CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

CASES, APPROACHES, AND APPLICATIONS

2017 ANNUAL SUPPLEMENT

William D. Araiza

Professor of Law

Brooklyn Law School

Carolina Academic Press

Durham, North Carolina

Carolina Academic Press

700 Kent Street

Durham, North Carolina 27701

Telephone (919) 489-7486

Fax (919) 493-5668

E-mail: cap@cap-press.com

www.cap-press.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I: The Branches of the Federal Government

Chapter 1: The Judicial Power

B. Congressional Checks on the Judicial Power

2. Other Means of Congressional Control over the Courts

Insert at page 48, before the Note:

Problem: Targeting Assets

It has long been suspected that the government of Upper Riparia has encouraged and abetted acts of terrorism against Americans. Several years ago, victims of those terrorist attacks sued the Government of Upper Riparia in United States District court for the Southern District of New York. After consolidating those cases under the title *Jackson v. Government of Upper Riparia*, the court issued default judgments against that government, in the amount of billions of dollars. The plaintiffs' attempts to collect on those judgments by having the court attach assets of the Central Bank of Upper Riparia held by New York City-based banks have floundered because of foreign sovereign immunity principles.

In order to overcome those roadblocks, Congress last year enacted the Upper Riparia Terrorism Justice Act. That statute read as follows:

> "Financial assets that are identified in and the subject of proceedings in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in *Jackson v. Government of Upper Riparia*, Case No. 10 Civ. 4518(BSJ)(GWG), that were restrained by attachments secured by the plaintiffs in those proceedings, and that are proven to be the sole property of the government of Upper Riparia or any of its subdivisions, may be obtained by that court in order to satisfy any federal court judgment against the Government of Upper Riparia that is rendered based on illegal terrorist activities committed by that government."

When the district court attempts to seize those assets, the Central Bank files a motion to quash the seizure, alleging that the statute violates the separation of powers by prescribing a rule of decision. What result?

After you've thought about this, read the following opinion.

Bank Markazi v. Peterson
___ U.S. ___ (2016)

Justice GINSBURG delivered the opinion of the Court.*

A provision of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 makes available for postjudgment execution a set of assets held at a New York bank for Bank Markazi, the Central Bank of Iran. The assets would partially satisfy judgments gained in separate actions by over 1,000 victims of terrorist acts sponsored by Iran. The judgments remain unpaid. Section 8772 is an unusual statute: It designates a particular set of assets and renders them available to satisfy the liability and damages judgments underlying a consolidated enforcement proceeding that the statute identifies by the District Court's docket number. The question raised by petitioner Bank Markazi: Does § 8772 violate the separation of powers by purporting to change the law for, and directing a particular result in, a single pending case?

Section 8772, we hold, does not transgress constraints placed on Congress and the President by the Constitution. The statute, we point out, is not fairly portrayed as a "one-case-only regime." Rather, it covers a category of postjudgment execution claims filed by numerous plaintiffs who, in multiple civil actions, obtained evidence-based judgments against Iran together amounting to billions of dollars. Section 8772 subjects the designated assets to execution "to satisfy *any* judgment" against Iran for damages caused by specified acts of terrorism. Congress, our decisions make clear, may amend the law and make the change applicable to pending cases, even when the amendment is outcome determinative. . . .

I

A

. . . . American nationals may file suit against state sponsors of terrorism in the courts of the United States. . . .This authorization—known as the "terrorism exception"—is among enumerated exceptions prescribed in the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976 (FSIA) to the general rule of sovereign immunity.

. . . After gaining a judgment, however, plaintiffs proceeding under the terrorism exception "have often faced practical and legal difficulties" at the enforcement stage. Subject to stated exceptions, the FSIA shields foreign-state property from execution. . . . Further limiting judgment-enforcement prospects, the FSIA shields from execution property "of a foreign central bank or monetary authority held for its own account."

To lessen these enforcement difficulties, Congress enacted the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (TRIA), which authorizes execution of judgments obtained under the FSIA's terrorism exception against "the blocked assets of a terrorist party (including the blocked assets of any agency or instrumentality of that terrorist party)." . . . Invoking his authority under [a related statute] the President, in February 2012, issued an Executive Order blocking "all property and interests in property of any Iranian financial institution, including the Central Bank of Iran, that are in the United States." The availability of these assets for execution, however, was contested.

To place beyond dispute the availability of some of [these] blocked assets for satisfaction of judgments rendered in terrorism cases, Congress passed the statute at issue here: § 502 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, 22 U.S.C. § 8772. . . . § 8772 provides that, if a court makes specified findings, "a financial asset . . .

* Justice THOMAS joins all but Part II–C of this opinion.

shall be subject to execution . . . in order to satisfy any judgment to the extent of any compensatory damages awarded against Iran for damages for personal injury or death caused by" the acts of terrorism enumerated in the FSIA's terrorism exception. § 8772(a)(1). Section 8772(b) defines as available for execution by holders of terrorism judgments against Iran "the financial assets that are identified in and the subject of proceedings in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in Peterson et al. v. Islamic Republic of Iran et al., Case No. 10 Civ. 4518(BSJ)(GWG), that were restrained by restraining notices and levies secured by the plaintiffs in those proceedings."

Before allowing execution against an asset described in § 8772(b), a court must determine that the asset is:

> "(A) held in the United States for a foreign securities intermediary doing business in the United States;
>
> "(B) a blocked asset (whether or not subsequently unblocked) . . .; and
>
> "(C) equal in value to a financial asset of Iran, including an asset of the central bank or monetary authority of the Government of Iran. . . ." § 8772(a)(1).

In addition, the court in which execution is sought must determine "whether Iran holds equitable title to, or the beneficial interest in, the assets . . . and that no other person possesses a constitutionally protected interest in the assets . . . under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States." § 8772(a)(2).

B

Respondents are victims of Iran-sponsored acts of terrorism, their estate representatives, and surviving family members. Numbering more than 1,000, respondents rank within 16 discrete groups, each of which brought a lawsuit against Iran pursuant to the FSIA's terrorism exception. . . . Upon finding a clear evidentiary basis for Iran's liability to each suitor, the court entered judgments by default. . . . "Together, [respondents] have obtained billions of dollars in judgments against Iran, the vast majority of which remain unpaid." The validity of those judgments is not in dispute.

To enforce their judgments, the 16 groups of respondents . . . moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 69 for turnover of about $1.75 billion in bond assets held in a New York bank account—assets that, respondents alleged, were owned by Bank Markazi. This turnover proceeding began in 2008 when the terrorism judgment holders . . . filed writs of execution and the District Court restrained the bonds. . . . Making the findings necessary under § 8772, the District Court ordered the requested turnover.

In reaching its decision, the court reviewed the financial history of the assets and other record evidence showing that Bank Markazi owned the assets. . . . After § 8772's passage, Bank Markazi . . . conceded that Iran held the requisite "equitable title to, or beneficial interest in, the assets," § 8772(a)(2)(A), but maintained that § 8772 could not withstand inspection under the separation-of-powers doctrine. . . . The District Court disagreed. . . . The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit unanimously affirmed. . . . To consider the separation-of-powers question Bank Markazi presents, we granted certiorari, and now affirm.

II

Article III of the Constitution establishes an independent Judiciary, a Third Branch of Government with the "province and duty . . . to say what the law is" in particular cases and controversies. *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) [*Supra* this Chapter]. Necessarily, that endowment of authority blocks Congress from "requiring federal courts to exercise the judicial power in a manner that Article III forbids." *Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc.* (1995) [*Supra* this Chapter]. Congress, no doubt, "may not usurp a court's power to interpret and apply the law to the [circumstances] before it,"

for "those who apply a rule to particular cases, must of necessity expound and interpret that rule," *Marbury*.[17] And our decisions place off limits to Congress "vesting review of the decisions of Article III courts in officials of the Executive Branch." *Plaut*. Congress, we have also held, may not "retroactively command the federal courts to reopen final judgments." *Plaut*.

A

Citing *United States v. Klein,* 13 Wall. 128 (1872) [Note *supra* this Chapter], Bank Markazi urges a further limitation. Congress treads impermissibly on judicial turf, the Bank maintains, when it "prescribes rules of decision to the Judicial Department . . . in [pending] cases." According to the Bank, § 8772 fits that description. *Klein* has been called "a deeply puzzling decision." More recent decisions, however, have made it clear that *Klein* does not inhibit Congress from "amending applicable law." *Robertson*; *Plaut* (*Klein*'s "prohibition does not take hold when Congress 'amends applicable law.'" (quoting *Robertson*)). Section 8772, we hold, did just that.

Klein involved Civil War legislation providing that persons whose property had been seized and sold in wartime could recover the proceeds of the sale in the Court of Claims upon proof that they had "never given any aid or comfort to the present rebellion." In 1863, President Lincoln pardoned "persons who . . . participated in the . . . rebellion" if they swore an oath of loyalty to the United States. One of the persons so pardoned was a southerner named Wilson, whose cotton had been seized and sold by Government agents. Klein was the administrator of Wilson's estate. In *United States v. Padelford,* 9 Wall. 531 (1870), this Court held that the recipient of a Presidential pardon must be treated as loyal, *i.e.,* the pardon operated as "a complete substitute for proof that [the recipient] gave no aid or comfort to the rebellion." Thereafter, Klein prevailed in an action in the Court of Claims, yielding an award of $125,300 for Wilson's cotton.

During the pendency of an appeal to this Court from the Court of Claims judgment in *Klein,* Congress enacted a statute providing that no pardon should be admissible as proof of loyalty. Moreover, acceptance of a pardon without disclaiming participation in the rebellion would serve as conclusive evidence of disloyalty. The statute directed the Court of Claims and the Supreme Court to dismiss for want of jurisdiction any claim based on a pardon. Affirming the judgment of the Court of Claims, this Court held that Congress had no authority to "impair the effect of a pardon," for the Constitution entrusted the pardon power "to the executive alone." *Klein*. The Legislature, the Court stated, "cannot change the effect of . . . a pardon any more than the executive can change a law." *Id.* Lacking authority to impair the pardon power of the Executive, Congress could not "direct a court to be instrumental to that end." *Ibid.* In other words, the statute in *Klein* infringed the judicial power, not because it left too little for courts to do, but because it attempted to direct the result without altering the legal standards governing the effect of a pardon—standards Congress was powerless to prescribe. See *id.*; *Robertson* (Congress may not "compel . . . findings or results under old law").[19]

Bank Markazi, as earlier observed, argues that § 8772 conflicts with *Klein*. The Bank points to a statement in the *Klein*

[17] Consistent with this limitation, respondents rightly acknowledged at oral argument that Congress could not enact a statute directing that, in "Smith v. Jones," "Smith wins." Tr. of Oral Arg. 40. Such a statute would create no new substantive law; it would instead direct the court how pre-existing law applies to particular circumstances. THE CHIEF JUSTICE challenges this distinction, but it is solidly grounded in our precedent. See *Robertson v. Seattle Audubon Soc*., 503 U.S. 429, (1992) [Note *supra* this Chapter] (A statute is invalid if it "fail[s] to supply new law, but direct[s] results under old law.").

[19] Given the issue before the Court—Presidential pardons Congress sought to nullify by withdrawing federal-court jurisdiction—commentators have rightly read *Klein* to have at least this contemporary significance: Congress "may not exercise [its authority, including its power to regulate federal jurisdiction,] in a way that requires a federal court to act unconstitutionally." Meltzer, Congress, Courts, and Constitutional Remedies, 86 Geo. L.J. 2537, 2549 (1998).

opinion questioning whether "the legislature may prescribe rules of decision to the Judicial Department . . . in cases pending before it." One cannot take this language from *Klein* "at face value," however, "for congressional power to make valid statutes retroactively applicable to pending cases has often been recognized." See, *e.g., United States v. Schooner Peggy,* 1 Cranch 103 (1801). As we explained in *Landgraf v. USI Film Products,* 511 U.S. 244 (1994), the restrictions that the Constitution places on retroactive legislation "are of limited scope":

> "The *Ex Post Facto* Clause flatly prohibits retroactive application of penal legislation. Article I, § 10, cl. 1, prohibits States from passing . . . laws 'impairing the Obligation of Contracts.' The Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause prevents the Legislature (and other government actors) from depriving private persons of vested property rights except for a 'public use' and upon payment of 'just compensation.' The prohibitions on 'Bills of Attainder' in Art. I, §§ 9–10, prohibit legislatures from singling out disfavored persons and meting out summary punishment for past conduct. The Due Process Clause also protects the interests in fair notice and repose that may be compromised by retroactive legislation; a justification sufficient to validate a statute's prospective application under the Clause 'may not suffice' to warrant its retroactive application."

"Absent a violation of one of those specific provisions," when a new law makes clear that it is retroactive, the arguable "unfairness of retroactive civil legislation is not a sufficient reason for a court to fail to give [that law] its intended scope." *Id*. So yes, we have affirmed, Congress may indeed direct courts to apply newly enacted, outcome-altering legislation in pending civil cases. See *Plaut*. Any lingering doubts on that score have been dispelled by *Robertson* and *Plaut*.

Bank Markazi argues most strenuously that § 8772 did not simply amend pre-existing law. Because the judicial findings contemplated by § 8772 were "foregone conclusions," the Bank urges, the statute "effectively" directed certain factfindings and specified the outcome under the amended law. Recall that the District Court, closely monitoring the case, disagreed. [District court opinion] ("[The] determinations [required by § 8772] [were] not mere fig leaves," for "it [was] quite possible that the court could have found that defendants raised a triable issue as to whether the blocked [a]ssets were owned by Iran, or [whether other banks] had some form of beneficial or equitable interest.").

In any event, a statute does not impinge on judicial power when it directs courts to apply a new legal standard to undisputed facts. "When a plaintiff brings suit to enforce a legal obligation it is not any less a case or controversy upon which a court possessing the federal judicial power may rightly give judgment, because the plaintiff's claim is uncontested or incontestable." . . .

Resisting this conclusion, THE CHIEF JUSTICE compares § 8772 to a hypothetical "law directing judgment for Smith if the court finds that Jones was duly served with notice of the proceedings." Of course, the hypothesized law would be invalid—as would a law directing judgment for Smith, for instance, if the court finds that the sun rises in the east. For one thing, a law so cast may well be irrational and, therefore, unconstitutional for reasons distinct from the separation-of-powers issues considered here. For another, the law imagined by the dissent does what *Robertson* says Congress cannot do: Like a statute that directs, in "Smith v. Jones," "Smith wins," it "compels . . . findings or results under old law," for it fails to supply any new legal standard effectuating the lawmakers' reasonable policy judgment.[22] By contrast, § 8772 provides a new standard clarifying that, if Iran owns certain assets, the victims of Iran-sponsored terrorist attacks will be permitted to execute against those assets. Applying laws implementing Congress' policy judgments, with fidelity to those judgments, is commonplace for the Judiciary.

[22] The dissent also analogizes § 8772 to a law that makes "conclusive" one party's flimsy evidence of a boundary line in a pending property dispute, notwithstanding that the governing law ordinarily provides that an official map establishes the boundary. Section 8772, however, does not restrict the evidence on which a court may rely in making the required findings. A more fitting analogy for depicting § 8772's operation might be: In a pending property dispute, the parties contest whether an ambiguous statute makes a 1990 or 2000 county map the relevant document for establishing boundary lines. To clarify the matter, the legislature enacts a law specifying that the 2000 map supersedes the earlier map.

B

Section 8772 remains "unprecedented," Bank Markazi charges, because it "prescribes a rule for a single pending case—identified by caption and docket number." The amended law in *Robertson,* however, also applied to cases identified by caption and docket number, and was nonetheless upheld. Moreover, § 8772 . . . facilitates execution of judgments in 16 suits, together encompassing more than 1,000 victims of Iran-sponsored terrorist attacks. Although consolidated for administrative purposes at the execution stage, the judgment-execution claims brought pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 69 were not independent of the original actions for damages and each claim retained its separate character.

The Bank's argument is further flawed, for it rests on the assumption that legislation must be generally applicable, that "there is something wrong with particularized legislative action." *Plaut*. We have found that assumption suspect:

> "While legislatures usually act through laws of general applicability, that is by no means their only legitimate mode of action. Private bills in Congress are still common, and were even more so in the days before establishment of the Claims Court. Even laws that impose a duty or liability upon a single individual or firm are not on that account invalid—or else we would not have the extensive jurisprudence that we do concerning the Bill of Attainder Clause, including cases which say that [the Clause] requires not merely 'singling out' but also *punishment,* see, *e.g., United States v. Lovett,* 328 U.S. 303 (1946), [or] a case [holding] that Congress may legislate 'a legitimate class of one,' *Nixon v. Administrator of General Services,* 433 U.S. 425 (1977)." *Ibid*. . . .

* * *

For the reasons stated, we are satisfied that § 8772—a statute designed to aid in the enforcement of federal-court judgments—does not offend "separation of powers principles . . . protecting the role of the independent Judiciary within the constitutional design." The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is therefore *Affirmed.*

Chief Justice ROBERTS, with whom Justice SOTOMAYOR joins, dissenting.

Imagine your neighbor sues you, claiming that your fence is on his property. His evidence is a letter from the previous owner of your home, accepting your neighbor's version of the facts. Your defense is an official county map, which under state law establishes the boundaries of your land. The map shows the fence on your side of the property line. You also argue that your neighbor's claim is six months outside the statute of limitations.

Now imagine that while the lawsuit is pending, your neighbor persuades the legislature to enact a new statute. The new statute provides that for your case, and your case alone, a letter from one neighbor to another is conclusive of property boundaries, and the statute of limitations is one year longer. Your neighbor wins. Who would you say decided your case: the legislature, which targeted your specific case and eliminated your specific defenses so as to ensure your neighbor's victory, or the court, which presided over the *fait accompli*?

That question lies at the root of the case the Court confronts today. Article III of the Constitution commits the power to decide cases to the Judiciary alone. See *Stern v. Marshall,* 564 U.S. 462 (2011) [Note *supra* this Chapter]. Yet, in this case, Congress arrogated that power to itself. Since 2008, respondents have sought $1.75 billion in assets owned by Bank Markazi, Iran's central bank, in order to satisfy judgments against Iran for acts of terrorism. The Bank has vigorously opposed those efforts, asserting numerous legal defenses. So, in 2012, four years into the litigation, respondents persuaded Congress to enact a statute, 22 U.S.C. § 8772, that for this case alone eliminates each of the defenses standing in respondents' way. Then, having gotten Congress to resolve all outstanding issues in their favor, respondents returned to court . . . and won.

Contrary to the majority, I would hold that § 8772 violates the separation of powers. No less than if it had passed a law saying "respondents win," Congress has decided this case by enacting a bespoke statute tailored to this case that resolves the parties' specific legal disputes to guarantee respondents victory.

I

A

Article III, § 1 of the Constitution vests the "judicial Power of the United States" in the Federal Judiciary. That provision, this Court has observed, "safeguards the role of the Judicial Branch in our tripartite system." *Commodity Futures Trading Comm'n v. Schor* (1986) [*Supra* this Chapter]. It establishes the Judiciary's independence by giving the Judiciary distinct and inviolable authority. "Under the basic concept of separation of powers," the judicial power "can no more be shared with another branch than the Chief Executive, for example, can share with the Judiciary the veto power, or the Congress share with the Judiciary the power to override a Presidential veto." *Stern*. The separation of powers, in turn, safeguards individual freedom. As Hamilton wrote, quoting Montesquieu, "'there is no liberty if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers.'" *The Federalist* No. 78; see Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws*.

The question we confront today is whether § 8772 violates Article III by invading the judicial power.

B

"The Framers of our Constitution lived among the ruins of a system of intermingled legislative and judicial powers." *Plaut*. We surveyed those ruins in *Plaut* to determine the scope of the judicial power under Article III, and we ought to return to them today for that same purpose.

Throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, colonial legislatures performed what are now recognized as core judicial roles. . . . The judicial power exercised by colonial legislatures was often expressly vested in them by the colonial charter or statute. Legislative involvement in judicial matters intensified during the American Revolution, fueled by the "vigorous, indeed often radical, populism of the revolutionary legislatures and assemblies."

