  
*Bustop, Inc. v. Bd. of Ed. of L.A., 2 Rapp 870*  
*Catholic League v. Fem. Women's Health Ctr.*  
*Chesapeake Western Co. v. Murray*  
*Day v. Louisiana Western Railroad Co.*  
*DeBoer v. DeBoer*  
*Hile v. Baker*  
*Montanans for Balanced Fed. Budget v. Harper*  
*National Broadcasting Co. v. Niemi*  
*Pacific Tel. & Tel. v. Public Util. Comm'n of Cal.*  
*Republican National Committee v. Burton*  
*Roller v. Murray, 4 Rapp 1579*  
*Roller v. Murray, 4 Rapp 1582*  
*Roller v. Murray, 4 Rapp 1583*  
*Sulzer v. Sohmer*  
*Thomas v. South Side Elevated Railroad Co.*  
*Uhler v. AFL-CIO*  
*Uphaus v. Wyman*

### **STAY**

*Marcello v. Brownell*

### **Standard for Grant**

*Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*

### **Temporary**

*Clements v. Logan*  
*Cooper v. New York*  
*Eckwerth v. New York, 1 Rapp 216*  
*Evans v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*  
*Flynn v. United States*  
*Gen'l Council of F&A v. Sup. Ct., 2 Rapp 852*  
*Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*  
*National League of Cities v. Brennan*  
*Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party*  
*Russo v. United States*  
*Strickland Transportation Co. v. United States*  
*Yasa v. Esperdy*

### **SUBPOENA**

*New York Times v. Jascavevich, 2 Rapp 803*  
*New York Times v. Jascavevich, 2 Rapp 816*  
*Packwood v. Senate Select Comm. on Ethics*  
*Rubin v. United States Independent Counsel*

### **TENTH AMENDMENT**

*Merryman, Ex parte*

### **TIME TO ACT**

*Capitol Square Review & Advisory Bd. v. Pinette*  
*Columbus Bd. of Ed. v. Penick*  
*Grubbs v. Delo*  
*Levy v. Parker*  
*Los Angeles NAACP v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.*  
*Louisiana v. United States*  
*Matthews v. Little*  
*Montgomery v. Jefferson*  
*Moore v. Brown*  
*National League of Cities v. Brennan*  
*Republican Party of Hawaii v. Mink*  
*Spencer v. Pugh*

### **TIME TO FILE**

*N.E. Water Works v. Farmers' Loan*

### **TREASON**

*Merryman, Ex parte*

### **TREATIES**

*Kaine, Ex parte*  
*Kaine, In re*

### **United Nations Convention Against Torture**

*Kenyeres v. Ashcroft*

### **VACATE STAY, APPLICATIONS TO**

*Alexander v. Board of Education*  
*Barnstone v. University of Houston*  
*Block v. North Side Lumber Co.*  
*Bonura v. CBS Inc.*  
*Certain Named and Unnamed Children v. Texas*  
*Chabad of Southern Ohio v. Cincinnati*  
*Coleman v. Paccar, Inc.*  
*CFTC v. British Am. Commodity Options*  
*Doe v. Gonzales*  
*FCC v. Radiofone Inc.*  
*Garcia-Mir v. Smith*

## CUMULATIVE INDEX OF CASES BY TOPIC

### **VACATE STAY, APPLICATIONS TO (cont'd)**

*Haywood v. National Basketball Assn.*  
*Henry v. Warner*  
*Holtzman v. Schlesinger*, 2 Rapp 590  
*Holtzman v. Schlesinger*, 2 Rapp 602  
*Karr v. Schmidt*  
*Keyes v. School Dist. No. 1, Denver*  
*King v. Smith*  
*Mallonee v. Fahey*  
*Meredith v. Fair*  
*Metropolitan County Bd. of Ed. v. Kelley*  
*Murdaugh v. Livingston*  
*Nat'l Farmers Ins. v. Crow Tribe*, 3 Rapp 1211  
*New York v. Kleppe*  
*O'Connor v. Board of Ed. of School Dist. 23*  
*Office of Personnel Mgmt. v. Gov't Employees*  
*Orloff v. Willoughby*

### **Authority to Vacate**

*Certain Named and Unnamed Children v. Texas*  
*Coleman v. Paccar, Inc.*  
*CFTC v. British Am. Commodity Options*  
*Holtzman v. Schlesinger*, 2 Rapp 590  
*Meredith v. Fair*  
*New York v. Kleppe*  
*O'Connor v. Board of Ed. of School Dist. 23*

### **Remand Order**

*Blodgett v. Campbell*

### **Stay of Execution**

*Kemp v. Smith*, 3 Rapp 1133  
*Kemp v. Smith*, 3 Rapp 1155  
*Netherland v. Tuggle*  
*Netherland v. Gray*

GB

[Publisher's note: This opinion is also available in the *Federal Reporter* at 29 F. 775 (C.C.N.J. 1887); see also *Ex parte Lamar*, 274 F. 160, 175 (2d Cir. 1921).]

UNITED STATES v. PATTERSON, Keeper, etc.

(*Circuit Court, D. New Jersey*. January 31, 1887.)

On *Habeas Corpus* for the body of Oscar L. Baldwin. The petition for *habeas corpus* in this case was presented to JOSEPH P. BRADLEY, an associate justice of the supreme court of the United States, allotted to the Third circuit, on the thirtieth of December, 1886, and alleges that the petitioner, Oscar L. Baldwin, is imprisoned in the state's prison of the state of New Jersey, in custody of John H. Patterson, the keeper thereof, under judgment, sentence, and commitment thereon of the district court of the United States for the district of New Jersey, said judgment being rendered on the thirty-first day of January, 1882, upon petitioner's plea of guilty to three indictments found against him under section 5209 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, — one for misapplying the funds of the Mechanics' National Bank of Newark, of which he was cashier, one for false entries to conceal such misapplication, and the third for making a false statement with intent to deceive the examining officers; that, being set at the bar of said district court for sentence, the same was pronounced against him in the following words, as recorded in the records of said court, to-wit:

“The court do order and adjudge that the prisoner, Oscar L. Baldwin, be confined at hard labor in the state's prison of the state of New Jersey, for the term of five (5) years upon each of the three indictments above named, said terms not to run concurrently; and from and after the expiration of said terms until the costs of this prosecution shall have been paid.”

