

William & Mary Law School

William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository

Supreme Court Preview

Conferences, Events, and Lectures

9-2011

2011-2012 Supreme Court Preview: Contents

Institute of Bill of Rights Law, William & Mary Law School

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/preview>

Repository Citation

Institute of Bill of Rights Law, William & Mary Law School, "2011-2012 Supreme Court Preview: Contents" (2011). *Supreme Court Preview*. 7.

<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/preview/7>

Copyright c 2011 by the authors. This article is brought to you by the William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository.

<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/preview>



SUPREME COURT PREVIEW

What to Expect
From the New Term
September 23 & 24, 2011

2011-2012 Supreme Court Preview

The Institute of Bill of Rights Law

THE INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW was established at William & Mary in 1982 to support research and education on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. One of the principal missions of the Institute is to facilitate interaction between the professions of law and journalism. Through a discussion of key cases on the Supreme Court's docket at the start of each term, the annual SUPREME COURT PREVIEW provides in-depth education for journalists on the underlying issues to enhance press coverage of the decisions.

NEAL DEVINS

Goodrich Professor of Law

Director of the Institute of Bill of Rights Law

MELODY S. NICHOLS

Assistant Director of the Institute of Bill of Rights Law

REBECCA GREEN

Professor of Practice


LINDA QUIGLEY

Adjunct Professor of Law

Consultant to the Institute of Bill of Rights Law for the Supreme Court Preview

Lead Student Editor

JOHN A. FISHER



THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM & MARY

SCHOOL OF LAW

WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA 23187-8795

(757) 221-3810 • FAX (757) 221-3775

IBRL@wm.edu • <http://www.IBRL.org>

2011-2012 Supreme Court Preview

Table of Contents

Introduction

In This Section:

Schedule of Events	p. i
Panel Members	p. ii

I. Moot Court

In This Section:

New Case: 10-1259 <i>United States v. Jones</i>	p. 2
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 2
“SUPREME COURT TO DECIDE WHETHER POLICE CAN ATTACH GPS DEVICE TO A CAR WITHOUT A WARRANT” David G. Savage	p. 19
“COURT ASKED TO BALANCE INFORMATION AGE ADVANCES WITH CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS” Robert Barnes	p. 20
“APPEALS COURT LIMITS USE OF GPS TO TRACK SUSPECTS” Spencer S. Hsu	p. 22
“SUPREME COURT AGREES TO REVIEW CASE ON GPS AND THE FOURTH AMENDMENT” Orin Kerr	p. 24
“THE COURT AGREES TO HEAR A CASE ABOUT WARRANTLESS GPS TRACKING ON CARS” Walter Dellinger	p. 25
“POLICE AND HIGH-TECH MONITORING” Lyle Denniston	p. 27

II. Structure

In This Section:

New Case: 10-699 <i>M.B.Z. v. Clinton</i>	p. 32
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 32
“‘JERUSALEM’ OR ‘ISRAEL?’ SUPREME COURT CASE RAISES TROVE OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS” Robert Barnes	p. 45
“A POLITICAL QUESTION, OR A JUDICIAL ONE—AND THEN WHAT?” Matthew J. Franck	p. 47
New Case:	p. 49
09-958 <i>Maxwell-Jolly v. Independent Living Center of Southern California</i> 09-1158 <i>Maxwell-Jolly v. California Pharmacists Association</i> 10-283 <i>Maxwell-Jolly v. Santa Rosa Memorial Hospital</i>	
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 49
“U.S. SUPREME COURT TO DECIDE IF CALIFORNIA CAN CUT PAYMENTS TO MEDI-CAL PROVIDERS” David Savage & Shane Goldmacher	p. 62
“THE OTHER HEALTHCARE LAWSUIT: CALIFORNIA MEDICAID (AKA MEDI-CAL) CASE HEADED TO SUPREME COURT” Marilyn Chase, <i>Kaiser Health News</i>	p. 64
“STATE CAN’T CUT MEDI-CAL PAYMENTS TO HOSPITALS” Bob Egelko	p. 67
“FEDERAL COURT RULES AGAINST CALIFORNIA MEDICAID CUTS” Tom Gilroy, <i>BNA</i>	p. 69
“HEALTHCARE PROGRAMS MAY END: GOVERNOR’S REVISED BUDGET IS EXPECTED TO CALL FOR AXING SOME HE COULDN’T SCALE BACK” Evan Halper	p. 71
“ADMINISTRATION OPPOSES CHALLENGES TO MEDICAID CUTS” Robert Pear	p. 73
New Case: 10-1016 <i>Coleman v. Maryland Court of Appeals</i>	p. 75
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 75

