

2016

2016-2017 Supreme Court Preview: Contents

Institute of Bill of Rights Law at the William & Mary Law School

Repository Citation

Institute of Bill of Rights Law at the William & Mary Law School, "2016-2017 Supreme Court Preview: Contents" (2016). *Supreme Court Preview*. 268.

<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/preview/268>

Copyright c 2016 by the authors. This article is brought to you by the William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository.

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

2016-2017 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.



WILLIAM & MARY
LAW SCHOOL
INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW

NEAL DEVINS
Sandra Day O'Connor Professor of Law
Director of the Institute of Bill of Rights Law

KELSEY ROTHERA
Conference & Event Planner

REBECCA GREEN
Professor of Practice

Student Editors
BENJAMIN HOLWERDA
ETHAN EMERY

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>

2016-2017 Supreme Court Preview

Table of Contents

Introduction

In This Section:

Schedule of Events	p. i
Panel Members	p. ii

I. Moot Court: *Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado*

In This Section:

New Case: 15-606 <i>Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado</i>	p. 2
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 2
“SUPREME COURT TO HEAR CASE OF ALLEGED RACIAL BIAS BY JUROR” Robert Barnes	p. 12
“IS EVIDENCE OF JUROR BIAS IN DELIBERATIONS ADMISSIBLE? SUPREME COURT TO DECIDE” Shawn S. Ledingham, Jr.	p. 14
“COURT TO RULE ON CHALLENGE TO JUROR BIAS” Lyle Denniston	p. 16
“JURY ROOM RACISM IS PROTECTED. IT SHOULDN'T BE” Noah Feldman	p. 18

II. The Court and the 2016 Election

In This Section:

“PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION WILL SHAPE SUPREME COURT, AND NATIONAL POLICIES, FOR YEARS TO COME” Jess Bravin	p. 20
“THE SUPREME COURT REALLY MATTERS IN THIS ELECTION” Albert R. Hunt	p. 23
“CLINTON'S COURT SHORTLIST EMERGES” Lydia Wheeler	p. 25

“TRUMP’S SUPREME COURT PICKS COULD BRING REAL-WORLD EXPERIENCE” David Hawkings	p. 27
“SCOTUS UNITES TRUMP AND SENATE GOP” Sam Hananel and Mary Clare Jalonick	p. 29
“CAUTIOUSLY OPTIMISTIC ABOUT TRUMP’S SCOTUS SHORTLIST” Josh Blackman	p. 32
“HOW THE G.O.P. OUTSOURCED THE JUDICIAL NOMINATION PROCESS” Linda Greenhouse	p. 35
“OP-ED: FILLING SUPREME COURT VACANCIES ISN’T A GOOD ENOUGH REASON TO VOTE FOR TRUMP” John Yoo and Jeremy Rabkin	p. 39
“RUTH BADER GINSBURG, NO FAN OF DONALD TRUMP, CRITIQUES LATEST TERM” Adam Liptak	p. 42
“JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG CALLS TRUMP A ‘FAKER,’ HE SAYS SHE SHOULD RESIGN” Joan Biskupic	p. 45
“JUSTICES HAVE FREE SPEECH RIGHTS TOO” Erwin Chemerinsky	p. 47

III. Business

In This Section:

New Case: 15-777 <i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Apple, Inc</i>	p. 49
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 49
“SUPREME COURT TO HEAR SAMSUNG APPEAL ON APPLE PATENT AWARD” Adam Liptak	p. 64
“APPLE CASE AGAINST SAMSUNG SHOULD GO BACK TO THE LOWER COURT: JUSTICE DEPARTMENT” Dan Levine	p. 66
“SUPREME COURT TAKES UP <i>APPLE V. SAMSUNG</i> , FIRST DESIGN PATENT CASE IN A CENTURY” Joe Mullin	p. 67

“COURT WILL REDUCE APPLE'S \$930 MILLION WIN IN SAMSUNG PATENT CASE” Adi Robertson	p. 69
New Case: 15-8049 <i>Salman v. United States</i>	p. 71
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 71
“AN INSIDER TRADING CASE HEADS TO THE SUPREME COURT” Peter J. Henning	p. 78
“SUPREME COURT DECIDES TO WEIGH IN ON INSIDER TRADING” Michael Bobelian	p. 82
“JUDGE RAKOFF RULING ON TIPS MAY HELP PROSECUTION ON INSIDER TRADING CASES” Peter J. Henning	p. 84
New Case: 13-485 <i>Visa, Inc. v. Stoumbos & Visa, Inc. v. Osborn</i>	p. 88
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 88
“SUPREME COURT AGREES TO REVIEW ATM FEE ANTITRUST LAWSUIT” Lawrence Hurley	p. 96
“SUPREME COURT WILL HEAR ANTITRUST CASE OVER ATM FEES” Zoe Tillman	p. 97
“JUDGE REINSTATES ATM ANTITRUST CASE AGAINST VISA, MASTERCARD” Angela Chen	p. 99
New Case: 15-1251 <i>National Labor Relations Board v. SW General, Inc.</i>	p. 100
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 100
“U.S. JUSTICES TO MULL PRESIDENT'S POWER TO NOMINATE OFFICIALS” Robert Iafolla	p. 110
“AGAIN, THE PRESIDENT’S POWER TO APPOINT IS AT ISSUE” Lyle Denniston	p. 111
“D.C. CIRCUIT COURT INVALIDATES SOLOMON’S APPOINTMENT AS ACTING NLRB GENERAL COUNSEL– WHAT DOES IT MEAN?” Peter M. Panken	p. 113

