Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?								Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Lochner v. New York (1905)		1					The right to contract is protected by the Due Process Clause	1	Markets: are institutions that promote liberty and entail equal bargaining power between employer and employee	I	0										0
									Blue Collar Occupations: are not dangerous professions	57, 59, 61	0										
Muller v. Oregon (1908)					1		Laws limiting the work hours of women do not violate the Due Process Clause, as in *Lochner*	1	Women: are naturally dependent on men, not independent actors	421-2	1	"That woman's physical structure and the performance of maternal functions place her at a disadvantage in the struggle for subsistence **is obvious**... by abundant **testimony of the medical fraternity**, continuance for a long time on her feet at work, repeating this from day to day, tends to injurious effects upon the body... **history discloses** the fact that woman has always been dependent upon man... **It is impossible to close one's eyes to the fact** that she still looks to her brother... **ninety reports** of committees, bureaus of statistics, commissioners of hygiene, inspectors of factories, both in this country and in Europe, to the effect that long hours of labor are dangerous for women"	421	1	1							0
Schenck v. U.S. (1919)	1						Restrictions of speech under the 1st Amendment require a clear and present danger	0													0
Gitlow v. New York (1925)	1						14th Amendment incorporates 1st Amendment protections of free speech	1	Communist Doctrine: is a direct incitement to action rather than academic opinions of the future; "such utterances, by their very nature, involve danger to the public peace and to the security of the state"	665, 661	0										0
Buck v. Bell (1927)	1						VA sterilization law does not violate Due Process or Equal Protection Clauses	1	Mental Disability: is hereditary	206	1	"An Act of Virginia… recites that… experience has shown that heredity plays an important part in the transmission of insanity, imbecility"	206				1				0
									Mentally Disabled People: are wards of the state; cannot fend for themselves	206											

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Near v Minnesota (1931)	1						Prior restraint violates 1st Amendment	0													1
Schechter Poultry v. US (1935)		1					Separation of powers requires that Congress not delegate law-making to the Executive; the extent of interstate commerce powers determined by direct or indirect effect on commerce	0														0
Palko v Conn (1937)			1				14th Amendment only applies fundamental rights to states, incorporated based on scheme of ordered liberty	0													0
U.S. v. Carolene Products (1938)		1					Prohibition of a product is allowable under the Commerce Clause; fundamental rights require a higher form of scrutiny	1	Unnatural Products: are fraudulent and harmful	148	1	"The Filled Milk Act was adopted by Congress after committee hearings, in the course of which **eminent scientists and health experts testified**. An extensive investigation was made of... the effect upon the public health... The conclusions drawn from evidence presented at the hearings were embodied in reports of the House Committee on Agriculture... **Both committees concluded**... that the use of filled milk as a substitute for pure milk is generally injurious to health and facilitates fraud on the public... that **decision was for Congress**"	148, 152	1		1						1
Chaplinsky v. NH (1942)	1						Fighting words are an exception to free speech protections	1	Insults: such as "damn fascist" are fighting words that demand retribution in our culture, as understood by "men of common intelligence"	574	1	common man standard	573		1						0

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Wickard v. Filburn (1942)		1					Commerce Clause allows for regulation of private production for private consumption if it "exerts a substantial economic effect on interstate commerce"	1	National Markets: have become so extensive that local production is no longer merely local	I	0										1
Korematsu v. U.S. (1944)	1						war powers during threat of invasion create a compelling state interest that overrides protection against ethnic categorization under equal protection	1	Military Threat: danger of sabotage, etc. is real; "the real military dangers which were presented" (223); Dissent:"this forced exclusion was the result in good measure of this erroneous assumption of racial guilt rather bona fide military necessity" (235)	217, 223, D235	1	defers to executive branch judgment; "we cannot reject as unfounded the judgment of the military authorities" (218); "we could not reject the finding of the military authorities" (219)	218, 219, 223						1		0
									Camps: "we deem it unjustifiable to call them concentration camps with all the ugly connotations that term implies" (223); Dissent: "punishment for not submitting to imprisonment in a concentration camp" (226)	223; D226	0										
Southern Pacific v. Arizona (1945)		1					State regualtion that substantially impedes interstate trade is void under the Commerce Clause	0													1
Adamson v. CA (1947)			1				5th Amendment protection against self-incrimination does not apply to the states via the 14th (no total incorporation)	0													0
Everson v. Board of Education (1947)	1						1st Amendment is incorporated under Palko standard of ordered liberty; neutral expenditures on school kids does not violate Establishment Clause	1	Catholic Schools: are primarily schools; dissent argues are primarily church services	18, D21, D24	0										0