“SUPREME COURT TAKES MARYLAND FMLA CASE” Steve Lash	p. 80
“PSU LAW CLINIC RIDES LEAVE LAW TUFF TO HIGH COURT” Jen Zimmerman, <i>The Legal Intelligencer</i>	p. 82
“4TH CIRCUIT UPHOLDS DISMISSAL OF RACE DISCRIMINATION CASE” Steve Lash	p. 84
New Case: 10-1195 <i>Mims v. Arrow Financial Services, LLC</i>	p. 86
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 86
“A QUESTION WORTH ANSWERING UNDER THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT” Judith L. Harris & Amy S. Mushahwar	p. 88
New Case: 10-1207 <i>Williams v. Maryland (looking ahead)</i>	p. 91
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 91
“CERT. PETITION IN RIGHT TO CARRY CASE” David Kopel	p. 101
“MARYLAND HANDGUN LAWS RULED OUTSIDE SCOPE OF SECOND AMENDMENT” Danny Jacobs	p. 103
“HIGHEST COURT OF MARYLAND HOLDS THAT SECOND AMENDMENT DOES NOT PROTECT CARRYING (CONCEALED OR NOT) OF GUNS OUTSIDE THE HOME” Eugene Volokh	p. 105
New Case: 10-11212 <i>Masciandaro v. United States (looking ahead)</i>	p. 107
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 107
“CASES LINING UP TO ASK SUPREME COURT TO CLARIFY SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS” Robert Barnes	p. 121

III. Criminal

In This Section:

New Case: 10-945 <i>Florence v. Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Burlington</i>	p. 126
--	--------

Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 126
“HIGH COURT TO EXAMINE STRIP SEARCHES FOR MINOR OFFENSES” Bill Mears	p. 138
“N.J. MAN AND 2 COUNTIES BATTLE OVER CONSTITUTIONALITY OF BLANKET STRIP-SEARCHES FOR ALL INMATES” Jason Grant	p. 140
“NO CRIME, BUT AN ARREST AND TWO STRIP-SEARCHES” Adam Liptak	p. 143
New Case: 10-8145 <i>Smith v. Louisiana</i>	p. 145
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 145
“BRADY AND THE NEW ORLEANS DA: ANOTHER LOOK” Lyle Denniston	p. 164
“U.S. JUSTICES WEIGH ANOTHER CASE INVOLVING CLAIMS OF PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT IN NEW ORLEANS” John Simermn	p. 166
New Case: 10-63 <i>Maples v. Thomas</i>	p. 168
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 168
“SUPREME COURT SAYS NO TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE REVIEW, YES TO DEATH ROW INMATE APPEAL” Robert Barnes	p. 177
“SULLIVAN & CROMWELL’S LIFE-OR-DEATH MISTAKE?” Kashmir Hill	p. 178
“ALABAMA PLANS DEATH PENALTY DESPITE PAPERWORK MIX-UP” Ed Pilkington	p. 180
“PRO BONO AND BIG LAW FIRMS (OR WHO EXACTLY WAS CORY MAPLES’S LAWYER?)” Jason Mazzone	p. 182
New Case: 10-680 <i>Howes v. Fields</i>	p. 185
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 185
“SCOPE OF <i>MIRANDA</i> IN JAIL” Lyle Denniston	p. 197