— That, immediately upon the rendition of said judgment and sentence, the petitioner was committed to the custody of the keeper of said state's prison, and that from thence hitherto he has been and is now kept in said state's prison, at hard labor, according to all the rules and regulations of said prison, the same established and carried on in the case of all persons convicted under the laws of New Jersey, and sentenced to hard labor by its courts; that by the laws of said state the keeper of the state's prison is required to have kept a correct, impartial, daily record of the conduct of each prisoner, and of his labor, whether satisfactory or otherwise, and to lay the same before the inspectors as often as they may require; that the said inspectors, being satisfied that the record is properly kept, shall di-

rect the keeper, for every month of faithful performance of assigned labor by any convict, to remit to him two days of the term for which he was sentenced; for every month of manifest effort at intellectual improvement and self-control, to be certified by the moral instructors, one day; provided, that in any month in which a convict shall have merited and received punishment no such remission shall be made, and, in case of any flagrant misconduct, the inspectors may declare a forfeiture of the time previously remitted, either in whole or in part, as to them shall seem just; that, on the recommendation of the keeper and moral instructor, it shall be lawful for the inspectors to remit an additional day per month to every convict who for 12 months preceding shall have merited the same by his continuous good conduct, and for each succeeding year, progressively, to increase the remission one day per month for that year.

The petitioner states that, by virtue of the 5544th section of the Revised Statutes of the United States, he is entitled to the benefit of these regulations; and that by reason of his good behavior he became entitled to and has been awarded such credits; and that by force thereof such deductions have been made from the said term of five years, for which he was sentenced, that said term expired and came to an end on the twenty-fifth day of January, 1886, a remission of 372 days having been allowed to him; also that the costs of prosecution of said indictments have been fully paid. The petitioner further states that he is advised by his counsel that he is not now detained in custody in said state's prison by virtue of any sentence; that a second term of five years' imprisonment has not begun, and will not begin, till the thirty-first day of January, 1887; and that he is therefore unlawfully detained in prison. He also, upon the same advice, contends that the judgment was unlawful, because it sentenced him to imprisonment at hard labor, whereas section 5209 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, under which he was indicted, imposed the punishment of imprisonment only. Also that no more than one sentence of five years' imprisonment could lawfully be imposed upon him under the said section, inasmuch as said offenses were each acts forming part of one act of misapplication of moneys. Also that the said sentence is unlawful for uncertainty, except as to the first term of five years' imprisonment, which has expired, and that the court had no lawful right or authority to impose any more than one term of five years' imprisonment on him. A duly-exemplified copy of the three indictments, and the proceedings thereon, and of the sentence pronounced against the petitioner, and of the award of remission of penalty by the inspectors of the state's prison, as stated in the petition, was annexed thereto, confirming the statement of facts set forth therein.

Upon this petition being presented to the said justice of the supreme court he allowed a writ of *habeas corpus* as prayed, and on the seventh



UNITED STATES v. PATTERSON

day of January, 1887, the same was duly returned before the said justice, at his chambers, in the city of Washington. The return set forth as the cause of imprisonment the warrant of commitment by virtue of which the petitioner was detained in custody, and which consists of a statement of the three indictments, by their several titles, with a copy of the sentence as set out in the petition, duly certified by the clerk of the said district court. The return further states that it appears by the receipt of said clerk, under his seal, that the costs of the prosecution have been paid; also that, upon the books of the prison, the petitioner appears entitled to a remission from the first of the three terms of imprisonment of 372 days, whereby the period of his punishment under the same expired on the twenty-fifth day of January, 1886.

Annexed to the return is a writing signed by the petitioner and his counsel, waiving all right to the production of his body according to the command of the writ, before the judge issuing the same, and requesting the said judge to proceed to inquire into the cause of his detention, and give judgment thereon without such production. And a supplemental return of the keeper was presented, containing a copy of said waiver and consent, and certifying that in consequence thereof the refrains from producing the said body, but avows his readiness, and submits, to produce the same to answer any order which may be made by said judge.

*Cortlandt Parker*, for petitioner.

*Job H. Lippincott*, U.S. Dist. Atty., *contra*.

BRADLEY, Justice. I have duly considered the matter aforesaid, and will proceed to state the conclusion to which I have come, and the reasons thereof. It is manifest that the judgment or sentence in this case is uncertain in this respect: it imposes the penalty of imprisonment at hard labor in the state's prison for the term of five years upon each indictment, and adds that the said terms shall not run concurrently, but does not specify upon which indictment either of said terms of imprisonment is to be undergone. If the prisoner is to be detained in prison for three successive terms, neither he, nor the keeper of the prison, nor any other person, knows, or can possibly know, under which indictment he has passed his first term, or under which he will have to pass the second or the third. If, for any reason peculiar to either of said indictments, as, for example, some newly-discovered evidence, should be a different face put upon the case, so as to induce the executive to grant the prisoner a pardon of the sentence on that indictment, no person could affirm which of the three terms of imprisonment was condoned. If a formal record of any one of the indictments, and the judgment rendered thereon, were, for any reason, required to be made out and exemplified, no clerk or person skilled in the law could extend the proper judgment upon such record. He could not tell

whether it was the sentence for the first, the second, or the last term of imprisonment. Without the last words of the sentence, declaring that the terms of imprisonment should not run concurrently, it would be sufficiently clear and certain. It would then, by force of law, be a sentence of five years' imprisonment on each indictment, and each sentence would begin to run at once, and they would all run concurrently. Such a sentence is lawful and proper. But the addition that they were not to run concurrently, without specifying the order in which they were to run, is uncertain, and incapable of application. It seems to me that the additional words must be regarded as void.

The words used are undoubtedly equivalent to the words, 'the said terms shall follow each other successively.' But, if these words had been used, the case would not have been different. The inherent vice of being insensible and incapable of application to the respective terms, without specifying the order of their succession, would still exist. The joint sentence is equivalent to three sentences, one on each indictment. One of them is applicable to the indictment for misapplication of funds; but, if they are successive, which one? That which is first to be executed, or that which is secondly or thirdly to be executed? No intelligence is sufficient to answer the question. A prisoner is entitled to know under what sentence he is imprisoned. The vague words in question furnish no means of knowing. They must be regarded as without effect, and as insufficient to alter the legal rule that each sentence is to commence at once, unless otherwise specially ordered.

If this were a mere error, it could not be considered on *habeas corpus*. The judgments of the district and circuit courts in criminal cases are final, and cannot be reviewed by writ of error, and a mere error of law, if in fact committed, is irremediable; as much so as are the decisions of the supreme court. But if a judgment or any part thereof is void, either because the court that renders it is not competent to do so for want of jurisdiction, or because it is rendered under a law clearly unconstitutional, or because it is senseless, and without meaning, and cannot be corrected, or for any other cause, then a party imprisoned by virtue of such void judgment may be discharged on *habeas corpus*.

