

The Roberts Court 2019-20: Distancing from the Kennedy Era, the Roberts Era Has Begun

John M. Barkett
Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P.
Miami, Florida

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	7
VOTE COUNTS.....	8
VOTE COUNT TRENDS.....	8
PER CURIAM DECISIONS	9
AUTHORSHIP COUNT	10
JUSTICE KAVANAUGH.....	11
DECISIONS WITH FIVE-VOTE MAJORITIES OR A PLURALITY OF THE COURT.....	12
Chief Justice Roberts.....	12
<i>Georgia v. Public Resource Org., Inc.</i> : The annotations in the Official Code of Georgia Annotated are not copyrightable under the government edicts doctrine since they are authored by an arm of the Georgia legislature in the course of official duties.	12
<i>Department of Homeland Security v. Regents of Univ. of Calif.</i> : The decision of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to rescind DACA is reviewable and because of the Secretary's failure to consider forbearance from enforcement and reliance interests of Dreamers, was arbitrary and capricious in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act	14
<i>Espinosa v. Montana Dept. of Revenue</i> : The Montana Supreme Court's decision to invalidate a state scholarship program because it provided aid to sectarian schools barred by the Montana Constitution's no-aid-to-sectarian-schools provision violated the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment because it discriminated solely on the basis of the religious character of a school..	20
<i>Seila Law LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau</i> : The single-Director structure of the Consumer Finance Protection Board created by Congress in 2010, which limited the ability of the President to remove the Director, violates the Constitution's separation of powers, but the removal protection granted the Director was severable from the remainder of the implementing statute.	25
Justice Breyer.....	31
<i>June Medical Services L.L.C. v Russo</i> : Louisiana's Act 620, requiring any doctor who performs abortions to hold "active admitting privileges" at a hospital located "not further than thirty miles	

from the location at which the abortion is performed or induced and that provides obstetrical or gynecological health care services,” is unconstitutional, but limiting the reach of <i>Whole Women’s Health v. Hellerstedt</i>	31
Justice Kavanaugh	37
<i>Barton v. Barr</i> : A permanent resident ordered removed from the United States because of the commission of certain offenses for which he was later convicted is not eligible for “cancellation of removal” even though the offenses that triggered the removal action are not the same as those considered in rejecting his application for cancellation of removal.....	37
<i>Thole v. U.S. Bank, N.A.</i> : In a suit against pension plan fiduciaries of a defined contribution plan where they would receive the same pension for life irrespective of investment decisions made by the fiduciaries, Plaintiffs lacked Article III standing to pursue alleged breaches of ERISA’s duties of loyalty and prudence by poorly investing the assets of the plan.....	39
<i>McKinney v. Arizona</i> : After a successful habeas petition to establish that mitigating circumstances were not considered when he was sentenced to death for multiple murders, McKinney’s plea to have those circumstances weighed by a jury instead of the Arizona Supreme Court, as allowed by <i>Clemons v. Mississippi</i> , 494 U. S. 738 (1990), was rejected.....	41
<i>Agency for Int’l Development v. Alliance for Open Society</i> : The First Amendment is not applicable to the foreign, legally distinct affiliates of American organizations that had sought to extend a 2013 decision providing First Amendment protection to their objection to a policy requirement that prohibited distribution of Congressionally-appropriated funds to fight HIV/AIDS to organizations that did not accept the policy requirement.....	42
<i>Barr v. American Assn. of Political Consultants, Inc.</i> : A 2015 amendment to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act allowing robocalls to cell phones by government-debt collectors is content-based speech that discriminates against political speech, thereby violating the First Amendment, but the provision is severable from the remainder of the TCPA, thereby eliminating the discrimination and restoring the TCPA to its pre-2015-amendment status of prohibiting all robocalls to cell phones	43
Justice Alito	47
<i>Hernandez v. Mesa</i> : Petitioners’ request to extend the federal-common-law tort remedy created in <i>Bivens v. Six Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents</i> , 403 U.S. 388 (1971) to a claim for the wrongful death of their son who was shot by a U.S. border patrol agent was rejected, primarily based on a separation-of-powers analysis.	48
<i>Kansas v. Garcia</i> : The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 does not expressly or impliedly preempt Kansas statutes under which respondents were convicted when they engaged in identity theft in completing tax withholding forms when they obtained employment.....	50
Justice Gorsuch	52
<i>McGirt v. Oklahoma</i> : Land on which McGirt committed certain crimes was a part of the Creek Indian reservation and thus his conviction in state court was overturned since federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction to try individuals for crimes committed on tribal lands	52
PER CURIAM DECISIONS WITH A FIVE-VOTE MAJORITY	56
<i>Republican National Committee v. Democratic National Committee</i> : The district court erred when, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and to give election officials time to respond to all of the requests for absentee ballots, it issued an order allowing ballots in Wisconsin’s April 7, 2020 primary election to be postmarked after April 7, and still be counted (if received by April 13)	

