

Administrative Law

Carolina Academic Press Context and Practice Series

Michael Hunter Schwartz
Series Editor

Administrative Law, Second Edition
Richard Henry Seamon

Advanced Torts
Alex B. Long and Meredith J. Duncan

Animal Law—New Perspectives on Teaching Traditional Law
Kathy Hessler, Joyce Tischler, Pamela Hart, and Sonia S. Waisman

Antitrust Law
Steven Semeraro

Civil Procedure, Second Edition
Gerald F. Hess, Theresa M. Beiner, and Scott R. Bauries

Civil Procedure for All States
Benjamin V. Madison, III

Complex Litigation
James M. Underwood

Constitutional Law, Second Edition
David Schwartz and Lori Ringhand

**A Context and Practice Global Case File:
An Intersex Athlete's Constitutional Challenge,
*Hastings v. USATE, IAAF, and IOC***
Olivia M. Farrar

**A Context and Practice Global Case File:
Rossi v. Bryce, An International Embryo and Surrogacy Dispute**
Olivia M. Farrar

**A Context and Practice Global Case File:
Thorpe v. Lightfoot, A Mother's International Hague Petition
for the Return of Her Child**
Olivia M. Farrar

Contracts, Third Edition
Michael Hunter Schwartz and Adrian J. Walters

Criminal Law, Second Edition

Steven I. Friedland, Catherine L. Carpenter,
Kami N. Chavis, and Catherine Arcabascio

Current Issues in Constitutional Litigation, Second Edition

Sarah E. Ricks and Evelyn M. Tenenbaum

Employment Discrimination, Third Edition

Sandra F. Sperino and Jarod S. Gonzalez

Energy Law

Joshua P. Fershee

Evidence, Second Edition

Pavel Wonsowicz

International Business Transactions

Amy Deen Westbrook

International Women's Rights, Equality, and Justice

Christine M. Venter

The Lawyer's Practice

Kris Franklin

Professional Responsibility

Barbara Glesner Fines

Property Law

Alicia Kelly and Nancy Knauer

Sales, Second Edition

Edith R. Warkentine

Secured Transactions

Edith R. Warkentine and Jerome A. Grossman

Torts

Paula J. Manning

Workers' Compensation Law, Second Edition

Michael C. Duff

Your Brain and Law School

Marybeth Herald

Administrative Law

*A Context and Practice
Casebook*

SECOND EDITION

Richard H. Seamon

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO COLLEGE OF LAW



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2020
Richard Henry Seamon
All Rights Reserved

ISBN 978-1-5310-0738-6
e-ISBN 978-1-5310-0739-3
LCCN 2019950072

Carolina Academic Press
700 Kent Street
Durham, NC 27701
Telephone (919) 489-7486
Fax (919) 493-5668
www.cap-press.com

Printed in the United States of America

To my family: Holly, Maggie, and Kate

And to my friend, mentor, and the inspiration for this book: John H. Reese

Offered to the Glory of God in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ

Contents

List of Diagrams and Figures	xxxiii
Table of Cases	xxxv
Series Editor’s Preface	li
Preface	liii
Acknowledgments	lvii

Part One · Administrative Law Fundamentals

Chapter 1 · Welcome to Administrative Law!	3
A. What Is This All About?	4
B. What Are Administrative Agencies?	5
1. Administrative Agencies in the Everyday Sense	5
2. Technical Definitions of “Agency”	9
C. How Are Administrative Agencies Created?	11
1. Agencies Created by Statute	11
2. Agencies Created by Executive-Branch Action	12
3. State Agencies Created by State Constitution	13
4. Summary	13
D. What Do Administrative Agencies Do, and How Do They Do It?	13
1. What Administrative Agencies Do	13
2. How Agencies Do What They Do (Types of Agency Powers)	14
a. Legislative Power—Making Rules with “the Force and Effect of Law”	15
b. Executive Power—Interpreting the Laws to Be Executed; Advising the Public of Those Interpretations; Investigating; and Prosecuting	17
(i) Interpretation	17
(ii) Investigations	18
(iii) Prosecutions	19
c. Adjudicatory Power—Deciding Cases	19
d. The Blending of the Three Types of Powers in Many Modern Administrative Agencies	20
E. Why Do We Have Administrative Agencies?	21
F. What Does the Practice of Administrative Law Involve?	23
G. Chapter 1 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	24

Chapter 2 · Administrative Law Problem Solving; Overview of the Rest of This Book	27
A. Types of Agency Action	28
B. Sources of Agency Power	29
C. Limits on Agency Power	31
1. Internal Limits vs. External Limits	32
a. Internal (Intrinsic) Limits	32
b. External (Extrinsic) Limits	33
c. Why Distinguish Internal from External Limits	34
2. Substantive vs. Procedural Limits	34
a. Substantive Limits (or Requirements)	34
b. Procedural Limits (or Requirements)	35
c. The Limited Usefulness of Distinguishing Substantive from Procedural Limits	36
3. Agency Discretion	37
D. Enforcing Limits on Agency Power	37
1. The Agency	38
2. The Judicial Branch	39
3. The Legislative Branch	39
4. The Executive Branch	39
5. The People	40
E. Game Plan for the Rest of the Book	42
Chapter 3 · Statutory Research and Analysis in Administrative Law	45
A. Context for Statutory Research and Analysis in Administrative Law	46
B. The Three Types of Statutes Governing Administrative Agencies	47
1. Agency Organic Statutes	47
2. Other Agency-Specific Statutes	49
3. Cross-Cutting Statutes	49
C. Finding the Agency Legislation	49
1. Internet	50
2. Other Resources	50
a. Federal Agencies	50
b. State Agencies	51
3. Timing Is Everything	51
D. Finding Cross-Cutting Statutes	52
E. Reading the Agency Statutes	53
1. Reading an Unfamiliar Agency Statute	54
a. Contextual Information	54
b. Structural Information	55
c. Agency Duties and Powers	56
d. Judicial Oversight	57
e. Applicability of APA and Other Statutes	60
2. Re-Readings of an Agency Statute	61

