

2012

2012-2013 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, "2012-2013 Supreme Court Preview: Contents" (2012). *Supreme Court Preview*. 16.
<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/preview/16>

Copyright c 2012 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 28 & 29, 2012

2012-2013 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

Student Editors
KRISTIN BERGMAN & KAYLIN GAAL



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>

2012-2013 Supreme Court Preview

Table of Contents

Introduction

In This Section:

Schedule of Events	p. xii
Panel Members	p. xiii

I. Moot Court

In This Section:

New Case: 11-345 <i>Fisher v. University of Texas</i>	p. 2
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 2
“JUSTICES TAKE UP RACE AS A FACTOR IN COLLEGE ENTRY” Adam Liptak	p. 20
“IN FISHER V. TEXAS, LOOK AT THE POLITICS” Ian Haney-Lopez	p. 23
“THE FUTURE OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: KENNEDY IS THE KEY” Stephen Menendian	p. 24
“OBAMA LAWYERS URGE HIGH COURT TO BACK AFFIRMATIVE ACTION” Greg Stohr	p. 27
“THE NEXT BIG AFFIRMATIVE-ACTION CASE” Richard Kahlenberg	p. 29
“ASIANS AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION” Scott Jaschik	p. 31

II. Roberts Court

In This Section:

Featured Articles:	p. 38
“SPLIT DEFINITIVE” Lawrence Baum and Neal Devins	p. 38

“CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS AND THE CHANGING CONSERVATIVE LEGAL MOVEMENT” Joel Alicia	p. 41
“NO RESPITE FOR LIBERALS” Pamela Karlan	p. 45
“COURT UNDER ROBERTS IS MOST CONSERVATIVE IN DECADES” Adam Liptak	p. 48
“JUSTICE KAGAN--GIVING LIBERALS A RHETORICAL LIFT” Joan Biskupic	p. 55
“CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS AND HIS APOLOGISTS” John Yoo	p. 59
“ENUMERATING CONSERVATISM’S LONG-TERM VICTORY” George Will	p. 62
“CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS SIGNALS THAT SUPREME COURT REMAINS INDEPENDENT “ David G. Savage	p. 64
“THE MYSTERY OF JOHN ROBERTS” Linda Greenhouse	p. 66
“ROBERTS SENT MESSAGE OF COURT’S LEGITIMACY” Dan Balz	p. 69
“CONSTITUTION CHECK: WHAT DOES “CHIEF” IN “CHIEF JUSTICE” MEAN?” Lyle Denniston	p. 71

III. Election Law

In This Section:

New Case: 12-96 <i>Shelby County, Ala. v. Holder</i> (looking ahead)	p. 75
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 75
“SECTION 5 CHALLENGES REACH COURT” Lyle Denniston	p. 99
“INSIGHT: FROM ALABAMA, AN EPIC CHALLENGE TO VOTING RIGHTS” Joan Biskupic	p. 103

“APPEALS COURT UPHOLDS KEY VOTING-RIGHTS LAW” Evan Perez	p. 107
“DO WE STILL NEED THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT?” Jeffrey Toobin	p. 109
New Case: 11-4667 <i>United States v. Danielczyk (looking ahead)</i>	p. 111
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 111
“VIRGINIA APPEALS COURT AFFIRMS CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW” Larry O’Dell	p. 117
“SEVERAL CLINTON FUNDRAISERS NOW FACING CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS” Dan Eggen	p. 118
“CORPORATE CONTRIBUTION BAN UPHELD” Shanna Reulbach	p. 120
Miscellaneous Topics:	p. 122
CORPORATE CAMPAIGN SPENDING AND <i>AMERICAN TRADITION PARTNERSHIP, INC. v. BULLOCK</i> : “CORPORATE CAMPAIGN SPENDING RIGHTS AFFIRMED BY HIGH COURT” Greg Stohr and Julie Bykowicz	p. 122
FALSE CAMPAIGN SPEECH AND <i>281 CARE COMMITTEE v. ARNESON</i> : “HAS SCOTUS OK’D CAMPAIGN DIRTY TRICKS?” Rick Hasen	p. 125
CONFIGURING CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS: “ONE MYSTERY, ONE ORDER ON ELECTIONS” Lyle Denniston	p. 127
TOP TWO PRIMARY SYSTEM AND THE WASHINGTON STATE GRANGE CASES: “PARTY CHALLENGE TO TOP 2 PRIMARY BACK TO SUPREME COURT?” David Ammons	p. 129
VOTER ID LAWS AND THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT: “NEW TARGET IN VOTER ID BATTLE: 1965 VOTING RIGHTS ACT” Corey Dade	p. 132
VOTER ID LAWS AND ALLEGED VOTER SUPPRESSION: “LEGAL BATTLES ERUPT OVER TOUGH VOTER ID LAWS” Ethan Bronner	p. 135