The Revolution-era "crescendo of legislative interference with private judgments of the courts," however, soon prompted a "sense of a sharp necessity to separate the legislative from the judicial power." *Plaut*. In 1778, an influential critique of a proposed (and ultimately rejected) Massachusetts constitution warned that "if the legislative and judicial powers are united, the maker of the law will also interpret it; and the law may then speak a language, dictated by the whims, the caprice, or the prejudice of the judge." In Virginia, Thomas Jefferson complained that the assembly had, "in many instances, decided rights which should have been left to judiciary controversy." And in Pennsylvania, the Council of Censors—a body appointed to assess compliance with the state constitution—decried the state assembly's practice of "extending their deliberations to the cases of individuals" instead of deferring to "the usual process of law," citing instances when the assembly overturned fines, settled estates, and suspended prosecutions. "There is reason to think," the Censors observed, "that favour and partiality have, from the nature of public bodies of men, predominated in the distribution of this relief." . . .

The States' experiences ultimately shaped the Federal Constitution, figuring prominently in the Framers' decision to devise a system for securing liberty through the division of power:

> "Before and during the debates on ratification, Madison, Jefferson, and Hamilton each wrote of the factional disorders and disarray that the system of legislative equity had produced in the years before the framing; and each thought that the separation of the legislative from the judicial power in the new Constitution would cure them." *Plaut*. . . .

As Professor Manning has concluded, "Article III, in large measure, reflects a reaction against the practice" of legislative interference with state courts. Manning, Response, Deriving Rules of Statutory Interpretation from the Constitution, 101 *Colum. L. Rev.* 1648 (2001).

Experience had confirmed Montesquieu's theory. The Framers saw that if the "power of judging . . . were joined to legislative power, the power over the life and liberty of the citizens would be arbitrary." They accordingly resolved to take the unprecedented step of establishing a "truly distinct" judiciary. *The Federalist* No. 78 (A. Hamilton). To help

ensure the "complete independence of the courts of justice," *ibid.,* they provided life tenure for judges and protection against diminution of their compensation. But such safeguards against indirect interference would have been meaningless if Congress could simply exercise the judicial power directly. The central pillar of judicial independence was Article III itself, which vested "the judicial Power of the United States" in "one supreme Court" and such "inferior Courts" as might be established. The judicial power was to be the Judiciary's alone.

II

A

Mindful of this history, our decisions have recognized three kinds of "unconstitutional restrictions upon the exercise of judicial power." *Plaut*. Two concern the effect of judgments once they have been rendered: "Congress cannot vest review of the decisions of Article III courts in officials of the Executive Branch," *ibid.,* for to do so would make a court's judgment merely "an advisory opinion in its most obnoxious form," And Congress cannot "retroactively command the federal courts to reopen final judgments," because Article III "gives the Federal Judiciary the power, not merely to rule on cases, but to *decide* them, subject to review only by superior courts in the Article III hierarchy." *Id.* Neither of these rules is directly implicated here.

This case is about the third type of unconstitutional interference with the judicial function, whereby Congress assumes the role of judge and decides a particular pending case in the first instance. Section 8772 does precisely that, changing the law—for these proceedings alone—simply to guarantee that respondents win. The law serves no other purpose—a point, indeed, that is hardly in dispute. As the majority acknowledges, the statute "sweeps away . . . any . . . federal or state law impediments that might otherwise exist" to bar respondents from obtaining Bank Markazi's assets. . . .

Section 8772 authorized attachment, moreover, only for the

> "financial assets that are identified in and the subject of proceedings in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in Peterson et al. v. Islamic Republic of Iran et al., Case No. 10 Civ. 4518(BSJ)(GWG), that were restrained by restraining notices and levies secured by the plaintiffs in those proceedings. . . ." § 8772(b).

And lest there be any doubt that Congress's sole concern was deciding this particular case, rather than establishing any generally applicable rules, § 8772 provided that nothing in the statute "shall be construed . . . to affect the availability, or lack thereof, of a right to satisfy a judgment in any other action against a terrorist party in any proceedings other than" these. § 8772(c).

B

There has never been anything like § 8772 before. Neither the majority nor respondents have identified another statute that changed the law for a pending case in an outcome-determinative way and explicitly limited its effect to particular judicial proceedings. That fact alone is "perhaps the most telling indication of the severe constitutional problem" with the law. Congress's "prolonged reticence would be amazing if such interference were not understood to be constitutionally proscribed." *Plaut*.

Section 8772 violates the bedrock rule of Article III that the judicial power is vested in the Judicial Branch alone. We first enforced that rule against an Act of Congress during the Reconstruction era in *Klein*. *Klein* arose from congressional opposition to conciliation with the South, and in particular to the pardons Presidents Lincoln and Johnson had offered to former Confederate rebels. Although this Court had held that a pardon was proof of loyalty and entitled its holder to compensation in the Court of Claims for property seized by Union forces during the war, see

United States v. Padelford, 9 Wall. 531 (1870), the Radical Republican Congress wished to prevent pardoned rebels from obtaining such compensation. It therefore enacted a law prohibiting claimants from using a pardon as evidence of loyalty, instead requiring the Court of Claims and Supreme Court to dismiss for want of jurisdiction any suit based on a pardon.

Klein's suit was among those Congress wished to block. Klein represented the estate of one V.F. Wilson, a Confederate supporter whom Lincoln had pardoned. On behalf of the estate, Klein had obtained a sizable judgment in the Court of Claims for property seized by the Union. The Government's appeal from that judgment was pending in the Supreme Court when the law targeting such suits took effect. The Government accordingly moved to dismiss the entire proceeding.

This Court, however, denied that motion and instead declared the law unconstitutional. It held that the law "passed the limit which separates the legislative from the judicial power." The Court acknowledged that Congress may "make exceptions and prescribe regulations to the appellate power," but it refused to sustain the law as an exercise of that authority. Instead, the Court held that the law violated the separation of powers by attempting to "decide" the case by "prescribing rules of decision to the Judicial Department of the government in cases pending before it." "It is of vital importance," the Court stressed, that the legislative and judicial powers "be kept distinct."

The majority characterizes *Klein* as a delphic, puzzling decision whose central holding—that Congress may not prescribe the result in pending cases—cannot be taken at face value.[2] It is true that *Klein* can be read too broadly, in a way that would swallow the rule that courts generally must apply a retroactively applicable statute to pending cases. See *United States v. Schooner Peggy,* 1 Cranch 103 (1801). But *Schooner Peggy* can be read too broadly, too. Applying a retroactive law that says "Smith wins" to the pending case of *Smith v. Jones* implicates profound issues of separation of powers, issues not adequately answered by a citation to *Schooner Peggy*. And just because *Klein* did not set forth clear rules defining the limits on Congress's authority to legislate with respect to a pending case does not mean—as the majority seems to think—that Article III itself imposes no such limits.

The same "record of history" that drove the Framers to adopt Article III to implement the separation of powers ought to compel us to give meaning to their design. *Plaut*. The nearly two centuries of experience with legislative assumption of judicial power meant that "the Framers were well acquainted with the danger of subjecting the determination of the rights of one person to the tyranny of shifting majorities." Article III vested the judicial power in the Judiciary alone to protect against that threat to liberty. It defined not only what the Judiciary can do, but also what Congress cannot.

The Court says it would reject a law that says "Smith wins" because such a statute "would create no new substantive law." Of course it would: Prior to the passage of the hypothetical statute, the law did not provide that Smith wins. After the passage of the law, it does. Changing the law is simply how Congress acts. The question is whether its action constitutes an exercise of judicial power. Saying Congress "creates new law" in one case but not another simply expresses a conclusion on that issue; it does not supply a reason.

"Smith wins" is a new law, tailored to one case in the same way as § 8772 and having the same effect. All that both statutes "effectuate," in substance, is lawmakers' "policy judgment" that one side in one case ought to prevail. The

[2] The majority instead seeks to recast *Klein* as being primarily about congressional impairment of the President's pardon power, despite *Klein*'s unmistakable indication that the impairment of the pardon power was an *alternative* ground for its holding, secondary to its Article III concerns. 13 Wall., at 147 ("The rule prescribed is *also* liable to just exception as impairing the effect of a pardon, and thus infringing the constitutional power of the Executive." (emphasis added)). The majority then suggests that *Klein* stands simply for the proposition that Congress may not require courts to act unconstitutionally. That is without doubt a good rule, recognized by this Court since *Marbury*. But it is hard to reconstruct *Klein* along these lines, given its focus on the threat to the separation of powers from allowing Congress to manipulate jurisdictional rules to dictate judicial results. See Hart, The Power of Congress To Limit the Jurisdiction of Federal Courts: An Exercise in Dialectic, 66 *Harv. L. Rev.* 1362, 1373 (1953) ("[I]f Congress directs an Article III court to decide a case, I can easily read into Article III a limitation on the power of Congress to tell the court *how* to decide it . . . as the Court itself made clear long ago in *United States v. Klein*.").

cause for concern is that though the statutes are indistinguishable, it is plain that the majority recognizes no limit under the separation of powers beyond the prohibition on statutes as brazen as "Smith wins." Hamilton warned that the Judiciary must take "all possible care . . . to defend itself against [the] attacks" of the other branches. *The Federalist* No. 78. In the Court's view, however, Article III is but a constitutional Maginot Line, easily circumvented by the simplest maneuver of taking away every defense against Smith's victory, without saying "Smith wins."

Take the majority's acceptance of the District Court's conclusion that § 8772 left "plenty" of factual determinations for the court "to adjudicate." All § 8772 actually required of the court was two factual determinations—that Bank Markazi has an equitable or beneficial interest in the assets, and that no other party does, § 8772(a)(2)—both of which were well established by the time Congress enacted § 8772. Not only had the assets at issue been frozen pursuant to an Executive Order blocking "property of the Government of Iran," but the Bank had "repeatedly insisted that it is the sole beneficial owner of the Blocked Assets." By that measure of "plenty," the majority would have to uphold a law directing judgment for Smith if the court finds that Jones was duly served with notice of the proceedings, and that Smith's claim was within the statute of limitations. In reality, the Court's "plenty" is plenty of nothing, and, apparently, nothing is plenty for the Court. See D. Heyward & I. Gershwin, *Porgy and Bess*: Libretto 28 (1958).

It is true that some of the precedents cited by the majority have allowed Congress to approach the boundary between legislative and judicial power. None, however, involved statutes comparable to § 8772. In *Robertson v. Seattle Audubon Soc.*, for example, the statute at issue referenced particular cases only as a shorthand for describing certain environmental law requirements, not to limit the statute's effect to those cases alone. And in *Plaut,* the Court explicitly distinguished the statute before it—which directed courts to reopen final judgments in an entire class of cases—from one that "'singles out' any defendant for adverse treatment (or any plaintiff for favorable treatment)." *Plaut,* in any event, held the statute before it *invalid,* concluding that it violated Article III based on the same historical understanding of the judicial power outlined above.[3]

I readily concede, without embarrassment, that it can sometimes be difficult to draw the line between legislative and judicial power. That should come as no surprise; Chief Justice Marshall's admonition "that 'it is a *constitution* we are expounding' is especially relevant when the Court is required to give legal sanctions to an underlying principle of the Constitution—that of separation of powers." But however difficult it may be to discern the line between the Legislative and Judicial Branches, the entire constitutional enterprise depends on there *being* such a line. The Court's failure to enforce that boundary in a case as clear as this reduces Article III to a mere "parchment barrier against the encroaching spirit" of legislative power. *The Federalist* No. 48 (J. Madison). . . .

* * *

At issue here is a basic principle, not a technical rule. Section 8772 decides this case no less certainly than if Congress had directed entry of judgment for respondents. As a result, the potential of the decision today "to effect important change in the equilibrium of power" is "immediately evident." Hereafter, with this Court's seal of approval, Congress can unabashedly pick the winners and losers in particular pending cases. Today's decision will indeed become a "blueprint for extensive expansion of the legislative power" at the Judiciary's expense, feeding Congress's tendency to "extend the sphere of its activity and draw all power into its impetuous vortex," *The Federalist* No. 48 (J. Madison).

I respectfully dissent.

[3] We have also upheld Congress's long practice of settling individual claims involving public rights, such as claims against the Government, through private bills. But the Court points to no example of a private bill that retroactively changed the law for a single case involving private rights.

C. Self-Imposed Limits on the Judicial Power

2. The Case or Controversy Requirement

b. Standing

Insert at page 104, before the Note:

Problem: Standing

Read the following two fact patterns, and analyze whether and why (or why not) the plaintiff(s) in each case would have standing.

1. Wrestling with Standing

Title IX of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits the federal government from funding any institution that "fails to provide equal opportunities to both sexes." In 1975, the Department of Education, which is responsible for distributing federal assistance to private universities and colleges, promulgated a regulation regarding gender equity in intercollegiate sports, to enforce Title IX. The regulation states that "The Department determines whether an institution provides equal athletic opportunities to both sexes by examining, *inter alia*, "whether the selection of sports and levels of competition effectively accommodate the interests and abilities of members of both sexes."

In 1990 the Department issued guidelines clarifying the 1975 regulation. Those guidelines explain that an institution's compliance with the "interests and abilities" requirement of the 1975 Regulation will be assessed pursuant to a three-part test that asks:

> (1) Whether intercollegiate level participation opportunities for male and female students are provided in numbers substantially proportionate to their respective enrollments; or
>
> (2) Where the members of one sex have been and are underrepresented among intercollegiate athletes, whether the institution can show a history and continuing practice of program expansion which is demonstrably responsive to the developing interest and abilities of the members of that sex; or
>
> (3) Where the members of one sex are underrepresented among intercollegiate athletes, and the institution cannot show a continuing practice of program expansion such as that cited above, whether it can be demonstrated that the interests and abilities of the members of that sex have been fully and effectively accommodated by the present program.

The guidelines explain that satisfaction of any one prong of this three-pronged test will satisfy the 1975 regulation.

Over the course of the succeeding two decades, several colleges eliminate their men's wrestling programs, or demote them from intercollegiate to "club" status. A group of wrestling coaches and college wrestling fans sue the Department. They do not challenge the underlying

1975 regulation; instead, they argue that the 1990 guidelines are too rigid, and violate both the 1975 Regulation and the 1964 law.

Would the coaches have standing? The fans? Why or why not?

2. Witnessing Animal Cruelty

Tom Jenkovic loves to visit zoos. Whenever he travels to a city on business he makes it a point to visit that city's zoo. On a recent business trip to Kansas City, when Tom visited the Kansas City Zoological Park, he was appalled to witness what he believed to be the substandard, inhumane conditions in which several primates were exhibited. After researching the matter, he comes across the federal Animal Welfare Act (AWA), which seeks to ensure that animals kept in captivity are treated humanely. Tom alleges that the AWA requires the Department to issue stringent regulations regarding primates' living conditions, and further alleges that the Department has failed to issue such regulations.

Does Tom have standing? Why or why not?

Chapter 2: The Distribution of National Regulatory Powers

C. Congress, the President, and the Administrative State

1. Limits on Congressional Authority to Delegate Legislative Power

***Insert at page 164, before Section 2*:**

Problem: Retroactive Application of a Criminal Law

In 2006 Congress enacted the Sexual Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA), which makes it a federal crime for a convicted sex offender moving across state lines to fail to register with the arrival state's law enforcement authorities. The first section of SORNA states that the Act's aim is "to establish a comprehensive national sex offender registry in order to protect children and the public at large from sex offenders." The statute also defines "sex offender" and provides in intricate detail the particulars of the registration requirement. It also states the following with regard to the registration requirements of a "sex offender" convicted before the date of SORNA's enactment.

> "The Attorney General shall have the authority to specify the applicability of the requirements of this [statute] to sex offenders convicted before the enactment of this [statute], and to prescribe rules for the registration of any such sex offenders. . . ."

In 2008 the Attorney General promulgated a regulation stating that sex offenders convicted on or after January 1, 2001, are required to comply with SORNA.

Bob Billingsley would fit SORNA's definition of a "sex offender;" however, his conviction occurred in 2003. When he moved from New Mexico to Colorado in 2015, he failed to register with Colorado authorities. He was arrested and charged with violating SORNA. His defense is that SORNA's delegation of power to the Attorney General violates the non-delegation doctrine. Is he correct? Why or why not?

3. Executive Control Over the Bureaucracy

Insert at page 203 before the first note:

Note: Agency Leadership Structure and Agency Independence

In 2016, a federal Court of Appeals introduced a new element into analysis of the constitutionality of independent agencies—namely, whether the agency in question was headed by a single person or by a group such as the Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission. The agency at issue in the case was the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), which Congress created in the aftermath of the Great Recession of 2008 to protect consumers from predatory financial practices.

In *PHH Corporation. v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, 839 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2016), a mortgage lender that was the subject of a CFPB enforcement action argued that the agency was unconstitutional because it was led by a single person who enjoyed for-cause removal protection—that is, a person who was not subject to removal at will by the President. Agreeing with that argument, the appellate panel acknowledged that the constitutional text did not answer the question. However, the court argued that historical practice militated against the constitutionality of the CFPB's structure, because there were very few examples of independent agencies led by one person, and because the few examples that existed were of relatively recent vintage.

The court did acknowledge that the Supreme Court upheld the independence of the Special Prosecutor's office in *Morrison v. Olson*. However, the appellate court stated that "*Morrison* did not expressly consider whether an independent agency could be headed by a single director." It also stated that "[t]he independent counsel . . . had only a limited jurisdiction for particular defined investigations." The court concluded this part of its analysis by stating that "in separation of powers cases not resolved by the constitutional text alone, historical practice matters a great deal in defining the constitutional limits on the Executive and Legislative branches."

The court then continued by stating that "[t]he historical practice of structuring independent agencies as multi-member commissions or boards is the historical practice for a reason: It reflects a deep and abiding concern for safeguarding the individual liberty protected by the Constitution." The court argued that an independent agency's multi-person leadership structure helped to mitigate the problem of an agency possessing coercive power while being unaccountable to the President. In particular, it observed that a multi-member structure helped ensure that the agency acted deliberatively rather than arbitrarily, and not in ways that unduly infringed on individuals' liberty. It also argued that a multi-member structure helped ensure that the agency was not unduly influenced (or "captured") by a single interest group, and observed that a dissenting opinion by one of the members of that agency leadership group could serve to warn Congress and the public of inappropriate agency action.

Having concluded that the CFPB's leadership by a single person immune from presidential removal at-will violated the Constitution, the court faced the question of a remedy. Rather than invalidate the agency entirely, the court concluded that the more prudent response would be to

strike down the for-cause provision that immunized the agency head from at-will presidential removal. Thus, in effect, the court ordered that the CFPB head become removable at will by the President.

One judge on the three-judge panel did not join the court's constitutional analysis, arguing that it was unnecessary to the resolution of the case before it. Moreover, in early 2017, the full Court of Appeals vacated this opinion and ordered review by the full *en banc* court. As of the writing of this supplement, the full *en banc* court has yet to announce a decision.

What do you think of the court's heavy focus on historical practice as an important factor in determining the constitutionality of the CFPB's structure? In a different case, dealing with a different alleged regulatory innovation, Chief Justice Roberts echoed the Court of Appeals' analysis, warning that "the most telling indication of [a] severe constitutional problem [with a statute] . . . is the lack of historical precedent for Congress's action." *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012). Yet in the sentence before he issued that warning, he also acknowledged that "[l]egislative novelty is not necessarily fatal; there is a first time for everything." How should the unusual or innovative nature of a given regulatory structure affect the question of its constitutionality? Leaving that issue aside, what do you think of the court's policy analysis of the dangers of an independent agency headed by a single person, and the benefits of leadership by a multi-person group? Can you flip the court's analysis—that is, can you find *benefits* in having an independent agency being led by a single person? If so, are those benefits consistent with the theories of separation of powers that you've encountered up to now?

Part II: The Division of Federal and State Regulatory Power

Chapter 4: Congress's Regulatory Powers

B. Federal Power to Regulate Interstate Commerce

3. The Evolution of Expanded Federal Power

***Insert at page 303, before Section 4*:**

Problem: The Federal Commerce Power—Then and Now

Tom Tyringham was arrested by federal authorities and charged with violating a federal statute that criminalized the possession of obscene material. Tom had set up a hidden tripod and camera in his bedroom and had taken photos of himself and his wife (without her knowledge) that would qualify as obscene, and thus would not enjoy any constitutional protection as free speech. Tom had no intention of distributing the material, or even showing it to anyone else (including his wife), nor has he ever purchased any obscene material in his lifetime.

You are an assistant U.S. Attorney for the district in which Tom was arrested. Your supervisor asks you to analyze whether it would be constitutional to apply the federal obscenity statute to Tom. What would you need to know about that statute to make that determination? How relevant would the particular facts about Tom be? Are there other facts about the case that you think might be relevant?

Return to this question after you read both *United States v. Lopez* (pages 303-319) and the note about *United States v. Morrison* (page 319-320).

Return to this question again after you read *United States v. Raich* (page 320-333).