“GUAM JOINS <i>MIRANDA</i> SUIT IN HIGH COURT” Steve Limtiaco	p. 198
New Case: 10-704 <i>Messerschmidt v. Millender</i>	p. 199
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 199
“CERT. GRANT IN <i>MILLENDER V. LA</i> : QUALIFIED IMMUNITY FOR AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL GENERAL WARRANT TO SEIZE FIREARMS?” David Kopel	p. 219
“SEARCHES FOR GUNS AT THE HOME OF A SUSPECT’S FAMILY MEMBER” Eugene Volokh	p. 221
New Case: 10-8505 <i>Williams v. Illinois</i>	p. 222
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 222
“TWO MORE CASES GRANTED” Lyle Denniston	p. 238
“INDEPENDENCE DAY, TAKE 3: WHY I THINK THAT THE SUPREME COURT WILL FIND NO CONFRONTATION CLAUSE VIOLATION IN <i>WILLIAMS V. ILLINOIS</i> ” Colin Miller	p. 239
“INITIAL THOUGHTS ON <i>WILLIAMS</i> ” Richard Friedman	p. 243
New Case: 10-637 <i>Greene v. Fisher</i>	p. 247
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 247
“Supreme Court Grants Two Clinic Cert Petitions” <i>Stanford Law School Blog</i>	p. 266
“THORNY HABEAS RULE WILL GET HIGH COURT ROAD MAP” <i>Courthouse News Service</i>	p. 267
“CLEARLY ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW IS DETERMINED AS OF THE DATE OF THE RELEVANT STATE-COURT DECISION SUBJECT TO HABEAS REVIEW “ Melinda Ghilardi	p. 269

IV. First Amendment

In This Section:

New Case: 10-545 <i>Golan v. Holder</i>	p. 272
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 272
“CAN CONGRESS RESTORE FOREIGN PUBLIC DOMAIN COPYRIGHT PROTECTIONS?” Corynne McSherry	p. 286
“ONCE IN THE PUBLIC’S HANDS, NOW BACK IN PICASSO’S” Adam Liptak	p. 289
“SUPREME COURT TAKES UP SCHOLARS’ RIGHTS” Marc Parry	p. 291
“TENTH CIRCUIT VICTORY FOR COPYRIGHT OWNERS” Henry Z. Horbaczewski	p. 295
New Case: 10-553 <i>Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC</i>	p. 297
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 297
“HIGH COURT TO WEIGH BIAS EXEMPTION FOR RELIGIOUS TEACHERS” Mark Walsh	p. 307
“ <i>PERICH VS. THE PARISH</i> : 6TH CIRCUIT SAYS TEACHER NOT MINISTERIAL EMPLOYEE” Brian Frasier	p. 309
“HOSANNA-TABOR CASE TO TEST OUR CHURCH-STATE DIVIDE” Richard W. Garnett	p. 312
“SHOULD RELIGIONS BE ALLOWED TO DISCRIMINATE?” Marci A. Hamilton	p. 314
New Case: 10-1293 <i>Federal Communications Commission v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.</i>	p. 316
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 316
“FCC’S RULES AGAINST NUDITY, PROFANITY WILL BE REVIEWED” Brent Kendall & Amy Schatz	p. 329

“JUSTICES AGREE TO CONSIDER F.C.C. RULES ON INDECENCY” Edward Wyatt	p. 330
“F.C.C. INDECENCY POLICY REJECTED ON APPEAL” Edward Wyatt	p. 332
“‘FLEETING EXPLETIVE’ BAN LIFTED” Lyle Denniston	p. 334
“SUPREME COURT RULES THAT GOVERNMENT CAN FINE FOR ‘FLEETING EXPLETIVES’” Robert Barnes	p. 336
New Case: 10-1121 <i>Knox v. Service Employees Int’l Union, Local 1000</i>	p. 338
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 338
“U.S. SUPREME COURT TO DECIDE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SPECIAL UNION FEES” Pat Murphy	p. 357
“U.S. SC WILL HEAR CASE INVOLVING UNION FEES” Jessica M. Karmasek	p. 358
“UNIONS AND FORCED POLITICAL SPEECH” Frank Miniter	p. 360
New Case: 10-1024 <i>Federal Aviation Administration v. Cooper</i>	p. 363
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 363
“SUPREME COURT TO REVIEW PILOT’S PRIVACY SUIT” Bob Egelko	p. 378
“EMOTIONAL INJURY AS PRIVACY HARM” William McGeeveran	p. 379
“GAY PILOT WINS NEW HEARING ON PRIVACY ACT DAMAGES” Arthur S. Leonard	p. 380
“THE NATURE OF PRIVACY HARMS: FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL HARM VS. EMOTIONAL AND MENTAL HARM” Daniel Solove	p. 382