I do not say that the judgment in this case is void. It is a good judgment for the term of five years' imprisonment on each indictment. Perhaps these terms might have been lawfully made to take effect successively, if the order of their succession had been specified, although there is no United States statute authorizing it to be done. But this was not done. No distinction was made between them in this respect, and, as neither of them was made to take effect after the one or the others, they all took effect alike; that is, from the time of the rendering of judgment. The additional words as to non-concurrence are void, because they are inca-

pable of application. It is as if a man should be sentenced to successive terms of imprisonment on each of several indictments, and to hard labor, or to be kept on bread and water, during one of the terms, without specifying which. The latter part of such a sentence would clearly be void, for it could not be allowed to the jailer to exercise his discretion as to the application of the aggravated penalties.

If there were any way in which the district court could amend its judgment, the case might perhaps be different. But I see no way in which it could do so without passing a new sentence, and that it could not do now, after the term has passed, and after one term of imprisonment has been suffered. What right would the court have now to determine that the expired term was due to any particular indictment more than to either of the others?

I have carefully read the able opinion of the supreme court of New Jersey in the case of *Gibbs v. State*, 45 N.J. Law, 379, and agree to all that the court there says as to the right of a criminal court to extend its judgment and proceedings on the record in proper form, regardless of imperfections in the minutes of its clerk. But in the present case there are no materials in existence for altering the form of the judgment under consideration, — at least nothing but what may rest in the bosom of the judge; and for him to resort to his memory at this day to alter the judgment would be to render a new judgment. It is unnecessary to say that the honorable judge of the district court would not adopt a proceeding so questionable and hazardous. The district attorney has supplied me with a certified copy, *literatim*, with all the erasures and interlineations of the rough minutes; but they exhibit nothing upon which the court could base any substantial alteration in the judgment as recorded.

In this view of the case, it is unnecessary to consider the other questions raised by the petition, and by the prisoner's counsel on the argument. But it does suggest another question which cannot be entirely overlooked. When the *habeas corpus* was allowed, the first term of five years had not expired by lapse of time, although at least one of the sentences had been satisfied by means of the remissions allowed for good conduct. Considering the three terms of imprisonment as by law running concurrently, do those remissions apply to all three of the sentences, or to only one of them? If to only one, and I had to decide this case, as in ordinary civil actions, according to the state of things when the writ was issued, I might be obliged to remand the petitioner into custody, and put him to the expense and trouble of another writ. But I think that on a *habeas corpus*, where the personal liberty of the citizen is involved, the decision should be made upon the actual *status* of the case. And as the five years have now entirely elapsed, and all the concurring terms have been fulfilled, the question of the applicability of the remission for good conduct to all the

UNITED STATES v. PATTERSON

sentences may be waived, and the prisoner be lawfully discharged, without deciding it. He is discharged accordingly.

[Publisher's note: This case should be captioned *In re Heath*. Chief Justice Fuller's handwritten opinion (signed in his hand) is referred to but not quoted in a "Statement by Mr. Chief Justice Fuller" at the beginning of the Supreme Court's decision in the case. From the Melville Weston Fuller Papers, Box 16, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC; *see also In re Heath*, 144 U.S. 92 (1892).]

Supreme Court of the United States.  
October Term 1891

In the matter of the petition of  
Thomas ~~James~~ H Heath  
  
for a writ of error to the  
Supreme Court of the District  
of Columbia

---

It appearing upon an examination of the petition, assignment of errors and record, that upon this application for a writ of error, a question arises in respect to the jurisdiction of this court, of sufficient gravity to render it proper that the application should be made to the court in session: It is ordered that the petitioner have leave and he is hereby directed to present his application to the court in open session on Monday next, January 25th, for argument upon the question of jurisdiction, and that notice of this order be at once given to the United States, and ~~it is ordered that~~ a copy of the brief for the petitioner be served not later than Friday, January 22d.

/s/ Melville W. Fuller  
Chief Justice of the  
United States

January 18, 1892

[Publisher's note: This case should be captioned *In re Richardson*. The opinion is in typescript, with "(copy)" handwritten at the top of the first page, and Justice Harlan's signature in his own hand at the end. From the Melville Weston Fuller Papers, Box 5, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC; *see also* Letters from John M. Harlan to Chief Justice Fuller, Aug. 17 & 24, 1896, in Melville Weston Fuller Papers, Box 5, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC; *State v. Richardson*, 24 S.E. 1028 (S.C. 1896).]

Washington, D.C., August 24th, 1896.

Dear Mr. Barrett:

I have your letter of the 21st, in which it is said that you were specially desirous that I should act on the application for the allowance of an appeal in the case of Aleck Richardson from the order of the Circuit Court of the United States denying his application for the writ of *habeas corpus*. The members of our court do not, in the first instance, unless in some cases requiring immediate action, pass upon applications for writs of error or appeals in cases beyond their respective circuits. In accordance with that custom, the papers you sent to me were transmitted to the Chief Justice, who, as I learn from your letter, has refused to allow an appeal.

You have the technical legal right to apply for your client to each one of the Justices of the Supreme Court, and I therefore take your letter to be substantially an application to me. Before the papers were sent to the Chief Justice, I examined them, and reached the same conclusion that he did. The only ground assigned in the papers sent by you for granting the writ is that your client was tried by a jury composed entirely of white men. It is not claimed that this resulted from any statute of the State excluding blacks from serving on juries, because of their race. If, therefore, any black man was, because of his race, excluded from the jury in Richardson's case, it was error on the part of the court in the trial, which was to be remedied by writ of error, not by *habeas corpus*. The Constitution of the United States does not secure to a black man the right to be tried by a jury composed in whole or in part of men of his race, nor does it secure to a white man the right to be tried by a jury composed in whole or in part of men of his race. The Constitution only secures to each person the right to be tried by a jury from which is not excluded, because of his race, any citizen, otherwise qualified, of the same race as that of the accused. *Ex parte Royall*, 117 U.S. 241, 252, 252; *In re Wood* [Publisher's note: "*In re Wood*" should be "*Wood v. Brush*"], 140 U.S. 278, 289; *Gibson v. Mississippi* [Publisher's note: "*Missippii*" should be "*Mississippi*,"] 162 U.S. 565. If you will read these cases you will perceive that there was not the slightest reason for the interference by the Circuit Court of the United States upon *habeas corpus* with the final action of the State Court, and

IN RE RICHARDSON

therefore the application for an appeal from the order of the Circuit Court denying the application made to it ought not to be granted. I should feel otherwise about this application if I could perceive that there was any possibility whatever that the Supreme Court would entertain jurisdiction of the case and consider it upon its merits. If the appeal were allowed, it would be dismissed on motion. The careless allowance of appeals in such cases has no other effect than to interfere with the ordinary administration of the criminal laws of the State. If the State court in the trial of the case has denied to the accused any right secured to him by the Constitution and laws of the United States, his remedy is not by *habeas corpus*. *Pepke vs Cronan*, 155 U.S. 100; *Andrews vs Swartz*, 155 [Publisher's note: "155" should be "156"] U.S. 272 [Publisher's note: There should be a period at the end of this sentence.]