How does your analysis change after each successive case?

Chapter 5: Residual State Powers—and Their Limits

A. The Commerce Clause as a Limitation on State Regulatory Power

3. Modern Applications

***Insert at the end of page 372*:**

Problem: Regulating Health Care Clinics

In the last decade, there has been rising interest among states in regulating health care clinics that offer sophisticated bone and organ imaging services. The machines that perform these services are very expensive, and there is concern that a proliferation of clinics offering them will cause destructive price competition that will lead to a decline in proper care, and that, as part of that competition, these businesses will seek to promote these services even when they are not medically appropriate.

The State of Franklin is one of these states. Last year it enacted a law that requires a license before a new clinic of this sort may be opened. That license will be granted only if the State Department of Health concludes that the community where the clinic is proposed to be located has a "demonstrated need" for such services—*e.g.*, if that community is underserved with regard to this technology. Clinics in operation when the law was enacted are not subject to this requirement.

Imaging Resources, Inc., is a corporation based in California that owns and operates a chain of such clinics. It wishes to expand into Franklin. Upon being denied licenses for those clinics, it sues the Franklin Department of Health, the agency responsible for licensing these clinics in Franklin. Imaging Resources alleges that the Franklin law violates the dormant Commerce Clause, as it discriminates against new entrants into the market for the benefit of existing clinics.

What facts would you want to know before you decide how you would analyze this case? Why would you want to know them?

Part III: Substantive Rights Under the

Chapter 9: The Right to An Abortion

C. The Casey Resolution (?)

Insert at the end of page 581:

6. In recent years, abortion opponents have shifted their tactics to regulations of abortion providers, justified as measures to protect women's health. Recall that *Casey* accepted this justification as a legitimate reason for regulating abortion, but cautioned that "unnecessary health regulations that have the purpose or effect of presenting a substantial obstacle to a woman seeking an abortion impose an undue burden on the right" and are thus unconstitutional. When Texas enacted a stringent version of such regulations, abortion providers sued, and the Court reviewed the lower court opinion upholding the regulations as consistent with *Casey*.

Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt

___ U.S. ___, 136 S.Ct. 2292 (2016)

Justice BREYER delivered the opinion of the Court.

In *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pa. v. Casey* (1992) [*Supra* this Chapter], a plurality of the Court concluded that there "exists" an "undue burden" on a woman's right to decide to have an abortion, and consequently a provision of law is constitutionally invalid, if the "*purpose or effect* " of the provision "*is to place a substantial obstacle* in the path of a woman seeking an abortion before the fetus attains viability." (Emphasis added.) The plurality added that "unnecessary health regulations that have the purpose or effect of presenting a substantial obstacle to a woman seeking an abortion impose an undue burden on the right."

We must here decide whether two provisions of Texas' House Bill 2 violate the Federal Constitution as interpreted in *Casey*. The first provision, which we shall call the *"admitting-privileges requirement,*" says that

> "a physician performing or inducing an abortion . . . must, on the date the abortion is performed or induced, have active admitting privileges at a hospital that . . . is located not further than 30 miles from the location at which the abortion is performed or induced."

This provision amended Texas law that had previously required an abortion facility to maintain a written protocol "for managing medical emergencies and the transfer of patients requiring further emergency care to a hospital."

The second provision, which we shall call the "*surgical-center requirement,*" says that

> "the minimum standards for an abortion facility must be equivalent to the minimum standards adopted under [the Texas Health and Safety Code section] for ambulatory surgical centers."

We conclude that neither of these provisions offers medical benefits sufficient to justify the burdens upon access that each imposes. Each places a substantial obstacle in the path of women seeking a previability abortion, each constitutes an undue burden on abortion access, *Casey* (plurality opinion), and each violates the Federal Constitution.

I

. . .

B

[Petitioners], a group of abortion providers . . . , filed the present lawsuit in Federal District Court. They sought an injunction preventing enforcement of the admitting-privileges provision as applied to physicians at two abortion facilities, one operated by Whole Woman's Health in McAllen and the other operated by Nova Health Systems in El Paso. They also sought an injunction prohibiting enforcement of the surgical-center provision anywhere in Texas. They claimed that the admitting-privileges provision and the surgical-center provision violated the Constitution's Fourteenth Amendment, as interpreted in *Casey*.

The District Court . . . conducted a 4–day bench trial. It heard, among other testimony, the opinions from expert witnesses for both sides. On the basis of the stipulations, depositions, and testimony, that court reached the following conclusions:

1. Of Texas' population of more than 25 million people, "approximately 5.4 million" are "women" of "reproductive age," living within a geographical area of "nearly 280,000 square miles."

2. "In recent years, the number of abortions reported in Texas has stayed fairly consistent at approximately 15–16% of the reported pregnancy rate, for a total number of approximately 60,000–72,000 legal abortions performed annually."

3. Prior to the enactment of H.B. 2, there were more than 40 licensed abortion facilities in Texas, which "number dropped by almost half leading up to and in the wake of enforcement of the admitting-privileges requirement that went into effect in late-October 2013."

4. If the surgical-center provision were allowed to take effect, the number of abortion facilities, after September 1, 2014, would be reduced further, so that "only seven facilities and a potential eighth will exist in Texas."

5. Abortion facilities "will remain only in Houston, Austin, San Antonio, and the Dallas/Fort Worth metropolitan region." . . .

6. "Based on historical data pertaining to Texas's average number of abortions, and assuming perfectly equal distribution among the remaining seven or eight providers, this would result in each facility serving between 7,500 and 10,000 patients per year. Accounting for the seasonal variations in pregnancy rates and a slightly unequal distribution of patients at each clinic, it is foreseeable that over 1,200 women per month could be vying for counseling, appointments, and follow-up visits at some of these facilities."

7. The suggestion "that these seven or eight providers could meet the demand of the entire state stretches credulity."

8. "Between November 1, 2012 and May 1, 2014," that is, before and after enforcement of the admitting-privileges requirement, "the decrease in geographical distribution of abortion facilities" has meant that the number of women of reproductive age living more than 50 miles from a clinic has doubled (from 800,000 to over 1.6 million); those living more than 100 miles has increased by 150% (from 400,000 to 1 million); those living more than 150 miles has increased by more than 350% (from 86,000 to 400,000); and those living more than 200 miles has increased by about 2,800% (from 10,000 to 290,000). After September 2014, should the surgical-center requirement go into effect, the number of women of reproductive age living significant distances from an abortion provider will increase as follows: 2 million women of reproductive age will live more than 50 miles from an abortion provider; 1.3 million will live more than 100 miles from an abortion provider; 900,000 will live more than 150 miles from an abortion provider; and 750,000 more than 200 miles from an abortion provider.

9. The "two requirements erect a particularly high barrier for poor, rural, or disadvantaged women."

10. "The great weight of evidence demonstrates that, before the act's passage, abortion in Texas was extremely safe with particularly low rates of serious complications and virtually no deaths occurring on account of the procedure."

11. "Abortion, as regulated by the State before the enactment of House Bill 2, has been shown to be much safer, in terms of minor and serious complications, than many common medical procedures not subject to such intense regulation and scrutiny."

12. "Additionally, risks are not appreciably lowered for patients who undergo abortions at ambulatory surgical centers as compared to nonsurgical-center facilities."

13. "Women will not obtain better care or experience more frequent positive outcomes at an ambulatory surgical center as compared to a previously licensed facility."

14. "There are 433 licensed ambulatory surgical centers in Texas," of which "336 . . . are apparently either 'grandfathered' or enjoy the benefit of a waiver of some or all" of the surgical-center "requirements."

15. The "cost of coming into compliance" with the surgical-center requirement "for existing clinics is significant," "undisputedly approaching 1 million dollars," and "most likely exceeding 1.5 million dollars," with "some . . . clinics" unable to "comply due to physical size limitations of their sites." The "cost of acquiring land and constructing a new compliant clinic will likely exceed three million dollars."

On the basis of these and other related findings, the District Court determined that the surgical-center requirement "imposes an undue burden on the right of women throughout Texas to seek a previability abortion," and that the "admitting-privileges requirement, . . . in conjunction with the ambulatory-surgical-center requirement, imposes an undue burden on the right of women in the Rio Grande Valley, El Paso, and West Texas to seek a previability abortion." The District Court concluded that the "two provisions" would cause "the closing of almost all abortion clinics in Texas that were operating legally in the fall of 2013," and thereby create a constitutionally "impermissible obstacle as applied to all women seeking a previability abortion" by "restricting access to previously available legal facilities." On August 29, 2014, the court enjoined the enforcement of the two provisions.

C

On October 2, 2014, at Texas' request, the Court of Appeals stayed the District Court's injunction. . . . On June 9, 2015, the Court of Appeals reversed the District Court on the merits. With minor exceptions, it found both provisions constitutional and allowed them to take effect. Because the Court of Appeals' decision rests upon alternative grounds and fact-related considerations, we set forth its basic reasoning in some detail. The Court of Appeals concluded: . . .

- [A] state law "regulating previability abortion is constitutional if: (1) it does not have the purpose or effect of placing a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion of a nonviable fetus; and (2) it is reasonably related to (or designed to further) a legitimate state interest."

- "Both the admitting privileges requirement and" the surgical-center requirement "were rationally related to a legitimate state interest," namely, "raising the standard and quality of care for women seeking abortions and . . . protecting the health and welfare of women seeking abortions."

- The "plaintiffs" failed "to proffer competent evidence contradicting the legislature's statement of a legitimate purpose."

- "The district court erred by substituting its own judgment [as to the provisions' effects] for that of the legislature, albeit . . . in the name of the undue burden inquiry."

- Holding the provisions unconstitutional on their face is improper because the plaintiffs had failed to show that either of the provisions "imposes an undue burden on a large fraction of women."

- The District Court erred in finding that, if the surgical-center requirement takes effect, there will be too few abortion providers in Texas to meet the demand. That factual determination was based upon the finding of one of plaintiffs' expert witnesses (Dr. Grossman) that abortion providers in Texas "'will not be able to go from providing approximately 14,000 abortions annually, as they currently are, to providing the 60,000 to 70,000 abortions that are done each year in Texas once all'" of the clinics failing to meet the surgical-center requirement "'are forced to close.'" But Dr. Grossman's opinion is (in the Court of Appeals' view) "*ipse dixit*"; the "record lacks any actual evidence regarding the current or future capacity of the eight clinics''; and there is no "evidence in the record that" the providers that currently meet the surgical center requirement "are operating at full capacity or that they cannot increase capacity."

For these and related reasons, the Court of Appeals reversed the District Court's holding that the admitting-privileges requirement is unconstitutional and its holding that the surgical-center requirement is unconstitutional. . . .

III

Undue Burden—Legal Standard

We begin with the standard, as described in *Casey.* We recognize that the "State has a legitimate interest in seeing to it that abortion, like any other medical procedure, is performed under circumstances that insure maximum safety for the patient." *Roe v. Wade* (1973) [*Supra* this Chapter)]. But, we added, "a statute which, while furthering a valid state interest, has the effect of placing a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman's choice cannot be considered a permissible means of serving its legitimate ends." *Casey* (plurality opinion). Moreover, "unnecessary health regulations that have the purpose or effect of presenting a substantial obstacle to a woman seeking an abortion impose an undue burden on the right."

The Court of Appeals wrote that a state law is "constitutional if: (1) it does not have the purpose or effect of placing a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion of a nonviable fetus; and (2) it is reasonably related to (or designed to further) a legitimate state interest." The Court of Appeals went on to hold that "the district court erred by substituting its own judgment for that of the legislature" when it conducted its "undue burden inquiry," in part because "medical uncertainty underlying a statute is for resolution by legislatures, not the courts." (citing *Gonzales v. Carhart,* 550 U.S. 124 (2007)) [Note *supra* this Chapter].

The Court of Appeals' articulation of the relevant standard is incorrect. The first part of the Court of Appeals' test may be read to imply that a district court should not consider the existence or nonexistence of medical benefits when considering whether a regulation of abortion constitutes an undue burden. The rule announced in *Casey,* however, requires that courts consider the burdens a law imposes on abortion access together with the benefits those laws confer. See *Casey* (opinion of the Court) (performing this balancing with respect to a spousal notification provision); *id.* (joint opinion of O'Connor, KENNEDY, and Souter, JJ.) (same balancing with respect to a parental notification provision). And the second part of the test is wrong to equate the judicial review applicable to the regulation of a constitutionally protected personal liberty with the less strict review applicable where, for example, economic legislation is at issue. See, *e.g., Williamson v. Lee Optical of Okla., Inc.,* 348 U.S. 483 (1955) [Note *supra* Chapter 7]. The Court of Appeals' approach simply does not match the standard that this Court laid out in *Casey,* which asks courts to consider whether any burden imposed on abortion access is "undue."

The statement that legislatures, and not courts, must resolve questions of medical uncertainty is also inconsistent with this Court's case law. Instead, the Court, when determining the constitutionality of laws regulating abortion procedures, has placed considerable weight upon evidence and argument presented in judicial proceedings. In *Casey,* for example, we relied heavily on the District Court's factual findings and the research-based submissions of *amici* in declaring a portion of the law at issue unconstitutional. *Casey* (opinion of the Court) (discussing evidence related to the prevalence of spousal abuse in determining that a spousal notification provision erected an undue burden to abortion access). And, in *Gonzales* the Court, while pointing out that we must review legislative "factfinding under a deferential standard," added that we must not "place dispositive weight" on those "findings." *Gonzales* went on to point out that the "*Court retains an independent constitutional duty to review factual findings where constitutional*

rights are at stake." (emphasis added). Although there we upheld a statute regulating abortion, we did not do so solely on the basis of legislative findings explicitly set forth in the statute, noting that "evidence presented in the District Courts contradicts" some of the legislative findings. In these circumstances, we said, "uncritical deference to Congress' factual findings . . . is inappropriate."

Unlike in *Gonzales,* the relevant statute here does not set forth any legislative findings. Rather, one is left to infer that the legislature sought to further a constitutionally acceptable objective (namely, protecting women's health). For a district court to give significant weight to evidence in the judicial record in these circumstances is consistent with this Court's case law. As we shall describe, the District Court did so here. It did not simply substitute its own judgment for that of the legislature. It considered the evidence in the record—including expert evidence, presented in stipulations, depositions, and testimony. It then weighed the asserted benefits against the burdens. We hold that, in so doing, the District Court applied the correct legal standard.

IV

Undue Burden—Admitting–Privileges Requirement

Turning to the lower courts' evaluation of the evidence, we first consider the admitting-privileges requirement. Before the enactment of H.B. 2, doctors who provided abortions were required to "have admitting privileges *or* have a working arrangement with a physician(s) who has admitting privileges at a local hospital in order to ensure the necessary back up for medical complications." Tex. Admin. Code, tit. 25, § 139.56 (2009) (emphasis added). The new law changed this requirement by requiring that a "physician performing or inducing an abortion . . . must, on the date the abortion is performed or induced, have active admitting privileges at a hospital that . . . is located not further than 30 miles from the location at which the abortion is performed or induced." The District Court held that the legislative change imposed an "undue burden" on a woman's right to have an abortion. We conclude that there is adequate legal and factual support for the District Court's conclusion.

The purpose of the admitting-privileges requirement is to help ensure that women have easy access to a hospital should complications arise during an abortion procedure. But the District Court found that it brought about no such health-related benefit. The court found that "the great weight of evidence demonstrates that, before the act's passage, abortion in Texas was extremely safe with particularly low rates of serious complications and virtually no deaths occurring on account of the procedure." Thus, there was no significant health-related problem that the new law helped to cure.

The evidence upon which the court based this conclusion included, among other things:

- A collection of at least five peer-reviewed studies on abortion complications in the first trimester, showing that the highest rate of major complications—including those complications requiring hospital admission—was less than one-quarter of 1%.

- Figures in three peer-reviewed studies showing that the highest complication rate found for the much rarer second trimester abortion was less than one-half of 1% (0.45% or about 1 out of about 200).

- Expert testimony to the effect that complications rarely require hospital admission, much less immediate transfer to a hospital from an outpatient clinic.

- Expert testimony stating that "it is extremely unlikely that a patient will experience a serious complication at the clinic that requires emergent hospitalization" and "in the rare case in which [one does], the quality of care that the patient receives is not affected by whether the abortion provider has admitting privileges at the hospital."

- Expert testimony stating that in respect to surgical abortion patients who do suffer complications requiring hospitalization, most of these complications occur in the days after the abortion, not on the spot.

- Expert testimony stating that a delay before the onset of complications is also expected for medical abortions, as "abortifacient drugs take time to exert their effects, and thus the abortion itself almost always occurs after the patient has left the abortion facility."

- Some experts added that, if a patient needs a hospital in the day or week following her abortion, she will likely seek medical attention at the hospital nearest her home.

We have found nothing in Texas' record evidence that shows that, compared to prior law (which required a "working arrangement" with a doctor with admitting privileges), the new law advanced Texas' legitimate interest in protecting women's health. . . .

At the same time, the record evidence indicates that the admitting-privileges requirement places a "substantial obstacle in the path of a woman's choice." *Casey* (plurality opinion). The District Court found, as of the time the admitting-privileges requirement began to be enforced, the number of facilities providing abortions dropped in half, from about 40 to about 20. . . .

In our view, the record contains sufficient evidence that the admitting-privileges requirement led to the closure of half of Texas' clinics, or thereabouts. Those closures meant fewer doctors, longer waiting times, and increased crowding. Record evidence also supports the finding that after the admitting-privileges provision went into effect, the "number of women of reproductive age living in a county . . . more than 150 miles from a provider increased from approximately 86,000 to 400,000 . . . and the number of women living in a county more than 200 miles from a provider from approximately 10,000 to 290,000." We recognize that increased driving distances do not always constitute an "undue burden." See *Casey* (joint opinion of O'Connor, KENNEDY, and Souter, JJ.). But here, those increases are but one additional burden, which, when taken together with others that the closings brought about, and when viewed in light of the virtual absence of any health benefit, lead us to conclude that the record adequately supports the District Court's "undue burden" conclusion.

The dissent's only argument why these clinic closures, as well as the ones discussed in Part V, *infra,* may not have imposed an undue burden is this: Although "H. B. 2 caused the closure of *some* clinics" (emphasis added), other clinics may have closed for other reasons (so we should not "actually count" the burdens resulting from those closures against H.B. 2). But petitioners satisfied their burden to present evidence of causation by presenting direct testimony as well as plausible inferences to be drawn from the timing of the clinic closures. The District Court credited that evidence and concluded from it that H.B. 2 in fact led to the clinic closures. The dissent's speculation that perhaps other evidence, not presented at trial or credited by the District Court, might have shown that some clinics closed for unrelated reasons does not provide sufficient ground to disturb the District Court's factual finding on that issue.

In the same breath, the dissent suggests that one benefit of H.B. 2's requirements would be that they might "force unsafe facilities to shut down." To support that assertion, the dissent points to the Kermit Gosnell scandal. Gosnell, a physician in Pennsylvania, was convicted of first-degree murder and manslaughter. He "staffed his facility with unlicensed and indifferent workers, and then let them practice medicine unsupervised" and had "dirty facilities; unsanitary instruments; an absence of functioning monitoring and resuscitation equipment; the use of cheap, but dangerous, drugs; illegal procedures; and inadequate emergency access for when things inevitably went wrong." Gosnell's behavior was terribly wrong. But there is no reason to believe that an extra layer of regulation would have affected that behavior. Determined wrongdoers, already ignoring existing statutes and safety measures, are unlikely to be convinced to adopt safe practices by a new overlay of regulations. Regardless, Gosnell's deplorable crimes could escape detection only because his facility went uninspected for more than 15 years. Pre-existing Texas law already contained numerous detailed regulations covering abortion facilities, including a requirement that facilities be inspected at least annually. The record contains nothing to suggest that H. B. 2 would be more effective than pre-existing Texas law at deterring wrongdoers like Gosnell from criminal behavior.

V

Undue Burden—Surgical–Center Requirement

The second challenged provision of Texas' new law sets forth the surgical-center requirement. Prior to enactment of the new requirement, Texas law required abortion facilities to meet a host of health and safety requirements. . . . These requirements are policed by random and announced inspections, at least annually, as well as administrative penalties, injunctions, civil penalties, and criminal penalties for certain violations.

H.B. 2 added the requirement that an "abortion facility" meet the "minimum standards . . . for ambulatory surgical centers" under Texas law. The surgical-center regulations include, among other things, detailed specifications relating to the size of the nursing staff, building dimensions, and other building requirements. . . .