<i>because it violated Court precedents that ordinarily district courts should not alter election rules on the eve of an election.....</i>	56
<i>Barr v Lee</i> : <i>The federal government’s planned use of pentobarbital in the execution of four death-row inmates did not constitute cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendment.....</i>	58
MAJOR DECISIONS WITH MORE THAN A FIVE-VOTE MAJORITY	60
<i>Trump v. Vance</i> : <i>The President of the United States does not have absolute immunity from a state court grand jury subpoena and is not entitled to a heightened standard of review before having to comply with such subpoenas</i>	60
<i>Trump v. Mazars USA, LLP</i> : <i>Remanding, the Court established guideposts for the lower courts to consider in deciding whether to enforce three Congressional subpoenas issued to a bank and an accounting firm in possession of records and tax returns of President Trump.....</i>	65
<i>Bostock v. Clayton County</i> : <i>Title VII’s prohibition on discrimination “because of” “sex” includes employment decisions based on sexual orientation or sexual identity.....</i>	69
<i>Our Lady of Guadalupe School v. Morrissey-Berru</i> : <i>The First Amendment “ministerial exception” to employment discrimination claims articulated in Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC, 565 U. S. 171 (2012) was “function” based and not title-based and was properly invoked by the district court in granting summary judgments against two Catholic school teachers who were involved in religious formation teaching and other Catholic-mission based training</i>	74
<i>Ramos v. Louisiana</i> : <i>The Sixth Amendment right to a jury trial requires a unanimous verdict to convict a defendant of a serious offense, overruling Apodaca v. Oregon, 40 U. S. 404 (1972) (plurality opinion).....</i>	76
OTHER DECISIONS OF NOTE	80
Affordable Care Act	80
<i>Maine Community Health Options v. United States</i> : <i>The Affordable Care Act’s Risk Corridors program created a mandatory Government obligation to pay insurers who took the risk of loss on plans they sold on the healthcare exchanges, that obligation was not repealed by two appropriation riders limiting payments under the program; and the Tucker Act provided an avenue to the insurers to obtain the \$12 billion they were owed under the program</i>	80
<i>Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter and Paul Home v. Pennsylvania</i> : <i>The relevant Government agencies were authorized by ACA’s text to issue religious and “moral” exemptions from contraceptive coverage and, procedurally, did not violate the Administrative Procedures Act in doing so, leaving for resolution on remand whether the exemptions were issued in compliance with the substantive requirements of the APA and how the Religious Freedom and Restoration Act applies to entities affected by the exemptions</i>	82
Age Discrimination in Employment Act	86
<i>Babb v. Wilkie</i> : <i>Federal employees suing under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act need not show “but-for” causation to prove discrimination, but must show “but-for” causation to secure monetary relief or other forms of relief related to the end result of an employment decision</i>	86
Arbitration.....	87
<i>GE Energy Power Conversion France SAS v. Outokumpu Stainless USA, LLC</i> : <i>The New York Convention does not limit the application of domestic law to an agreement to arbitrate.....</i>	87
Bankruptcy	89