IV. International Law

In This Section:

New Case: 10-1491 <i>Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Co.</i>	p. 141
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 141
“SUPREME COURT TO RULE ON CORPORATE PERSONHOOD FOR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY?” Mike Sacks	p. 152
“SUPREME COURT SEEKS CLARIFICATION ON JURISDICTION IN A HUMAN RIGHTS CASE” Adam Liptak	p. 154
“SUPREME COURT SAYS TORTURE VICTIM LAW APPLIES ONLY TO PEOPLE, NOT ORGANIZATIONS” Robert Barnes	p. 155
“U.S. URGES NARROWING HUMAN RIGHTS CLAIMS” Lyle Denniston	p. 156
New Case: 11-1025 <i>Clapper v. Amnesty International USA</i>	p. 160
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 160
“SUPREME COURT AGREES TO HEAR CASE ON ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE” Robert Barnes	p. 182
“STANDING TO CHALLENGE WIRETAP LAW DIVIDES CIRCUIT” Mark Hamblett	p. 184
“AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL USA V. CLAPPER AND STANDING TO CHALLENGE SECRET SURVEILLANCE REGIMES” Orin Kerr	p. 188
“WHY CLAPPER MATTERS: THE FUTURE OF PROGRAMMATIC SURVEILLANCE” Steve Vladeck	p. 191
New Case: 11-820 <i>Chaidez v. United</i>	p. 195
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 195

“NEW LOOK AT LAWYERS’ ADVICE” Lyle Denniston	p. 206
“7TH CIRCUIT HOLDS LAWYER RULE ON IMPACT OF GUILTY PLEA FOR IMMIGRANTS NOT RETROACTIVE” Michael Hopkins	p. 208
“OPENING THE GATE TO CRIMINAL ALIEN APPEALS” Michael Kirkland	p. 210
“ON THE TWO YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF PADILLA V. KENTUCKY, PREZIOSI SAYS SUPREME COURT DECISION’S SIGNIFICANCE STILL DEBATED” <i>PRWeb</i>	p. 213
New Case: 11-702 <i>Moncrieffe v. Holder</i>	p. 215
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 215
“SUPREME COURT TO REVIEW MONCRIEFFE V. HOLDER” Jennifer Miller	p. 219
“SUPREME COURT TO REVISIT ‘AGGRAVATED FELONY’ PROVISION” César Cuauhtémoc García Hernández	p. 221
New Case: <i>Garcia v. Thomas (looking ahead)</i>	p. 224
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 224
“MUNAF SEQUEL ON WAY TO COURT” Lyle Denniston	p. 234
“DOJ TO SEEK EXTRADITION OF NO. 3 KIDNAPPER” Aurea Calica	p. 236
“WHY THE “MUNAF SEQUELS” MATTER: A PRIMER ON FARRA, REAL ID, AND THE ROLE OF THE COURTS IN TRANSFER/EXTRADITION CASES” Steve Vladeck	p. 237
Immigration in the Wake of <i>Arizona</i>	p. 242
“BLOCKING PARTS OF ARIZONA LAW, JUSTICES ALLOW ITS CENTERPIECE” Adam Liptak	p. 242
“S.B. 1070: IN PLAIN ENGLISH” Amy Howe	p. 245

“RAISING ARIZONA: SUPREME COURT’S IMMIGRATION DECISION CREATES MORE QUESTIONS THAN IT ANSWERS” Ginny Sloan	p. 249
“STATEMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC HOLDER ON THE SUPREME COURT’S RULING ON ARIZONA V. THE UNITED STATES” Department of Justice	p. 251
Guantanamo Bay	p. 252
“CLOSING GUANTANAMO FADES AS A PRIORITY” Charlie Savage	p. 252
“WHAT’S LEFT OF THE GUANTANAMO LITIGATION? NOTHING.” Shayana Kadidal	p. 255
“D.C. CIRCUIT: LAST STOP FOR DETAINEES?” Lyle Denniston	p. 258