There is considerable evidence in the record supporting the District Court's findings indicating that the statutory provision requiring all abortion facilities to meet all surgical-center standards does not benefit patients and is not necessary. The District Court found that "risks are not appreciably lowered for patients who undergo abortions at ambulatory surgical centers as compared to nonsurgical-center facilities." The court added that women "will not obtain better care or experience more frequent positive outcomes at an ambulatory surgical center as compared to a previously licensed facility." And these findings are well supported. . . .

The upshot is that this record evidence, along with the absence of any evidence to the contrary, provides ample support for the District Court's conclusion that "many of the building standards mandated by the act and its implementing rules have such a tangential relationship to patient safety in the context of abortion as to be nearly arbitrary." That conclusion, along with the supporting evidence, provides sufficient support for the more general conclusion that the surgical-center requirement "will not [provide] better care or . . . more frequent positive outcomes." The record evidence thus supports the ultimate legal conclusion that the surgical-center requirement is not necessary.

At the same time, the record provides adequate evidentiary support for the District Court's conclusion that the surgical-center requirement places a substantial obstacle in the path of women seeking an abortion. The parties stipulated that the requirement would further reduce the number of abortion facilities available to seven or eight facilities, located in Houston, Austin, San Antonio, and Dallas/Fort Worth. In the District Court's view, the proposition that these "seven or eight providers could meet the demand of the entire State stretches credulity." We take this statement as a finding that these few facilities could not "meet" that "demand."

The Court of Appeals held that this finding was "clearly erroneous." It wrote that the finding rested upon the "*ipse dixit*" of one expert, Dr. Grossman, and that there was no evidence that the current surgical centers (*i.e.,* the seven or eight) are operating at full capacity or could not increase capacity. Unlike the Court of Appeals, however, we hold that the record provides adequate support for the District Court's finding. . . .

Texas suggests that the seven or eight remaining clinics could expand sufficiently to provide abortions for the 60,000 to 72,000 Texas women who sought them each year. Because petitioners had satisfied their burden, the obligation was on Texas, if it could, to present evidence rebutting that issue to the District Court. Texas admitted that it presented no such evidence. . . .

More fundamentally, in the face of no threat to women's health, Texas seeks to force women to travel long distances to get abortions in crammed-to-capacity superfacilities. Patients seeking these services are less likely to get the kind of individualized attention, serious conversation, and emotional support that doctors at less taxed facilities may have offered. Healthcare facilities and medical professionals are not fungible commodities. Surgical centers attempting to accommodate sudden, vastly increased demand, may find that quality of care declines. Another commonsense inference that the District Court made is that these effects would be harmful to, not supportive of, women's health.

Finally, the District Court found that the costs that a currently licensed abortion facility would have to incur to meet the surgical-center requirements were considerable, ranging from $1 million per facility (for facilities with adequate space) to $3 million per facility (where additional land must be purchased). This evidence supports the conclusion that more surgical centers will not soon fill the gap when licensed facilities are forced to close.

We agree with the District Court that the surgical-center requirement, like the admitting-privileges requirement, provides few, if any, health benefits for women, poses a substantial obstacle to women seeking abortions, and constitutes an "undue burden" on their constitutional right to do so.

VI

We consider three additional arguments that Texas makes and deem none persuasive.

First, Texas argues that facial invalidation of both challenged provisions is precluded by H.B. 2's severability clause. [The Court rejected this argument.]

Second, Texas claims that the provisions at issue here do not impose a substantial obstacle because the women affected by those laws are not a "large fraction" of Texan women "of reproductive age," which Texas reads *Casey* to have required. But *Casey* used the language "large fraction" to refer to "a large fraction of cases in which [the provision at issue] is *relevant,*" a class narrower than "all women," "pregnant women," or even "the class of *women seeking abortions* identified by the State." *Casey* (opinion of the Court) (emphasis added). Here, as in *Casey,* the relevant denominator is "those [women] for whom [the provision] is an actual rather than an irrelevant restriction." . . .

Third, Texas looks for support to *Simopoulos v. Virginia,* 462 U.S. 506 (1983), a case in which this Court upheld a surgical-center requirement as applied to second-trimester abortions. This case, however, unlike *Simopoulos,* involves restrictions applicable to all abortions, not simply to those that take place during the second trimester. Most abortions in Texas occur in the first trimester, not the second. More importantly, in *Casey* we discarded the trimester framework, and we now use "viability" as the relevant point at which a State may begin limiting women's access to abortion for reasons unrelated to maternal health. Because the second trimester includes time that is both previability and postviability, *Simopoulos* cannot provide clear guidance. . . .

* * *

For these reasons the judgment of the Court of Appeals is reversed, and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

Justice GINSBURG, concurring.

The Texas law called H.B. 2 inevitably will reduce the number of clinics and doctors allowed to provide abortion services. Texas argues that H.B. 2's restrictions are constitutional because they protect the health of women who experience complications from abortions. In truth, "complications from an abortion are both rare and rarely dangerous." *Planned Parenthood of Wis., Inc. v. Schimel,* 806 F.3d 908 (C.A.7 2015). See Brief for American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists et al. as *Amici Curiae* (collecting studies and concluding "abortion is one of the safest medical procedures performed in the United States"); Brief for Social Science Researchers as *Amici Curiae* (compiling studies that show "complication rates from abortion are very low"). Many medical procedures, including childbirth, are far more dangerous to patients, yet are not subject to ambulatory-surgical-center or hospital admitting-privileges requirements. Given those realities, it is beyond rational belief that H.B. 2 could genuinely protect the health of women, and certain that the law "would simply make it more difficult for them to obtain abortions." When a State severely limits access to safe and legal procedures, women in desperate circumstances may resort to unlicensed rogue practitioners, *faute de mieux,* at great risk to their health and safety. So long as this Court adheres to *Roe* and *Casey*, targeted Regulation of Abortion Providers laws like H.B. 2 that "do little or nothing for health, but rather strew impediments to abortion" cannot survive judicial inspection.

Justice THOMAS, dissenting.

. . . This case . . . underscores the Court's increasingly common practice of invoking a given level of scrutiny—here, the abortion-specific undue burden standard—while applying a different standard of review entirely. Whatever scrutiny the majority applies to Texas' law, it bears little resemblance to the undue-burden test the Court articulated in *Casey* and its successors. Instead, the majority eviscerates important features of that test to return to a regime like the one that *Casey* repudiated. . . .

II

Today's opinion . . . reimagines the undue-burden standard used to assess the constitutionality of abortion restrictions. Nearly 25 years ago, in *Casey*, a plurality of this Court invented the "undue burden" standard as a special test for gauging the permissibility of abortion restrictions. *Casey* held that a law is unconstitutional if it imposes an "undue burden" on a woman's ability to choose to have an abortion, meaning that it "has the purpose or effect of placing a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion of a nonviable fetus." *Casey* thus instructed courts to look to whether a law substantially impedes women's access to abortion, and whether it is reasonably related to legitimate state interests. As the Court explained, "where it has a rational basis to act, and it does not impose an undue burden, the State may use its regulatory power" to regulate aspects of abortion procedures, "all in furtherance of its legitimate interests in regulating the medical profession in order to promote respect for life, including life of the unborn." *Gonzales v. Carhart*.

I remain fundamentally opposed to the Court's abortion jurisprudence. Even taking *Casey* as the baseline, however, the majority radically rewrites the undue-burden test in three ways. First, today's decision requires courts to "consider the burdens a law imposes on abortion access together with the benefits those laws confer." Second, today's opinion tells the courts that, when the law's justifications are medically uncertain, they need not defer to the legislature, and must instead assess medical justifications for abortion restrictions by scrutinizing the record themselves. Finally, even if a law imposes no "substantial obstacle" to women's access to abortions, the law now must have more than a "reasonable relation to . . . a legitimate state interest." These precepts are nowhere to be found in *Casey* or its successors, and transform the undue-burden test to something much more akin to strict scrutiny.

First, the majority's free-form balancing test is contrary to *Casey*. When assessing Pennsylvania's recordkeeping requirements for abortion providers, for instance, *Casey* did not weigh its benefits and burdens. Rather, *Casey* held that the law had a legitimate purpose because data collection advances medical research, "so it cannot be said that the requirements serve no purpose other than to make abortions more difficult." The opinion then asked whether the recordkeeping requirements imposed a "substantial obstacle," and found none. Contrary to the majority's statements, *Casey* did not balance the benefits and burdens of Pennsylvania's spousal and parental notification provisions, either. Pennsylvania's spousal notification requirement, the plurality said, imposed an undue burden because findings established that the requirement would "likely . . . prevent a significant number of women from obtaining an abortion"—not because these burdens outweighed its benefits. And *Casey* summarily upheld parental notification provisions because even pre-*Casey* decisions had done so. . . .

Second, by rejecting the notion that "legislatures, and not courts, must resolve questions of medical uncertainty," the majority discards another core element of the *Casey* framework. Before today, this Court had "given state and federal legislatures wide discretion to pass legislation in areas where there is medical and scientific uncertainty." *Gonzales.* This Court emphasized that this "traditional rule" of deference "is consistent with *Casey*." . . .

Today, however, the majority refuses to leave disputed medical science to the legislature because past cases "placed considerable weight upon the evidence and argument presented in judicial proceedings." But while *Casey* relied on record evidence to uphold Pennsylvania's spousal-notification requirement, that requirement had nothing to do with debated medical science. And while *Gonzales* observed that courts need not blindly accept all legislative findings, that does not help the majority. *Gonzales* refused to accept Congress' finding of "a medical consensus that the prohibited procedure is never medically necessary" because the procedure's necessity was debated within the medical community. Having identified medical uncertainty, *Gonzales* explained how courts should resolve conflicting

positions: by respecting the legislature's judgment.

Finally, the majority overrules another central aspect of *Casey* by requiring laws to have more than a rational basis even if they do not substantially impede access to abortion. "Where [the State] *has a rational basis to act* and it does not impose an undue burden," this Court previously held, "the State may use its regulatory power" to impose regulations "in furtherance of its legitimate interests in regulating the medical profession in order to promote respect for life, including life of the unborn." *Gonzales* (emphasis added); see *Casey* (plurality opinion) (similar). No longer. Though the majority declines to say how substantial a State's interest must be, one thing is clear: The State's burden has been ratcheted to a level that has not applied for a quarter century.

Today's opinion does resemble *Casey* in one respect: After disregarding significant aspects of the Court's prior jurisprudence, the majority applies the undue-burden standard in a way that will surely mystify lower courts for years to come. As in *Casey,* today's opinion "simply . . . highlights certain facts in the record that apparently strike the . . . Justices as particularly significant in establishing (or refuting) the existence of an undue burden." *Casey* (Scalia, J., concurring in judgment in part and dissenting in part). As in *Casey,* "the opinion then simply announces that the provision either does or does not impose a 'substantial obstacle' or an 'undue burden.'" *Casey* (opinion of Scalia, J). And still "we do not know whether the same conclusions could have been reached on a different record, or in what respects the record would have had to differ before an opposite conclusion would have been appropriate." *Id.* (opinion of Scalia, J.). All we know is that an undue burden now has little to do with whether the law, in a "real sense, deprives women of the ultimate decision," *Casey,* and more to do with the loss of "individualized attention, serious conversation, and emotional support."

The majority's undue-burden test looks far less like our post-*Casey* precedents and far more like the strict-scrutiny standard that *Casey* rejected, under which only the most compelling rationales justified restrictions on abortion. One searches the majority opinion in vain for any acknowledgment of the "premise central" to *Casey*'s rejection of strict scrutiny: "that the government has a legitimate and substantial interest in preserving and promoting fetal life" from conception, not just in regulating medical procedures. *Gonzales*. Meanwhile, the majority's undue-burden balancing approach risks ruling out even minor, previously valid infringements on access to abortion. Moreover, by second-guessing medical evidence and making its own assessments of "quality of care" issues, the majority reappoints this Court as "the country's *ex officio* medical board with powers to disapprove medical and operative practices and standards throughout the United States." *Gonzales*. And the majority seriously burdens States, which must guess at how much more compelling their interests must be to pass muster and what "commonsense inferences" of an undue burden this Court will identify next.

* * *

Today's decision will prompt some to claim victory, just as it will stiffen opponents' will to object. But the entire Nation has lost something essential. The majority's embrace of a jurisprudence of rights-specific exceptions and balancing tests is "a regrettable concession of defeat—an acknowledgement that we have passed the point where 'law,' properly speaking, has any further application." Scalia, The Rule of Law as a Law of Rules, 56 *U. Chi. L.Rev.* 1175 (1989). I respectfully dissent.

Justice ALITO, with whom THE CHIEF JUSTICE and Justice THOMAS join, dissenting. . . .

III

A sweeping, statewide injunction against the enforcement of the admitting privileges and ASC requirements is unjustified. Petitioners in this case are abortion clinics and physicians who perform abortions. If they were simply asserting a constitutional right to conduct a business or to practice a profession without unnecessary state regulation, they would have little chance of success. See, *e.g., Williamson v. Lee Optical of Okla., Inc.,* 348 U.S. 483 (1955) [Note *supra* Chapter 7). Under our abortion cases, however, they are permitted to rely on the right of the abortion patients they serve.

Thus, what matters for present purposes is not the effect of the H.B. 2 provisions on petitioners but the effect on their patients. Under our cases, petitioners must show that the admitting privileges and ASC requirements impose an "undue burden" on women seeking abortions. And in order to obtain the sweeping relief they seek—facial invalidation of those provisions—they must show, at a minimum, that these provisions have an unconstitutional impact on at least a "large fraction" of Texas women of reproductive age. Such a situation could result if the clinics able to comply with the new requirements either lacked the requisite overall capacity or were located too far away to serve a "large fraction" of the women in question.

Petitioners did not make that showing. Instead of offering direct evidence, they relied on two crude inferences. First, they pointed to the number of abortion clinics that closed after the enactment of H.B. 2, and asked that it be inferred that all these closures resulted from the two challenged provisions. They made little effort to show why particular clinics closed. Second, they pointed to the number of abortions performed annually at ASCs before H.B. 2 took effect and, because this figure is well below the total number of abortions performed each year in the State, they asked that it be inferred that ASC-compliant clinics could not meet the demands of women in the State. Petitioners failed to provide any evidence of the actual capacity of the facilities that would be available to perform abortions in compliance with the new law . . . .

A

I do not dispute the fact that H.B. 2 caused the closure of some clinics. Indeed, it seems clear that H.B. 2 was intended to force unsafe facilities to shut down. The law was one of many enacted by States in the wake of the Kermit Gosnell scandal, in which a physician who ran an abortion clinic in Philadelphia was convicted for the first-degree murder of three infants who were born alive and for the manslaughter of a patient. Gosnell had not been actively supervised by state or local authorities or by his peers, and the Philadelphia grand jury that investigated the case recommended that the Commonwealth adopt a law requiring abortion clinics to comply with the same regulations as ASCs. If Pennsylvania had had such a requirement in force, the Gosnell facility may have been shut down before his crimes. And if there were any similarly unsafe facilities in Texas, H.B. 2 was clearly intended to put them out of business.[13]

While there can be no doubt that H.B. 2 caused some clinics to cease operation, the absence of proof regarding the reasons for particular closures is a problem because some clinics have or may have closed for at least four reasons other than the two H.B. 2 requirements at issue here. These are:

1. *H. B. 2's restriction on medication abortion.* In their first case, petitioners challenged the provision of H.B. 2 that regulates medication abortion, but that part of the statute was upheld by the Fifth Circuit and not relitigated in this case. The record in this case indicates that in the first six months after this restriction took effect, the number of medication abortions dropped by 6,957 (compared to the same period the previous year).

2. *Withdrawal of Texas family planning funds.* In 2011, Texas passed a law preventing family planning grants to providers that perform abortions and their affiliates. In the first case, petitioners' expert admitted that some clinics closed "as a result of the defunding," and as discussed below, this withdrawal appears specifically to have caused multiple clinic closures in West Texas.

3. *The nationwide decline in abortion demand.* Petitioners' expert testimony relies on a study from the Guttmacher Institute which concludes that "the national abortion rate has resumed its decline, and *no evidence was found that the overall drop in abortion incidence was related to the decrease in providers or to restrictions implemented between 2008 and 2011*." Consistent with that trend, "the number of abortions to residents of Texas declined by 4,956 between 2010 and 2011 and by 3,905 between 2011 and 2012."

[13] The Court attempts to distinguish the Gosnell horror story by pointing to differences between Pennsylvania and Texas law. But Texas did not need to be in Pennsylvania's precise position for the legislature to rationally conclude that a similar law would be helpful.

> 4. *Physician retirement (or other localized factors).* Like everyone else, most physicians eventually retire, and the retirement of a physician who performs abortions can cause the closing of a clinic or a reduction in the number of abortions that a clinic can perform. . . .

Neither petitioners nor the District Court properly addressed these complexities in assessing causation—and for no good reason. . . .

Precise findings are important because the key issue here is not the number or percentage of clinics affected, but the effect of the closures on women seeking abortions, *i.e.,* on the capacity and geographic distribution of clinics used by those women. To the extent that clinics closed (or experienced a reduction in capacity) for any reason unrelated to the challenged provisions of H.B. 2, the corresponding burden on abortion access may not be factored into the access analysis. Because there was ample reason to believe that some closures were caused by these other factors, the District Court's failure to ascertain the reasons for clinic closures means that, on the record before us, there is no way to tell which closures actually count. Petitioners—who, as plaintiffs, bore the burden of proof—cannot simply point to temporal correlation and call it causation.

B

Even if the District Court had properly filtered out immaterial closures, its analysis would have been incomplete for a second reason. Petitioners offered scant evidence on the capacity of the clinics that are able to comply with the admitting privileges and ASC requirements, or on those clinics' geographic distribution. Reviewing the evidence in the record, it is far from clear that there has been a material impact on access to abortion. . . .

So much for capacity. The other potential obstacle to abortion access is the distribution of facilities throughout the State. This might occur if the two challenged H.B. 2 requirements, by causing the closure of clinics in some rural areas, led to a situation in which a "large fraction" of women of reproductive age live too far away from any open clinic. Based on the Court's holding in *Casey*, it appears that the need to travel up to 150 miles is not an undue burden, and the evidence in this case shows that if the only clinics in the State were those that would have remained open if the judgment of the Fifth Circuit had not been enjoined, roughly 95% of the women of reproductive age in the State would live within 150 miles of an open facility (or lived outside that range before H.B. 2). Because the record does not show why particular facilities closed, the real figure may be even higher than 95%.

We should decline to hold that these statistics justify the facial invalidation of the H.B. 2 requirements. The possibility that the admitting privileges requirement *might* have caused a closure in Lubbock is no reason to issue a facial injunction exempting Houston clinics from that requirement. I do not dismiss the situation of those women who would no longer live within 150 miles of a clinic as a result of H.B. 2. But under current doctrine such localized problems can be addressed by narrow as-applied challenges. . . .

Chapter 10: Modern Due Process Methodologies

***Insert at page 640, before the Note*:**

Problem: Sex Toys

In the State of Jefferson, a law reads as follows:

> "The sale or other distribution of any device whose primary purpose is to stimulate the sexual organs of any person is hereby prohibited."

Sam's Playland is an adult-oriented book and novelty shop in Jefferson City, the capital of the State of Jefferson. The store sells, among other things, items that come within the statute's prohibition (*e.g.*, vibrators). The owner of the store and one of its customers sues, alleging that the law violates the Due Process Clause as construed in *Lawrence v. Texas*.

What arguments would you make for the plaintiffs? For the State? How do you think a court would rule, and why?

Insert at page 665, before the Note:

Note: The Implications of *Obergefell*

Obergefell held that same-sex couples had the right to marry. But what does "marriage" mean? In a case from 2017, the Court encountered a claim that *Obergefell* left room for states to treat same-sex married couples differently than their opposite-sex counterparts.

In *Pavan v. Smith*, 137 S.Ct. 2075 (2017), the Court reviewed a decision by the Arkansas Supreme Court that upheld a provision of that state's birth certificate law that discriminated against same-sex married couples. Under that provision, the husband in an opposite-sex married couple was presumptively listed as the father of any child born to his wife, including in situations where the husband was not the biological father—most notably, in cases of artificial insemination using an anonymous sperm donor. By contrast, in *Pavan* two women in same-sex marriages gave birth via artificial insemination, but the state refused to identify their female spouses as the child's second parent on the child's birth certificate.