Yours truly,  
/s/ John M. Harlan

Mr. C.P. Barrett,  
Spartanburgh, S.C.

[Publisher's note: This case should be captioned *Haack v. Brooklyn Labor Lyceum Association*. The original of this opinion was typed and recorded, with Justice Day's signature, in a letterbook. From the Papers of William R. Day, Box 2, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC; *see also Haack v. Brooklyn Labor Lyceum Association*, 87 N.Y.S. 814; 87 N.Y.S. 814; 89 N.Y.S. 888 (Sup. Ct. 1904); 97 N.Y.S. 1136 (Sup. Ct.); 78 N.E. 1104 (N.Y. 1906); 107 N.Y.S. 1128 (Sup. Ct. 1907).]

Canton O. June, 29, 1906

Mr. Percival S. Menken, Counsellor etc.  
c/o Menken Brothers,  
87 Nassau St. New York

Dear sir:-

I am in receipt of your letter of the 26 inst. Also by express records in cases Haak V. [Publisher's note: "Haak V." should be "Haack v."] Brooklyn Labor Lyceum Association.

I note your statement of the cases and grounds upon which you claim to have the right of a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the United States.

After examination of the records I am of the opinion that no federal question appears upon the record in suchwise as to entitle you to an allowance of the writ. [Publisher's note: "thewrit." should be "the writ."]

I therefore return to you by express today the records and papers received from you.

very truly yours,

/s/ William R. Day



[Publisher's note: This case should be captioned *Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. Wills*. The originals of the two letters that make up this opinion were typed and recorded, with Justice Day's signature on each, in a letterbook. From the Papers of William R. Day, Box 3, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC; see also *Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. Wills*, 240 U.S. 642 (1916).]

Feb. 20, 1914.

My dear Sir:

I have your favor of the 18th inst., asking for allowance of appeal in the case of *The Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. William V. Wills*, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of the Federal Contracting Co. The papers which you sent are evidently made out for allowance by the presiding Judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, in which the case was decided. That Circuit is assigned to Justice Lurton, and ordinarily you would be required to make the application to him. Owing to the fact that Justice Lurton is temporarily absent, I am willing to consider your petition for allowance of appeal, although myself assigned to the Sixth Circuit.

I am inclined to allow the appeal, and suggest that you revise your papers to that it will appear that the allowance is made by me as a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and reform the other papers accordingly. I notice that you have given person surety on the bond; I think it would be better if you would have it signed by some responsible surety company.

I herewith return the paper which, upon revision, you may send to me again.

Very truly yours,

/s/ William R. Day

E.B. Durfee, Esq.  
Scofield, Durfee & Scofield  
Marion, Ohio.

[Publisher's note: A handwritten "539" and a check mark appear at the top of the February 23 letter.]

Feb. 23, 1914.

My dear Sir:

I am in receipt of yours of the 21st inst., enclosing papers for allowance of appeal in the case of *The Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co. v. Willis*

FAIRBANKS STEAM SHOVEL CO. v. WILLS

[Publisher's note: "Willis" should be "Wills".], Trustee, etc. I return them herewith, with order allowing appeal and citation signed and bond approved, as requested.

Very truly yours,

/s/ William R. Day

E.B. Durfee, Esq.  
Scofield, Durfee & Scofield  
Marion, Ohio.



[Publisher's note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper, quoting a version handwritten by Justice Burton on the motion itself and dated "December 22, 1956". From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 28 (OT56 Fil-Sch); *see also In re Portell*, 245 F.2d 183 (7th Cir. 1957).]

December 26, 1956.

Morris A. Shenker, Esquire,  
408 Olive Street, Suite 802,  
St. Louis, Missouri.

RE: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. PORTELL

Dear Mr. Shenker:

This letter is in confirmation of the action in the above-entitled case by Justices Burton and Douglas, respectively, and in confirmation of telegrams dispatched to you by this office on December 22nd and 24th, with respect to such action.

On December 22nd, Mr. Justice Burton denied the application for admission to bail in the following language:

"December 22, 1956 -

Upon consideration of the within motion, filed December 17, 1956, to admit to bail to appellant, who is now in custody pursuant to a commitment for civil contempt, and the brief in support of such motion, together with the memorandum for the United States, filed to-day, in opposition and a transcript of the contempt proceedings in the District Court of November 29 and December 6, 1956, and noting the denial by the District Court and the Court of Appeals on similar motions for bail, oral argument here is deemed unnecessary, and the motion for admission to bail is denied.

Treating such motion also as an application to stay the execution of the civil contempt order, such application is denied.

HAROLD H. BURTON  
Associate Justice assigned as Circuit  
Justice to the Seventh Judicial Circuit."

UNITED STATES v. PORTELL

On December 24th, Mr. Justice Douglas denied the application, referred to herein, with the simple endorsement

“Denied - Wm. O. DOUGLAS - 12/24/56.”

Very truly yours,  
JOHN T. FEY, Clerk  
BY

CJDG:tw

Deputy.

[Publisher's note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper, quoting a version handwritten by Justice Frankfurter on the application itself and dated "Aug. 7/57". From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 28 (OT56 Fil-Sch); *see also Oerlikon Machine Tool Works Buehrle & Co. v. United States*, 151 F. Supp. 332 (Ct. Cl. 1957).]

August 7, 1957

Ralph A. Gilchrist, Esq.  
1200 - 18th Street, N.W.  
Washington 6, D.C.

RE: OERLIKON MACHINE TOOL WORKS  
BUEHRLE & CO. v. UNITED STATES:

Dear Sir:

Confirming our telephone conversation, I quote below the endorsement of Mr. Justice Frankfurter on your application for an extension of time within which to file a petition for certiorari in the above-entitled cause:

“To change counsel the last day for filing a petition for certiorari — particularly since no suggestion is even offered that original counsel were incompetent — is, for me, a wholly inadmissible reason for granting an extension.”

Aug. 7/57

Frankfurter, J.