3. Learning About an Agency from Non-Statutory Sources	61
F. Chapter 3 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	62
Chapter 4 • Administrative Procedure Acts (APAs)	65
A. The History of APAs	66
1. Federal APA	66
2. State APAs	68
B. The Purposes and Structure of the Federal APA	69
C. General Analysis under an APA	74
1. Definitional Section	74
2. Applicability of APA to a Problem	75
a. Does the APA (Federal or State) Apply to This Agency?	75
(i) APA Definitions of “Agency”	75
(ii) Agency Legislation Addressing the Applicability of the APA to the Agency	77
b. If the APA Does Apply to This Agency, Does the APA Apply in Whole or in Part to the Agency Action Involved in the Particular Problem under Analysis?	79
(i) APA Provisions Addressing Various Agency Activities	79
(ii) Agency Legislation and Agency Rules Addressing Applicability of APA to the Agency’s Activities	80
c. If the APA Does Apply to the Agency Action under Analysis, How Does the APA Interact with Other Laws Applicable to the Problem?	82
D. The Fundamental Distinction between Rulemaking and Adjudication	84
1. The Distinction under the Federal APA	84
2. The Distinction under State APAs	90
3. The Distinction in U.S. Supreme Court Case Law	91
a. Introduction to the <i>Londoner/Bi-Metallic</i> Distinction	91
b. The <i>Londoner</i> and <i>Bi-Metallic</i> Opinions	92
<i>Londoner v. City and County of Denver</i>	92
<i>Bi-Metallic Investment Company v. State Board of Equalization of Colorado</i>	94
c. Exploring the <i>Londoner/Bi-Metallic</i> Distinction	95
4. Differences between the APA Distinction between Rulemaking and Adjudication and the Procedural Due Process Distinction between Rulemaking and Adjudication	99
E. Chapter 4 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	102
Chapter 5 • Administrative Law, Federal Supremacy, and Cooperative Federalism	105
A. When Must Federal Agencies and Officials Obey State and Local Law?	107
1. Federal Agencies and Officials Must Obey a State or Local Law if that Law Does Not Meaningfully Interfere with the Execution of Federal Law and Is Not Preempted by Federal Law	107

a. Under the Doctrine of “Intergovernmental Immunity,” a State or Local Law Is Invalid If It Meaningfully Interferes with the Execution of Federal Law	107
b. Preemption of State and Local Law by Federal Statutes and Regulations	109
c. Preemption of State or Local Law by Federal Common Law	110
d. Preemption Summary	111
2. Federal Agencies and Officials Must Obey State and Local Laws When Required to Do So by Federal Law	112
3. Summary	113
B. When Must State and Local Agencies and Officials Obey Federal Law?	114
1. State and Local Agencies and Officials Must Obey All Valid Federal Laws	114
2. Cooperative Federalism	115
C. Chapter 5 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	118

Part Two · Rulemaking

Chapter 6 · Introduction to Agency Rulemaking	125
A. Rulemaking in a Legal-Practice Context	125
B. Rulemaking within the Problem Solving Framework	126
C. Rulemaking from the Agency Perspective	126
D. The Role of Lawyers in Rulemaking	128
E. Roadmap of Part Two	129
Chapter 7 · The Distinction between Legislative Rules and Non-Legislative Rules	131
A. Why It Matters Whether a Rule Is a Legislative or a Non-Legislative Rule	133
1. Legislative Rules Have the Force and Effect of Law	133
a. A Legislative Rule Binds Members of the Public	133
b. A Legislative Rule Binds the Agency	135
2. Other Differences between Legislative and Non-Legislative Rules	137
a. Different Procedures for Making	137
b. Different Codification Requirements	137
c. Different Constitutional Implications	137
d. Different Scope of Federal Judicial Review	137
B. Types of Non-Legislative Rules	138
1. Interpretative (Also Known as “Interpretive”) Rules	139
2. General Statements of Policy	140
C. To Make Legislative Rules, an Agency Needs Statutory Power to Make Legislative Rules	142
1. Open-Ended Grants of Rulemaking Power	143
2. Statutory Grants of Power to Make Rules That, If Violated, Expose the Violator to Statutorily Authorized Sanctions	145

3. Statutory Grants of Power to Make Rules Necessary to Complete the Statutory Scheme	146
4. Summary	147
D. How to Tell If a Rule Is a Legislative or a Non-Legislative Rule	149
E. The Distinction between “Legislative” Rules and “Substantive” Rules	149
F. Types of Rules Recognized in APAs	152
1. Federal APA	152
2. State APAs	153
G. Chapter 7 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	154
Chapter 8 • Agency Rulemaking Power	157
A. Sources of Power for Legislative and Non-Legislative Rules	158
B. The Delegation Doctrine as a Limit on Federal Statutes Granting Federal Agencies Power to Make Legislative Rules	159
1. Background on Federal Delegation Doctrine	160
a. Relevant Constitutional Text	160
(i) Textual Basis for Federal Separation of Powers Doctrine	160
(ii) Textual Basis for Federal Delegation Doctrine	161
b. Historical U.S. Supreme Court Case Law	162
(i) Early Cases	163
(ii) New Deal Cases	164
2. Modern Federal Delegation Doctrine	164
a. The Most Common Situation in Which the Delegation Doctrine Arises	165
<i>Gundy v. United States</i>	165
b. Other Situations Presenting Delegation Issues	169
(i) Interpreting Federal Statutes Narrowly to Avoid Delegation Problems	169
(ii) Statutes Granting an Agency the Power to Define Criminal Offenses	170
3. Modern Nondelegation Doctrine in the States	171
a. The Federal Nondelegation Doctrine Does Not Apply to the States	171
b. The Sources and Prevalence of the Nondelegation Doctrine in the States	172
4. Delegations of Power to Private Entities	173
C. Other Limits on Statutes Granting Agencies Power to Make Legislative Rules	174
D. Chapter 8 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	175
Chapter 9 • Limits on Agency Rulemaking Power	179
A. Internal Limits on Agency Rulemaking Power	180
1. Internal Substantive Limits	181
a. Internal Substantive Limits on Agency Power to Make Legislative Rules	181

b. Internal Substantive Limits on Agency Power to Make Non-Legislative Rules	182
2. Internal Procedural Limits	183
B. External Limits on Agency Rulemaking Power	184
1. Constitutional Law	184
a. Substantive Limits	184
b. Procedural Limits	185
2. Statutory Law	185
a. Substantive Limits	186
b. Procedural Limits	186
3. Agency Rules and Other Executive-Branch Material	186
a. The Agency's Own Rules	187
(i) Substantive Limits	187
(ii) Procedural Limits	187
b. Other Executive-Branch Material	188
4. Judicial Review	188
a. Substantive Limits	189
(i) Factual Support	189
(ii) Reasoned Decision Making	190
b. Procedural Requirements	190
(i) Federal Court Review of Federal Agency Action— The <i>Vermont Yankee</i> Principle	190
<i>Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.</i>	192
Note Introducing “Open Record” vs. “Closed Record” Proceedings	198
(ii) State Court Review of State Agency Action	199
C. Chapter 9 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	200
Chapter 10 · The APA as a Source of Procedural Requirements for Agency Rulemaking	203
A. Framework for Analyzing APA's Applicability to an Agency Rule	205
B. Step 1 of Analysis: Does the APA Apply to This Agency?	206
C. Step 2 of Analysis: If the APA Does Apply to the Agency, Do the APA's Rulemaking Requirements Apply to the Rule under Analysis?— Examining the APA Exemptions	206
1. Federal APA Rulemaking Exemptions	206
a. The Differences Between the Exemptions in § 553(a) and Those in § 553(b)	207
b. The Similarities Between the Exemptions in § 553(a) and Those in § 553(b)	208
c. Subject-Matter Exemptions in Section 553(a)	209
(i) Military and Foreign Affairs Exemption	209
(ii) Exemption for Agency Management or Personnel, Public Property, Etc.	210