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Railway Express Agency v. NY (1949)		1					Equal protection does not mean equal regulation of all ills; the legislature can attack one problem without attacking similar problems	0													0
Dennis v. U.S. (1951)	1						Clear and present danger test defines limits to free speech under 1st Amendment	1	Communist Party: is disciplined, deceptive, dedicated to destruction of U.S.	498, D587-588	1	"we must base any discussion of this point upon the conclusions stated in the opinion of the Court of Appeals, which treated the issue in great detail. That court held that the record in this case amply supports the necessary finding of the jury" (497); "the Court of Appeals held that the record supports the following broad conclusions" (498); "we are in accord with the court below, which affirmed the trial court's finding that the requisite danger existed" (510)	497, 498, 510							1	0
Youngstown Sheet & Tube (1952)						1	President has no extra-constitutonal authority; power as Commander in Chief extends to theater of war alone	1	Modern War: does not include domestic production, which is not in theater of war	587, D668	0										N
Brown v. Board of Education (1954)				1			Separate is not equal under 14th Amendment	1	Minorities: are full persons	490	0										1
									Education in America: has evolved to be the center of American opportunity; "the status of public education at that time [of the ratification of the 14th Amendment]… had not yet taken hold. ...the conditions of public education did not approximate those of today" (489-90); "the importance of education to our democratic society" (493)	489-90, 492-3	0										
									Segregation: creates psychological effect on minority kids; "generates a feeling of inferiority" (494)	494	1	"amply supported by modern authority" (494)	494, fn11	1							

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Roth v. U.S. (1957)	1						Obscenity is not protected free speech	1	Obscenity: is anything that appeals purely to prurient interest	487	1	the method of determining prurient interest is contemporary community standard as determined by jury	489					1			0
Cooper v. Aaron *(1958)*				1			Elected state officials cannot disobey federal court orders, regardless of violence or disruption as grounds for delay	0													1
NAACP v. Alabama (1958)				1			14thAmendment precludes state demand for membership lists of political organizations; the state cannot publicize or investigate members of unpopular organizations	0													1
Mapp v. Ohio (1961)			1				Exclusionary rule (as in *Weeks* 1914) applies to states	0													1
Baker v. Carr (1962)						1	Reapportionment cases do not present a nonjusticiable political question	0													1
Engel v. Vitale (1962)	1						Establishment Clause means a wall of separation between church and state	1	Prayer: is religious act, not historical heritage, even if non-denominational	424, 445	0										1
Gideon v. Wainwright (1963)			1				The right to counsel is a fundamental right, therefore state must provide	1	Lawyers: are necessities, not luxuries, in contemporary criminal proceedings	344	0										1
New York Times v. Sullivan (1964)	1						Speech is libelous of a public official only if made with actual malice	1	Public Figures: are different from normal citizens, distinct category regarding protections	268	0										1
Reynolds v. Sims (1964)						1	Equal Protection Clause = one person, one vote	1	Political Representation: rests in persons, not places	562	0										1