IV. Criminal

In This Section:

New Case: 15-8049 <i>Buck v. Stephens</i>	p. 115
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 115
“SUPREME COURT TO RECONSIDER TWO DEATH PENALTY CASES AND TAKE UP A REDISTRICTING DISPUTE” David G. Savage	p. 121
“U.S. TOP COURT TO HEAR APPEALS BY TWO BLACK TEXAS DEATH ROW INMATES” Lawrence Hurley	p. 123
“SUPREME COURT TAKES UP 2 TEXAS DEATH PENALTY APPEALS” Jess Davis	p. 125
“MAN SENTENCED TO DIE AFTER ‘EXPERT’ TESTIFIED THAT BLACK PEOPLE ARE DANGEROUS” Ian Millhiser	p. 127
New Case: 15-797 <i>Moore v. Texas</i>	p. 130
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 130
“SUPREME COURT TO HEAR DEATH PENALTY CASES” Adam Liptak	p. 168
“SUPREME COURT MAKES SLIP-UP IN DEATH PENALTY CASE” Cristian Farias	p. 171
“HOUSTON MAN ON DEATH ROW 35 YEARS LOSES APPEAL” NBC Local Affiliate – Dallas/Ft. Worth	p. 173
“SUPREME COURT TO CONSIDER LEGAL STANDARD DRAWN FROM ‘OF MICE AND MEN’” Adam Liptak	p. 174
New Case: 15-9496 <i>Manuel v. City of Joliet</i>	p. 177
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 177
“U.S. SUPREME COURT TO HEAR JOLIET POLICE CASE” David Savage	p. 180

“JUSTICES TO HEAR 4TH AMENDMENT MALICIOUS PROSECUTION CASE” Carmen Germaine	p. 181
--	--------

V. Civil Rights and Liberties

In This Section:

New Cases: <i>Wells Fargo & Co. v. City of Miami & Bank of America Corp. v. City of Miami</i>	p. 183
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 183
“U.S. SUPREME COURT TO WEIGH MIAMI PREDATORY LENDING LAWSUIT” Lawrence Hurley	p. 211
“SUPREME COURT COULD CUT CITIES OUT OF FAIR LENDING FIGHTS” Evan Weinburger	p. 213
“MIAMI MORTGAGE LAWSUITS VS BOFA, CITIGROUP, WELLS FARGO ARE REVIVED” Jonathan Stempel	p. 216
New Case: <i>Fry v. Napoleon Community Schools</i>	p. 218
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 218
“SUPREME COURT TAKES UP CASE OF GIRL'S SERVICE DOG” CBSNews	p. 233
“GIRL WITH SERVICE DOG WANTS US SUPREME COURT TO TAKE CASE” Ed White	p. 234
“SERVICE ANIMALS: MUST PARENT EXHAUST IDEA ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES” Lusk Albertson	p. 236
New Case: <i>Ivy v. Morath</i>	p. 238
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 238
“SUPREME COURT TAKES UP DEAF TEXANS' SUIT AGAINST STATE” Aneri Pattani	p. 249
“SUPREME COURT TO HEAR DEAF TEXANS' DRIVERS ED APPEAL” Michelle Casady	p. 251

Looking Ahead: <i>G.G. v. Gloucester</i>	p. 253
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 253
“SUPREME COURT GRANTS EMERGENCY ORDER TO BLOCK TRANSGENDER MALE STUDENT IN VIRGINIA FROM USING BOYS’ RESTROOM” David Savage	p. 275
“VIRGINIA SCHOOL BOARD ASKS SUPREME COURT TO BLOCK ORDER ON TRANSGENDER BATHROOM USE” Jess Bravin	p. 277
“FEDERAL JUDGE URGES PROMPT APPEAL TO COURT ON TRANSGENDER RIGHTS” Lyle Denniston	p. 279
“FEDERAL APPEALS COURT SIDES WITH TRANSGENDER TEEN, SAYS BATHROOM CASE CAN GO FORWARD” Moriah Balingit	p. 282
“APPEALS COURT FAVORS TRANSGENDER STUDENT IN VIRGINIA RESTROOM CASE” Richard Fausset	p. 285
New Case: <i>Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Pauley</i>	p. 291
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 291
“SUPREME COURT AGREES TO HEAR CASE OVER SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE” Robert Barnes	p. 302
“PLAYGROUND SPAT LOOMS AS KEY CHURCH-STATE SEPARATION CASE” Valerie Richardson	p. 304
“THE CASE AGAINST SEPARATING CHURCH AND STATE” Noah Feldman	p. 307
“SYMPOSIUM: CONFRONTING A NATIVIST PAST; PROTECTING SCHOOL-CHOICE’S FUTURE” Rick Garnett	p. 310
“CATHOLIC BISHOPS URGE SUPREME COURT ON PLAYGROUND FUNDING” The Washington Times	p. 314