<i>Ritzen Group, Inc. v. Jackson Masonry, LLC</i> : Adjudication of a motion for relief from the automatic stay in bankruptcy is a final appealable order when the bankruptcy court unreservedly grants or denies relief.....	89
<i>Rodriguez v. FDIC</i> : State law, not federal common law, should determine the allocation of a tax refund among multiple claimants.....	91
Civil Rights Section 1981	91
<i>Comcast Corp. v. National Assn. of African-American Owned Media</i> : To state a claim under 42 U. S. C. §1981 for damages, a plaintiff must allege “but-for” causation.....	91
Clean Water Act	93
<i>County of Maui v. Hawaii Wildlife Fund</i> : The addition of a pollutant to groundwater that eventually discharges into a navigable water violates the Clean Water Act if the addition of the pollutant is the “functional equivalent of a direct discharge” into the navigable water.....	93
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) :	96
<i>Atlantic Richfield Co. v. Christian</i> : The Superfund law, which gives EPA sole remedial decision-making authority at a Superfund site, prohibits landowners from imposing their own remedy under state law because they were also liable as “current owners” at the site and thus bound by EPA’s remedial decisions.....	96
Contracts: Safe Berth Clause Oil Spill	98
<i>CITGO Asphalt Refining Co. v. Frescati Shipping Co.</i> : The safe berth clause in issue represented a warranty of safety, not a duty of diligence, and thus the Charterer, which designated the berth, was responsible for cleanup costs incurred when a vessel allided with an anchor puncturing the hull and releasing 246,000 gallons of diesel fuel into the Delaware River	98
Criminal Law	99
<i>Kelly v. United States</i> : Because they did not have as their object the deprivation of “money or property” of another, defendants’ convictions under the federal wire fraud and federal-program fraud statutes were overturned.....	99
Death Penalty	101
<i>Andrus v. Texas</i> : The Texas Court of Criminal Appeals erred in determining that counsel’s failure to present mitigating evidence to the jury when the jury was considering the death penalty did not represent ineffective assistance of counsel, and remanding for a determination of whether that failure prejudiced Andrus	101
Defense Preclusion	102
<i>Lucky Brand Dungarees, Inc. v. Marcel Fashions Group, Inc.</i> : Defenses raised in a second lawsuit were not precluded by the resolution of an earlier lawsuit because the second lawsuit involved different claims and different conduct than those involved in the first lawsuit	102
Electoral College	104
<i>Ciafalo v. Washington</i> : Washington’s fine of three Electors for failing to cast their Electoral College votes for Hilary Clinton who had won the majority of the votes in the State in the 2016 Presidential election, as they had pledged to do, was upheld.....	104
ERISA	106
<i>Intel Corp. Investment Policy Comm. v. Sulyma</i> : For purposes of the trigger of the three-year limitations period to bring a breach of fiduciary claim against an ERISA-plan fiduciary, “actual knowledge” (of a piece of information) as used in 29 U. S. C. §1113(2) means that the plaintiff must be aware of it.....	106