d. Exemptions for Interpretative Rules, Policy Statements, and Procedural Rules	212
(i) “[R]ules of [A]gency [O]rganization, [P]rocedure, or [P]ractice”	212
(ii) “[G]eneral [S]tatements of [P]olicy”	214
(iii) “[I]nterpretative [R]ules” (Also Known as “Interpretive” Rules)	216
e. The Good Cause Exemption	219
f. Researching the Exemptions	221
2. State APA Rulemaking Exemptions	222
D. Step 2 of Analysis, Continued: If the APA Does Apply to the Agency, Do the APA’s Rulemaking Requirements Apply to the Rule under Analysis? — Examining the Agency Legislation and Agency Rules	223
1. The Agency Legislation and Agency Rules Are Silent	223
2. The Agency Legislation Expressly Exempts Some or All of the Agency’s Rules from the APA’s Rulemaking Requirements	224
3. The Agency Legislation Expressly Subjects Agency Rules to the APA	226
4. The Agency Rules Make the APA’s Rulemaking Requirements Applicable	228
E. Chapter 10 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	232
Chapter 11 · Types of Rulemaking Under the APA	235
A. The Three Types of Rulemaking under the Federal APA	236
B. Agency Legislation Requiring Informal Rulemaking under the Federal APA	238
1. The Agency Statute Is Silent	238
2. The Agency Statute Expressly Refers to the APA’s Informal Rulemaking Requirements	239
C. Agency Legislation Requiring Formal Rulemaking under the Federal APA	240
D. Agency Legislation Requiring Hybrid Rulemaking under the Federal APA	244
1. Agency Legislation Expressly Modifying the APA	245
2. Agency Statutes That Modify the APA’s Informal Rulemaking Procedures without Mentioning the APA	247
3. Agency Statutes Requiring Rules to Be Made after a “Hearing”	248
E. Types of Rulemaking under State APAs	250
F. Procedural Steps Common to All Types of Rulemaking under an APA	252
G. Chapter 11 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	252
Chapter 12 · Informal Rulemaking	255
A. The Federal Agency Publishes General Notice of Proposed Rulemaking	257
1. The Purposes and Express Requirements of APA § 553(b)	257
a. Purpose of Notice	258
b. The Federal Register	258

c. Information Expressly Required by § 553(b)	259
2. The Implied Requirement That an Agency Disclose the Technical Basis of a Proposed Rule	263
<i>American Radio Relay League, Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission</i>	264
Note on Using the Freedom of Information Act to Learn the Technical Basis of a Proposed Rule	271
3. Deviation between the Proposed Rule and the Final Rule	273
B. The Federal Agency Gives the Public a Chance to File Written Comments on the Proposed Rule	275
C. The Federal Agency Considers Public Input on the Proposed Rule and Other Relevant Matters When Deciding on the Final Rule	277
1. What Is “[R]elevant”?	278
2. What Does the “[M]atter [P]resented” Include?	281
a. The Federal APA Generally Does Not Forbid Off-the-Record Communications in Informal Rulemaking	283
b. If the Off-the-Record Communication Causes a Federal Agency to Consider Irrelevant Factors, the Agency’s Reliance on It Could Make the Rule Invalid	284
c. A Federal Agency’s Own Rules or Policies, or the Agency Legislation, May Bar the Agency from Considering Off-the-Record Communications in Informal or Hybrid Rulemaking	284
d. In Formal Rulemaking (as well as Formal Adjudication), the Federal APA Requires the Agency to Consider Only Evidence That Has Been Made Part of the Record under Provisions That Restrict Ex Parte Communications	285
e. The President Gets Special Treatment When It Comes to Communicating Off-the-Record with Federal Officials in Executive-Branch Agencies during Informal Rulemaking	285
f. In a Judicial Challenge to a Rule Made through Informal Rulemaking, the Federal Agency Must Submit to the Reviewing Court an “Administrative Record” with All Material on Which the Agency Based the Rule	285
3. How Can You Tell If a Federal Agency Has “[C]onsider[ed] . . . [R]elevant [M]atter [P]resented”?	286
D. The Federal Agency Publishes the Final Rule along with a Concise General Statement of Its Basis and Purpose	287
1. Publication of the Final Rule	287
2. Concise General Statement	288
a. The Agency Must Respond to Significant Public Comments	290
b. The Agency Must Explain How the Rule Meets Statutory Requirements or Purposes, Unless This Is Obvious	291

c. The Agency Must Explain the Connection between Its Rule and the Relevant Data or Other Relevant Evidence	292
d. The Agency Must Consider Significant Alternatives to the Approach Taken in the Final Rule and Explain Why It Rejected Those Alternatives	293
e. The Agency Must Consider all Important Aspects of the Problem that the Rule is Designed to Address	294
f. The Agency Must Explain Any “Change in Course”	295
E. The Federal Agency Makes the Rule Effective No Sooner Than 30 Days after Publication	296
F. Rulemaking Requirements in State APAs	297
G. Chapter 12 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	299
Chapter 13 · Formal Rulemaking	303
A. Review: The Five Steps of Rulemaking under the Federal APA	304
B. Similarities between Formal and Informal Rulemaking	304
C. Differences between Formal and Informal Rulemaking	305
1. Public Participation	305
2. Agency Consideration of Public Input	306
3. Agency Explanation of the Final Rule	306
D. Chapter 13 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	307
Chapter 14 · Hybrid Rulemaking	309
A. Context for Studying Hybrid Rulemaking	310
B. One Example of a Hybrid Rulemaking Statute	311
1. Notify the Public of the Proposed Rulemaking	314
2. Invite Public Input on the Proposed Rule	315
3. Consider That Input When Deciding on the Final Rule	315
4. Explain the Final Rule	316
5. Publish the Final Rule before It Takes Effect	316
C. Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking	316
D. Chapter 14 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	320
Chapter 15 · Other Laws Creating Procedural Requirements for Rulemaking	323
A. Federal Statutes	324
1. National Environmental Policy Act	324
2. Congressional Review Act	325
3. Regulatory Flexibility Act	326
4. Paperwork Reduction Act	326
5. Information Quality Act (Also Known as the Data Quality Act)	326
B. Presidential Executive Orders	327