Yours truly,  
JOHN T. FEY, Clerk  
By

E.P. Cullinan,  
Deputy.

EPC:ht

[Publisher's note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper, quoting a version handwritten by Justice Frankfurter on the motion itself and dated "July 16/58". From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 35 (OT58 Ne-Tu); see also *Ramirez-Pabon v. Board of Personnel of Puerto Rico*, 254 F.2d 1 (2d Cir. 1958).]

July 16, 1958

Santos P. Amadeo, Esq.  
Professor of Law  
University of Puerto Rico  
San Juan, Puerto Rico

RE: PASON [Publisher's note: "PASON" should be "PABON".] v. BOARD OF PERSONNEL OF PUERTO RICO, ETC., No. ---, October Term, 1958:

Dear Sir:

Your application for an extension of time to file a petition for certiorari, together with a certified copy of the record, was presented to Mr. Justice Frankfurter who has today endorsed thereon:

"Petitioner is asking for an extension of time to file a certiorari at a time when she had thirty days remaining within which to file such a petition. The reason for the request is 'inability' to get counsel other than the one who represented petitioner in the Court of Appeals. This is not, in my view, considering the merits of the case, a sufficient reason to extend the statutory period of ninety days. The most plausible grounds for a petition for certiorari can be briefly stated. Application denied."

The certified record accompanying your application is returned herewith.

Very truly yours,  
JOHN T. FEY, Clerk  
By

Encl.  
EPC:ht  
AIRMAIL

E.P. Cullinan,  
Deputy.

[Publisher’s note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper, quoting a typewritten version (signed and dated “1/31/59 1<sup>30</sup> pm” in Chief Justice Warren’s hand) inserted at the bottom of the motion itself. Also inserted on the motion was an intermediate order (signed and dated “1/30/59 1<sup>am</sup>” in Chief Justice Warren’s hand) that reads as follows:

This motion does not conform to our Rule 35 in that it fails to state the grounds on which it is based and is not accompanied by proof of service on respondents. If counsel desire they may supply these defects by five o’clock p.m. today. Respondents may, if they desire, file a response by eleven o’clock tomorrow morning, and the motion will be decided on the papers.

From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 33 (OT58 A-Dar); *see also Hamm v. County School Bd. of Arlington County, Va.*, 263 F.2d 226 (4th Cir. 1959).]

February 2, 1959

Frank L. Ball, Esq.  
Ball Building  
Court House Road  
Arlington, Va.

RE: COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD OF ARLINGTON  
COUNTY, VIRGINIA, ET AL. v.  
DESKINS, ET AL.

Dear Mr. Ball:

Confirming our telephone conversation of Saturday, January 31, I quote below the order entered by the Chief Justice on January 31 in the above-captioned cause:

“Upon consideration of the memorandum in support of the application and of the opposition thereto, I conclude that the test of extraordinary showing required in these circumstances by Magnum Import Co. v. Coty, 262 U.S. 159, 164, has not been met.



COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD OF ARLINGTON v. DESKINS

“The ‘Motion for Recall and Stay of Mandate of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit’ is denied.”

1/31/59 1<sup>30</sup> p.m. /S/ Earl Warren  
C.J.

Very truly yours,  
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk  
By

E.P. Cullinan,  
Deputy.

EPC:ht

cc: James H. Simmonds, Esq.  
1500 N. Court House Road  
Arlington, Va.

[Publisher's note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper, quoting a version handwritten by Justice Whittaker on the motion itself and dated "June 29, 1959". From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 35 (OT58 Ne-Tu); *see also Shelton v. Tucker*, 364 U.S. 479 (1960).]

June 29, 1959

Robert L. Carter, Esquire  
20 West 40th Street  
New York 18, N.Y.

RE: SHELTON, ET AL. v. McKINLEY, ET AL.

Dear Sir:

Your application for stay in the above-entitled case was presented to Mr. Justice Whittaker, who was returned it to this office with the following endorsement:

"The challenged portion of the Judgment rejected appellants contention that Act 10 is unconstitutional and thus left that Act standing. The requested "stay" of that portion of the Judgment, if granted, would still leave that Act standing and be fruitless. What appellants appear, inferentially and in effect, to ask is that I, a single Justice, issue an injunction, enjoining not the challenged portion of the Judgment but Act 10 itself pending determination by this court of appellants appeal. That I decline to do. This application is therefore denied. Charles E. Whittaker. June 20 [Publisher's note: "20" should be "29"]., 1959."

Very truly yours,  
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk  
By

Michael Rodak, Jr.  
Assistant

MRjr:jmh

[Publisher's note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper, quoting a version handwritten by Justice Black on the application itself and dated "July 20, 59". From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 38 (OT59 Gu-Na); *see also Keith v. New York*, 1 Rapp 218 (Harlan, J., in chambers); 359 U.S. 998 (1959).]

July 20, 1959

Nathan Kestnbaum, Esquire  
110 East 42nd Street  
New York 17, New York

RE: LEROY KEITH VS. NEW YORK

Dear Sir:

This is to advise you that Mr. Justice Black today denied the application for stay of execution in the above case with the following endorsement thereon:

“Application for stay denied. The questions presented here in this new independent proceeding were apparently all presented to the court in the original petition for certiorari and I am unable to find any circumstances that lead me to believe four votes for certiorari here could be enlisted.

July 20, 1959

Hugo L. Black”

Mr. Justice Stewart has also denied the application for stay with the endorsement “Denied. July 20, 1959.”

Yours truly,  
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk  
By

R. J. Blanchard  
Deputy

RJB:erl

cc: Irving Anolik, Esq.  
Assistant Dist. Attorney  
County of Bronx  
New York, New York

[Publisher's note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper. From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 37 (OT59 Bunn-Gr).]

September 28, 1959

Fred Crane, Esquire  
P.O. Box 200  
Fairbanks, Alaska

RE: DEERE v. UNITED STATES

Dear Sir:

This will confirm my telegram of today's date, and advise you that your application for stay of execution in the above-entitled cause was presented to Mr. Justice Black, who returned it to this office with the following endorsement thereon:

“Petition for stay of execution denied since the facts set out in the present application fail to show that certiorari is available under timeliness provisions of Rule 22. Hugo L. Black, Associate Justice. September 25, 1959.”

Very truly yours,  
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk  
By

R.J. Blanchard  
Deputy

RJB:jmh

AIR MAIL

[Publisher's note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper, quoting a typewritten version (initialed in Justice Harlan's hand and dated "April 4, 1960") attached the motion itself. From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 37 (OT59 Bunn-Gr); *see also United States v. Guterma*, 281 F.2d 742 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 364 U.S. 871 (1960); *Guterma v. United States*, 1 Rapp 245 (1960).]