The Court granted the couples' *cert.* petitions and summarily reversed the Arkansas court's decision. (A "summary decision" is one that the Court renders without briefing on the merits or oral argument.) In a *per curiam* opinion (*i.e.*, an opinion "by the Court" rather than one written by a particular justice), the Court noted that *Obergefell* required states to provide to same-sex couples "the constellation of benefits that the States have linked to marriage." The Court rejected the state's argument that its birth certificate regime concerned itself with biological parentage rather than marriage, explaining (as noted above) that a birth certificate would identify the husband in an opposite-sex marriage as the father of a child even when he clearly was not the biological father, as in a case of insemination with the sperm of an anonymous donor.

Justice Gorsuch, joined by Justices Thomas and Alito, dissented. He noted that summary reversals are reserved for cases where "the law is settled and stable, the facts are not in dispute, and the decision below is clearly in error." He argued that *Pavan* was not such a case, given Arkansas's argument that its birth certificate regime was connected to biological parenthood rather than marriage, and thus was not affected by *Obergefell*. He acknowledged that Arkansas law made an exception for this biology-based rule for artificial-insemination/anonymous sperm donor births. However, he faulted the plaintiffs for not challenging that exception but instead challenging the state's overall birth certificate statute and its biology-based rules of decision. He also criticized the Court for summarily reversing the state court when the state had already conceded that the artificial insemination provision's discrimination against same-sex couples was unconstitutional, and had acknowledged that "the benefits afforded non-biological parents under [that exception] must be afforded equally to both same-sex and opposite-sex couples."

Despite the result in *Pavan*, the state's conduct in that case suggests that litigation may continue to arise over what exactly constitutes "the constellation of benefits that the States have linked to marriage." For example, litigation is currently pending in Texas about whether *Obergefell* requires that cities provide same-sex spouses of city employees the same benefits they provide opposite-sex spouses. *See Pidgeon v. Turner*, 2017 WL 2829350 (Tex. Supreme Ct. June 30, 2017) (remanding to the lower court the question whether *Obergefell* compels equality in city-provided employee benefits).

Insert at the end of page 666:

Problem: Plural Marriage

Plural marriage ("polygamy") has been an issue in American constitutional law since the establishment of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, colloquially known as the Mormon Church, which in the nineteenth century embraced polygamy as a central tenet of that faith. In 1878, the Supreme Court rejected a claim that the federal government's prohibition of polygamy in the Utah Territory violated Mormons' rights under the First Amendment's guarantee of the right to free religious exercise. *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145 (1878).

In recent years, attention has focused on the continued polygamist beliefs and preferences of certain fundamentalist offshoots of the Mormon Church, but also on the wishes of non-Mormons to enter into plural marriages. Leave aside the Free Exercise Clause argument. Consider instead claims, both by fundamentalist Mormons and non-Mormons, that their substantive due process rights are violated by state laws restricting polygamy. In particular, consider two hypothetical laws, and challenges to those laws:

First, consider a law that bans "co-habitation," with "co-habitation" defined as "a legally-married couple living with a third (or additional) person as if that third person was a member of the married couple's intimate life." Assume that a three-person grouping wishes to live a polygamous lifestyle, in which the three share a household and a common intimate life. (They do not seek a marriage license officially recognizing their relationship as a legal marriage.) Two of

the three persons are legally married to each other; the third is legally single; thus, they would violate the statute. What arguments could that group make that *Lawrence v. Texas* supports their claim that the statute violates the Due Process Clause?

Second, consider a law that defines marriage as "the union of two adults." A three-person grouping applies for, and is denied, a marriage license. What arguments could that group make that *Obergefell v. Hodges* supports their argument that the law violates the Due Process Clause?

Part IV: Constitutional Equality

Chapter 12: Suspect Classes and Suspect Class Analysis

A. Sex Discrimination

***Insert at page 736, before Part B*:**

Problem: Same-Sex Public Education

In recent years, some educational experts have suggested that some junior high and high school students might benefit from attending a single-sex, rather than a co-ed, school. Among other theories, it has been suggested that single-sex education diminishes social and dating pressures in the classroom, that it helps girls take leadership positions that they would shy away from in a co-ed environment, and that it helps both girls and boys develop their interests and talents free from gendered stereotypes. It is further suggested that these phenomena lead to better academic outcomes and outcomes for students' socio-emotional development.

In 2015 the State of Nebraska Department of Education commissioned a study by several educational experts to consider this issue. The executive summary of that study reads as follows:

> "As in previous reviews, the results are equivocal. There is some support for the premise that single-sex schooling can be helpful, especially for certain outcomes related to academic achievement and more positive academic aspirations. For many outcomes, there is no evidence of either benefit or harm. There is limited support for the view that single-sex schooling may be harmful or that coeducational schooling is more beneficial for students."

Based on this study, the Department decides to require every school district in the state to offer a single-sex educational experience to any junior high or high school student who would like one. Traditional co-ed schools would be the norm, but any junior high or high school student who wished to avail himself or herself of a single-sex education could obtain one from the state.

You are a lawyer employed by the State Department of Education. You are asked to outline the arguments you would make defending the constitutionality of this program. (Assume that someone would have standing to sue.) How would you structure that defense? Is there any additional information you'd like from the Department to help your argument? Would you suggest any particular features for the program in order to buttress your argument?

* * * * *

The following case considers a gender-based immigration statute similar to, but nevertheless distinct from, the one upheld in *Nguyen*. Beyond the fact that all six justices who reached the equal protection issue voted to strike down the law, is there a difference in tone between this case and the description you read of *Nguyen*? If so, what might account for that difference?

Sessions v. Morales-Santana

___ U.S. ___, 137 S.Ct. 1678 (2017)

Justice GINSBURG delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case concerns a gender-based differential in the law governing acquisition of U.S. citizenship by a child born abroad, when one parent is a U.S. citizen, the other, a citizen of another nation. The main rule appears in 8 U.S.C. §1401(a)(7). Applicable to married couples, §1401(a)(7) requires a period of physical presence in the United States for the U.S.-citizen parent. [At the time of the plaintiff's birth, this rule required the U.S.-citizen parent, at the time of the child's birth, to have lived in the United States for a period of at least ten years, five of which had to be after turning 14 years old.] That main rule is rendered applicable to unwed U.S.-citizen fathers by §1409(a). Congress ordered an exception, however, for unwed U.S.-citizen mothers. Contained in §1409(c), the exception allows an unwed mother to transmit her citizenship to a child born abroad if she has lived in the United States for just one year prior to the child's birth.

The respondent in this case, Luis Ramón Morales–Santana, was born in the Dominican Republic when his father was just 20 days short of meeting §1401(a)(7)'s physical-presence requirement. Opposing removal to the Dominican Republic, Morales–Santana asserts that the equal protection principle implicit in the Fifth Amendment entitles him to citizenship stature. We hold that the gender line Congress drew is incompatible with the requirement that the Government accord to all persons "the equal protection of the laws." . . .

I

. . .

B

Respondent Luis Ramón Morales–Santana moved to the United States at age 13, and has resided in this country most of his life. Now facing deportation, he asserts U.S. citizenship at birth based on the citizenship of his biological father, José Morales, who accepted parental responsibility and included Morales–Santana in his household.

José Morales was born in Guánica, Puerto Rico, on March 19, 1900. Puerto Rico was then, as it is now, part of the United States . . . . After living in Puerto Rico for nearly two decades, José left his childhood home on February 27, 1919, 20 days short of his 19th birthday, therefore failing to satisfy §1401(a)(7)'s requirement of five years' physical presence after age 14. He did so to take up employment as a builder-mechanic for a U.S. company in the then-U.S.-occupied Dominican Republic.

By 1959, . . . he was living with Yrma Santana Montilla, a Dominican woman he would eventually marry. In 1962, Yrma gave birth to their child, respondent Luis Morales–Santana. . . . Yrma and José married in 1970, and . . . José was then added to Morales–Santana's birth certificate as his father. . . . In 1975, when Morales–Santana was 13, he moved to Puerto Rico, and by 1976, the year his father died, he was attending public school in the Bronx, a New York City borough.

C

In 2000, the Government placed Morales–Santana in removal proceedings based on several convictions for offenses under New York State Penal Law, all of them rendered on May 17, 1995. Morales–Santana ranked as an alien despite the many years he lived in the United States, because, at the time of his birth, his father did not satisfy the requirement

of five years' physical presence after age 14. An immigration judge rejected Morales–Santana's claim to citizenship derived from the U.S. citizenship of his father, and ordered Morales–Santana's removal to the Dominican Republic. In 2010, Morales–Santana moved to reopen the proceedings, asserting that the Government's refusal to recognize that he derived citizenship from his U.S.-citizen father violated the Constitution's equal protection guarantee. The Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) denied the motion.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed the BIA's decision. . . .

II

Because §1409 treats sons and daughters alike, Morales–Santana does not suffer discrimination on the basis of *his* gender. He complains, instead, of gender-based discrimination against his father, who was unwed at the time of Morales–Santana's birth and was not accorded the right an unwed U.S.-citizen mother would have to transmit citizenship to her child. Although the Government does not contend otherwise, we briefly explain why Morales–Santana may seek to vindicate his father's right to the equal protection of the laws. . . .

III

Sections 1401 and 1409, we note, date from an era when the lawbooks of our Nation were rife with overbroad generalizations about the way men and women are. *See*, *e.g.*, *Hoyt v. Florida*, 368 U.S. 57 (1961) (women are the "center of home and family life," therefore they can be "relieved from the civic duty of jury service"); *Goesaert v. Cleary*, 335 U.S. 464 (1948) (States may draw "a sharp line between the sexes") [Both note *supra* this Chapter]. Today, laws of this kind are subject to review under the heightened scrutiny that now attends "all gender-based classifications." . . . Successful defense of legislation that differentiates on the basis of gender, we have reiterated, requires an "exceedingly persuasive justification." *United States v. Virginia* (1996) (*Supra* this chapter).

A

The defender of legislation that differentiates on the basis of gender must show "at least that the [challenged] classification serves important governmental objectives and that the discriminatory means employed are substantially related to the achievement of those objectives." *Virginia* (quoting *Mississippi Univ. for Women v. Hogan*, 458 U.S. 718 (1982) [Note *supra* this Chapter]. Moreover, the classification must substantially serve an important governmental interest *today*, for "in interpreting the [e]qual [p]rotection [guarantee], [we have] recognized that new insights and societal understandings can reveal unjustified inequality . . . that once passed unnoticed and unchallenged." *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. ___ (2015). Here, the Government has supplied no "exceedingly persuasive justification," *Virginia*, for §1409(a) and (c)'s "gender-based" and "gender-biased" disparity.

1

History reveals what lurks behind §1409. Enacted in the Nationality Act of 1940 (1940 Act), §1409 ended a century and a half of congressional silence on the citizenship of children born abroad to unwed parents. During this era, two once habitual, but now untenable, assumptions pervaded our Nation's citizenship laws and underpinned judicial and administrative rulings: In marriage, husband is dominant, wife subordinate; unwed mother is the natural and sole guardian of a nonmarital child.

Under the once entrenched principle of male dominance in marriage, the husband controlled both wife and child. "[D]ominance [of] the husband," this Court observed in 1915, "is an ancient principle of our jurisprudence." *Mackenzie v. Hare*, 239 U.S. 299 (1915). Through the early 20th century, a male citizen automatically conferred U.S. citizenship on his alien wife. A female citizen, however, was incapable of conferring citizenship on her husband; indeed, she was subject to expatriation if she married an alien. . . . And from 1790 until 1934, the foreign-born child of a married couple gained U.S. citizenship only through the father.

For unwed parents, the father-controls tradition never held sway. Instead, the mother was regarded as the child's natural and sole guardian. At common law, the mother, and only the mother, was "bound to maintain [a nonmarital child] as its natural guardian." In line with that understanding, in the early 20th century, the State Department

sometimes permitted unwed mothers to pass citizenship to their children, despite the absence of any statutory authority for the practice.

In the 1940 Act, Congress discarded the father-controls assumption concerning married parents, but codified the mother-as-sole-guardian perception regarding unmarried parents. The Roosevelt administration, which proposed §1409, explained: "[T]he mother [of a nonmarital child] stands in the place of the father ... [,] has a right to the custody and control of such a child as against the putative father, and is bound to maintain it as its natural guardian."

This unwed-mother-as-natural-guardian notion renders §1409's gender-based residency rules understandable. Fearing that a foreign-born child could turn out "more alien than American in character," the administration believed that a citizen parent with lengthy ties to the United States would counteract the influence of the alien parent. Concern about the attachment of foreign-born children to the United States explains the treatment of unwed citizen fathers, who, according to the familiar stereotype, would care little about, and have scant contact with, their nonmarital children. For unwed citizen mothers, however, there was no need for a prolonged residency prophylactic: The alien father, who might transmit foreign ways, was presumptively out of the picture.

2

For close to a half century . . . this Court has viewed with suspicion laws that rely on "overbroad generalizations about the different talents, capacities, or preferences of males and females." In particular, we have recognized that if a "statutory objective is to exclude or 'protect' members of one gender" in reliance on "fixed notions concerning [that gender's] roles and abilities," the "objective itself is illegitimate." *Mississippi Univ. for Women*.

In accord with this eventual understanding, the Court has held that no "important [governmental] interest" is served by laws grounded, as §1409(a) and (c) are, in the obsolescing view that "unwed fathers [are] invariably less qualified and entitled than mothers" to take responsibility for nonmarital children. Overbroad generalizations of that order, the Court has come to comprehend, have a constraining impact, descriptive though they may be of the way many people still order their lives.[13] Laws according or denying benefits in reliance on "[s]tereotypes about women's domestic roles," the Court has observed, may "creat[e] a self-fulfilling cycle of discrimination that force[s] women to continue to assume the role of primary family caregiver." *Nevada Dept. of Human Resources v. Hibbs*, 538 U.S. 721 (2003). Correspondingly, such laws may disserve men who exercise responsibility for raising their children. In light of the equal protection jurisprudence this Court has developed since 1971, §1409(a) and (c)'s discrete duration-of-residence requirements for unwed mothers and fathers who have accepted parental responsibility is stunningly anachronistic.

B

In urging this Court nevertheless to reject Morales–Santana's equal protection plea, the Government cites three decisions of this Court: *Fiallo v. Bell*, 430 U.S. 787 (1977); *Miller v. Albright*, 523 U.S. 420 (1998); and *Nguyen v. INS*, 533 U.S. 53 (2001) [Note *supra* this chapter]. None controls this case.

The 1952 Act provision at issue in *Fiallo* gave special immigration preferences to alien children of citizen (or lawful-permanent-resident) mothers, and to alien unwed mothers of citizen (or lawful-permanent-resident) children. . . . This case, however, involves no entry preference for aliens. Morales–Santana claims he is, and since birth has been, a U.S. citizen. . . .

The provision challenged in *Miller* and *Nguyen* as violative of equal protection requires unwed U.S.-citizen fathers, but not mothers, to formally acknowledge parenthood of their foreign-born children in order to transmit their U.S. citizenship to those children. After *Miller* produced no opinion for the Court, we took up the issue anew in *Nguyen*. There, the Court held that imposing a paternal-acknowledgment requirement on fathers was a justifiable, easily met

[13] Even if stereotypes frozen into legislation have "statistical support," our decisions reject measures that classify unnecessarily and overbroadly by gender when more accurate and impartial lines can be drawn. [*S*]*ee*, *e.g.*, *Craig v. Boren* (1976) [*Supra* this chapter]. In fact, unwed fathers assume responsibility for their children in numbers already large and notably increasing.

means of ensuring the existence of a biological parent-child relationship, which the mother establishes by giving birth. Morales–Santana's challenge does not renew the contest over §1409's paternal-acknowledgment requirement (whether the current version or that in effect in 1970), and the Government does not dispute that Morales–Santana's father, by marrying Morales–Santana's mother, satisfied that requirement.

Unlike the paternal-acknowledgment requirement at issue in *Nguyen* and *Miller*, the physical-presence requirements now before us relate solely to the duration of the parent's prebirth residency in the United States, not to the parent's filial tie to the child. As the Court of Appeals observed in this case, a man needs no more time in the United States than a woman "in order to have assimilated citizenship-related values to transmit to [his] child." And unlike *Nguyen*'s parental-acknowledgment requirement, §1409(a)'s age-calibrated physical-presence requirements cannot fairly be described as "minimal."

C

Notwithstanding §1409(a) and (c)'s provenance in traditional notions of the way women and men are, the Government maintains that the statute serves two important objectives: (1) ensuring a connection between the child to become a citizen and the United States and (2) preventing "statelessness," *i.e.*, a child's possession of no citizenship at all. Even indulging the assumption that Congress intended §1409 to serve these interests, neither rationale survives heightened scrutiny.

1

We take up first the Government's assertion that §1409(a) and (c)'s gender-based differential ensures that a child born abroad has a connection to the United States of sufficient strength to warrant conferral of citizenship at birth. The Government does not contend, nor could it, that unmarried men take more time to absorb U.S. values than unmarried women do. Instead, it presents a novel argument . . . .

An unwed mother, the Government urges, is the child's only "legally recognized" parent at the time of childbirth. An unwed citizen father enters the scene later, as a second parent. A longer physical connection to the United States is warranted for the unwed father, the Government maintains, because of the "competing national influence" of the alien mother. . . .

Underlying this apparent design is the assumption that the alien father of a nonmarital child born abroad to a U.S.-citizen mother will not accept parental responsibility. For an actual affiliation between alien father and nonmarital child would create the "competing national influence" that, according to the Government, justifies imposing on unwed U.S.-citizen fathers, but not unwed U.S.-citizen mothers, lengthy physical-presence requirements. Hardly gender neutral, that assumption conforms to the long-held view that unwed fathers care little about, indeed are strangers to, their children. Lump characterization of that kind, however, no longer passes equal protection inspection. . . .

2

The Government maintains that Congress established the gender-based residency differential in §1409(a) and (c) to reduce the risk that a foreign-born child of a U.S. citizen would be born stateless. This risk, according to the Government, was substantially greater for the foreign-born child of an unwed U.S.-citizen mother than it was for the foreign-born child of an unwed U.S.-citizen father. But there is little reason to believe that a statelessness concern prompted the diverse physical-presence requirements. Nor has the Government shown that the risk of statelessness disproportionately endangered the children of unwed mothers.

As the Court of Appeals pointed out, with one exception, nothing in the congressional hearings and reports on the 1940 and 1952 Acts "refer[s] to the problem of statelessness for children born abroad." Reducing the incidence of statelessness was the express goal of other sections of the 1940 Act. The justification for §1409's gender-based dichotomy, however, was not the child's plight, it was the mother's role as the "natural guardian" of a nonmarital child. It will not do to "hypothesiz[e] or inven[t]" governmental purposes for gender classifications "post hoc in response to litigation." *Virginia*.

Infecting the Government's risk-of-statelessness argument is an assumption without foundation. "[F]oreign laws that would put the child of the U.S.-citizen mother at risk of statelessness (by not providing for the child to acquire the father's citizenship at birth)," the Government asserts, "would protect the child of the U.S.-citizen father against statelessness by providing that the child would take his mother's citizenship." The Government, however, neglected to expose this supposed "protection" to a reality check. Had it done so, it would have recognized the formidable impediments placed by foreign laws on an unwed mother's transmission of citizenship to her child. . . . One can hardly characterize as gender neutral a scheme allegedly attending to the risk of statelessness for children of unwed U.S.-citizen mothers while ignoring the same risk for children of unwed U.S.-citizen fathers. . . .

In sum, the Government has advanced no "exceedingly persuasive" justification for §1409(a) and (c)'s gender-specific residency and age criteria. Those disparate criteria, we hold, cannot withstand inspection under a Constitution that requires the Government to respect the equal dignity and stature of its male and female citizens.

IV

While the equal protection infirmity in retaining a longer physical-presence requirement for unwed fathers than for unwed mothers is clear, this Court is not equipped to grant the relief Morales–Santana seeks, *i.e.*, extending to his father (and, derivatively, to him) the benefit of the one-year physical-presence term §1409(c) reserves for unwed mothers. [The Court concluded that Congress, if had been aware of the unconstitutionality of its gender-based residency provisions for conferring citizenship on foreign-born children, would have required the longer residency requirement for all citizen-parents. This result would have left Morales-Santana without a remedy. The Court concluded that Congress would have to determine the time period it preferred, as long as that period was gender-neutral.]

Justice GORSUCH took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Justice THOMAS, with whom Justice ALITO joins, concurring in the judgment in part.

[Justice Thomas agreed with the majority that, regardless of the outcome of the plaintiff's sex equality claim, the Court could not grant him relief. Thus, he declined to reach both the standing and the underlying sex quality issues the majority discussed.]