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?								Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Griswold v. CN (1965)	1						Right to privacy is a constitutional right, protected by the penumbras of the Bill of Rights	1	Marriage: marriage is one of the most private relationships, "intimate to the degree of being sacred"	286	0										1
Miranda v. Arizona (1966)			1				Suspect in custody must be informed of right to counsel & right to remain silent	1	Contemporary Law Enforcement: is violent, coercive, untrustworthy; "The use of physical brutality and violence is not, unfortunately, relegated to the past or to any part of the country" (446); such examples "are sufficiently widespread to be the object of concern" (447); D: "Nor can I join in the Court's criticism of the present practices of police and investigatory agencies as to custodial interrogation... I am proud of their efforts, which in my view are not fairly characterized by the Court's opinion" (D499-500)	446, 447, D499-500	1	"The Commission on Civil Rights in 1961 found much evidence to indicate that some policemen still resort to physical force to obtain confessions" (446); "A valuable source of information about present police practices, however, may be found in various police manuals and texts which document procedures employed" (448); these descriptions explain how "the police then persuade, trick, or cajole him out of exercising his constitutional rights" (455)	448-455	1								1
									Psychological Coercion = physical coercion; "this is not physical intimidation, but it is equally destructive of human dignity" (457); "the compulsion inherent in custodial surroundings" (458); "the compelling atmosphere inherent in the process of in-custody interrogation" (478)	457											
Katzenbach v. Morgan (1966)						1	Congress can expand 14th Amendment protections under enforcement clause	0													1
Katz v. U.S. (1967)			1				4th Amendment protects people, not places; "reasonable expectation of privacy" invokes the 4th Amendment	1	Technology: has changed regarding electronics, to which the law must respond; "the vital role that the public telephone has come to play in private communication" (352)	352	0										1
Loving v. VA (1967)				1			Due Process Clause does not allow for racial distinctions	0													1
Terry v Ohio (1968)			1				A "stop & frisk" without a warrant, but with reasonable suspicion, is not an unreasonable search under the 4th Amendment	0													0

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
U.S. v. O'Brien (1968)	1						State regulation of non-speech which also constrains speech is allowable under the 1st Amendment	1	Draft Cards: are not "so many pieces of paper" but serve several state functions	378-80	0										0
Brandenburg v. Ohio (1969)	1						Speech cannot be criminalized for mere advocacy; must incite imminent lawless action (replaces *Schenck* standard of clear and present danger)	0			0										1
Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC (1969)	1						Regulation of speech in the public interest (promoting rights of the public) overrides rights of individual speakers	1	Radio Frequencies: are scarce and politically influential	383, 386, 388	0										1
Shapiro v. Thompson (1969)	1						Right to travel is fundamental	0			0										1
Cohen v. CA (1971)	1						Offensive words on clothing cannot be regulated under the 1st Amendment	1	Profanity such as "fuck": is not a fighting word when used in general, i.e. not directed at a specific person	20	0										1
									Courthouse: is not a place of greater protection from disruption	I											
Lemon v. Kurtzman (1971)	1						Three prong test for violation of Establishment Clause: secular purpose; not advancing or inhibiting religion; no excessive entanglement	1	Catholic Schools: are primarily religious rather than educational institutions; dissent wants hearing to determine	609	0										1
New York Times v. U.S. (1971)	1						Prior restraint is allowable under 1st Amendment only if grave & irreparable damage would ensue	0													1

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenberg (1971)				1			District courts have wide latitude to implement policies to further *Brown* decision	1	Segregation: is the result of previous intentional political choices	21, 28	0										1
Furman v. Georgia (1972)			1				Death penalty violates 8th Amendment	0													1
Branzburg v. Hayes (1972)	1						Valid laws that apply to normal citizens also apply to reporters	1	Flow of News: is not disrupted by the knowledge that reporters might have to appear before a grand jury	693	0										0
Wisconsin v. Yoder (1972)	1						Neutral regulations not aimed at religion nonetheless offend the 1st Amendment if they create an undue burden on free exercise	1	Education: an 8th grade education adequately prepares children for life and American citizenship in mainstream society	224	0										1
Roe v. Wade (1973)	1						Privacy rights are fundamental; abortion bans during the early trimesters are unconstitutional	1	Fetus: is not a person (but acquires personhood at viability); "the word 'person,' as used in the Fourteenth Amendment, does not include the unborn" (158); "the unborn have never been recognized in the law as persons in the whole sense" (162)	158, 162	1	"The position of the American Medical Association…" (141); "The position of the American Public Health Association…" (144); "the wide divergence of thinking on this most sensitive and difficult question. There has always been strong support for the view that life does not begin until live birth. This was the belief of the Stoics. It appears to be the predominant, though not unanimous, attitude of the Jewish faith. It may be taken to represent the position of the large segment of the Protestant community, insofar as that can be ascertained" (160)	141, 144, 160	1	1							1
Miller v. CA (1973)	1						Obscenity is not protected speech under the 1st Amendment	1	Obscenity: is what (1) appeals to prurient interest, (2) depicts sex in a patently offensive way, and (3) lacks literary, artistic, political, or scientific value	24	1	the method of determining is contemporary community standard as determined by a jury	30					1			0