1. Background on Executive Orders	327
a. An Executive Order Cannot Conflict with a Valid Statute or the Constitution	327
b. Violations of Executive Orders Are Usually Not Judicially Reviewable	328
c. Many Executive Orders Do Not Apply at All, or Do Not Apply Fully, to Independent Agencies	329
d. Finding Executive Orders	329
2. Executive Orders on Federal Rulemaking	330
C. Dealing with the Complexity of Federal Rulemaking	332
D. State Laws	333
E. Chapter 15 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	334
Chapter 16 · Legal Effect of a Valid Legislative Rule When Published	335
A. Retroactive (Also Known as “Retrospective”) Rules	338
1. Determining Whether a Rule Is Retroactive	338
a. General Principles	338
b. Rules That Are Clearly Retroactive	340
c. Hard Retroactivity Cases	340
2. Determining Whether an Agency May Adopt Retroactive Legislative Rules	341
a. Federal Agency Authority to Make Retroactive Rules	342
b. Federal Constitutional Restrictions on Retroactive Laws	343
3. State Law on Retroactive Rulemaking by State Agencies	344
B. Effect of Publication of Legislative Rules	344
1. Effect of Agency’s Failure to Publish a Rule	345
2. Effect of Publishing a Legislative Rule	345
3. Publication of State Agency Rules	348
C. Federal Regulatory Preemption	349
1. Express Preemption	350
2. Implied Preemption	353
D. Chapter 16 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	355

Part Three · Agency Adjudication

Chapter 17 · Introduction to Agency Adjudication	363
A. How and Why Agencies Get Adjudicatory Power	364
B. What Lawyers Do in Agency Adjudications	366
C. How Agency Adjudication Compares to Court Adjudication	368
1. Federal Agency Adjudications	369
a. Formal Adjudications	369
b. Informal Adjudications	369
2. State Agency Adjudications	372

D. How Agency Adjudication Compares to Agency Rulemaking	372
1. Procedural Differences	373
a. Notice of the Initiation of the Proceeding	373
b. Participation	373
c. Notice of the Outcome of the Proceeding	374
2. Nature of Agency Determinations	374
a. “Adjudicative Facts” vs. “Legislative Facts”	374
b. Applying Law vs. Making Law; Making Policy	374
3. Legal Effect	375
4. Summary	375
E. Common Subjects of Agency Adjudication	375
1. Enforcement Proceedings	375
2. Benefits Proceedings	376
3. Licensing Proceedings	376
4. Parties to Agency Adjudication	377
a. Workers’ Compensation Schemes	377
b. Reparations Claims	378
c. Patent Interference Proceedings	378
5. Cautions	378
F. The Distinction between the Agency as Adjudicator and the Agency as Litigant	379
1. Agency Adjudication Followed by Court Adjudication	379
a. Judicial Review of Agency Orders	380
b. Judicial Enforcement of Agency Orders	380
2. Court Adjudications Not Preceded by an Agency Adjudication	381
a. The Agency as Plaintiff	381
b. The Agency as Defendant	382
G. Agency Adjudication within the Problem Solving Framework	384
H. Chapter 17 Wrap Up and Roadmap of Part 3	384
Chapter 18 · Agency Adjudicatory Power	387
A. Analyzing Agency Adjudicatory Power	388
B. Identifying and Analyzing Grants of Adjudicatory Power to Agencies	389
1. Identifying the Source of Adjudicatory Authority	389
2. Analyzing Potential Sources of Agency Adjudicatory Authority	390
a. Statutes Granting Agencies Power to Conduct Enforcement Proceedings	390
b. Statutes Granting Agencies Power to Distribute Benefits	392
c. Statutes Granting Agencies Licensing Authority	393
d. Statutes Not Granting Adjudicatory Power	394
C. Federal Constitutional Restrictions on Statutory Grants of Adjudicatory Power to Federal Agencies	397
1. Relevant Constitutional Text	397

a. Textual Basis for Separation of Powers Doctrine	398
b. Textual Basis for Separation of Powers Limits and Seventh Amendment Limits on Federal Adjudicative Delegations	398
2. Historical U.S. Supreme Court Case Law	399
a. Public Rights	399
b. Agencies as Adjuncts to Courts	401
3. Modern Federal Law on Adjudicative Delegations	402
a. Article III Limits	402
b. Seventh Amendment Limits	406
c. Federal Agency Adjudication of Fines and Other Penalties	407
D. Modern State Law on Adjudicative Delegations to State Agencies	408
E. Chapter 18 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	410
Chapter 19 · Limits on Agency Adjudicatory Power	413
A. Internal Limits on Agency Adjudicatory Power	414
1. Internal Substantive Limits	414
2. Internal Procedural Limits	416
B. External Limits on Agency Adjudicatory Power	417
1. Constitutional Law	417
a. Substantive Limits	417
b. Procedural Limits	417
2. Statutory Law	418
a. Substantive Limits	418
b. Procedural Limits	418
c. Mixed Substantive and Procedural Limits	419
3. Agency Rules and Other Executive-Branch Material	420
a. Compliance with the Agency's Own Rules	420
(i) The Agency Order Conflicts with the Agency's Substantive Legislative Rule	420
(ii) The Agency Order Conflicts with the Agency's Substantive Non-Legislative Rule	420
(iii) The Agency Order Conflicts with the Agency's Procedural Rules	421
b. Compliance with Other, Valid Executive-Branch Material	424
4. Judicial Review	424
C. Chapter 19 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	425
Chapter 20 · The Due Process Clauses as Sources of Procedural Requirements for Agency Adjudications	427
A. Context	429
1. Why Study Due Process in an Administrative Law Course	429
2. What Due Process Doctrine We Study in Administrative Law	430