VI. Immigration

In This Section:

New Case: 15-1204 <i>Jennings v. Rodriguez</i>	p. 316
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 316
“SUPREME COURT TO REVIEW NO-BAIL POLICY FOR IMMIGRANTS AWAITING HEARINGS” Jess Bravin	p. 336
“HIGH COURT TO DECIDE IF IMMIGRANTS ENTITLED TO BOND HEARINGS” Allissa Wickham	p. 338
“COURTS SAY DETAINED NON-CITIZENS HAVE THE RIGHT TO BOND HEARINGS” Richard Gonzales	p. 340
New Case: 15-1191 <i>Lynch v. Morales-Santana</i>	p. 342
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 342
“GENDER-BASED CITIZENSHIP LAW GETS U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW” Greg Stohr	p. 353
“SUPREME COURT CITIZENSHIP CASE: SHOULD THE GENDERS OF PARENTS’ MATTER?” Christina Beck	p. 354
“SUPREME COURT AGREES TO HEAR BIRTHRIGHT CITIZENSHIP CASE” Maggie Murphy	p. 356
“2ND CIRC. AXES CITIZENSHIP RULE WEIGHTED AGAINST FATHERS” Allissa Wickham	p. 358
New Case: 13-502 <i>United States v. Texas</i>	p. 360
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 360

“WHITE HOUSE ASKS SUPREME COURT FOR NEW REVIEW OF IMMIGRATION POLICY WITH 9 JUSTICES” Jess Bravin	p. 361
“OBAMA ADMINISTRATION ASKS SUPREME COURT TO RECONSIDER IMMIGRATION PLAN” Robert Barnes	p. 364
“SUPREME COURT TIE BLOCKS OBAMA IMMIGRATION PLAN” Adam Liptak & Michael D. Shear	p. 366
“OBAMA'S IMMIGRATION PLAN APPEARS TO BE IN TROUBLE AFTER SUPREME COURT HEARING” David G. Savage	p. 367
“U.S. SUPREME COURT TO DECIDE MAJOR CASE ON OBAMA IMMIGRATION PLAN” Lawrence Hurley	p. 371
“A RULING AGAINST THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION ON IMMIGRATION” Matt Ford	p. 374

VII. Election Law

In This Section:

New Case: 15-680 <i>Bethune-Hill v. Virginia State Board of Elections</i>	p. 377
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 377
“SUPREME COURT WILL WEIGH IN ON WHETHER VA. DISTRICTS ARE RACIALLY GERRYMANDERED” Robert Barnes & Laura Vozzella	p. 435
“HOW RACIAL GERRYMANDERING DEPRIVES BLACK PEOPLE OF POLITICAL POWER” Kim Soffen	p. 438
“COURT REOPENS RACE AND DEATH PENALTY ISSUES” Lyle Denniston	p. 441p.
“VIRGINIA HOUSE DISTRICTS UPHELD” Travis Fain	p. 443p.
New Case: 15-1262 <i>McCrorry v. Harris</i>	p. 446
Synopsis and Questions Presented	p. 447

“SUPREME COURT TO REVIEW WHETHER NORTH CAROLINA RELIED TOO HEAVILY ON RACE IN REDISTRICTING” Jonathan Drew	p. 478
“NORTH CAROLINA REDISTRICTING DELAY DENIED” Lyle Denniston	p. 480
“NORTH CAROLINA'S CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARIES ARE A MESS BECAUSE OF THESE MAPS” Tom Bullock	p. 482
Looking Ahead: Voter Identification	p. 484
“SUPREME COURT BLOCKS NORTH CAROLINA FROM RESTORING STRICT VOTING LAW” Adam Liptak	p. 485
“ELECTION LITIGATION 2016: WHERE THINGS STAND” Rick Hasen	p. 488
“AS NOVEMBER APPROACHES, COURTS DEAL SERIES OF BLOWS TO VOTER ID LAWS” Camila Domonoske	p. 490
“APPEALS COURT STRIKES DOWN TEXAS VOTER ID LAW” Richard Wolf	p. 494
“APPEALS COURT UPHOLDS WISCONSIN VOTER ID RULINGS” The Associated Press	p. 496
“APPEALS COURT STRIKES DOWN NORTH CAROLINA’S VOTER-ID LAW” Robert Barnes and Ann E. Marimow	p. 497
“TEXAS TO APPEAL VOTER ID RULING TO SUPREME COURT” Reid Wilson	p. 501
“NORTH CAROLINA ASKS SUPREME COURT TO REINSTATE VOTER ID LAW” Josh Gerstein	p. 502