

2015

2015-2016 Supreme Court Preview: Contents

Institute of Bill of Rights Law at The College of William & Mary School of Law

Repository Citation

Institute of Bill of Rights Law at The College of William & Mary School of Law, "2015-2016 Supreme Court Preview: Contents" (2015). *Supreme Court Preview*. Paper 259.
<http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/preview/259>

Copyright c 2015 by the authors. This article is brought to you by the William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository.
<http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/preview>

2015-2016 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

KELSEY ROTHERA
Conference & Event Planner

REBECCA GREEN
Professor of Practice

Student Editors
VIOLET BOGGS
BENJAMIN HOLWERDA



WILLIAM & MARY
LAW SCHOOL

INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW

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>

2015-2016 Supreme Court Preview

Table of Contents

Introduction

In This Section:

Schedule of Events	p. i
Panel Members	p. ii

I. Moot Court: *Friedrichs v. California Teachers Association*

In This Section:

New Case: <i>Friedrichs v. California Teachers Association</i>	p. 2
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 2
“SUPREME COURT TAKES UP MAJOR CASE ON PUBLIC SECTOR UNION FEES” Lawrence Hurley	p. 5
“SUPREME COURT RULING COULD GIVE STRENGTH TO TEACHER SUIT” Allie Bidwell	p. 7
“THE END OF PUBLIC-EMPLOYEE UNIONS?” Garrett Epps	p. 10
“WHY AN UPCOMING SUPREME COURT CASE HAS TEACHERS UNIONS FEELING VERY, VERY NERVOUS” Laura Moser	p. 13
“HIGH COURT MAY DEAL UNIONS SERIOUS BLOW” Brian Mahoney	p. 15

II. Did the Roberts Court Turn Leftward?

In This Section:

“RIGHT DIVIDED, A DISCIPLINED LEFT STEERED THE SUPREME COURT” Adam Liptak	p. 19
“SUPREME COURT’S LIBERAL ADMIRERS GET REALITY CHECK” Josh Gerstein	p. 23

“THE NUMBERS ON THE EXTENT TO WHICH THIS WAS A ‘LIBERAL’ SUPREME COURT TERM” Tom Goldstein	p. 26
“HAS THE SUPREME COURT REALLY MOVED LEFTWARD THIS TERM?” Jonathan H. Adler	p. 28
“A FRACTIOUS MAJORITY” Eric Posner	p. 31
“WHY IS JOHN ROBERTS SIDING WITH THE SUPREME COURT’S LIBERALS?” Adam Winkler	p. 35
“A LIBERAL BUT RESTRAINED SUPREME COURT TERM” Jess Bravin	p. 38
“THE POLARIZED COURT” Adam Liptak	p. 41
“POLAR VISION” Linda Greenhouse	p. 46

III. Election Law

In This Section:

New Case: 14-940 <i>Evenwel v. Abbott</i>	p. 52
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 52
“SUPREME COURT AGREES TO SETTLE MEANING OF ‘ONE-PERSON ONE-VOTE’” Adam Liptak	p. 56
“ONLY VOTERS COUNT?” Richard Hasen	p. 59
“MISGUIDED HYSTERIA OVER <i>EVENWEL V. ABBOTT</i> ” Richard Pildes	p. 62
“ONE PERSON, ONE VOTE?” Garrett Epps	p. 66
“FEDERAL COURT REJECTS LATEST ATTEMPT TO CREATE DIFFERENT CLASSES OF CONSTITUENTS THROUGH EXCLUSIONARY REDISTRICTING” <i>MALDEF</i>	p. 70

New Case: 14-232 <i>Harris v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission</i>	p. 71
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 71
“NEW ARIZONA REDISTRICTING CASE GETS U.S. HIGH COURT REVIEW ” Greg Stohr	p. 106
“JUSTICES AGREE TO HEAR DISPUTE OVER UNION FEES, REAPPORTIONMENT” Robert Barnes	p. 107
“ARIZONA REPUBLICANS LOSE LEGAL CHALLENGES TO STATE VOTING MAP” Edvard Pettersson	p. 108
“SUPREME COURT UPHOLDS ARIZONA’S INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION” Samantha Lachman	p. 109

IV. Business

In This Section:

New Case: 13-1339 <i>Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins</i>	p. 115
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 115
“9 TH CIRCUIT REVIVES FCRA SUIT AGAINST SPOKEO SITE ” Kurt Orzeck	p. 119
“SCOTUS TO DECIDE IF ‘UNHARMED’ PLAINTIFFS HAVE RIGHT TO SUE” Alison Frankel	p. 121
“SUPREME COURT WEIGHS RIGHT TO SUE IN SPOKEO CASE” Jacob Gershman	p. 123
“NO INJURY? NO PROBLEM” Paul Scudato, Brittany Robbins & Thomas Crispi	p. 125
New Case: 14-840 <i>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission v. Electric Power Supply Association</i>	p. 127
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 127
“SUPREME COURT TO RULE ON BREAKS FOR CUTTING PEAK-DEMAND ENERGY USE” Robert Barnes & Chris Mooney	p. 147