3. Other Contextual Considerations	430
B. Text, Framework for Due Process Analysis, and Overview of Due Process Principles	431
C. Question One: Does Due Process Apply?	433
1. There Must Be Conduct Attributable to the Government	433
2. The Conduct Must Cause a Deprivation	433
3. The Deprivation Must Affect a “Person”	435
4. The Deprivation Must Be a Deprivation of Life, Liberty, or Property	435
a. Property	435
<i>Perry v. Sindermann</i>	437
b. Liberty	442
(i) Removal of Aliens from the United States by Immigration Agencies	442
(ii) Treatment of Prisoners and Other Institutionalized Persons	442
(iii) Corporal Punishment of Public School Children	443
(iv) Harm to Reputation	443
D. Question Two: If Due Process Applies, What Process Is Due?	444
1. <i>Mathews v. Eldridge</i>	445
a. Context for <i>Mathews</i>	445
b. Summary of the <i>Mathews v. Eldridge</i> Opinion	445
c. Significance of <i>Mathews v. Eldridge</i>	448
(i) Private Interest	448
(ii) Risk of Error	449
(iii) Government and Public Interest	449
2. Due Process Principles	449
a. The Timing Principle: Generally Requiring a Pre-Deprivation Notice and Right to Be Heard	450
b. The Elaborateness Principle: The Pre-Deprivation Hearing Need Not Be as Elaborate as a Trial	452
3. An Unbiased Decision Maker	454
a. Summary of <i>Withrow v. Larkin</i>	454
b. Significance of <i>Withrow v. Larkin</i>	455
c. Scope of the Due Process Rule Requiring Unbiased Agency Adjudicators	456
(i) Who Is an Administrative “Adjudicator” for Purposes of the <i>Withrow</i> Rule?	456
(ii) An Exception to the Rule Requiring Unbiased Adjudicators: “The Rule of Necessity”	457
d. Improper Pecuniary Interests	458
e. Personal Animosity	459
f. Ex parte Contacts	459
E. Chapter 20 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	459

Chapter 21 · The APA as a Source of Procedural Requirements for Agency Adjudications	463
A. Identifying an “Adjudication” or “Order” for Purposes of the Federal APA	466
B. Framework for Determining the Federal APA’s Applicability to a Federal Agency Adjudication	469
C. First Step: Does the Federal APA Apply to the Agency under Analysis?	471
D. Second Step, Part (a): If the Federal APA Does Apply to the Agency under Analysis, and the Agency Action under Analysis Is an Adjudication, Do the APA’s Formal Adjudication Requirements Apply to This Adjudication?	471
1. The Agency Legislation Must Not Expressly Exempt the Adjudication from the APA’s Formal Adjudication Requirements	471
2. The Agency Legislation Must Require the Adjudication “[T]o [B]e [D]etermined on the [R]ecord after [O]ppportunity for an [A]gency [H]earing”	472
a. The Agency Legislation Requires Both an Opportunity for a Hearing and a Determination on the Record	473
b. The Agency Legislation Does Not Require Both an Opportunity for a Hearing and a Determination on the Record, But the Due Process Clause Applies to the Particular Adjudication under Analysis	476
c. The Agency Legislation Requires a “Hearing,” but Does Not Require an On-the-Record Determination, and the Adjudication under Analysis Is Not Subject to the Due Process Clause	478
3. The Adjudication Must Not Fall within One of the Exemptions Prescribed in Federal APA §§ 554(a)(1) through (a)(6)	480
a. “[A] [M]atter [S]ubject to a [S]ubsequent [T]rial of the [L]aw and the [F]acts de [N]ovo in a [C]ourt”	480
b. “[T]he [S]election or [T]enure of an [E]mployee, [E]xcept an [A]dministrative [L]aw [J]udge [A]ppointed under [S]ection 3105 of [T]his [T]itle”	481
c. “[P]roceedings in [W]hich [D]ecisions [R]est [S]olely on [I]nspections, [T]ests, or [E]lections”	481
d. “[T]he [C]onduct of [M]ilitary or [F]oreign [A]ffairs [F]unctions”	481
e. “[C]ases in [W]hich an [A]gency [I]s [A]cting as an [A]gent for a [C]ourt”	481
f. “[T]he [C]ertification of [W]orker [R]epresentatives”	481
E. Second Step, Part (b): If the Federal APA Does Apply to the Agency under Analysis, and the Agency Action under Analysis Is an Adjudication, Does Federal APA §§ 555 or 558 Apply to This Adjudication?	482
1. § 555	483
a. Introduction	483

b. § 555 Provisions Most Relevant to Adjudications	484
(i) Right to Appear with Counsel	484
(ii) Right of Informal Appearance	484
(iii) Agency Duty to Conclude Matters within a Reasonable Time	485
(iv) Prompt Notice of, and Brief Statement Explaining, Agency Denial of a Written Request	486
(v) Summary	486
2. § 558	487
a. Introduction	487
b. § 558's Requirements for Licensing	488
F. Third Step: If the Federal APA Does Apply to the Agency Adjudication under Analysis, How Does the APA Interact with Other Laws Applicable to the Adjudication?	490
G. Determining the Applicability of a State APA to a State Agency Adjudication	494
H. Chapter 21 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	496
Chapter 22 · Formal Adjudications under an APA—Initiation and Prehearing Procedures	501
A. Context for Examining the Federal APA's Formal Adjudication Requirements	502
B. Stages of a Formal Adjudication under the APA	502
C. Initiation of a Formal Adjudication under the Federal APA	505
1. Who Initiates the Adjudication	505
a. Enforcement Proceedings	505
b. Licensing Proceedings	506
c. Benefits Proceedings	506
2. Notice	507
a. Who Is Entitled to Notice	507
b. Contents of Notice	507
c. Responses to the Matters Asserted by the Moving Party	510
3. Who Participates as Parties to the Adjudication	511
D. Prehearing Procedures in Formal Adjudications under the Federal APA	513
1. Administrative Law Judges	514
a. Officials Who May Preside at the Formal Hearing	514
b. ALJ Independence	514
2. Discovery	516
a. APA Provisions	516
b. The Agency Legislation	518
c. Agency Rules	519
d. Due Process	519
3. Settlement	520
a. Agency Approval of Settlements	521
b. Agency Settlement Procedures	522

c. Judicial Review of Settlements	524
4. Prehearing Conferences	526
5. Administrative Summary Judgment	528
E. Initiation and Prehearing Procedures in Contested Cases under a State APA	530
1. Initiation of Contested Cases	530
2. Prehearing Procedures	531
F. Chapter 22 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	532
Chapter 23 · Formal Adjudications under an APA—Hearings	535
A. Powers of a Presiding Official in a Formal Adjudication under the Federal APA	536
B. The Course of the Hearing in a Formal Adjudication under the Federal APA	537
1. Burden of Proof	538
<i>Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor v. Greenwich Collieries</i>	539
2. Standard of Proof	543
3. Admissibility of Evidence	545
4. Cross-Examination	548
5. Proof by Methods Other Than Ordinary, Record Evidence	548
a. Inferences, Presumptions, Methods of Proof	548
b. Rules Establishing Generalized Facts	550
c. Official Notice	551
6. Hearings Based Wholly or Partly on Documentary Evidence	552
C. The Course of the Hearing in a Formal Adjudication (Contested Case) under a State APA	552
1. Burden of Proof	553
2. Standard of Proof	553
3. Admissibility of Evidence	553
4. Cross-Examination	554
5. Proof by Methods Other Than Ordinary, Record Evidence	554
D. Chapter 23 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	554
Chapter 24 · Formal Adjudications under an APA—Decisions	559
A. Context and Essential History: Agency Decisions in Formal Adjudications as Institutional Decisions	560
1. Description of the <i>Morgan</i> Cases	561
2. Significance of the <i>Morgan</i> Cases	562
a. Federal APA	562
b. Subdelegation	562
c. Judicial Probing of Administrators' Mental Processes	563
B. Decision Requirements in Agency Legislation and Agency Rules	564