April 5, 1960

Emanuel Eschwege, Esquire  
200 West 57th Street  
New York 19, New York

RE: EVELEIGH v. UNITED STATES

Dear Sir:

I write to advise that Mr. Justice Harlan on April 4th denied the application for bail pending appeal in the above case. The Justice has attached the following memorandum to the application:

“Petitioner's application for bail pending appeal was considered by the District Court and the Court of Appeals in conjunction with that of petitioner's co-defendant Guterma. Having considered the papers submitted by both sides, I am constrained to deny this application for the reasons stated in my Memorandum of March 18, 1960, denying a similar application of Guterma.

(S) JMH

J.M.H.

April 4, 1960.”

I am enclosing a copy of the Justice's memorandum in the case of Guterma v. United States.

Very truly yours,  
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk  
By

E.P. Cullinan  
Deputy

EPC:vmg  
Enclosure

[Publisher's note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper, quoting a version handwritten by Justice Frankfurter on the application itself and dated "July 5/60". From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 42 (OT60 G-Lon); *see also In re Harvey*, 168 N.E.2d 715 (N.Y. 1960).]

July 5, 1960

Ralph L. Ellis, Esq.  
Manning, Harnisch, Hollinger & Shea  
41 East 42nd Street  
New York 17, N.Y.

IN THE MATTER OF ROBERT E. HARVEY

Dear Mr. Ellis:

I write to advise you that Mr. Justice Frankfurter has today endorsed the following upon your application for stay In the Matter of Robert E. Harvey:

“Careful consideration leaves me with the firm conviction that the grounds on which a petition for certiorari is to be made are so unmeritorious that balancing the remoteness of its being granted with the threatened mootness for the State of Washington’s proceedings, for which the books, etc. are found to be necessary, the application for stay is denied.”

The records and briefs accompanying your letter are returned herewith.

Very truly yours,  
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk  
By

Encl.  
EPC:ht

E.P. Cullinan,  
Deputy.

[Publisher's note: This opinion was handwritten by Justice Frankfurter on a piece of his chambers stationary. Typed copies were distributed to counsel for the parties and to Justice John Marshall Harlan. From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 42 (OT60 G-Lon); see also *Long Island R. Co. v. New York Cent. R. Co.*, 281 F.2d 379 (2d Cir. 1960).]

<u>The Long Island Railroad</u>	)	
<u>Company, et al.</u>	)	
Petitioners	)	
vs.	)	Application for a stay
<u>The New York Central R.R.</u>	)	

The issue which will be tendered by the petition for certiorari to be filed has been decided against the petitioners by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the District Court and the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Having fully considered the issue, I cannot bring myself to believe that a petition for certiorari will be granted to review the judgment below or that it would be reversed. Accordingly, I do not feel justified to overrule the Court of Appeals in denying a stay.

Felix Frankfurter  
Associate Justice

August 1, 1960

[Publisher's note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper, quoting a version handwritten by Justice Harlan on the motion itself and dated "12/12/60". From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 42 (OT60 G-Lon); see also *Hirsch v. Bruchhausen*, 284 F.2d 783 (2d Cir. 1960).]

December 12, 1960

Leonard W. Wagman, Esquire  
60 East 42d Street  
New York 17, N.Y.

RE: MYRTLE G. HIRSCH, ET AL. v. UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Dear Sir:

Your application for stay, together with opposition thereto, in the above-captioned cause was presented to Mr. Justice Harlan, who has today denied the application with the following endorsement thereon:

“I can find no equity in this application nor any other reason for granting the stay which the Court of Appeals has denied. Application denied.

12/12/60    JMH.”

Very truly yours,  
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk  
By

E.P. Cullinan  
Deputy

EPC:jmh

cc: Martin Rosen, Esquire  
170 Broadway  
New York 38, N.Y.

A. Daniel Fusaro, Esquire  
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals  
for the Second Circuit  
New York 7, N.Y.



[Publisher's note: This opinion was typed on a sheet of plain paper. From RG 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States, Entry 30 – Applications for Actions by the Court, 1929-1989, Box 42 (OT60 G-Lon); see also *Local 1545, United Broth. of Carpenters and Joiners of America, AFL-CIO v. Vincent*, 286 F.2d 127 (2d Cir. 1960).]

February 1, 1961

Charles H. Tuttle, Esquire  
15 Broad Street  
New York 5, N.Y.

RE: LOCAL 1545, UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF  
CARPENTERS, ETC. v. VINCENT, ET AL.

Dear Sir:

Your application for a stay of the enforcement of the Decision and Direction of Election by the N.L.R.B., dated August 24, 1960, in the above-entitled cause was presented to Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who denied the application on January 31, 1961 with the following endorsement thereon:

“With due regard to the merits of the decision proposed to be reviewed on a petition for certiorari and balancing the respective equities of the parties, on a claim of “irreparable damage”, granting the application for a stay would, under the particular circumstances here, in effect give the losing litigant what it would have had had the Court of Appeals decided in its favor. Stay denied.

January 31/61

Frankfurter, J.”

Very truly yours,  
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk  
By

R.J. Blanchard  
Deputy

RJB:jmh

cc: Mr. Justice Harlan  
The Honorable Archibald Cox  
The Honorable Henry J. Friendly  
Martin Raphael, Esquire

[Publisher’s note: See 559 U.S. \_\_\_\_ for the official version.]

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

No. 09A807)

---

HARRY R. JACKSON ET AL. v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD  
OF ELECTIONS AND ETHICS ET AL.

ON APPLICATION FOR STAY

[March 2, 2010]

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, Circuit Justice.

Petitioners in this case are Washington D.C. voters who would like to subject the District of Columbia’s Religious Freedom and Civil Marriage Equality Amendment Act of 2009 to a public referendum before it goes into effect, pursuant to procedures set forth in the D. C. Charter. See D.C. Code §§ 1-204.101 to 1-204.107 (2001-2006). The Act expands the definition of marriage in the District to include same-sex couples. See D.C. Act 18-248; 57 D.C. Reg. 27 (Jan. 1, 2010).

The D.C. Charter specifies that legislation enacted by the D.C. Council may be blocked if a sufficient number of voters request a referendum on the issue. D. C. Code § 1-204.102. The Council, however, purported in 1979 to exempt from this provision any referendum that would violate the D. C. Human Rights Act. See §§ 1-1001.16(b)(1)(C), 2-1402.73 (2001-2007). The D.C. Board of Elections, D.C. Superior Court, and D.C. Court of Appeals denied petitioners’ request for a referendum on the grounds that the referendum would violate the Human Rights Act.