“FERC GETS TOP U.S. COURT HEARING ON ENERGY-CONSERVATION RULE” Greg Stohr & Jonathan Crawford	p. 149
“ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY ASS’N V. FERC” <i>Harvard Law Review</i>	p. 152
New Case: 14-1146 <i>Tyson Foods Inc. v. Bouaphakeo</i>	p. 157
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 157
“HIGH COURT TOLD TO KILL TYSON WORKERS’ \$5.8M DON-DOFF AWARD” Kurt Orzeck	p. 167
“ROBERTS COURT TO REVIEW WAGE THEFT CLASS ACTION CASE” Jessica Mason Pieklo	p. 169
“GAME CHANGER?” Richard Alfred, Patrick Bannon, and Esther Slater McDonald	p. 171
New Case: 14-462 <i>DIRECTV, Inc. v. Imburgia</i>	p. 173
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 173
“U.S. SUPREME COURT AGREES TO HEAR DIRECTV ARBITRATION CASE” Lawrence Hurley	p. 179
“DIRECT TO ARBITRATION: ENFORCING ARBITRATION IN CONSUMER CONTRACTS” Wayne Yu	p. 180
“RECENT CALIFORNIA APPELLATE OPINION RAISES ISSUE OF <i>CONCEPTION’S</i> SCOPE” <i>National Law Review</i>	p. 182

V. Race

In This Section:

New Case: 14-981 <i>Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin</i>	p. 186
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 186
“SUPREME COURT TO WEIGH RACE IN COLLEGE ADMISSIONS ” Adam Liptak	p. 220

“FISHER V. TEXAS DISMISSED AGAIN; IS IT HEADED BACK TO SUPREME COURT?” Daniel Fisher	p. 223
“FINALLY! THE <i>FISHER</i> DECISION IN PLAIN ENGLISH” Amy Howe	p. 226
“EASY AA” Janelle Bouie	p. 228
“LOOMING SUPREME COURT BATTLE COULD BE A MAJOR BLOW TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION” Peter Jacobs	p. 231
New Case: 14-8349 <i>Foster v. Humphrey</i>	p. 233
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 233
“HIGH COURT TO CONSIDER APPEAL OVER EXCLUSION OF BLACK JURORS” <i>Associated Press</i>	p. 244
“WHY IS IT SO EASY FOR PROSECUTORS TO STRIKE BLACK JURORS?” Gilad Edelman	p. 245
“GEORGIA JUSTICE” Mark Joseph Stern	p. 249
New Case: 13-1496 <i>Dollar General Corp. v. The Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians</i>	p. 252
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 252
“SUPREME COURT TO RULE ON TRIBAL COURT POWER OVER NON-INDIANS” <i>Associated Press</i>	p. 255
“DOLGENCORP, INC. V. MISSISSIPPI BAND OF CHOCTAW INDIANS” <i>Harvard Law Review</i>	p. 256
“DOLLAR GENERAL URGES JUSTICES TO TACKLE TRIBAL JURISDICTIONS” Caroline Simson	p. 262
“DOLLAR GENERAL CORPORATION V. MISSISSIPPI BAND OF CHOCTAW INDIANS” Cass Madden	p. 264

VI. Criminal

In This Section:

New Case: 14-7505 <i>Hurst v. Florida</i>	p. 268
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 268
“SUPREME COURT TO REVIEW FLORIDA’S CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SYSTEM ” Jess Bravin	p. 284
“FLORIDA’S DEATH ROW COULD SEE VACANCIES IF SUPREME COURT RULES JURIES MUST BE UNANIMOUS” Larry Hannan	p. 286
“TALKING ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, COURT TO COURT” Linda Greenhouse	p. 292
“DEATH PENALTY IN FAST-FOOD SLAYING” <i>Pensacola News Journal</i>	p. 296
New Case: 14-449 <i>Kansas v. Carr</i>	p. 297
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 297
“CARR BROTHERS’ DEATH SENTENCES TO BE REVIEWED BY U.S. SUPREME COURT” Roxana Hegeman	p. 320
“HOW THE ‘WICHITA MASSACRE’ BECAME A FACTOR IN THE KANSAS GOV’S RACE” Ryan Lovelace	p. 322
“KANSAS COURT OVERTURNS BROTHER’S DEATH SENTENCES” <i>CBS</i>	p. 324
New Case: 14-7505 <i>Montgomery v. Louisiana</i>	p. 326
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 326
“THE SUPREME COURT TAKES ONE MORE LOOK AT LIFE SENTENCES FOR TEENS” Matt Stroud	p. 328
“U.S. SUPREME COURT TO CONSIDER BATON ROUGE CASE TO RE- EVALUATE LIFE SENTENCES FOR MURDERS BY JUVENILES” Joe Gyan Jr.	p. 329