Chapter 13: Race and the Constitution

E. Race Consciousness Today

***Insert at page 889, before the Note*:**

Note: Clarifying Strict Scrutiny(?): The *Fisher* Litigation

1. In two separate opinions from 2013 and 2016, the Court issued opinions in an affirmative action case that provided the Court with the opportunity to clarify the meaning of strict scrutiny. The picture resulting from those two opinions nevertheless remains murky.

2. In 2008, Abigail Fisher, a white high school student, applied and was rejected for admission to the undergraduate program at the University of Texas at Austin. At that time the school had a bifurcated admissions program. Most admissions slots were awarded under a state law (the "Top Ten Percent" law) that provided automatic admission to any student who graduated in the top ten percent of any approved Texas high school. The remaining admissions offers were awarded based on a holistic consideration of each candidate that was comprised of an "academic index" (AI) (test scores and high school performance) and a "personal achievement index" (PAI). The PAI was comprised of the combination of scores the applicant received for his application essays and for factors such as leadership and a student's ability to contribute to the student body. The latter criterion in turn was comprised in part of any "special circumstances" the applicant featured. By the time Fisher applied for admission, the "special circumstances" category included a consideration of the applicant's race—thus, as the Court explained in its second opinion in this case, race was "a factor of a factor of a factor" in the admissions decision.

Fisher did not graduate in the top 10% of her Texas high school class, and thus was considered for admission as part of this latter, holistic, review. When she was rejected she sued, alleging that the use of race as part of the PAI violated the Equal Protection Clause.

3. When the case first reached the Supreme Court, it reversed the lower court's judgment for the school, concluding that the lower court had applied a mistakenly deferential level of review. *Fisher v. University of Texas*, 570 U.S. ___, 133 S.Ct. 2411 (2013) ("*Fisher I*"). Writing for seven justices of an eight-justice Court, Justice Kennedy agreed with the lower court that courts should defer to the university's expertise about its educational mission—here, its judgment that racial diversity was essential to that mission. However, he concluded that the court had inappropriately deferred to the university's judgment whether the means it adopted were narrowly tailored to achieve the goal of fulfilling that mission. In particular, he concluded that it was the court's duty to ensure that race-conscious admissions plans treated all applicants as individuals, "'and not in a way that makes an applicant's race or ethnicity the defining feature of his or her application'" (quoting *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003) (*Supra* this chapter)).

Justices Scalia and Thomas both joined the majority opinion but each also wrote a separate concurrence. Justice Ginsburg dissented. She argued that the Top Ten Percent plan, which was unchallenged in the case, was itself race-conscious, as the Texas Legislature had adopted it with full knowledge that residential segregation in Texas had created a situation where a high school-based admissions plan like the Top Ten Percent would result in a particular racial make-up at the University of Texas. She urged that legislatures be explicitly allowed to consider race in light of the lingering effects of past discrimination, and repeated the concern she expressed in her dissent in *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 244 (2003) (Note *supra* this Chapter), that to hold otherwise would encourage legislatures and universities to camouflage their use of race. Justice Kagan did not participate.

4. On remand, the appellate court again ruled for the university, and Fisher again appealed to the Supreme Court. This time, the Court on a 4-3 vote upheld the lower court decision. *Fisher v. University of Texas*, ___ U.S. ___, 136 S.Ct. 2198 (2016) ("*Fisher II*"). (Justice Kagan again did not participate, and Justice Scalia had died before the opinion was released.) Writing for those four justices, Justice Kennedy concluded that the university's admissions plan satisfied strict scrutiny as that standard had been set forth in *Fisher I*. He accepted as compelling the university's goal of ensuring "the educational benefits that flow from student diversity." He rejected Fisher's argument that the university had not specified that goal more precisely, observing that to do so might result in the university adopting numerical goals for students of different races, a step that might itself violate the Fourteenth Amendment.

Justice Kennedy then turned to the means by which the university sought to achieve that goal. He rejected Fisher's argument that the Top Ten Percent plan already achieved the "critical mass" of minority students necessary to meet the university's diversity goal, noting the "months of study" the university did before concluding that that plan was inadequate, and citing data indicating "consistent stagnation" in the university's enrollment of minorities. He also rejected Fisher's argument that the small admissions effects of the race-based component of the university's admissions procedure rendered its use of race unconstitutional, concluding that that component had led to "meaningful, if still limited," increases in diversity.

Finally, he rejected Fisher's argument that race-neutral means could have achieved the university's goals. He noted the failure of the university's minority outreach efforts, and, in response to Fisher's suggestion that the university simply uncap the number of admissions offered through the Top Ten Percent plan, he quoted Justice Ginsburg's opinion in *Fisher I* observing that that plan was motivated by race-consciousness.

5. Justice Thomas wrote a dissent for himself only, calling for *Grutter* to be overruled. Justice Alito dissented for himself, Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Thomas. He opened his dissent by writing "Something strange has happened since [*Fisher I*]." In particular, he complained that the Court in *Fisher II* had ignored the teaching of that earlier opinion, and had applied a more deferential standard than the one it had set forth in 2013. He wrote:

> "In [*Fisher I*], we held that strict scrutiny requires the University of Texas at Austin (UT or University) to show that its use of race and ethnicity in making admissions decisions serves compelling interests and that its plan is narrowly tailored to achieve those ends. Rejecting the argument that we should defer to UT's judgment on those matters, we made it clear that UT was obligated (1) to identify the interests justifying its plan with enough specificity to permit a reviewing court to determine whether the requirements of strict scrutiny were met, and (2) to show that those requirements were in fact satisfied. On remand, UT failed to do what our prior decision demanded. The University has still not identified with any degree of specificity the interests that its use of race and ethnicity is supposed to serve. Its primary argument is that merely invoking "the educational benefits of diversity" is sufficient and that it need not identify any metric that would allow a court to determine whether its plan is needed to serve, or is actually serving, those interests. This is nothing less than the plea for deference that we emphatically rejected in our prior decision. Today, however, the Court inexplicably grants that request."

The balance of his opinion was devoted to demonstrating what he viewed as the Court's application of an inappropriately deferential review of university's use of race.

Consider both *Grutter*'s and *Fisher II*'s application of strict scrutiny. Do you agree that they reflect the strict scrutiny the Court has insisted on when reviewing any government uses of race? In particular, was *Fisher II*'s application of strict scrutiny consistent with *Fisher I*'s description of it? Was it consistent with *Parents Involved*?

Chapter 14: The Intent Requirement

***Insert at Page 910, before the Note*:**

Note: An Example of Discriminatory Intent Analysis

It should be clear from *Davis*, *Arlington Heights*, and *Feeney* that the discriminatory intent inquiry is highly fact-specific. The following appellate case provides an example of that inquiry in action. Note the lack of a "smoking gun" revealing the alleged discriminatory intent—*e.g.*, explicit statements about residents wanting to exclude minorities from their community. Do you agree with how the court analyzed the intent question in the absence of such a "smoking gun"? Why or why not?

Mhany Management, Inc. v. County of Nassau

819 F.3d 581 (2nd Cir. 2016)

[This case dealt with a city's plan to convert under-used city-owned real estate into housing, and the ensuing controversy about the type of housing that would be built.]

A. Nassau County and Garden City

The Village of Garden City is a municipal corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York and located in Nassau County. As of the year 2000, individuals of Hispanic or African–American ethnicity comprised 20.3% of Nassau County's population. However, these minority groups comprised a disproportionate share of the County's low-income population. While constituting 14.8% of all households in Nassau County, African–Americans and Hispanics represented 53.1% of the County's "very low" income, non-elderly renter households. In addition, African-Americans made up 88% of the County's waiting list for Section 8 housing. Under the Section 8 program, the federal government provides funds to local housing authorities, which then subsidize rental payments for qualifying low-income tenants in privately-owned buildings.

Garden City's African-American and Hispanic population in the year 2000 was 4.1%. However, excluding the 61% of the minority population representing students living in dormitories, Garden City's minority population was only 2.6%. In addition, only 2.3% of the households in Garden City were headed by an African–American or Hispanic person. However, several of the communities surrounding Garden City are "majority-minority," communities in which minorities make up a majority of the population.

Although the lack of affordable housing has long been a problem for Nassau County, Garden City contains no affordable housing. Indeed, in the past, Garden City and its residents have resisted the introduction of affordable housing into the community. . . .

B. The Social Services Site

In 2002, Nassau County faced a budget and infrastructure crisis. Under the leadership of then-County Executive Thomas Suozzi, the County undertook a Real Estate Consolidation Plan, which involved consolidating County operations in several facilities and selling excess government property in order to raise revenue to fund renovations of the County's existing operations.

One of the properties proposed for sale under the Real Estate Consolidation Plan was a parcel of land owned by Nassau County within the boundaries of Garden City. This parcel of land was part of Garden City's Public or P– Zone. Garden City's P–Zone encompasses numerous Nassau County Buildings, including the Nassau County Police Headquarters, the County Executive Building, and the Nassau County Supreme Court Building.

The portion of the P–Zone site at issue in this case, referred to as the "Social Services Site," is an approximately 25–acre site that housed the former Nassau County Social Services Building . . . .

C. Garden City's Rezoning

In June 2002, at the County's request, Garden City began the process of rezoning the Social Services Site. This process was managed by the Garden City Board of Trustees, the elected body which governs Village affairs. In response to the County's request, the Board of Trustees created a sub-committee (the "P–Zone Committee") charged with retaining a planner and reviewing zoning options for the Social Services Site, as well as the remainder of the P– Zone properties in Garden City. This P–Zone Committee consisted of Village Trustees Peter Bee, Peter Negri, and Gerard Lundquist. Trustee Bee was the chairman of the P– Zone Committee. Garden City also retained the planning firm of Buckhurst Fish and Jacquemart ("BFJ") to provide a recommendation with regard to the rezoning of the Social Services Site. . . .

On April 29, 2003, BFJ submitted its proposal to the P–Zone Committee, recommending a "CO–5(b) zone" for the Social Services Site. BFJ proposed applying "multi-family residential group" or "R–M" zoning controls to this property. R–M zoning would have allowed for the construction of up to 311 residential apartment units on the Site, or 75 single-family homes. BFJ reiterated the proposed R–M zoning in a May 2003 report to the P–Zone Committee, stating that the rezoning would "be likely to generate a net tax benefit to the Village." . . .

Throughout the rezoning process, the P–Zone Committee also kept Garden City's four Property Owners' Associations ("POAs") apprised of the process. . . . The Social Services Site is located within the neighborhood of the Eastern Property Owners' Association. On May 29, 2003, BFJ gave a PowerPoint presentation of its May 2003 report at a public forum. At the first forum, designed to solicit public input on the proposal, several residents expressed concern about the impact of 311 residential units on traffic and schools. In response to these citizen concerns, BFJ analyzed these issues further.

In July 2003, BFJ issued a revised version of its study, which reiterated the proposal for R–M zoning. BFJ emphasized again that its proposal "would be careful of not overwhelming the neighborhoods with any significant adverse environmental impacts, particularly traffic, visual effects, or burdens on public facilities." Responding to issues raised at the citizen forum, the July 2003 report states that "there would be a smaller number of school children generated by the new development than with the development of single-family homes. . . . With a community aimed at young couples and empty nesters, there could be as few as 0.2 to 0.3 public school children per unit." Upon review of the report, the P–Zone Committee adopted BFJ's recommendation for R–M zoning for the approval of the Board of Trustees.

In September 2003, as required by state law, BFJ issued a draft Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") for the proposed rezoning. The EAF concluded that the proposed rezoning to R–M "will not have a significant impact on the environment." The EAF further stated that the proposed multi-family development at the Site would not "result in the generation of traffic significantly above present levels" and would have a minimal impact on schools. In addition, the EAF emphasized that "in terms of potential aesthetic impacts, the proposed zoning controls were specifically designed to accommodate existing conditions, respect existing neighborhoods—particularly residential neighborhoods, maximize the use of existing zoning controls and minimize adverse visual impacts." Michael Filippon, the Superintendent of the Garden City Buildings Department, concurred in these conclusions.

On October 17, 2003, an ad was placed in the Garden City News entitled, "Tell Them What You Think About the County's Plan for Garden City." This notice stated:

> Where is the Benefit to Garden City? Are We Being Urbanized? . . .
>
> The County is asking the Village to change our existing zoning—P (Public use) ZONE—to allow the County to sell the building and land . . . now occupied by the Social Services Building, to private developers. Among the proposed plans: Low-density (high-rise?) housing—up to 311 apartments. . . .

> These proposals will affect ALL of Garden City.

The Village held a subsequent public forum on October 23, 2003, where BFJ gave another PowerPoint presentation summarizing the proposed rezoning. The record indicates that at this meeting, citizens again raised questions about traffic and an increase in schoolchildren. BFJ again reiterated that traffic would be reduced relative to existing use, and that multi-family housing would generate fewer schoolchildren than the development of single-family homes. In keeping with these conclusions, in November 2003, BFJ presented an additional report to the P–Zone Committee, again confirming its proposal for the R–M zoning control that allowed for a possible 311 apartment units on the Social Services Site. The November 2003 report set forth a draft text for the rezoning.

In light of BFJ's final report, on November 20, 2003, the Garden City Village Board of Trustees unanimously accepted the P–Zone Committee's recommendation for the rezoning. In addition, on December 4, 2003, the Board made a finding pursuant to New York State's Environmental Quality Review Act that the zoning incorporated in what was now termed proposed Local Law 1–2004 would have "no impact on the environment." . . .

Starting in January 2004, three public hearings occurred in the span of one month. At the first hearing, on January 8, 2004, residents voiced concerns that multi-family housing would generate traffic, parking problems, and schoolchildren. In response, Filippon emphasized, "you have to remember that the existing use on that site now generates a certain amount of traffic, a fair amount of traffic. That use is going to be vacated. The two residential uses that are being proposed as one of the alternates, each of which on their face automatically generate far less traffic than the existing use. That is something to consider also." In addition, although assured by Garden City officials that the rezoning could result in single-family homes, one resident expressed concern that Nassau County would ultimately only sell the property to a multi-family developer in order to maximize revenue.

On January 20, 2004, the Eastern Property Owners' Association held a meeting at which Trustee Bee discussed BFJ's recommendation for the Social Services Site. A summary of the meeting reports that "Trustee Bee addressed many questions from the floor" and, in doing so, expressed the opinion that "Garden City demographically has a need for multi-family housing." Trustee Bee also reiterated that because relatively few schoolchildren resided in existing multi-family housing in Garden City, BFJ and the Board had reasonably predicted that multi-family housing would have less of an impact on schools than single-family housing. Trustee Bee "indicated he would keep an open mind but he still felt the recommended zoning changes were appropriate." In addition, Trustee Bee addressed citizen concerns about the possibility of affordable housing on the Site. In response to one question, Trustee Bee stated that "although economics would indicate that a developer would likely build high-end housing, the zoning language would also allow 'affordable' housing (as referred to by [the] resident asking the question) at the [Social Services Site]." The meeting notes further indicate that a majority 15 of the residents "who asked questions or made comments" at the meeting 16 supported restricting the rezoning of the Site to single-family homes. According to these notes, "residents wanted to preserve the single-family character of the Village. One resident in particular requested the [Eastern Property Owners' Association] Board take a firmer stand on the P–Zone issue and only support R–8 zoning, i.e. zoning for single-family housing.

On February 5, 2004, the Village held a third public hearing on the proposed rezoning. The record indicates that this hearing was well attended and much more crowded than usual. After an introduction by Trustee Bee, the meeting commenced with two presentations. First, Tom Yardley of BFJ emphasized that the proposed rezoning preserved the possibility of single-family homes, and that any multi-family housing would not result in high-rise apartments due to height and density restrictions. Second, Nassau County Executive Suozzi, the author of the County's Real Estate Consolidation Plan, emphasized the County's need to sell the Social Services Site to a private developer, as well as the benefits of developing multi-family housing on the property. During this discussion, a member of the audience interrupted Suozzi.

> Thomas Suozzi: Instead of putting commercial there or single family there, you do something right in between the two that creates a transition from the commercial area from one to the other. I guarantee you that it will be much better than what is there now, which is a building that is falling apart with a lot of problems in the building, a lot of problems going on around the building on a regular basis and a huge sea of parking. This will make it a much more attractive area for the

> property. Multi-family housing will be more likely to generate empty nesters and single people moving into the area as opposed to families that are going to create a burden on your school district to increase the burden on the school district.
>
> Unidentified Speaker: You say it's supposed to be upscale.
>
> Thomas Suozzi: It's going to be upscale. Single people and senior citizen empty nesters. If you sell your $2 million house in Garden City and you don't want to take care of the lawn anymore, you can go into . . . who lives in Wyndham for example?[*] It's a very upscale place. There's a lot of retirees that live there.

When Suozzi finished his presentation, the meeting was opened to questions from the public. The first question from the audience related to Trustee Bee's statements "last time," referring to the January 20, 2004 meeting of the Eastern Property Owners' Association.

> Lauren Davies: I'm just confused between what Mr. Suozzi said about the Social Services Building. You said you wanted it to be upscale, from what I understand from what Peter Bee said the last time is that they wanted it to be affordable housing. . . .
>
> Trustee Bee: Well, either I mis-spoke or you misheard, because I do not recollect using that phrase. If I did it was an inappropriate phrase. The idea was a place for Garden City's seniors to go when they did not wish to maintain the physical structure and cut the lawns and do all the various things. But not necessarily looking at a different style of life. In terms of economics.
>
> Thomas Suozzi: We're absolutely not interested in building affordable housing there and there is a great need for affordable housing, but Garden City is not the location. We need to build housing there. . . . We would generate more revenues to the County by selling it to upscale housing in that location. That is what we think is in the character of Garden City and would be appropriate there.
>
> Unidentified Speaker: How do you have control over what the developer does . . .
>
> Trustee Bee: Before the next speaker though, just to finish on that last remark, neither the County nor the Village is looking to create . . . so-called affordable housing at that spot.
>
> Unidentified Speaker: Can you guarantee that, that it won't be in that building?

In response to these questions, Suozzi indicated that the County "would be willing to put deed restrictions on any property that we sold" so "that it can't be anything but upscale housing." In response to further questioning, Suozzi stated "Don't take my word for it, we'll put whatever legal codifications that people want. This will not be affordable housing projects. That's number one." Gerard Fishberg, Garden City's counsel, further noted that the estimated sale prices for multi-family residential units "don't suggest affordable housing."

Throughout the remainder of the meeting, residents indicated their opposition to multi-family housing and their preference for single-family homes. One resident emphasized that the proposed multi-family development was not "in the flavor and character of what Garden City is now. Garden City started as a neighborhood of single family homes and it should remain as such. Others stated, to applause from the audience, that "we're not against residential, we're against multi-level residential. (Applause)." One resident expressed concern about the possibility of "four people or ten people in an apartment and nobody is going to know that."

In keeping with these statements, citizens repeatedly expressed concern about limiting the options of a developer. . . .

Another citizen expressed concerns about the possibility of what any multi-family housing might eventually become.

---

[*] [Ed. note: The ellipses in this sentence appear in the full text of the opinion.]

> Anthony Agrippina: We left a community in Queens County that started off similar, single family homes, two family homes, town houses that became—six story units. It was originally for the elderly, people who were looking to downsize. It started off that way. Right now you've got full families living in one bedroom townhouses, two bedroom co-ops, the school is overburdened and overcrowded.

In response, another resident emphasized that the only way to control such consequences was to restrict the zoning.

As at the previous meetings, residents also expressed concern about traffic and schools. County and Village officials reiterated that a transition to residential use, including multi-family housing, would generate far less traffic than the existing use of the Social Services Site.

> Thomas Suozzi: One thing that would happen is that you would have 1,000 less employees that work in that building, that would no longer be working there anymore.
>
> Sheila DiMasso: But, we would also have more traffic because of more people owning cars and leaving there in and out. As opposed to . . . [applause]
>
> Thomas Suozzi: You may want to clap for that, but that's irrational. (Applause)

In addition, Suozzi and Garden City officials tried to explain to citizens their view that the proposed multi-family housing would actually generate fewer schoolchildren than development of single-family homes.