C. Decision Requirements in the Federal APA	564
1. APA Decisional Requirements in a Nutshell	564
2. The Two-Step Decision-Making Process	564
3. Right to Submit Proposed Findings and Conclusions, Exceptions, and Supporting Reasons	566
4. Required Contents of Decisions	567
a. APA Requirements	567
b. The Distinction between “Basic” Facts and “Ultimate” Facts <i>Saginaw Broadcasting Co. v. Federal Communications Commission</i> (<i>Gross et al., Intervenors</i>)	568
c. Rehearing, Reconsideration, and Reopening	570
D. Restrictions on Ex Parte Communications under Federal Law	570
1. § 554(d)	571
2. § 557(d)	573
3. Due Process	576
E. Decision Requirements under a State APA	577
F. Chapter 24 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	578
Chapter 25 · Agency Choice between Rulemaking and Adjudication	581
A. Context	583
B. The General Rule for Federal Agencies <i>Securities and Exchange Commission v. Chenery Corporation</i>	584
C. Exceptions to the Choice of Means Principle	590
1. Abuse of Discretion—Retroactivity	591
2. Mandatory Language in Agency Legislation	592
3. Constitutional Considerations—Due Process and Equal Protection	593
a. Equal Protection	593
b. Due Process	593
4. Common Law or Equitable Principles	594
D. Court-Ordered Adjudication	594
E. Chapter 25 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	596
Chapter 26 · Effect of Valid Agency Adjudicatory Decisions	599
A. Direct Effect of the Agency Decision on the Agency and the Parties	600
B. Administrative Stare Decisis	601
C. Administrative Res Judicata	603
1. Description of Administrative Res Judicata	603
2. Requirements for Administrative Res Judicata	605
a. Federal Common Law Requirements for Administrative Res Judicata	605
b. Statutory Modification of Administrative Res Judicata	607
D. Special Rules That Differ From, but Are Easy to Confuse with, Administrative Res Judicata; and Agency Non-Acquiescence	609

1. Special Rules for Invoking Equitable Estoppel against the Government	610
2. Special Rules of Judicial Res Judicata for Cases to Which the Government Is a Party	612
3. Agency Non-Acquiescence	614
E. Chapter 26 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	616

Part Four · Judicial Review

Chapter 27 · Introduction to Judicial Review of Agency Action	621
A. Context	621
B. Two Aspects of Judicial Review of Agency Action	622
C. Roadmap of Part Four (Judicial Review)	622
Chapter 28 · Jurisdiction	625
A. Jurisdiction: The Requirement for a Statute Granting Jurisdiction	626
1. Specialized Statutory Grants of Jurisdiction	627
2. General Jurisdiction Statutes	629
3. Statutes That, Contrary to Popular Belief, Do Not Grant Jurisdiction	629
4. Jurisdiction of State Courts to Review State Agency Action	630
B. Jurisdiction: Sovereign Immunity	630
1. Suits against the Federal Government and Its Agencies and Officials for Review of Federal Agency Action	631
2. Suits against States and Their Agencies and Officials	632
C. Jurisdiction: Standing Requirements in Federal Court	633
1. Constitutional (Article III) Standing Requirements	635
a. Injury in Fact	636
(i) Physical Injury	637
(ii) Economic Injury	637
(iii) Impairment of “Aesthetic” or “Recreational” Use of Specific Land, Including Governmentally Owned Land	637
(iv) Deprivation of Information to Which the Law Gives People a Personal, Legal Right	637
(v) Violation of Personal Constitutional Rights	638
(vi) Procedural Injury	638
(vii) Emotional Injury	639
b. Traceability	639
c. Redressability	640
2. Prudential Standing Requirements	641
3. Statutory “Standing” Requirements	642
D. Jurisdiction: Standing Requirements in State Courts	643
E. Chapter 28 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	643

Chapter 29 · Cause of Action	647
A. The Requirement of a Cause of Action	648
B. Sources of a Cause of Action for Review of Federal Agency Action	649
1. Special Statutory Review	649
2. General Statutory Review	653
a. APA's Creation of a Cause of Action	653
b. Limits on the Scope of the APA-Created Cause of Action	656
(i) There Must Be an "Agency Action"	656
(ii) The Agency Action Must Be "[F]inal"	658
(iii) There Must Be "[N]o [O]ther [A]dequate [R]emedies in a [C]ourt"	658
(iv) The Plaintiff Must Either Be "[S]uffering [L]egal [W]rong [B]ecause of [A]gency [A]ction, or [Be] [A]dversely [A]ffected or [A]ggrieved by [A]gency [A]ction within the [M]eaning of a [R]elevant [S]tatute"	659
c. Warning! "Danger, Will Robinson!"	662
3. "Nonstatutory" Review	663
C. Sources of a Cause of Action for Review of State Agency Action	664
D. Preclusion of Review	665
1. Presumption of Reviewability	666
a. Federal Law	666
b. State Law	667
2. Preclusion of Judicial Challenges to Agency Action	667
a. Federal Law	667
(i) Statutory Preclusion	668
(ii) Agency Action Committed to Agency Discretion by Law	669
b. State Law	671
3. Preclusion in Enforcement Proceedings	671
E. Chapter 29 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	673
Chapter 30 · Timing	677
A. Finality	679
1. What Is the Finality Requirement? What Is Its Rationale? Where Do You Find It?	679
2. The General Framework for Determining If an Agency Action Is Final	680
3. Recurring Situations Raising Finality Issues	681
a. Finality When Decision Making Involves Multiple Governmental Entities	681
b. Finality of Interlocutory Agency Decisions	682
c. Finality of Agency Advice Letters and Guidance Documents	683
d. Finality of Agency Inaction	685
4. Final Thoughts on Finality	685
B. Ripeness	686