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Keyes v. School District No. 1 (1973)				1			Determination of de jure segregation in one part of a school district supports a similar finding for the whole school district	1	Hispanics: are a distinct ethnic minority; "constitute an identifiable class for purposes of the Fourteenth Amendment" (197)	197	0											1
Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo (1974)	1						Government compulsion to publish is a violation of the 1st Amendment	0													1
Gertz v. Robert Welch Inc. (1974)	1						While defamation claims made by public officials or public figures must be held to the actual malice standard, defamation of private figures can be held to lower standards of negligence; if states allow standards lower than actual malice, plaintiffs can only recover actual damages, not punitive damages	0														0
Milliken v. Bradley (1974)				1			Desegregation plans for a school district shown to have a dual system cannot force neighboring or suburban school districts with no finding of segregation to be included in busing systems	1	School Districts: are distinct entitites that do not have responsibility for neighboring districts (school districts are based on a long tradition of local control and suburban ones do not have meaningful connection to their urban center)	719, 741	0										0
U.S. v. Nixon (1974)						1	There is no absolute executive privilege to withold evidence demonstrably relevant in a criminal trial	0													1

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Craig v Boren (1976)					1		Gender distinctions violate the Equal Protection Clause unless the state can demonstrate a substantial relation to important government objectives (intermediate scrutiny)	1	Gender: males and females are not distinct in regard to drinking habits or behaviors, which are "outdated misconceptions"	199	0										1
VA Pharmacy Board v. VA Citizens Consumer Council (1976)	1						Commercial speech is protected by the 1st Amendment; the receiver has a rights claim as well as the speaker	1	Markets: the flow of information is necessary for the free market to function; "Advertising… is nonetheless dessimination of information… As long as we preserve a predominantly free enterprise economy, the allocation of our resources in large measure will be made through numerous private economic decisions. It is a matter of public interest that those decisions, in the aggregate, be intelligent and well informed. To this end, the free flow of commercial information is indispensable" (765)	763, 764, 765	0										1
Washington v. Davis (1976)				1			State action without disproportionate impact is not unconstitutional unless a racially discriminatory motive is present	1	Discrimination: is intent, not impact (things may look discriminatory but are not); opposing premise is that if an act causes a racial divide, we can assume from our history that it is intentional; "disproportionate impact is not irrelevant, but it is not the sole touchstone of an invidious racial discrimination" (242)	239, 242	0										0
Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Bakke (1978)				1			Racial classification invokes strict scrutiny; fostering diversity creates a compelling state interest, though state must avoid quota and consider race only as a factor	1	Affirmative Action: is not a quota system; when demographic characteristics are taken into account along with other factors, "a court would not assume that a university, professing to employ a facially nondiscriminatory admissions policy, would operate it as a cover for the functional equivalent of a quota system" (318)	318	0										0