> David Piciulo: If you have 311 units you will have more children potentially in there than 956 single family homes.
>
> Thomas Suozzi: That's not accurate. Based upon statistics, people spend their whole lives looking at this stuff. That's not true. So you may feel that way, but it's not accurate.
>
> David Piciulo: Those are statistics having to do with a national study. If you drive down into the neighborhood, the average home here has two kids. They're in the system for 15 years and you are going to have children in the system . . . let me just make a point.
>
> Gerard Fishberg: Not to argue with you, again, I don't think anybody has prejudged this. How many apartments are there in Wyndham?
>
> Michael Filippon: 312.
>
> Gerard Fishberg: How many school children are there in 312 apartments?
>
> Tom Yardley: Less than twenty.
>
> Gerard Fishberg: Less than twenty children in 312 apartments.

BFJ's Fish later testified that those residents who claimed to prefer single-family homes because of school impacts were "simply wrong."

In response to these questions Suozzi made clear that before any development project was approved at the Site, the developer would have to satisfy state environmental guidelines, including addressing concerns regarding traffic and impact on public services, such as schools. He further emphasized that these conclusions would be subject to public comment.

In March 2004, in the weeks after this meeting, a flyer began circulating around Garden City. The flyer stated, in relevant part:

> WILL GARDEN CITY PROPERTY VALUES DECREASE IF OVER 300 APARTMENTS ARE BUILT AT THE SITE OF SOCIAL SERVICES? . . .

> The Garden City Village Trustees are close to voting on how to zone this property. They might choose to zone it for multi-family housing (If Senator Balboni's current bill passes in June, as many as 30 of those apartments would be considered "affordable housing". According to this bill, "Affordable workforce housing means housing for individuals or families at or below 80% of the median income for the Nassau Suffolk primary metropolitan statistical area as defined by the Federal Department of housing and urban development." . . . NOT JUST GARDEN CITY INCOMES! . . .
>
> ISN'T OUR SCHOOL DISTRICT CROWDED ENOUGH NOW?
>
> The trustees are saying that there will be fewer additional students to the Garden City school district if there are 340 apartments or townhouses built at the "P ZONE" as opposed to 90 single family homes. HOW CAN THEY BE SURE OF THAT? ISN'T IT TRUE THAT MANY FAMILIES MOVE TO GARDEN CITY TO ASSURE THEIR CHILDREN OF A QUALITY EDUCATION? WHAT WILL BRING MORE STUDENTS, OVER 300 FAMILIES OR 90 FAMILIES?

The reference to "Senator Balboni's current bill" in the flyer related to legislation pending at the time which would impose affordable-housing requirements on developers on Long Island. The flyer reached Garden City Village Administrator Schoelle, who faxed it to Fish and at least one member of the Board of Trustees. The flyer also came to the attention of Trustee Lundquist.

At a Board meeting held on March 18, 2004, residents again raised concerns about the possibility of affordable housing at the Social Services Site. Schoelle's notes from that meeting indicate that residents expressed concern that the Balboni Bill might apply "retroactively." One resident urged decision-makers to "play it safe" with respect to the Balboni Bill and "vote for single family homes." . . .

In response to public pressure, BFJ and Garden City began modifying the rezoning proposal. In materials produced in April 2004, BFJ changed the proposal, reducing the number of multi-family units potentially available at the Social Services Site to 215. However, by a memorandum to the Board dated May 4, 2004, BFJ scrapped the proposed R–M zoning entirely. Instead, BFJ proposed rezoning the vast majority of the Social Services Site "Residential–Townhouse" ("R–T"), an entirely new zoning classification. The May 2004 proposal only preserved R– M zoning on the 3.03 acres of the Social Services Site west of County Seat Drive, and only by special permit. Thus, the development of multi-family housing would be restricted to less than 15% of the Social Services Site, and only by permit. BFJ's proposed description of the R–T zone defined "townhouse" as a "single-family dwelling unit."

Whereas the previous proposed rezoning took more than a year to come before the Board, the shift to R–T zoning moved rapidly through the Village's government. BFJ issued a final EAF for R–T rezoning in May 2004. Even though BFJ officials testified that a switch from R–M zoning to R– T zoning was a significant change, no draft EAF was ever issued for the R–T rezoning. In addition, the shift from the P– Zone to R–T zoning was proposed by the Board as Local Law No. 2–2004 and moved to a public hearing on May 20, 2004.

The Trustees further stated at this meeting that they hoped to have a final vote on the rezoning as soon as June 3, 2004, and that the bill had already been referred to the Nassau County Planning Commission. Explaining the switch, Fish offered the following rationale:

> This was, this was a conscious decision, and I think those of you who might have been at the last two . . . workshops, this was discussed in quite a bit of detail, that there was, there was a concern that if the whole 25 acres were developed for multi family it would generate too much traffic and it didn't serve, it didn't serve as a true transition. . . .
>
> So, that, the proposal has been modified where previously multi family would have been allowed in all 25 acres, as of right, the proposal's been modified so that it's no longer allowed at all as-of-right, you'd have to get a special permit for it, through the Trustees, and it is a condition of the permit is

> that it can only be to the west of County Seat Drive. So, in essence, what the Trustees have done, is they have reduced the multi family to less than 15 percent of [the] site.

At this meeting, a member of the Garden City community thanked the Board of Trustees for responding to the concerns of residents:

> My husband works twelve hour, fourteen hour days so that we can live here. We didn't inherit any money from anyone. We weren't given anything. We didn't expect anything from anyone. We worked very hard to live in Garden City because [of] what it is. And I feel like very slowly it's creeping away by the building that is going on. . . . And I just think to all of you, just keep, be strong, like, just keep Garden City what it is. That is why people want to come here. You know, it's just a beautiful, beautiful town, people would like to live here, but I just think, just think of the people who live here, why you yourselves moved here. You don't move here to live near apartments. You don't move here so that when you turn your corner there's another high-rise.

Toward the close of this meeting, a member of former Plaintiff ACORN spoke about the need for affordable housing in Nassau County and asked that Garden City consider building affordable housing. . . .

On June 3, 2004, the Garden City Board of Trustees unanimously adopted Local Law No. 2–2004 and the Social Services Site was rezoned R–T. The following month, Nassau County issued a Request for Proposals ("RFP") concerning the Social Services Site under the R–T zoning designation. The RFP stated that the County would not consider bids of less than $30 million.

Plaintiffs were unable to submit a bid meeting the specifications of the RFP. Ismene Speliotis, Executive Director of NYAHC/MHANY, analyzed the R–T zoning and concluded that it was not financially feasible to build affordable housing under R–T zoning restrictions at any acquisition price. Testifying at trial, Suozzi concurred with this assessment. . . . NYAHC and New York ACORN met with Suozzi and other County officials to discuss the possibility of including affordable housing on the Social Services Site. But the County did not reissue the RFP. . . .

The County ultimately awarded the contract to develop the Social Services Site to Fairhaven Properties, Inc. ("Fairhaven"), a developer of single-family homes, for $56.5 million, the highest bid. Fairhaven proposed the development of 87 single-family detached homes, and did not include any townhouses.

After the contract was awarded to Fairhaven, NYAHC prepared four proposals, or "pro formas," for development at the Social Services Site under the R–M zoning designation, with the percentage of affordable and/or Section 8 housing units of the 311 total rental units ranging from 15% to 25%. Plaintiffs' expert Nancy McArdle evaluated each proposal in conjunction with the racial/ethnic distribution of the available pool of renters and determined that, had NYAHC been able to build housing under any of the four proposals in accordance with the rejected R–M zoning designation, the pool of renters likely to occupy all units, including market-rate, affordable, and Section 8 units, would have likely been between 18% and 32% minority, with minority households numbering between 56 and 101. Under the proposal predicting 18% minority population, NYAHC would have been able to bid $56.1 million for the Social Services Site.

McArdle further analyzed the likely racial composition of the pool of homeowners who could afford to purchase single-family units potentially developed by Fairhaven. She determined that between three and six minority households could afford such a purchase. Thus, while the NYAHC proposals would likely increase racial diversity in Garden City, McArdle testified, the Fairhaven proposal would likely leave the racial composition of Garden City "unchanged." . . .

In finding intentional racial discrimination here, the district court applied the familiar Arlington *Heights* factors. Because discriminatory intent is rarely susceptible to direct proof, a district court facing a question of discriminatory intent must make "a sensitive inquiry into such circumstantial and direct evidence of intent as may be available. The impact of the official action whether it bears more heavily on one race than another may provide an important starting point." *Arlington Heights*. But unless a "clear pattern, unexplainable on grounds other than race, emerges," *id.*, "impact alone is not determinative, and the Court must look to other evidence," *id*. Other relevant considerations for discerning a racially discriminatory intent include "the historical background of the decision . . . particularly if it reveals a series

of official actions taken for invidious purposes," "departures from the normal procedural sequence," *id.*, "substantive departures," and "the legislative or administrative history . . . especially where there are contemporary statements by members of the decisionmaking body, minutes of its meetings, or reports," *id*.

Here, the district court premised its finding of racial discrimination primarily on two of these factors:

(1) impact, i.e. "the considerable impact that [the Village's] zoning decision had on minorities in that community"; and

(2) sequence of events, i.e. "the sequence of events involved in the Board's decision to adopt R–T zoning instead of R– M zoning after it received public opposition to the prospect of affordable housing in Garden City." The district court noted a history of racial discrimination in Garden City, but declined to place "significant weight" on this factor. Trial court opinion ("Although [past events] could tend to suggest that racial discrimination has historically been a problem in Garden City, the Court declines to place significant weight on them for various reasons.").

The district court first noted statistical evidence that the original R–M proposal would have created a pool of potential renters with a significantly larger percentage of minority households than the pool of potential renters for the zoning proposal ultimately adopted as law by Garden City. However, in making its finding of discrimination, the district court relied primarily on the sequence of events leading up to the implementation of R–T zoning. The court first noted that Garden City officials and BFJ were initially enthusiastic about R–M zoning. BFJ's proposal permitted the development of up to 311 multi-family units, and Trustee Bee expressed the opinion at a January 20, 2004 meeting that "Garden City demographically has a need for multi-family housing," and that "he would keep an open mind but he still felt the recommended zoning change were appropriate." Trial court opinion.

However, the district court concluded that BFJ and the Board abruptly reversed course in response to vocal citizen opposition to the possibility of multi-family housing, including complaints that affordable housing with undesirable residents could be built under this zoning. At a February 4, 2004 meeting, Trustee Bee stated that "neither the County nor the Village is looking to create . . . so-called affordable housing." BFJ and the Board subsequently endorsed the R–T proposal, which banned the development of multi-family housing on all but a small portion of the Social Services Site and then only by special permit.

The district court focused on the suddenness of this change. Although the P–Zone Committee had consistently recommended R–M zoning for eighteen months, R–T zoning went from proposal to enactment in a matter of weeks. The district court noted that BFJ's consideration of R–T zoning was not nearly as comprehensive and deliberative as that for R–M zoning. In addition, the court found it strange that members of the P–Zone Committee—the Village officials most familiar with the situation—were excluded from the discussions regarding R–T zoning. Indeed, after a final public presentation on the proposed R–M zoning in April 2004, Schoelle, Filippon, and Fishberg met with BFJ to review the public comments. For some unknown reason, members of the P–Zone Committee did not participate in this meeting, and neither did the Village's zoning counsel Kiernan. The district court also found it peculiar that Local Law 2–2004, adopting R–T zoning, was moved to a public hearing even though no zoning text had yet been drafted and no environmental analysis of the law's impact had been conducted. Thus, in rejecting Garden City's argument below that the adoption of R–T zoning was business as usual, the district court concluded that Garden City was "seeking to rewrite history."

Although now recognizing the oddness and abruptness of this sequence of events, Garden City argues that these facts should not raise any suspicion. The Village contends that because BFJ, the Village Trustees, and Village residents had discussed the zoning of the Site for more than a year, there was no need to spend additional time discussing the same issues once they settled on a preferable lower-density approach. While the adoption of R–T zoning may seem rushed, and appear to be an abrupt change from Garden City's prior consistent course of conduct, according to Garden City, this was actually just efficient local government. Given the amount of time already invested in studying the Social Services Site, R–T zoning could proceed more quickly through the legislative process. While this may be one reasonable interpretation of the facts, the district court was nevertheless entitled to draw the contrary inference that the abandonment of R–M zoning was an abrupt change and that the "not nearly as deliberative" adoption of R–T zoning was suspect. Indeed, it is a bedrock principle that "where there are two permissible views of the evidence, the

factfinder's choice between them cannot be clearly erroneous." *Anderson v. City of Bessemer City*, 470 U.S. 564 (1985).

In considering the sequence of events leading up to the adoption of R–T zoning, the district court also focused closely on the nature of the citizen complaints regarding R– M zoning. Citizens expressed concerns about R–M zoning changing Garden City's "character" and "flavor." In addition, contrary to Garden City's contentions that any references to affordable housing were isolated, citizens repeatedly and forcefully expressed concern that R– M zoning would be used to introduce affordable housing and associated undesirable elements into their community. Residents expressed concerns about development that would lead to "sanitation [that] is overrun," "full families living in one bedroom townhouses, two bedroom co-ops" and "four people or ten people in an apartment." Other residents requested that officials "guarantee" that the housing would be "upscale" because of concerns "about a huge amount of apartments that come and depress the market for any co-op owner in this Village."

The district court also noted Garden City residents' concerns about the Balboni Bill and the possibility of creating "affordable housing," specifically discussing a flyer warning that property values might decrease if apartments were built on the Site and that such apartments might be required to include affordable housing under legislation pending in the State legislature. This flyer came to the attention of at least two trustees, as well as Fish and Schoelle. Concerned about the Balboni Bill, Garden City residents urged the Village officials to "play it safe" and "vote for single family homes." Viewing this opposition in light of (1) the racial makeup of Garden City, (2) the lack of affordable housing in Garden City, and (3) the likely number of minorities that would have lived in affordable housing at the Social Services Site,—the district court concluded that Garden City officials' abrupt change of course was a capitulation to citizen fears of affordable housing, which reflected race-based animus.

We find no clear error in the district court's determination. The tenor of the discussion at public hearings and in the flyer circulated throughout the community shows that citizen opposition, though not overtly race-based, was directed at a potential influx of poor, minority residents. Indeed, the description of the Garden City public hearing is eerily reminiscent of a scene described by the Court in [an earlier, unrelated, case, *United States v. Yonkers Bd of Education*, 837 F.2d 1181 (2nd Cir 1987), involving public housing]:

> At the meeting . . . the predominantly white audience overflowed the room. The discussion was emotionally charged, with frequent references to the effect that subsidized housing would have on the "character" of the neighborhood. The final speaker from the audience . . . stated that the Bronx had been ruined when blacks moved there and that he supported the condominium proposal because he did not want the same thing to happen in Yonkers.

Yonkers. Although no one used explicitly racial language at the Garden City public hearing, the parallels are striking. Like the residents in Yonkers, Garden City residents expressed concern that R–M zoning would change the "flavor" and "character" of Garden City. Citizens requested restricting the Site's zoning to single-family homes in order to preserve "the flavor and character of what Garden City is now." Citizens repeatedly requested "guarantees" that no affordable housing would be built at the Social Services Site and that the development would only be "upscale." Expressing concerns about the sort of residents who might occupy an eventual complex, one resident feared that the proposed development "could have four people or ten people in an apartment and nobody is going to know that." And, as with the emotionally charged scene in Yonkers, Suozzi stated that citizens at the public hearing were "yelling at him." Finally, recalling the Yonkers resident who spoke regarding the Bronx being "ruined," one resident explained that he had left Queens because apartment buildings originally intended for the elderly resulted in "full families living in one bedroom townhouses, two bedroom co-ops, the school is overburdened and overcrowded. You can't park your car. The sanitation is overrun." Another resident stated that she had left Brooklyn to avoid exactly the sort of development potentially available for the Social Services Site.

The district court concluded that, in light of the racial makeup of Garden City and the likely number of members of racial minorities that residents believed would have lived in affordable housing at the Social Services Site, these comments were code words for racial animus. See *Aman v. Cort Furniture Rental Corp*., 85 F.3d 1074 (3d Cir.1996) (observing that it "has become easier to coat various forms of discrimination with the appearance of propriety" because the threat of liability takes that which was once overt and makes it subtle). "Anti-discrimination laws and lawsuits

have 'educated' would-be violators such that extreme manifestations of discrimination are thankfully rare. . . . Regrettably, however, this in no way suggests that discrimination based upon an individual's race, gender, or age is near an end. Discrimination continues to pollute the social and economic mainstream of American life, and is often simply masked in more subtle forms." *Id.* "Racially charged code words may provide evidence of discriminatory intent by sending a clear message and carrying the distinct tone of racial motivations and implications." *Smith v. Fairview Ridges Hosp*., 625 F.3d 1076 (8th Cir.2010).

Empirical evidence supports the reasonableness of the district court's conclusion. Indeed, "research suggests that people believe that the majority of public housing residents are people of color, specifically, African American." See Carol M. Motley & Vanessa Gail Perry, Living on the Other Side of the Tracks: An Investigation of Public Housing Stereotypes, 32 *J. Pub. Pol'y & Marketing* 48 (2013); see also *id.* ("In the United States, public housing residents are perceived as predominantly ethnic peoples (mainly African American). . . ."). Here, the comments of Garden City residents employ recognized code words about low-income, minority housing. For example, "opponents of affordable housing provide subtle references to immigrant families when they condemn affordable housing due to the fear it will bring in 'families with lots of kids.'" Mai Thi Nguyen, Victoria Basolo & Abhishek Tiwari, Opposition to Affordable Housing in the USA: Debate Framing and the Responses of Local Actors, 30 *Housing, Theory & Soc'y* 107 (2013). Here, invoking this stereotype, Garden City residents complained of "full families living in one bedroom townhouses," and "four people or ten people in an apartment," as well as the possibility of "overburdened and overcrowded" schools. In addition, research shows that "opponents of affordable housing may mention that they do not want their city to become another 'Watts' or 'Bayview–Hunters–Point,' both places with a predominantly African–American population." Nguyen, at 123. So too here, Garden City residents expressed concerns about their community becoming like communities with majority-minority populations, such as Brooklyn and Queens. Moreover, "a series of studies have shown that when Whites are asked why they would not want to live near African–Americans (no income level is indicated in the question), common responses relate to the fear of property value decline, increasing crime, decreasing community quality (e.g. physical decay of housing, trash in neighborhood, and unkempt lawns) and increasing violence." Nguyen. Repeatedly expressing concerns that R–M zoning would lead to a decline in their property values as well as reduced quality of life in their community, Garden City residents urged the Board of Trustees to "keep Garden City what it is" and to "think of the people who live here." Considering these statements in context, we find that the district court's conclusion that citizen opposition to R–M zoning utilized code words to communicate their race-based animus to Garden City officials was not clearly erroneous. See *Smith v. Town of Clarkton*, 682 F.2d 1055 (4th Cir.1982) (finding "'camouflaged' racial expressions" based on concerns "about an influx of 'undesirables,'" who would "'dilute' the public schools"). While another factfinder might reasonably draw the contrary inference from these facially neutral statements, "the district court's account of the evidence is plausible in light of the record viewed in its entirety."

In response, Garden City notes that its officials testified that they did not understand the citizen opposition to be race-based. But, quite obviously, discrimination is rarely admitted. See *Rosen v. Thornburgh*, 928 F.2d 528 (2d Cir.1991) ("A victim of discrimination is . . . seldom able to prove his or her claim by direct evidence and is usually constrained to rely on the cumulative weight of circumstantial evidence."); *Iadimarco v. Runyon*, 190 F.3d 151 (3d Cir.1999) ("An employer who discriminates will almost never announce a discriminatory animus or provide employees or courts with direct evidence of discriminatory intent."). The district court reached its conclusion after a lengthy trial, during which the court had the opportunity to hear and evaluate the testimony of numerous witnesses, including all of the relevant Garden City officials. Moreover, there is ample evidence from which to question the credibility of these officials. Trustee Lundquist stated during his trial testimony that he was unsure if Garden City—an overwhelmingly white community—was majority black. Similarly, Building Superintendent Filippon stated that he did not know if Garden City was majority white. Trustee Negri further stated that he could not recall if he had ever had a conversation about affordable housing.

In addition to these incredible statements, which the district court would have been entitled to discredit, there was abundant evidence from which the district court could find that Garden City officials clearly understood residents' coded objections to R–M zoning. During his testimony, Village Administrator Schoelle indicated that he knew low-income residents of Garden City were primarily African Americans and Latinos. In addition, County Executive Suozzi testified to his knowledge that race is generally a factor in opposition to affordable housing in Nassau County, and

that Garden City residents' opposition to affordable housing was motivated, at least in part, by discriminatory animus. Furthermore, employing the code words apparently employed by Garden City residents, Trustee Negri testified that housing occupied by low-income minorities is not consistent with the "character" of Garden City.