Petitioners argue that this action was improper, because D.C. Council legislation providing that a referendum is not required cannot trump a provision of the D.C. Charter specifying that a referendum *is* required. See *Price v. District of Columbia Bd. of Elections*, 645 A. 2d 594, 599-600 (D.C. 1994). They point out that if the Act does become law, they will permanently lose any right to pursue a referendum under the Charter. See § 1-204.102(b)(2) (2001-2006). Petitioners ask the Court for a stay that would prevent the Act from going into effect, as expected, on March 3, 2010.

This argument has some force. Without addressing the merits of petitioners’ underlying claim, however, I conclude that a stay is not warranted. First, as “a matter of judicial policy” — if not “judicial power” — “it

JACKSON v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
BD. OF ELECTIONS AND ETHICS

has been the practice of the Court to defer to the decisions of the courts of the District of Columbia on matters of exclusively local concern.” *Whalen v. United States*, 445 U. S. 684, 687 (1980); see also *Fisher v. United States*, 328 U. S. 463, 476 (1946).

Second, the Act at issue was adopted by the Council and placed before Congress for the 30-day period of review required by the D.C. Charter, see § 1-206.02(c)(1). A joint resolution of disapproval by Congress would prevent the Act from going into effect, but Congress has chosen not to act. The challenged provision purporting to exempt certain D.C. Council actions from the referendum process, § 1-1001.16(b)(1)(C), was itself subject to review by Congress before it went into effect. While these considerations are of course not determinative of the legal issues, they do weigh against granting petitioners’ request for a stay, given that the concern is that action by the Council violates an Act of Congress.

Finally, while petitioners’ challenge to the Act by way of a referendum apparently will become moot when the Act goes into effect, petitioners have also pursued a ballot initiative, under related procedures in the D.C. Charter, that would give D.C. voters a similar opportunity to repeal the Act if they so choose. See §§ 1-204.101 to 1-204.107; *Jackson v. District of Columbia Bd. of Elections and Ethics*, Civ. A. No. 2009 CA 008613 B (D.C. Super., Jan. 14, 2010). Their separate petition for a ballot initiative is now awaiting consideration by the D.C. Court of Appeals, which will need to address many of the same legal questions that petitioners have raised here. Unlike their petition for a referendum, however, the request for an initiative will not become moot when the Act becomes law. On the contrary, the D.C. Court of Appeals will have the chance to consider the relevant legal questions on their merits, and petitioners will have the right to challenge any adverse decision through a petition for certiorari in this Court at the appropriate time.

The foregoing considerations, taken together, lead me to conclude that the Court is unlikely to grant certiorari in this case. Accordingly, the request for a stay is denied.

*It is so ordered.*

[Publisher’s note: See 561 U.S. \_\_\_\_ for the official version.]

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

No. 10A273)

---

PHILIP MORRIS USA INC. ET AL. v. GLORIA SCOTT ET AL.

ON APPLICATION FOR STAY

[September 24, 2010]

JUSTICE SCALIA, Circuit Justice.

Respondents brought this class action against several tobacco companies on behalf of all Louisiana smokers. The suit alleged that the companies defrauded the plaintiff class by “distort[ing] the entire body of public knowledge” about the addictive effects of nicotine. *Scott v. American Tobacco Co.*, 2004-2095, p. 14. (La. App. 2/7/07) 949 So. 2d 1266, 1277. The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeal of Louisiana granted relief on that theory, and entered a judgment requiring applicants to pay \$241,540,488 (plus accumulated interest of about \$29 million) to fund a 10-year smoking cessation program for the benefit of the members of the plaintiff class. *Scott v. American Tobacco Co.*, 2009-0461, p. 21-23 (5/5/10) 36 So. 3d 1046, 1059-1060. (Still to be determined are the allowable attorney’s fees, which will likely be requested in the tens of millions of dollars.) The Supreme Court of Louisiana declined review. *Scott v. American Tobacco Co.*, 2010-1361 (9/3/10), \_\_\_\_ So. 3d \_\_\_\_\_. The applicants have asked me, in my capacity as Circuit Justice for the Fifth Circuit, to stay the judgment until this Court can act on their intended petition for a writ of certiorari.

A single Justice has authority to enter such a stay, 28 U. S. C. § 2101(f), but the applicant bears a heavy burden. It is our settled practice to grant a stay only when three conditions are met: First, there must be a reasonable probability that certiorari will be granted (or probable jurisdiction noted). Second, there must be a significant possibility that the judgment below will be reversed. And third, assuming the applicant’s position on the merits is correct, there must be a likelihood of irreparable harm if the judgment is not stayed. *Barnes v. E-Systems, Inc. Group Hospital Medical & Surgical Ins. Plan*, 501 U. S. 1301, 1302 (1991) (SCALIA, J., in chambers). I conclude that this standard is met.

Applicants complain of many violations of due process, including (among others) denial of the opportunity to cross-examine the named representatives of the class, factually unsupported estimations of the number of class members entitled to relief, and constant revision of the legal basis for the plaintiffs' claim during the course of litigation. Even though the judgment that is the alleged consequence of these claimed errors is massive — more than \$250 million — I would not be inclined to believe that this Court would grant certiorari to consider these fact-bound contentions that may have no effect on other cases.

But one asserted error in particular (and perhaps some of the others as well) implicates constitutional constraints on the allowable alteration of normal process in class actions. This is a fraud case, and in Louisiana the tort of fraud normally requires proof that the plaintiff detrimentally relied on the defendant's misrepresentations. 949 So. 2d, at 1277. Accordingly, the Court of Appeal indicated that members of the plaintiff class who wish to seek individual damages, rather than just access to smoking cessation measures, would have to establish their own reliance on the alleged distortions. *Ibid.* But the Court of Appeal held that this element need *not* be proved insofar as the class seeks payment into a fund that will *benefit* individual plaintiffs, since the defendants are guilty of a “distort[ion of] the entire body of public knowledge” on which the “class as a whole” has relied. *Id.*, at 1277-1278. Thus, the court eliminated any need for plaintiffs to prove, and denied any opportunity for applicants to contest, that any particular plaintiff who benefits from the judgment (much less all of them) believed applicants' distortions and continued to smoke as a result.