1. What Is the Ripeness Requirement? What Is Its Rationale? Where Do You Find It?	687
2. How Do You Tell If a Lawsuit Challenging Agency Action Is Ripe?	687
a. The Traditional Ripeness Doctrine	688
(i) The <i>Abbott Labs</i> Trilogy	688
<i>Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner</i>	688
(ii) A Recasting of <i>Abbott Labs</i> ' Two-Part Test	692
b. Special Review Statutes Authorizing Pre-Enforcement Review of Agency Rules	694
c. Agency Actions That Lack the Force and Effect of Law	694
3. Ripeness in State Law	696
C. Exhaustion	697
1. The Traditional Exhaustion Doctrine and Statutory Alteration of It	698
a. Federal Law	698
b. State Law	700
2. The Effect of Failing Properly to Satisfy Exhaustion Requirements	700
3. Issue Exhaustion	701
a. Agency Adjudication	702
b. Agency Rulemaking	704
D. Relationship among Finality, Ripeness, and Exhaustion	704
E. Primary Jurisdiction	705
F. Statutes of Limitations for Lawsuits Seeking Review of Agency Action	707
G. Chapter 30 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	709
Chapter 31 · Introduction to the Scope of Judicial Review	713
A. The Connection between the Cause of Action and the Scope of Judicial Review	713
B. Overview of the Scope of Review under the APA	715
C. Identifying Grounds for an APA-Type Challenge to Agency Action	717
D. The Appellate Model for Judicial Review of APA-Type Challenges to Agency Action	718
E. Standards of Judicial Review in APA-Type Challenges to Agency Action	721
1. The Distinction Between Questions of Law and Questions of Fact—In General	721
2. The Distinction between Questions of Law and Questions of Fact—A Famous Illustration: The <i>Hearst</i> Case	723
a. Background on the <i>Hearst</i> Case	723
b. The <i>Hearst</i> Opinion	724
<i>National Labor Relations Board v. Hearst Publications, Inc.</i>	724
c. The Significance of <i>Hearst</i>	729
3. Overview of Standards of Review in APA-Type Challenges to Agency Action	731
F. Overview of Chapters on Scope of Judicial Review in APA-Type Challenges to Agency Action	732

Chapter 32 · The “Substantial Evidence” Standard	733
A. When Does the Substantial Evidence Standard Apply to Judicial Review of Federal Agency Action?	736
B. The Distinction between “Substantial Evidence” as a Standard of Judicial Review and “Substantial Evidence” as a Standard of Proof	737
C. What Does the Substantial Evidence Standard of Review Mean?	738
1. The Opinion in <i>Allentown Mack Sales and Service v. National Labor Relations Board</i>	739
<i>Allentown Mack Sales and Service, Inc. v. National Labor Relations Board</i>	739
2. <i>Allentown Mack</i> in Context	743
D. The “Substantial Evidence” Standard in the States	745
E. Chapter 32 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	746
Chapter 33 · The “Arbitrary and Capricious” Standard	749
A. When Does the Arbitrary and Capricious Standard Apply?	750
B. What Does the Arbitrary and Capricious Standard Mean?	753
C. Leading Cases on the Arbitrary and Capricious Standard	754
1. <i>Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe</i>	754
a. The <i>Citizens to Preserve Overton Park</i> Opinion	754
<i>Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe</i>	754
b. The Significance of <i>Citizens to Preserve Overton Park</i>	758
(i) Arbitrary and Capricious	758
(ii) The Record for Judicial Review	759
2. The <i>State Farm</i> Case	762
a. The <i>State Farm</i> Opinion	762
<i>Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the United States, Inc. v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.</i>	762
b. The Significance of <i>State Farm</i>	769
(i) <i>State Farm</i> ’s Elaboration and Illustration of the A&C Standard	769
(ii) <i>State Farm</i> ’s Focus on “[R]elevant [F]actors”	770
(iii) <i>State Farm</i> ’s Discussion of Agency Changes in Course	772
3. <i>Department of Commerce v. United States</i>	774
a. The <i>Department of Commerce</i> Opinion	774
<i>Department of Commerce v. New York</i>	775
b. Significance of <i>Department of Commerce</i>	785
D. Chapter 33 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	787
Chapter 34 · The <i>Chevron</i> Doctrine and State Counterparts	789
A. Questions of Law in General	790
B. Federal Agencies’ Interpretation of Statutes They Administer	792
1. The <i>Skidmore</i> Case	793
a. Background on the <i>Skidmore</i> Case	793
b. The <i>Skidmore</i> Opinion	794

<i>Skidmore v. Swift & Co.</i>	794
c. The Significance of <i>Skidmore</i>	796
2. The <i>Chevron</i> Case	797
a. Background on the <i>Chevron</i> Case	797
b. The <i>Chevron</i> Opinion	798
<i>Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.</i>	798
c. The Significance of <i>Chevron</i>	805
3. The <i>Mead</i> Case	807
a. The <i>Mead</i> Opinion	807
<i>United States v. Mead Corporation</i>	807
b. The Significance of <i>Mead</i>	812
4. <i>King v. Burwell</i>	813
<i>King v. Burwell</i>	814
C. State Agencies' Interpretations of Statutes They Administer	816
D. Chapter 34 Wrap Up and Look Ahead	817
Chapter 35 · “Auer Deference,” State Counterparts, and Other Specialized Review Situations	819
A. Federal Agencies' Interpretation of Their Own Rules	821
1. The <i>Kisor</i> Opinion	821
<i>Kisor v. Wilkie</i>	821
2. Significance of <i>Kisor</i>	830
B. State Agencies' Interpretations of Their Own Rules	831
C. Specialized Review Situations	832
1. Choice of Sanction	832
2. Selective Enforcement	833
3. Denial of Rulemaking Petitions	834
4. Denial of Reconsideration, Rehearing, and Reopening	835
5. Agency Inaction	836
D. Chapter 35 Wrap Up	839
Chapter 36 · Judicial Remedies	841
A. Context	842
B. Interim Relief	842
C. Relief Pending Judicial Review	843
1. Introduction	843
2. Laws Authorizing Stays	844
a. Federal APA	845
b. Special Review Provisions	846
c. Federal Courts' Inherent Authority	847
3. Preliminary Injunctive Relief	847
D. Judicial Relief on a Final Judgment	848
1. Federal APA	848
2. Special Review Statutes	850

3. Nonstatutory Review	852
4. Harmless Error	852
5. Attorneys' Fees	853
E. Chapter 36 Wrap Up	854
Chapter 37 · Farewell!	857
Appendix · Selected Portions of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act	859
Index	873

