

United States Supreme Court Project

In groups of 3 or 4 you will be assigned one Supreme Court Justice to research. You will need to find the following biographical information:

- Full name
- Age
- Education
- Experience prior to Supreme Court
- Appointed date & years as justice
- Appointed by which President
- Interesting fact

You will also need to decide as a group how your assigned justice will soon vote on the upcoming cases on gerrymandering, transgender bathrooms, and territorial application of U.S. rights. Your group will need to decide on a position for each case from the stand point/opinion of your justice NOT your personal opinion. To support your decision you will need to find at least one previous legal opinions/decisions that your justice made that lead you to your prediction.

Justice predicted decision:

Supporting historical court decisions: (at least 3)

- Case title
- Date
- Synopsis of case
- Opinion/decision (majority or dissenting)
- Reasoning given for decision on case

WRITTEN REQUIREMENTS

- 12 pt. Times New Roman
- Double spaced
- One-inch margins
- Works Cited page
- At least **3 sources** in the Works Cited page

SOURCES

You must use a variety of sources, including internet sources as well as written sources. (Online versions of print newspapers and magazines are acceptable.) Be careful with internet sources – many of them (like Wikipedia) are useful but not entirely valid. No plagiarism will be tolerated! Copying or borrowing the work of others without attribution will result in a **zero**.

United States Supreme Court Project

PARAGRAPH OUTLINE for Biography

1. **Introduction:** provide a brief summary of the Justice which you have researched. What will you be discussing and presenting to the reader?
2. **Work prior to Supreme Court:** What did the Justice do prior to their appointment to the Supreme Court? How are they an appropriate pick for the Supreme Court?
3. **Appointment to Supreme Court:** How are Justices appointed? Was it a unanimous decision to appoint this Justice or was it controversial? Which president appointed the Justice? When were they appointed and how long have they served?
4. **Political Leanings and Characteristics:** Are Justices supposed to side with one political party or another? What is their job and how do they differ from the other Justices?
5. **Major Cases Heard:** What major, or Landmark, cases has this Justice ruled on? What was the outcome?
6. **Reputation as a Supreme Court Justice:** How is this Supreme Court Justice viewed by others? What do they use to make decisions on certain cases? Are they an effective member of the Supreme Court?
7. **Conclusion:** Summarize the main points that you have made through this point. Has this Justice's decisions made an impact on our society? Why? Interesting fact.

PARAGRAPH OUTLINE for Predicted Decision

1. **FACTS/BACKGROUND:** provide a detailed factual synopsis of the who, what, when, where, and why of the case.
2. **ISSUES:** Discuss the constitutional issue or issues in this case. Discuss and analyze the arguments and reasoning of both sides of the case.
3. **RULE:** What previous laws, state Supreme Court or U.S. Supreme Court rulings could be applied to this case?
4. **ANALYSIS:** How do you think your Justice will apply this rule to this case? What is the reasoning that you used?
5. **CASE CONCLUSION:** What are the effects of this Supreme Court case? How will it impact our lives in society?

SUPREME COURT CASES

- **SEE ATTACHED**

Gill v. Whitford

In 2010, for the first time in over forty years, Wisconsin voters elected a Republican majority in the state assembly and the senate, and a Republican governor. As a result, the Republican leadership developed a voting district map that its drafters calculated would allow Republicans to maintain a majority under any likely voting scenario. The redistricting plan was introduced in July 2011, and both the senate and the assembly passed the bill shortly thereafter. The governor signed the bill into law in August 2011. Even before it was enacted, the plan faced two legal challenges, on constitutional and statutory grounds. A federal court upheld the plan as not violating the "one person one vote" principle nor violating the Equal Protection Clause.

Are partisan gerrymandering claims justiciable?

United States v. Microsoft Corp.

Since 1997, Microsoft has operated a web-based email service available for public use without charge (most recently called Outlook.com). Much of the data associated with this service is saved on datacenters operated by Microsoft and its subsidiaries, which are located throughout the world.

In 2013, Microsoft was served with a search and seizure warrant for the data pertaining to a particular user. That user's data was stored solely in Microsoft's datacenter in Dublin, Ireland. Microsoft disclosed all other responsive information requested in the warrant but moved the magistrate judge to quash the warrant with respect to the user data stored in Dublin. The district court also held Microsoft in civil contempt for refusing to comply fully with the warrant.

Is an email provider who has been served with a warrant required, under 18 U.S.C. § 2703, to provide the federal government with emails, even when the email records are stored exclusively outside the United States?

Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission

In July 2012, Charlie Craig and David Mullins went to Masterpiece Cakeshop in Lakewood, CO, and requested that its owner, Jack C. Phillips, design and create a cake for their wedding. Phillips declined to do so on the grounds that he does not create wedding cakes for same-sex weddings because of his religious beliefs.

Does the application of Colorado's public accommodations law to compel a cake maker to design and make a cake that violates his sincerely held religious beliefs about same-sex marriage violate the Free Speech or Free Exercise Clauses of the First Amendment?

Jennings v. Rodriguez

Sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act require that noncitizens who are determined to be inadmissible to the United States must be detained during removal proceedings, though some may be released on bond if they can demonstrate that they are not a flight risk or a danger to the community. Alejandro Rodriguez and other detained noncitizens sued and argued that their prolonged detention without hearings and determinations to justify the detentions violated their due process rights.

Are noncitizens who are subject to mandatory detention under the relevant text of the Immigration and Nationality Act entitled to bond hearings, with the possibility of release, if their detentions last six months?