V. Business

In This Section:

New Case: 11-864 <i>Behrend v. Comcast Corp</i>	p. 264
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 264
“WILL DAUBERT BECOME PART OF CLASS CERTIFICATION HEARINGS?” Kirk Jenkins	p. 276
“ <i>BEHREND V. COMCAST</i> : 3RD CIRCUIT AFFIRMS CLASS CERTIFICATION IN ANTITRUST CASE” Louis M. Solomon	p. 278
“FEDERAL JUDGE RECERTIFIES CLASS IN COMCAST ANTITRUST CASE” Shannon P. Duffy	p. 279
“SQUEEZING CLASS ACTIONS” Scott Dodson	p. 281
“COMCAST SETTLES, MAY AVOID SUPREME COURT” Tony Mauro	p. 284
New Case: 11-1085 <i>Connecticut Retirement Plans & Trust Funds v. Amgen, Inc.</i>	p. 286
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 286

“HIGH COURT TO HEAR AMGEN CHALLENGE” Brett Kendall	p. 293
“AMGEN MAY FACE TRIAL FOR ALLEGEDLY FUDGING INFO” Tim Hull	p. 294
“AMGEN GETS SUPREME COURT REVIEW OF STOCK FRAUD LAWSUIT” Bob Drummond	p. 295
“SOLVING A CIRCUIT SPLITTER: AMGEN IN THE HIGH COURT” Robert A. Horowitz	p. 297
New Case: 11-982 <i>Nike, Inc. v. Already, LLC</i>	p. 300
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 300
“SUPREME COURT FORCES NIKE TO DEFEND ITS RIGHT NOT TO DEFEND ITS TRADEMARKS” Alison Frankel	p. 309
“SUPREME COURT LOOKS TO TAKE TRADEMARK STANDING CASE FOLLOWING COVENANT-NOT-TO-SUE” Dennis Crouch	p. 311
“SUPREME COURT TO DECIDE WHETHER PATENT BULLIES CAN HIT AND RUN” Daniel B. Ravicher	p. 313
New Case: 11-697 <i>Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.</i>	p. 316
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 316
“THAI STUDENT’S MONEY-MAKING EFFORT AT CENTER OF SUPREME COURT COPYRIGHT CASE” Mark Sherman	p. 329
“THE WAIT FOR KIRTSAENG IS OVER” Andrew Berger	p. 330
“MADE IN THE USA: DOES THE “FIRST SALE” DOCTRINE REQUIRE IT” Richard Busch	p. 333
“SUPREME COURT TAKES ANOTHER LOOK AT GRAY MARKET RESALES” Erin Geiger Smith	p. 335
New Case: 10-3178 <i>Symczyk v. Genesis HealthCare Corp.</i>	p. 337
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 337

“SUPREME COURT TO CONSIDER WHETHER OFFER OF JUDGMENT TO NAMED PLAINTIFF MOOTS FLSA COLLECTION ACTION, AMONG OTHER CASES” p. 346
Wolters Kluwer

“EMPLOYERS CANNOT ‘PICK OFF’ PLAINTIFF TO END CASE EARLY” p. 347
Shannon P. Duffy

VI. Criminal

In This Section:

New Case: 11-564 *Florida v. Jardines* p. 351

Synopsis and Questions Presented p. 351

“DOES THE WAR ON DRUGS AFFECT YOUR PRIVACY RIGHTS?” p. 364
Jane Yakowitz Bambauer