Garden City's argument appears to boil down to the following—because no one ever said anything overtly race-based, this was all just business as usual. But the district court was entitled to conclude, based on the Arlington Heights factors, that something was amiss here, and that Garden City's abrupt shift in zoning in the face of vocal citizen opposition to changing the character of Garden City represented acquiescence to race-based animus. . . .

Note: Applying the Intent Requirement

1. What do you think about the appellate court's application of the *Arlington Heights* factors? Note how carefully the appellate court phrases its task in reviewing the trial court's findings about intent. What does that care—and the review suggested by that standard—suggest about the intent requirement?

2. The court's opinion notes that, today, discrimination is usually not explicit—that is, there are relatively few situations where the government expressly excludes persons based on their race. (The major exception is in affirmative action cases, where the government asserts that its race consciousness was justified by benign goals.) Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the *Arlington Heights* factors, how would you guide courts' determinations of whether a given government action, while neutral on its face, was nevertheless motivated by a desire to classify on some suspicious ground, such as race or sex?

3. Consider the intent requirement itself, apart from questions about how to apply it. While no justice expressly dissented from *Davis*'s announcement of that requirement, some scholars have sharply criticized it. They call instead for some version of an effects test, in which disparate results on the alleged ground (*e.g.*, race) triggers more searching judicial review without a formal inquiry into whether that disparate impact was the result of intentional government action. Do you agree with Justice White's objection in *Davis* that an effects test would necessarily be unmanageable? How did the *Mhany* court's application of the intent test deal with the disparate impact of the town's zoning decision? Is it accurate to say that that court did in fact apply something akin to a modified effects test?

Chapter 16: Equal Protection Fundamental Rights

Insert at the end of Page 963, before the Note:

Note: Tiered Scrutiny—A Dissent from Justice Thomas

In *Whole Woman's Health Center v. Hellerstedt*, ___ U.S. ___ (2016) (excerpted in Chapter 9 of this Supplement), the Court applied the undue burden standard of *Planned Parenthood of Southeast Pa. v. Casey* (1992) (*Supra* Chapter 9) to invalidate a Texas law regulating abortion providers. Among the three dissenters, Justice Thomas wrote a dissent only for himself. Most of that dissent critiqued the Court's application of *Casey*, as well as *Casey* itself. But part of his opinion consisted of a more general attack on the entire idea of tiers of scrutiny, including *Casey*'s undue burden standard but also more generally. An excerpt of that opinion follows.

III

The majority's furtive reconfiguration of the standard of scrutiny applicable to abortion restrictions also points to a deeper problem. The undue-burden standard is just one variant of the Court's tiers-of-scrutiny approach to constitutional adjudication. And the label the Court affixes to its level of scrutiny in assessing whether the government can restrict a given right—be it "rational basis," intermediate, strict, or something else—is increasingly a meaningless formalism. As the Court applies whatever standard it likes to any given case, nothing but empty words separates our constitutional decisions from judicial fiat.

Though the tiers of scrutiny have become a ubiquitous feature of constitutional law, they are of recent vintage. Only in the 1960's did the Court begin in earnest to speak of "strict scrutiny" versus reviewing legislation for mere rationality, and to develop the contours of these tests. In short order, the Court adopted strict scrutiny as the standard for reviewing everything from race-based classifications under the Equal Protection Clause to restrictions on constitutionally protected speech. *Roe v. Wade* (1973) [*Supra* Chapter 9], then applied strict scrutiny to a purportedly "fundamental" substantive due process right for the first time. Then the tiers of scrutiny proliferated into ever more gradations. See, *e.g., Craig v. Boren* (1976) [*Supra* Chapter 12] (intermediate scrutiny for sex-based classifications); *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003) (O'Connor, J., concurring in judgment) [Note *supra* this Chapter] ("a more searching form of rational basis review" applies to laws reflecting "a desire to harm a politically unpopular group"); *Buckley v. Valeo,* 424 U.S. 1 (1976) (*per curiam*) (applying "closest scrutiny" to campaign-finance contribution limits). Casey's undue-burden test added yet another right-specific test on the spectrum between rational-basis and strict-scrutiny review.

The illegitimacy of using "made-up tests" to "displace longstanding national traditions as the primary determinant of what the Constitution means" has long been apparent. (1996) (Scalia, J., dissenting) [*Supra* Chapter 12]. The Constitution does not prescribe tiers of scrutiny. The three basic tiers—"rational basis," intermediate, and strict scrutiny—"are no more scientific than their names suggest, and a further element of randomness is added by the fact that it is largely up to us which test will be applied in each case." *Id.*; see also *Craig* (Rehnquist, J., dissenting).

But the problem now goes beyond that. If our recent cases illustrate anything, it is how easily the Court tinkers with levels of scrutiny to achieve its desired result. This Term, it is easier for a State to survive strict scrutiny despite discriminating on the basis of race in college admissions than it is for the same State to regulate how abortion doctors and clinics operate under the putatively less stringent undue-burden test. All the State apparently needs to show to survive strict scrutiny is a list

of aspirational educational goals (such as the "cultivation [of] a set of leaders with legitimacy in the eyes of the citizenry") and a "reasoned, principled explanation" for why it is pursuing them—then this Court defers. *Fisher v. University of Tex. at Austin* (2016) [*Supra* Chapter 13 Supplement]. Yet the same State gets no deference under the undue-burden test, despite producing evidence that abortion safety, one rationale for Texas' law, is medically debated. See *Whole Woman's Health v. Lakey,* 46 F.Supp.3d 673 (WD Tex.2014) (noting conflict in expert testimony about abortion safety). Likewise, it is now easier for the government to restrict judicial candidates' campaign speech than for the Government to define marriage—even though the former is subject to strict scrutiny and the latter was supposedly subject to some form of rational-basis review. Compare *Williams–Yulee v. Florida Bar,* 575 U.S. ___ (2015), with *United States v. Windsor,* 570 U.S. ___ (2013) [Note *supra* this Chapter].

These more recent decisions reflect the Court's tendency to relax purportedly higher standards of review for less-preferred rights. Meanwhile, the Court selectively applies rational-basis review—under which the question is supposed to be whether "any state of facts reasonably may be conceived to justify" the law, *McGowan v. Maryland,* 366 U.S. 420 (1961)—with formidable toughness. *E.g., Lawrence* (O'Connor, J., concurring in judgment) (at least in equal protection cases, the Court is "most likely" to find no rational basis for a law if "the challenged legislation inhibits personal relationships"); see *id.* (Scalia, J., dissenting) (faulting the Court for applying "an unheard-of form of rational-basis review").

These labels now mean little. Whatever the Court claims to be doing, in practice it is treating its "doctrine referring to tiers of scrutiny as guidelines informing our approach to the case at hand, not tests to be mechanically applied." *Williams–Yulee* (Breyer, J., concurring). The Court should abandon the pretense that anything other than policy preferences underlies its balancing of constitutional rights and interests in any given case.

IV

It is tempting to identify the Court's invention of a constitutional right to abortion in *Roe v. Wade* (1973) [*Supra* Chapter 9] as the tipping point that transformed . . . the tiers of scrutiny into an unworkable morass of special exceptions and arbitrary applications. But those roots run deeper, to the very notion that some constitutional rights demand preferential treatment. During the *Lochner* era, the Court considered the right to contract and other economic liberties to be fundamental requirements of due process of law. See *Lochner v. New York* (1905) [*Supra* Chapter 7]. The Court in 1937 repudiated Lochner's foundations. See *West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish* (1937) [*Supra* Chapter 7]. But the Court then created a new taxonomy of preferred rights.

In 1938, seven Justices heard a constitutional challenge to a federal ban on shipping adulterated milk in interstate commerce. Without economic substantive due process, the ban clearly invaded no constitutional right. See *United States v. Carolene Products Co.,* 304 U.S. 144 (1938) [Note *supra* this Chapter]. Within Justice Stone's opinion for the Court, however, was a footnote that just three other Justices joined—the famous *Carolene Products* Footnote 4. The footnote's first paragraph suggested that the presumption of constitutionality that ordinarily attaches to legislation might be "narrower . . . when legislation appears on its face to be within a specific prohibition of the Constitution." Its second paragraph appeared to question "whether legislation which restricts those political processes, which can ordinarily be expected to bring about repeal of undesirable legislation, is to be subjected to more exacting judicial scrutiny under the general prohibitions of the [14th] Amendment than are most other types of legislation." And its third and most familiar paragraph raised the question "whether prejudice against discrete and insular minorities may be a special condition, which tends seriously to curtail the operation of those political processes ordinarily to be relied upon to protect minorities, and which may call for a correspondingly more searching judicial

inquiry."

> Though the footnote was pure dicta, the Court seized upon it to justify its special treatment of certain personal liberties like the First Amendment and the right against discrimination on the basis of race—but also rights not enumerated in the Constitution. As the Court identified which rights deserved special protection, it developed the tiers of scrutiny as part of its equal protection (and, later, due process) jurisprudence as a way to demand extra justifications for encroachments on these rights. And, having created a new category of fundamental rights, the Court loosened the reins to recognize even putative rights like abortion, see *Roe*, which hardly implicate "discrete and insular minorities." . . .
>
> Eighty years on, the Court has come full circle. The Court has simultaneously transformed judicially created rights like the right to abortion into preferred constitutional rights, while disfavoring many of the rights actually enumerated in the Constitution. But our Constitution renounces the notion that some constitutional rights are more equal than others. A plaintiff either possesses the constitutional right he is asserting, or not . . . . A law either infringes a constitutional right, or not; there is no room for the judiciary to invent tolerable degrees of encroachment. Unless the Court abides by one set of rules to adjudicate constitutional rights, it will continue reducing constitutional law to policy-driven value judgments until the last shreds of its legitimacy disappear.

You've now read several different sets of materials that employ tiers of scrutiny: the dormant Commerce Clause materials of Chapter 5, the suspect class materials of Chapter 12, the racial classification materials of Chapter 13, the rational basis-plus/animus materials of Chapter 15, the fundamental rights strand of equal protection materials of Chapter 16, and the abortion and due process materials of, respectively, Chapters 9 and 10 that Justice Thomas's dissent specifically addressed. What do you think of his critique?

Part V: General Fourteenth Amendment Issues

Chapter 18: The Problem of "State Action"

D. Cross-Cutting State Action Issues

***Insert at page 1061, before the Note*:**

Problem: Postal Services in a Church Building

The following is an excerpt of a case in which a plaintiff alleged that the United States Postal Service, a government entity, violated the First Amendment's prohibition on government establishment of religion when it entered into an agreement with a church organization to host and operate a "Contract Postal Unit" (which, as you'll read below, is essentially a satellite post office). As you'll see, it was the private church organization that was actually expressing religious views; nevertheless, the plaintiff claimed that the Postal Service's involvement with that organization, and the organization's performance of mailing functions, was such that the church's religious expression should be imputed to the federal government.

This excerpt presents the facts of this case. How do you think the court in this case should have analyzed the state action issue?

A. THE POSTAL SERVICE AND CONTRACT POSTAL UNITS (CPUs).

The Postal Service . . . acts as an independent establishment of the executive branch of the federal government. The general duties of the Postal Service are to plan, develop, promote, and provide adequate and efficient postal services at fair and reasonable rates and fees, and to receive, transmit, and deliver written and printed matter and parcels throughout the United States and the world. See 39 U.S.C. § 403. Congress has bestowed the Postal Service with the power "to provide and sell postage stamps and other stamped paper, cards, and envelopes and to provide such other evidences of payment of postage and fees as may be necessary or desirable."

In certain circumstances, the Postal Service enters into contracts establishing CPUs, which are distinguishable from traditional, government-run "official" post offices (also known as "classified units") staffed and operated by Postal Service employees. The Postal Service's Glossary of Postal Terms defines a CPU as

> "a postal unit that is a subordinate unit within the service area of a main post office. It is usually located in a store or place of business and is operated by a contractor who accepts mail from the public, sells postage and supplies, and provides selected special services (for example, postal money order or registered mail)."

CPUs are operated by persons who are not postal employees. CPUs are not permitted to provide products from competing services such as Federal Express or the United Parcel Service, but they may conduct non-postal business on the premises in an area that is separate and distinct from the postal products. All postal funds must be kept separate from the non-postal funds.

The Postal Service relies upon CPUs to bring postal services to areas in which the Postal Service has determined that the establishment of a classified unit would be unfeasible. There are approximately 5,200 CPUs nationwide, and they are currently operated in, among other places, colleges, grocery stores, pharmacies, quilting shops, and private residences. . . .

Each CPU has a contracting officer representative appointed to oversee that CPU. The contracting officer representative is responsible for administering the contract. Once a CPU contract has been awarded, the contracting

officer representative has the responsibilities of conducting on-site reviews, performing an annual review of the CPU's bond, conducting periodic financial reviews with an annual audit, and reviewing the operating/service hours at the CPU. There is no required schedule that a contracting officer representative must keep with regard to a CPU, although he must conduct on-site reviews "periodically."

B. THE SINCERELY YOURS, INC. CONTRACT POSTAL UNIT

. . . Before the CPU contract [at issue in this case] was awarded to the Church . . . , the Town of Manchester had two prior CPUs in operation, the Weston Pharmacy CPU and the Community Place CPU . . . . Boyne [the postmaster for that community] was the contracting officer representative for the Community Place CPU from 1998 through October 2001, when the Community Place CPU closed.

. . . There was substantial community interest generated by this closing, as the community sought to find a suitable replacement. . . . [On] November 20, 2001, the Postal Service awarded the CPU contract to the Church. . . . On October 9, 2003, the Church and the Postal Service modified the CPU contract by replacing the Church with [Sincerely Yours, Inc. (SYI)], a corporation set up by the Church for the purpose of establishing the CPU, and SYI began to run the CPU ("the SYI CPU").

Pursuant to the terms of the SYI CPU contract, the interior and exterior of the SYI CPU premises are to be kept clean, neat, uncluttered, and in good repair. The SYI CPU must contain signage indicating that the establishment is a contract postal unit and providing the address of the nearest Postal Service Administrative Office. All money collected at the SYI CPU is the property of the Postal Service, and all payments to SYI by the Postal Service are made in arrears after each Postal Service accounting period. As part of the SYI CPU contract, the Postal Service was required to pay for, among other things, the build-out of the SYI CPU counter and the construction of post office boxes at the SYI CPU. SYI was to pay for all other renovations to the building that housed the SYI CPU. Under the terms of the SYI CPU contract, SYI receives, as compensation, 18% of all sales made at the SYI CPU and 33% of all post office box rental proceeds. As the contracting officer representative, Boyne (or one of his supervisors) conducts periodic on-site reviews of the SYI CPU to ensure that SYI is in compliance with the contract; Boyne's contact and oversight of the SYI CPU is, however, minimal. SYI runs the day-to-day operations of the SYI CPU, and SYI has the authority to hire and fire its CPU employees. SYI pays for its employees to receive training from the Postal Service with regard to running a CPU; this training includes learning about accounting procedures and equipment operation. SYI employees do not, however, wear Postal Service uniforms.

C. DISPLAYS IN THE SYI CPU

As stated above, the Church is a religious organization. . . . The SYI CPU contains both religious and non-religious displays. The exterior wall of the SYI CPU, which faces the street, has a label with the stylized eagle of the Postal Service indicating that the premises contains a Postal Service contract postal unit. The sign over the threshold to the building reads "Sincerely Yours." Another sign on the outside of the SYI CPU reads, in cursive type, "Sincerely Yours, Inc." and, in print type, "United States Contract Post Office."

The interior of the SYI CPU contains evangelical displays, including posters, advertisements, artwork, and photography, which change at various times during the year. Upon entering the SYI CPU, a postal counter, built by the Postal Service, sits immediately to the customer's right; behind the counter is a slat wall, also built by the Postal Service. In their submissions to the court, the parties describe the religious displays in the SYI CPU as follows:

(1) On the wall directly to the right of the postal counter and slat wall is a large religious display that informs customers about Jesus Christ and invites them to submit a request if they "need prayer in their lives." . . .

(2) Directly on the postal counter adjacent to this display sits a pile of "prayer cards" and a box into which postal service customers can put their prayer requests. . . .

(3) There is another display in the SYI CPU containing a framed advertisement for World–Wide Lighthouse Missions, the missionary organization incorporated by the Church to which the SYI CPU's profits are donated. This display,

which sits directly opposite a shelving unit containing official USPS postal supplies and forms and above a table used by customers filling out USPS paperwork, offers biblical quotations and explains that the organization is "Endeavoring to Reach the World with the Love of Jesus Christ, one life at a time."

(4) Directly to the right of the World–Wide Lighthouse Missions display is yet another display that provides additional information about World–Wide Lighthouse Missions . . . . To the right of this display, immediately to the left of the Postal Service postal boxes, is a donation box, decorated with World–Wide Lighthouse Missions mission photographs.

(5) A "World–Wide Lighthouse Missions" coin donation jar, decorated with mission photographs, sits on the postal counter.

(6) To the left of the postal counter, a television monitor displays Church-related religious videos directly ahead, and in plain view, of customers waiting in line at the postal counter. . . .

(7) Above the official Postal Service rental post boxes and on the wall across from the transaction counter are various 8 ½″ x 14″ photographs of a number of the Church's events. Among these photographs is a picture of "Wally," a character who delivers Bibles, and conveys religious messages through puppets acting out skits, to children in the community. Wally is depicted standing beside George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

(8) In addition to the above-listed displays, the SYI CPU features additional seasonal displays, including a large extended crèche, which is displayed in the SYI CPU's storefront window during the Christmas holiday season. In addition, there are, at various times, video presentations displayed on a television set inside the SYI CPU.

For its part, the Postal Service states that it does not encourage or induce SYI to display the religious materials in the SYI CPU. On the SYI CPU transaction counter, there is a sign, provided by the Postal Service, which reads: "The United States Postal Service does not endorse the religious viewpoint expressed in the materials posted at this Contract Postal Unit." To the right of this disclaimer is another sign, which reads: "[The SYI] United States Contract Postal Unit is operated by the Full Gospel Interdenominational Church. Thank you for your patronage." The Intervenor Defendants maintain that SYI does not permit its employees to proselytize at the SYI CPU, and that, if a SYI CPU customer requests a prayer, SYI employees are instructed to refer such customers to the Church itself. . . .

Problem: City Involvement with a Neighborhood Association

The City of Shoreline maintains a "Community Promotion Program" (CPP), which seeks to assist neighborhood associations in Shoreline with organizing and operating. One of the ways the CPP does this is by providing funding for such associations. In order to receive CPP funding, a neighborhood association must have (1) an elected leadership board and (2) duly-enacted bylaws that, among other things, delineate the geographical boundaries of the association and specify "a democratic process" for electing the board.

The CPP also features a grievance procedure by which residents could complain to the CPP that a city-funded association is failing to satisfy these criteria. If the administrator of the CPP concludes that an association's bylaws do not satisfy these criteria, she may recommend that the association revise its bylaws and practices. If she concludes that the association has continued to fail to satisfy these criteria, her only recourse is to withdraw CPP funding. The North Shoreline Neighborhood Association ("NSNA" or "Association") receives such funding, as well as funding from private sources.

Last year a group of residents of the North Shoreline neighborhood complained that their applications to run for leadership positions in the Association were unfairly denied, and put up

signs in the neighborhood explaining their position. The NSNA rejected the complaint and the residents appealed to the CPP using its grievance process. The CPP also rejected the complaint. However, it recommended that the Association revise its bylaws to be clearer about the NSNA's election process and residents' eligibility to run for leadership positions. The CPP tasked Tom Ramirez, a city-employed "neighborhood empowerment counselor" to work with the Association on the revision process. After consulting with Ramirez, the NSNA adopted revised bylaws. Those bylaws provided more clarity with regard to the election process, but they also provided that "a resident who has engaged in defamatory conduct against the Association or failed to engage constructively with the Association over the past year" would be barred from running for a board position.

The disgruntled residents sued the Association, claiming that the new bylaws punished them for their speech criticizing the Association, and thus violated their First Amendment rights. When their brief turned to the state action issue, it argued that "the city was responsible for the deprivation of their First Amendment rights because the city commanded and encouraged the Association by exercising coercive power or overtly or covertly significantly encouraging" it to act unconstitutionally. In particular, the residents argued that the city encouraged the adoption of the new bylaws by both adopting a grievance procedure and requiring neighborhood organizations to have democratic processes and elections as "preconditions" for the receipt of public funds.

How likely is the court to find state action in this case? Why or why not? What facts would help you make that determination with more confidence? Why would those facts help you?