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Zurcher v. Stanford Daily (1978)			1				Probable cause = probability of evidence in a specific location, not probability of the commission of a crime by the owner of that location (therefore third party warrants are still allowable)	1	Flow of News: will not be disrupted by search warrants, which will not cause confidential sources to disappear, hindering the free flow of information	566	0											0
Lynch v. Donnelly (1984)	1						1st Amendment does not invoke wall of separation, following the Lemon test; therefore a display of religious holiday symbolism does not violate the Establishment Clause	1	Creche: indicates the origin and history of the holiday, not a religious statement	669, 680	0											0
									Religion: Americans are a religious people	677-8												
Bowers v. Hardwick (1986)	1						State laws criminalizing homosexuality do not violate the 14th Amendment; the right to privacy applies to marital and family relations, not all intimate conduct	1	Homosexuality: is an action rather than a state of being or category of person; "a fundamental right... to engage in sodomy" (190); "laws of many States that still make such conduct illegal" (190); "to engage in homosexual sodomy" (191); "to engage in acts of consensual sodomy" (192); "proscriptions against that conduct" (192); "conduct" (194, 195, 196); Dissent: "choices about the most intimate aspects of their lives" (199); "individuals define themselves in a significant way through their intimate sexual relationships" (205); "the heart of what makes individuals what they are" (211)	190-5, D199, 205, 211	0										0
Webster v. Reproductive Health (1989)	1						Right to privacy is a negative freedom that protects against government action, not a positive freedom that ensures access	0													0

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Texas v. Johnson (1989)	1						Flagburning is protected speech under the 1st Amendment	1	American Flag: is a symbol like many others, without special import that demands protection; its desecration is not fighting words that would predictably cause violence; see dissent: "the flag is not simply another 'idea' or 'point of view' competing for recogniting in the marketplace of ideas" (429); similar to desecration of the Lincoln Memorial, "the flag is itself a monument, subject to similar protection" "the government is simply recognizing as a fact the profound regard for the American flag"; "the Court decides that the American flag is just another symbol... for which the most minimal public respect may not be enjoined"; "the flag has "an intangible dimension" (Stevens 436)	409, 410	0										1
Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Dep of Health (1990)	1						Missouri refusal to allow parents' judgment to stand for incompetent person, imposing preservation of life as the default standard, does not violate the liberty recognized by the 14th Amendment	1	Families: are no longer a good proxy for individual views; the old assumption that the best estimate of an individual's intent is their family's judgment is no longer true due to changes in family unity ("there is no automatic assurance that the view of close family members will necessarily be the same as the patient's would have been had she been confronted with the prospect of her situation while competent" [286, also quoted in dissent: "I cannot quarrel with this observation" 327])	281	0										0
Employment Division v. Smith (1990)	1						Neutral regulations that restrict religious practice do not violate the 1st Amendment	0													0
Lee v. Weisman (1992)	1						A religious exercise at a public school graduation is a violation of the Establishment Clause	1	School: is inherently coercive; "subtle coercive pressures exist" (588); "public, as well as peer pressure, on attending students to stand as a group or, at least, maintain respectful silence during the invocation and benediction. This pressure, though subtle and indirect, can be as real as any overt compulsion" (593); see dissent: "the Court invents a boundless, and boundlessly manipulable, test of psychological coercion" (632); "The Court's argument that state officials have 'coerced' students to take part in the invocation and benediction at graduation ceremonies is, not to put too fine a point on it, incoherent" (636)	588, 593	1	"Research in psychology supports the common assumption that adolescents are often susceptible to pressure from peers toward conformity"	593	1							1

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Planned Parenthood v. Casey (1992)	1						Regulation of abortion is constitutional under *Roe* framework if it does not create an undue burden	1	Spousal Abuse: is prevalent and will keep a significant number of women from obtaining an abortion	837	1	"Studies reveal that family violence occurs in two million families in the U.S." (888) "These findings are supported by studies of domestic violence. The AMA has published a summary of the recent research in this field" (891) "Other studies fill in the rest of this troubling picture" (891)		1							1
Church of Lukumi v. City of Hialeah (1993)	1						Laws specifically targeting religious practice under the guise of neutral laws violate the 1st Amendment	0													1
U.S. v. Lopez (1995)		1					The Commerce Clause only allows Congress to regulate activity that "substantially affects" interstate commerce; which does not include firearm or educational regulations that are traditionally the province of states	0													0
U.S. v. Virginia (1996)					1		State educational institutions cannot exclude women, "who today count as citizens in our American democracy equal in stature to men" (545)	1	Women: have the will and capacity to perform in a military setting; "we note again these dispositive realities:… some women do well under the adversative model" (550)	525, 550	0										1
									Traditionally Male Professions (such as the military): are not degraded by the presence of women; "There is no reason to believe that the admissin of women capable of all the activities required of VMI cadets would destroy the Institute rather than enhance its capacity to serve the 'more perfect union'" (558)	542-4, 558	0										