“FLORIDA SAYS DRUG-SNIFFING DOGS IN FRONT OF PRIVATE HOMES DO NOT INVADE PRIVACY” p. 366
Tom Ramstack

“FLORIDA HIGH COURT RULES ON DRUG DOG SNIFF TESTS” p. 368
The Ledger

“THE DOG-SNIFFING CASES: MADE SIMPLE” p. 369
Lyle Denniston

New Case: 11-817 *Florida v. Harris* p. 373

Synopsis and Questions Presented p. 373

“JUSTICES TO DECIDE WHETHER DETAILED PROOF IS NEEDED IN COURT ON DRUG DOG’S EFFECTIVENESS” p. 388
Associated Press

“FLORIDA SUPREME COURT TOSSES EVIDENCE DETECTED BY DRUG-SNIFFING DOGS” p. 389
The Tampa Bay Times

“THE RELIABILITY OF DRUG SNIFFING DOGS” p. 390
Erica Goldberg

New Case: 11-770 *United States v. Bailey* p. 393

Synopsis and Questions Presented p. 393

“SUPREME COURT TO DECIDE CHUNON BAILEY CASE ON WHETHER POLICE CAN DETAIN WITHOUT A WARRANT” Associated Press	p. 401
“SECOND CIRCUIT UPHOLDS DETENTION OF PERSON LEAVING SCENE OF SEARCH WARRANT” C. Zadik Shapiro	p. 402
New Case: 12A48 <i>King v. Maryland (looking ahead)</i>	p. 404
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 404
“CHIEF JUSTICE LETS MARYLAND CONTINUE TO COLLECT DNA” Adam Liptak	p. 414
“DNA SAMPLING CASE DEVELOPS” Lyle Denniston	p. 415
“HIGHEST COURT IN MARYLAND BANS COLLECTION OF DNA AT CERTAIN CRIME SCENES” Alexis Taylor	p. 418
“COURT OF APPEALS HOLDING COULD STOP ARRESTEE DNA COLLECTION BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS” <i>Maryland Association of Counties</i>	p. 420
New Topic: Police Power and Tasers (<i>looking ahead</i>)	p. 422
“POLICE POWER TO USE STUN GUNS LEFT UNCLEAR” Lyle Denniston	p. 422
“NINTH CIRCUIT LAYS OUT CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS ON USE OF TASERS” <i>Metropolitan News-Enterprise</i>	p. 423
“POLICE USE OF STUN GUNS MAY INCREASE” Sarah Garland	p. 426
“SHOOT TO STUN” Paul Robinson	p. 428

VII. Gay Rights

In This Section:

New Case and Topic: Defense of Marriage Act (<i>looking ahead</i>)	p. 432
---	--------

12-15 *Department of Health and Human Services v. Massachusetts*
 12-13 *Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the United States House of Representatives v. Gill*
 12-16 *Office of Personnel Management v. Golinski*
 12-63 *Windsor v. United States*
 12-97 *Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Department of Health & Human Services*

Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 432
“SUIT CITES STATES’ RIGHTS ON BEHALF OF GAY RIGHTS” Adam Liptak	p. 444
“U.S. FILES DOMA CHALLENGES” Lyle Denniston	p. 446
“KEY PART OF FEDERAL GAY MARRIAGE LAW RULED UNCONSTITUTIONAL” David G. Savage	p. 447
“APPEALS COURT HEARS ARGUMENTS ON GAY MARRIAGE LAW” Abby Goodnough	p. 451
“COURT PUTS REVIEW OF DOMA RULING ON HOLD” Bob Egelko	p. 453
“83-YEAR-OLD ASKS SUPREME COURT TO REVIEW GAY MARRIAGE BAN” Terry Baynes	p. 454
“OBAMA TEAM WON’T DEFEND DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT” Kevin Johnson and Joan Biskupic	p. 456
New Case: 12-144 <i>Hollingsworth v. Perry (looking ahead)</i>	p. 458
“COURT STRIKES DOWN BAN ON GAY MARRIAGE IN CALIFORNIA” Adam Nagourney	p. 458
“GAY MARRIAGE FIGHT MAY HINGE ON SUPREME COURT’S ANTHONY KENNEDY” David G. Savage	p. 461
“FURTHER PROP. 8 REVIEW DENIED BY COURT OF APPEALS” Lyle Denniston	p. 462
“GAY-MARRIAGE FOES SEEK HIGH COURT REVIEW” Jess Bravin	p. 465

New Case: 12-23 <i>Brewer v. Diaz</i> (<i>looking ahead</i>)	p. 467
“A NEW TEST ON GAY RIGHTS” Lyle Denniston	p. 467
“SAME-SEX PARTNER BENEFITS CAN’T BE CUT OFF” Bob Egelko	p. 470