V. Business

In This Section:

New Case: 10-1150 <i>Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc.</i>	p. 387
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 387
“PROMETHEUS: BOUND FOR CLARIFICATION OR CONFUSION?” James W. Morando & Julie Wahlstrand	p. 398
“MAJOR RULING FOR DOCTORS DUE” Lyle Denniston	p. 402
“CLINICAL METHOD CLAIMS DODGE A BULLET: <i>PROMETHEUS V. MAYO</i> ” Mr. James Mullen III, Ph.D., Matthew I. Kreeger & Yan Leychkis	p. 404
“COURT BACKS PATENTS FOR DIAGNOSTIC TESTS” Andrew Pollack	p. 407
New Case: 10-844 <i>Caraco Pharmaceutical Laboratories, Ltd. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i>	p. 409
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 409
“HIGH COURT TO HEAR GENERIC-DRUG CASE, REJECTS ABU GHRAIB CHALLENGE” Brent Kendall	p. 427
“ <i>NOVO NORDISK A/S V. CARACO PHARMACEUTICAL LABORATORIES, LTD.</i> ” Kevin E. Noonan	p. 428
New Case: 10-1062 <i>Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency</i>	p. 434
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 434
“SUPREME COURT TO HEAR EPA WETLAND CASE” Lawrence Hurley, <i>Greenwire</i>	p. 440
“EPA BEATS BACK CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE TO WATER ACT ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM” Aaron Lovell	p. 442
New Case: 10-948 <i>CompuCredit Corp. v. Greenwood</i>	p. 444
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 444
“RIGHTS OF THE SECOND-CHANCE CARDHOLDER” Lyle Denniston	p. 455

“NINTH CIRCUIT RULES THAT CONGRESS’S USE OF THE PHRASE “RIGHT TO SUE” PRECLUDED PARTIES FROM AGREEING TO ARBITRATE ANY DISPUTE” Louis M. Solomon	p. 457
“ARBITRATION AND CONSUMER PROTECTION” <i>Harvard Law Review Association</i>	p. 458
New Case: 10-1261 <i>Credit Suisse Securities v. Simmonds</i>	p. 462
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 462
“SUPREME COURT TO CONSIDER TIME LIMIT ON INSIDER-TRADING SUIT” Brent Kendall	p. 475
“HIGH COURT TO CONSIDER TIME LIMIT FOR DERIVATIVE CLAIMS” Evan Weinberger	p. 476
“SUPREME COURT GRANTS CERT IN YET ANOTHER SECURITIES CASE” Kevin LaCroix	p. 478
New Case: 10-1104 <i>Minneci v. Pollard</i>	p. 480
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 480
“NEW CURB ON <i>BIVENS</i> REMEDY” Lyle Denniston	p. 498
“PRISON INMATE MAY SUE EMPLOYEES OF PRIVATE FIRM, SAYS 9TH CIRCUIT” Pat Murphy	p. 500
“SHOULD PRIVATE PRISON GUARDS BE LIABLE UNDER <i>BIVENS</i> ” Shon R. Hopwood	p. 501
New Case: 10-1491 <i>Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Co.</i> (Looking Ahead)	p. 503
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 503
“MAJOR NEW CORPORATE CASE AT COURT” Lyle Denniston	p. 523
“CORPORATE EXECUTIVES: GET READY FOR A BILLION DOLLAR LAWSUIT” Ben Kerschberg	p. 525
“FURTHER THOUGHTS ON TODAY’S SECOND CIRCUIT ATS DECISION ON CORPORATE LIABILITY” Kenneth Anderson	p. 527