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Romer v. Evans (1996)	1						Colorado Amendment 2 (banning preferential treatment or protection against discrimination for homosexuals) violates the Equal Protection Clause	0													1
Printz v. U.S. (1997)	1						The national government may not compel state officers to enact a federal regulatory program, including firearm background checks	0													0
Clinton v. City of New York (1998)						1	Line item veto violates separation of powers	0													N
Bush v. Gore (2000)						1	Counting procedures in 2000 election violated Equal Protection Clause	0													0
Boy Scouts of America v. Dale (2000)	1						Private organizations can exclude people from membership through 1st Amendment right to freedom of association despite state antidiscrimination laws	1	Christian Organizations: are ones that define themselves as promoting traditional Christian values, even if they admit secular members; therefore it does not have to allow leaders who are counter to its values	Rehnquist 11	0										0
U.S. v. Morrison (2000)		1					Section 13981 of Violence Against Women Act of 1994 exceeds Congress' power under the Commerce Clause and under Section 5 of the 14th Amendment	1	Gender Discrimination: The problem of discrimination against victims of gender-motivated crimes does not exist in all states or, even most states	Rehnquist 27	1	Congress through its findings determined this conclusion.	27			1						0
Kyllo v U.S. (2001)	1						Thermal imaging of a home constitutes as a search under the 4th Amendment	0													1

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Board of Education v. Earls (2002)	1						Drug testing imposed by school district upon students who participate in extracurricular activities does not violate 4th Amendment	1	Drug Abuse: The drug abuse problem among our Nation's youth has only grown worse since *Vernonia* was decided in 1995.	Thomas 10	1	Statistics from the Department of Health and Human Services.	10	1						0
Lawrence v. Texas (2003)	1						State law classifying consensual adult homosexual intercourse as illegal violates the liberty protected under the due process clause of the 14th Amendment	1	Sexual Orientation: is a distinct part of personhood; "To say that the issue in *Bowers* was simply the right to engage in certain sexual conduct demeans the claim the individual put forward, just as it would demean a married couple were it to be said marriage is simply about the right to have sexual intercourse. The laws involved in *Bowers* and here… purport to do no more than prohibit a particular sexual act. Their penalties and purposes, though, have more far-reaching consequences… The statutes do seek to control a personal relationship" (6); "The State cannot demean their existence" (18)	Kennedy 6, 18	0									1
Grutter v. Bollinger (2003)				1			An admissions program that gives special consideration to racial minorities does not violate the 14th Amendment because diversity in the classroom is a compelling government interest.	1	Diversity: has a positive impact on education, "diminish[es] the force of such stereotypes" which is "a crucial part of the Law School's mission, and one that it cannot accomplish with only token numbers of minority students" (21)	O'Connor 21	0									1
									University: is an entity that holds rights; "We have long recognized that, given the important purpose of public education and the expansive freedoms of speech and thought associated with the university environment, universities occupy a special niche in our constitutional tradition" (16); "Justice Powell invoked our cases recognizing a constitutional dimension, grounded in the First Amendment, of educational autonomy: 'The freedom of a university to make its own judgments as to education includes the selection of its student body.'" (17)	16, 17										