“SUPREME COURT TO WEIGH RETROACTIVITY OF MANDATORY JLWOP” Gary Gately	p. 333
“LIVES HANG IN LIMBO: SCOTUS TO HEAR CASE ON WHETHER RULING PROHIBITING MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCES FOR JUVENILES APPLIES RETROACTIVELY” Allison B. Kingsmill	p. 336
New Case: 14-419 <i>Luis v. United States</i>	p. 339
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 339
“SUPREME COURT TO DECIDE WHETHER CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS HAVE RIGHT TO HIRE LAWYERS WITH FROZEN ASSETS” Samantha Lachman	p. 341
“HIGH COURT TO EYE ‘UNTAINTED’ ASSET FREEZES IN CRIMINAL SUITS” Jessica Corso	p. 343
“IF A DEFENDANT MUST FORFEIT ALL ASSETS, IS HER RIGHT TO COUNSEL VIOLATED?” Warren Richey	p. 345

VII. Supreme Court Bar

In This Section:

“AT AMERICA’S COURT OF LAST RESORT, A HANDFUL OF LAWYERS NOW DOMINATES THE DOCKET ” Joan Biskupic, Janet Roberts and John Shiffman	p. 349
“ANALYZING THE IMPACT OF THE SUPREME COURT BAR” Janet Roberts	p. 358
“ELITE LAW FIRMS SPIN GOLD FROM A RAREFIELD NICHE: GETTING CASES BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT” John Shiffman, Janet Roberts and Joan Biskupic	p. 361
“CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FORMS ITS OWN ELITE LAW TEAM” John Shiffman	p. 368
“FORMER CLERKS: TODAY’S PROSPECTS, TOMORROW’S ELITE” John Shiffman	p. 370

“IN AN EVEN-CLUBBIER SPECIALTY BAR, 8 MEN HAVE BECOME SUPREME COURT CONFIDANTS” Janet Roberts, Joan Biskupic and John Shiffman	p. 372
“INNOVATIVE LAWYER CHANGED THE WAY TOP FIRMS OPERATE” John Shiffman	p. 379
“THE CASE AGAINST GAY MARRIAGE: TOP LAW FIRMS WON’T TOUCH IT” Adam Liptak	p. 381
“ADVOCACY MATTERS BEFORE AND WITHIN THE SUPREME COURT: TRANSFORMING THE COURT BY TRANSFORMING THE BAR” Richard J. Lazarus	p. 384

VIII. Looking Ahead: Abortion and the ACA Contraception Mandate

In This Section:

Looking Ahead Case: <i>Whole Women’s Health v. Lahey (looking ahead)</i>	p. 398
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 398
“SUPREME COURT ALLOWS TEXAS ABORTION CLINICS TO STAY OPEN” Adam Liptak	p. 414
“COURT UPHOLDS TEXAS LIMITS ON ABORTION” Manny Fernandez & Erick Eckholm	p. 417
“TEXAS ABORTION CASE REACHES THE COURT” Lyle Denniston	p. 420
“JUDGE GARZA REALLY DISAGREES WITH THE MISS. ABORTION-CLINIC OPINION” William Peacock	p. 422
“JUDGES BLOCK ABORTION CURB IN MISSISSIPPI” Campbell Robertson & Erik Eckholm	p. 424
“SUPREME COURT TAKES NO ACTION ON MISSISSIPPI ABORTION LAW” Pete Williams	p. 427
Looking Ahead Case: <i>MKB Mgmt. Corp. v. Stenehjem (looking ahead)</i>	p. 428
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 428

“ABORTION AND THE LAW: THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT EMBARRASSES ITSELF” <i>The Economist</i>	p. 435
“EIGHTH CIRCUIT CALLS FOR SUPREME COURT TO RECONSIDER ABORTION PRECEDENTS” Ed Whelan	p. 437
“WHEN WILL THE SUPREME COURT STOP AVOIDING ABORTION?” Dahlia Lithwick	p. 439
Looking Ahead Case: <i>Little Sisters of the Poor Home for the Aged v. Burwell</i> (looking ahead)	p. 442
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 442
“A RELIGION CASE TOO FAR FOR THE SUPREME COURT?” Linda Greenhouse	p. 473
“WITH HEALTH CARE LAWSUIT, THE LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR STEP INTO THE SPOTLIGHT” Saba Hamedy	p. 478
“WHY LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR IS RIGHT TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS FREEDOM” Elizabeth Slatterly	p. 481