Fair Debt Collection Practices Act	109
<i>Rotkiske v. Klemm</i> : The FDCPA’s requirement that a suit against a debt-collector for a statutory violation must be brought within one year from the date “on which the violation occurs” means what it says and Rotkiske’s failure to discover until more than one year after the alleged violation does not excuse the late filing	
	109
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.....	110
<i>Opati v. Republic of Sudan</i> : Congress authorized the award of punitive damages under the terrorist exception in the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act	
	110
Fourth Amendment	112
<i>Kansas v. Glover</i> : Where a computer check of a license plate number reveals that the registered owner of the vehicle had a revoked license, stopping the vehicle was based on reasonable suspicion consistent with the requirements of the Fourth Amendment where under the totality of the circumstances there was no information to rebut the inference that the owner was the driver..	
	112
Habeas Corpus	113
<i>Banister v. Davis</i> : A Rule 59(e) motion to alter or amend a habeas judgment is a part of the first habeas proceeding and does not represent a second successive habeas application under 28 U. S. C. §2244(b) requiring leave from a court of appeals.....	
	113
Immigration.....	114
<i>Department of Homeland Security v. Thuraissigiam</i> : Limitations in the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act on habeas review do not violate the Suspension Clause or the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment as applied to respondent	
	115
<i>Nasrallah v. Barr</i> : Because an order denying relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT) is distinct from a final order of removal, 8 U. S. C. §1252(a)(2)(C) and (D) do not preclude judicial review of a noncitizen’s factual challenges to a CAT order.	
	117
<i>Guerrero-Lasprilla v. Barr</i> : The phrase “questions of law” in the Limited Review Provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act includes the application of a legal standard to undisputed facts and is not limited to pure questions of law.....	
	118
Insanity Defense	119
<i>Kahler v Kansas</i> : The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment does not require a State to adopt the “moral-incapacity” strain of the insanity defense.....	
	119
Intellectual Property: Generic Marks.....	124
<i>Patent and Trademark Office v. Booking.com B. V.</i> : A mark that combines “.com” to an otherwise generic word does not preclude the mark from becoming descriptive and thus entitled to registration.....	
	124
Intellectual Property: Trademark Infringement	126
<i>Romag Fasteners, Inc. v. Fossil Group, Inc.</i> : A plaintiff who proved a Lanham Act violation for false and misleading advertising is entitled to defendant’s profits for the violation without having to show willfulness because, under the plain terms of the Lanham Act, a showing of willfulness as a precondition of recovering an infringer’s profits is required only when the claim is one for trademark dilution.....	
	126
Intellectual Property: Inter Partes Review.....	127
<i>Thryv, Inc. v. Click-To-Call Technologies, LP</i> : The Patent and Trademark Appeal Board’s application of the one-year time limit to institute inter partes review where a prior infringement	

<i>action had been dismissed without prejudice is closely tied to a decision to institute inter partes review and thus is not appealable under 35 U. S. C. §315(d).....</i>	<i>127</i>
Intellectual Property: Trademark Attorneys’ Fees	129
<i>Peter v. NantKwest, Inc.: Where 35 U. S. C. §145.provides that an applicant challenging a decision of the Patent Trial and Appeals Board in district court must pay “all expenses of the proceeding,” the word “expenses” does not include the salaries of attorneys and paralegal employees of the Patent and Trademark Office</i>	<i>129</i>
Second Amendment Right to Bear Arms.....	130
<i>New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn., Inc. v. City of New York: Because New York City amended its firearm licensing statute to allow residents to transport firearms to a second home or a shooting range outside of the city—the relief requested by petitioners—the case is moot.....</i>	<i>130</i>
Section 1983 (Dissent from Denial of the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari).....	130
<i>Baxter v. Bracey:</i>	<i>130</i>
Securities Laws:	131
<i>Liu v. S.E.C.: A disgorgement award that does not exceed a wrongdoer’s net profits and is awarded for victims is “equitable relief” permissible under 15 U. S. C. §78u(d)(5).....</i>	<i>131</i>
Sentencing.....	133
<i>Holguin-Hernandez v. United States: Defendant preserved for appeal his objection to a sentence by arguing for a shorter sentence before the district court because no more was needed to inform the court of the action the party wishes the court to take under Fed. Rule Crim. Proc. 51(b) ...</i>	<i>133</i>
State Immunity.....	135
<i>Allen v. Cooper: The Copyright Remedy Clarification Act’s waiver of state sovereign immunity for copyright infringement is unconstitutional</i>	<i>135</i>
The Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.....	138
<i>Monasky v. Taglieri: An infant’s “habitual residence” under the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Childhood Abduction requires a factual inquiry and review of the facts found is subject to the “clear error” rule</i>	<i>138</i>
CONCLUSION	141
ABOUT THE AUTHOR	143
John M. Barkett	143