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Hamdi v. Rumsfeld (2004)	1						The federal government has the power to detain enemy combatants, even those who are U.S. citizens, but detainees can challenge detainment before a neutral decision-maker	0													1
Kelo v. City of New London (2005)						1	Eminent domain transfering property from one private party to another does not violate Takings Clause	1	Public Use: private property is defined as having a public use when it creates public benefits and economic growth (i.e., jobs, tax revenue)	Stevens 13											1
Roper v Simmons (2005)			1				Execution of minors violates 8th Amendment	1	Minors: are less culpable than adults due to immaturity, vulnerability to negative influences, and lack of character formation	Kennedy 15,16	1	confirmed by scientific and sociological studies "First, as any parent knows and as the scientific and sociological studies respondent and his amici cite tend to confirm"	15	1							1
Gonzales v. Raich (2005)						1	The Commerce Clause allows Congress to ban the use of marijuana even in states that have legalized it for medical purposes	1	Marijuana: is a dangerous drug with no acceptable medical uses; "In enacting the CSA, Congress classified marijuana as a Schedule I drug" (10); "Schedule I drugs are categorized as such because of their high potential for abuse, lack of any accepted medical uses, and absence of any accepted safety for use in medically supervised treatment" (11); "Congress expressly found that the drug has no acceptable medical uses" (24)	Stevens 24	1	deference to Congress; "by characterizing marimuana as a Schedule I drug, Congress expressly found that the drug has no acceptable medical uses." (24)	24			1					1
Van Orden v. Perry (2005)	1						A 10 Commandments Monument on the grounds of the Texas State capital does not violate the Establishment Clause of the 1st Amendment	0													0

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Gonzales v. Carhart (2007)	1						The Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act does not impose an undue burden on a woman's due process to obtain an abortion	1	Abortion: is a procedure occuring within and not outside of a woman; "Partial-birth abortion, as defined by the Act, differs from a standard D&E because the former occurs when the fetus is partially outside the mother to the point of one of the Act's anatomical landmarks" (30)	Kennedy 30	1	deference to Congress: "It was reasonable for Congress to think that partial-birth abortion, more than standard D&E, 'undermines the public's perception of the appropriate role of a physican during the delivery process, and perverts a process during which life is brought into the world" (30)	30			1					0
									Abortion: has negative consequences (regret, mental health): "Whether to have an abortion requires a dfficult and painful moral decision…While we find no reliable data to measure the phenomenon, it seems unexceptional to conclude some women come to regret their choice to abort the infant life they once created and sustained... Severe depression and loss of esteem can follow" (28-29); disputed by dissent: "the Court invokes an antiabortion shibboleth for which it concededly has no reliable evidence: Women who have abortions come to regret their choices, and consequently suffer from 'severe depression and loss of esteem'" followed by a page-long footnote citing several scholarly studies arguing that no such effect exists (Ginsburg 183).	Kennedy 28-29, D183	0										
D.C. v. Heller (2008)	1						The 2nd Amendment guarantees an individual to possess a firearm unrelated to the militia and use it for traditional purposes such as self-defense.	0													0
Citizens United (2010)	1						Corporations are protected under the 1st Amendment; can make unlimited independent expenditures	1	Corporations: are persons, who hold 1st Amendment rights	Kennedy 25, 26	0										0
									Money: is speech ("prohibition on corporate independent expenditure is thus a ban on speech") (22)	Kennedy 22, 35, 56	0										
									Corporate money in campaigns: does not corrupt democracy ("we now conclude that independent expenditures, including those made by corporations, do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption") (42)	Kenney 42	0										

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Snyder v. Phelps (2011)	1						The 1st Amendment protects speech on a public sidewalk about a public issue from being liable for tort damages for emotional distress, even if the speech is found to be "outrageous"	0														1
Wal-Mart v. Dukes (2011)					1		Female Wal-Mart employees cannot bring a class-action because they are not certified as a common enough to constitute as a class	1	Gender: men and women may be different in ways that allow for different promotion on the job; "Some managers will claim that the availability of women, or qualified women, or interested women, in their stores' area does not mirror the national or regional statistics. And almost all of them will claim to have been applying some sex-neutral, performance-based criteria--whose nature and effects will differ from store to store... Merely showing that Wal-Mart's policy of discretion has produced an overall sex-based disparity does not suffice."	Scalia 17	0											0
U.S. v. Jones (2012)	1						Attachment of a GPS device to a vehicle and the use of that device to monitor the vehicle's movement constitutes a search under the 4th Amendment	0														1
NFIB v. Sebelius (2012)		1					The individual mandate of the ACA is constitutional because it functions as a tax; states cannot be required to expand Medicare	0													1