Applicants allege that this violates their due-process right to “an opportunity to present every available defense.” *Lindsey v. Normet*, 405 U. S. 56, 66 (1972) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting *American Surety Co. v. Baldwin*, 287 U. S. 156, 168 (1932)). Respondents concede that due process requires such an opportunity, but they contend that the intermediate state court's pronouncement means that, as a matter of Louisiana's substantive law, applicants *have* no nonreliance defense. That response may ultimately prove persuasive, but at this stage it serves to describe the issue rather than resolve it. The apparent consequence of the Court of Appeal's holding is that individual plaintiffs who could not recover had they sued separately *can* recover only because their claims were aggregated with others' through the procedural device of the class action.

The extent to which class treatment may constitutionally reduce the normal requirements of due process is an important question. National concern over abuse of the class-action device induced Congress to permit removal of most major class actions to federal court, see 28 U. S. C.

§ 1332(d), where they will be subject to the significant limitations of the Federal Rules. Federal removal jurisdiction has not been accorded, however, over many class actions in which more than two-thirds of the plaintiff class are citizens of the forum State. See §1332(d)(4). Because the class here was drawn to include only residents of Louisiana, this suit typifies the sort of major class action that often will not be removable, and in which the constraints of the Due Process Clause will be the only federal protection. There is no conflict between federal courts of appeals or between state supreme courts on the principal issue I have described; but the former seems impossible, since by definition only state class actions are at issue; and the latter seems implausible, unless one posits the unlikely case where the novel approach to class-action liability is a legislative rather than judicial creation, or the creation of a lower state court disapproved by the state supreme court on federal constitutional grounds. This constitutional issue ought not to be permanently beyond our review.

Given those considerations, I conclude applicants have satisfied the prerequisites for a stay. I think it reasonably probable that four Justices will vote to grant certiorari, and significantly possible that the judgment below will be reversed. As for irreparable harm: Normally the mere payment of money is not considered irreparable, see *Sampson v. Murray*, 415 U. S. 61, 90 (1974), but that is because money can usually be recovered from the person to whom it is paid. If expenditures cannot be recouped, the resulting loss may be irreparable. See, e.g., *Mori v. Boilermakers*, 454 U. S. 1301, 1303 (1981) (Rehnquist, J., in chambers). Here it appears that, before this Court will be able to consider and resolve applicants' claims, a substantial portion of the fund established by their payment will be irrevocably expended. Funds spent to provide anti-smoking counseling and devices will not likely be recoverable; nor, it seems, will the \$11,501,928 fee immediately payable toward administrative expenses in setting up the funded program.

That does not end the matter. A stay will not issue simply because the necessary conditions are satisfied. Rather, "sound equitable discretion will deny the stay when 'a decided balance of convenience'" weighs against it. *Barnes, supra*, at 1304-1305 (SCALIA, J., in chambers) (quoting *Magnum Import Co. v. Coty*, 262 U. S. 159, 164 (1923)). Here, however, the equities favor granting the application. Refusing a stay may visit an irreversible harm on applicants, but granting it will apparently do no permanent injury to respondents. Applicants allege that similar smoking-cessation measures are freely and readily available from other sources in Louisiana, and respondents have not disputed that. Under those circumstances, the equitable balance favors issuance of the stay.

The application for a stay of the execution of the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Louisiana, Fourth Circuit, is granted pending appli-

PHILIP MORRIS USA INC. v. SCOTT

cants' timely filing, and this Court's disposition, of a petition for a writ of certiorari.

*It is so ordered.*

[Publisher's note: See 561 U.S. \_\_\_\_ for the official version.]

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

No. 10A298

---

HERB LUX ET AL. v. NANCY RODRIGUES, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY  
AS A MEMBER OF THE VIRGINIA BOARD OF ELECTIONS, ET AL.

ON APPLICATION FOR INJUNCTION

[September 30, 2010]

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, Circuit Justice.

Herb Lux has filed with me as Circuit Justice for the Fourth Circuit an application for an injunction pending appeal. Lux seeks an injunction requiring the Virginia State Board of Elections to count signatures that he collected in an effort to place himself on the congressional ballot. The application is denied.

Lux is an independent candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives in Virginia's Seventh Congressional District. Under Virginia law, an independent candidate for Congress must obtain 1,000 signatures from voters registered in the relevant congressional district in order to appear on the ballot. Va. Code Ann. § 24.2-506 (Lexis 2010 Cum. Supp.). That same provision requires, among other things, that each signature be witnessed by a resident of that district. *Ibid.*

Although Lux is a candidate for the Seventh District, he is a resident of Virginia's First District. As a result, he cannot serve as a witness for signatures from Seventh District residents. Despite that fact, Lux witnessed 1,063 of the 1,224 signatures collected on his behalf. The State Board of Elections refused to count those signatures. Lux unsuccessfully sought an injunction requiring the Board to do so from the District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia and from the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

To obtain injunctive relief from a Circuit Justice, an applicant must demonstrate that "the legal rights at issue are 'indisputably clear.'" *Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC*, 507 U.S. 1301, 1303 (1993) (Rehnquist, C.J., in chambers) (quoting *Communist Party of Ind. v. Whitcomb*, 409 U.S. 1235 (1972) (Rehnquist, J., in chambers)). A Circuit Justice's issuance of an injunction "does not simply suspend judicial alteration of the status quo but grants judicial intervention that has been with-



LUX v. RODRIGUES

held by lower courts,” and therefore “demands a significantly higher justification” than that required for a stay. *Ohio Citizens for Responsible Energy, Inc. v. NRC*, 479 U.S. 1312, 1313 (1986) (SCALIA, J., in chambers).

Lux does not meet this standard. He may very well be correct that the Fourth Circuit precedent relied on by the District Court — *Libertarian Party of Va. v. Davis*, 766 F.2d 865 (1985) — has been undermined by our more recent decisions addressing the validity of petition circulation restrictions. See *Meyer v. Grant*, 486 U.S. 414, 422, 428 (1988) (invalidating a law criminalizing circulator compensation and describing petition circulation as “core political speech”); *Buckley v. American Constitutional Law Foundation, Inc.*, 525 U.S. 182, 186-187 (1999) (holding unconstitutional a requirement that initiative petition circulators be registered voters). At the same time, we were careful in *American Constitutional Law Foundation* to differentiate between registration requirements, which were before the Court, and residency requirements, which were not. *Id.*, at 197. Lux himself notes that the courts of appeals appear to be reaching divergent results in this area, at least with respect to the validity of state residency requirements. Application 13-14. Accordingly, even if the reasoning in *Meyer* and *American Constitutional Law Foundation* does support Lux’s claim, it cannot be said that his right to relief is “indisputably clear.”

*It is so ordered.*

GB