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
U.S. v. Windsor (2013)	1						Section 3 of DOMA is unconstitutional under 5th Amendment Due Process guarantee of equal protection; therefore the Federal Government must recognize same-sex marriages approved by the states	1	Marriage: Same-sex and traditional marriages are equal; no marriage is second tier. "The Act's demonstrated purpose is to ensure that if any State decides to recognize same-sex marriages, those unions will treated as second-class marriages for purposes of federal law." (22)	22	0										1
Shelby County v. Holder (2013)				1			Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act is unconstitutional under current conditions	1	Racial Discrimination: is not as bad now as it was in 1965: "Regardless of how to look at the record, however, no one can fairly say that it shows anything approaching the 'pervasive,' 'flagrant,' 'widespread,' and 'rampant' discrimination that faced Congress in 1965, and that clearly distnguished the covered jurisdictions from the rest of the Nation at that time" (21)	Roberts 21	0										0
Riley v. California (2014)	1						Police cannot search the digital information on a cell phone without a warrant	1	Modern Cell Phones: store and hold some of the most private or intimate information about a person; "Modern cell phones are not another technological convenience. With all they contain and all they may reveal, they hold for many Americans 'the privacies of life.'"	Roberts 28	0										1

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Burwell v. Hobby Lobby (2014)	1						Closley-held corporations hold religious rights	1	Corporations: can have a religious character; "As the Court explained in a later case, the 'exercise of religion' involves 'not only belief and profession but the performance of (abstention from) physical acts' that are 'engaged in for religious reasons... Business practices that are compelled or limited by the tenets of a religious doctrine fall comfortably within that definition." (21)	Alito 21	0										0
Schuette v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action (2014)				1			A state constitutional amendment banning affirmative action is permissable under the U.S. Constitution	0													0
McCullen v. Coakley (2014)	1						35 foot buffer zones around abortion clinics violates 1st Amendment because it limits free speech too broadly	0													0
Town of Greece v. Galloway (2014)	1						Establishment Clause is not violated by opening town meetings with sectarian prayer that corresponds with American tradition	0													0
McCutcheon v. FEC (2014)						1	Aggregate campaign contribution limits violate the 1st Amendment	0													0

Case	Area						Ruling	Q1: Does the Court rule on a social fact?			Q2: Does the Court provide a justification?			Q3: How justify?							Ideological Direction (0 = Right/Conservative; 1 = Left/Liberal)
	civil liberties	economic regulation	criminal procedure	race	gender	other		Social Fact (1=Yes; 0=No)	Description	Location in Text (#=page in U.S. Reports; Name #=page in slip opinion; I=implicit/no explicit location; D=dissent)	Justification (1=Yes, 0=No)	Description	Location in Text	expert judgment	current societal norm	deference to Congress	deference to state legislature	deference to local jury	deference to executive	deference to lower court	
Obergefell v. Hodges (2015)	1						The fundamental right of marriage demands that states recognize same-sex marriages	1	Sexual Orientation: is innate; "their immutable nature dictates that same-sex marriage is their only real path to this profound commitment" (4)	Kennedy 4, 8	1	"only more recently have psychiatrists and others recognized that sexual orientation is a normal expression of human sexuality and immutable" (8)	8	1							1
									Marriage: is of "transcendent importance" (4); "marriage is essential to our most profound hopes and aspirations" (4); "the nature of marriage is that, through its enduring bond, two persons together can find other freedoms, such as expression, intimacy, and spirituality" (13); "a two-person union unlike any other in its importance" (13); "keystone of our social order" (16); "building block of our national community" (16); "transcendent purposes of marriage" (17); "no union is more profound than marriage" (28)	Kennedy 3, 13, 16, 17, 28	0										
									Effect of Gay Marriages on Traditional Marriages: has no demonstrable negative influence; "the respondents have not shown a foundation for the conclusion that allowing same-sex marriage will cause the harmful outcomes they describe" (26)	Kennedy 26	0										
King v. Burwell (2015)		1					Section 36B of the ACA provides for subsidies under both federally-run and state-run exchanges	0													1
	54	10	10	12	4	10		59			19			10	3	4	1	2	1	1	