List of Diagrams and Figures

Diagram 1-1 · Statutes Creating Legal Duties and Requiring an Agency to Enforce Those Duties	6
Diagram 1-2 · Organizational Chart of the Federal Government	8
Diagram 1-3 · Types of Government Power	15
Diagram 1-4 · Legislative Power	15
Diagram 1-5 · Executive Power	17
Diagram 1-6 · Judicial Power	19
Diagram 1-7 · Typical Modern Agency with Blended Powers	20
Diagram 2-1 · Types of Control over Administrative Agencies	41
Diagram 3-1 · Statutory Grant of Legislative (or “Quasi-Legislative”) Power	56
Diagram 3-2 · Statutory Grant of an Executive Type of Power	57
Diagram 3-3 · Statutory Grant of Quasi-Judicial Power	58
Diagram 3-4 · Organic Act Creating Agency and Granting It a Combination of Powers	58
Diagram 3-5 · Judicial Oversight of Agency Action	60
Diagram 4-1 · Diagram of Original APA (S. Rep. No. 79-752 at 195 Fig. 2 (1945))	70
Diagram 4-2 · APA Provisions Applicable to Various Agency Activities	74
Diagram 4-3 · Outline for Analyzing APA Applicability	83–84
Diagram 4-4 · Flow Chart for Analyzing APA Applicability	85
Diagram 4-5 · “Rules” and “Orders” Under the Federal APA	89
Diagram 4-6 · The Londoner/Bi-Metallic Distinction	97
Diagram 7-1 · Statutory Delegation of Quasi-Legislative Power	142
Diagram 7-2 · Statutory Delegation of Executive Power	142
Diagram 7-3 · Types of Rules	152
Diagram 8-1 · U.S. Constitutional Restriction on Statutes Delegating Power to Make Legislative Rules to Executive-Branch Agencies	159
Diagram 10-1 · Flow Chart for Analyzing APA Applicability	231

Figure 12-A · Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM or NOPR) in Federal Register	260–262
Figure 12-B · Page from Code of Federal Regulations Reproducing Tail End of 47 C.F.R. § 15.3 (2011)	289
Diagram 17-1 · Statutory Delegation of Quasi-Judicial Power	364
Diagram 17-2 · Agency Adjudication Followed by Court Adjudication	380
Diagram 17-3 · Example of Agency as Litigant (Plaintiff)	382
Diagram 17-4 · Example of Agency as Litigant (Defendant)	383
Diagram 18-1 · Constitutional Limits on Statutory Grants of Adjudicatory Power	397
Figure 19-A · Page from 2018 Index to Code of Federal Regulations Showing Part of Entry for “Federal Trade Commission”	422
Figure 22-A · Federal Trade Commission Organizational Chart	504
Figure 22-B · Sample Agency Order Scheduling Prehearing Conference	527
Figure 22-C · Excerpt of Scheduling Order in FTC Adjudication	528
Diagram 28-1 · Three Kinds of Standing Requirements	634
Diagram 31-1 · The “Appellate Model” for Judicial Review of APA-Type Challenges to Agency Action	719
Diagram 31-2 · Appellate Review of Lower Court Decisions	720
Diagram 31-3 · Judicial Review of Agency Action	721
Diagram 31-4 · The Law/Fact Distinction	722
Diagram 34-1 · The Judicial Review Situation in <i>Skidmore</i>	797
Diagram 34-2 · The Judicial Review Situation in <i>Chevron</i>	806

Table of Cases

A

- A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States, 295 U.S. 495 (1935), 164
- Ageson Grain & Cattle v. U.S. Dep't of Agriculture, 500 F.3d 1038 (9th Cir. 2007), 497
- Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner, 387 U.S. 136 (1967), 666, 680, 688, 690–692, 694, 695, 754
- Accardi v. Shaughnessy, 347 U.S. 260 (1954), 150, 188, 423
- Actavis Elizabeth LLC v. FDA, 625 F.3d 760 (D.C. Cir. 2010), 823
- Action for Children's Television v. FCC, 564 F.2d 458 (D.C. Cir. 1976) 100–101
- Action on Safety & Health v. FTC, 498 F.2d 757 (D.C. Cir. 1974), 522
- Action on Smoking & Health v. Civil Aeronautics Bd., 713 F.2d 795 (D.C. Cir. 1983), 286
- Adams Fruit Co. v. Barrett, 494 U.S. 638 (1990), 181, 825
- Addison v. Holly Hill Fruit Prods., 322 U.S. 607 (1944), 181
- Air Transp. Ass'n of America v. FAA, 169 F.3d 1 (D. C. Cir. 1999), 268
- Al Mutarreb v. Holder, 561 F.3d 1023 (9th Cir. 2009), 604
- Alabama Power Co. v. Occupational Safety & Health Admin., 89 F.3d 740 (11th Cir. 1996), 753
- Alaska v. U.S. Dep't of Transportation, 868 F.2d 441 (D.C. Cir. 1989), 145
- Allen v. Wright, 468 U.S. 737 (1984), 640, 641
- Allentown Mack Sales & Serv., Inc. v. NLRB, 522 U.S. 359 (1998), 738
- Altera Corp. v. Comm of Internal Rev., 926 F.3d 1061 (9th Cir. 2019), 290
- Am. Ass'n of Retired Persons v. Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n, 489 F.3d 558 (3d Cir. 2007), 170
- Am. Hosp. Ass'n v. Bowen, 834 F.2d 1037 (D.C. Cir. 1987), 214, 292
- Am. Hosp. Ass'n v. Burwell, 812 F.3d 183 (D.C. Cir. 2016), 837
- Am. Hosp. Ass'n v. NLRB, 499 U.S. 606 (1991), 144, 551
- Am. Legion v. Am. Humanist Ass'n, 139 S. Ct. 2067 (2019), 639
- Am. Mfrs. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Sullivan, 526 U.S. 40 (1999), 441
- Am. Sch. of Magnetic Healing v. McAnnulty, 187 U.S. 94 (1902), 666
- American Min. Congress v. Mine Safety and Health Admin., 995 F.2d 1106 (D.C. Cir. 1993), 823
- American Power & Light Co. v. Securities & Exchange Comm'n, 329 U.S. 90 (1946), 167
- American Radio Relay League Inc. v. Federal Communications Comm'n, 524 F.3d 227 (D.C. Cir. 2008), 12, 271–272, 293, 761
- Anaconda Co. v. Ruckelshaus, 482 F.2d 1301 (10th Cir. 1973), 101
- Andrade v. Gonzales, 459 F.3d 538 (5th Cir. 2006), 606
- Andrus v. Glover Construction Co., 446 U.S. 608 (1980), 419
- Ariz. Grocery Co. v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry., 284 U.S. 370 (1932), 133
- Arizona v. California, 283 U.S. 423 (1931), 108
- Arkansas Dep't of Health & Human Servs. v. Ahlborn, 547 U.S. 268 (2006), 116

- Armour & Co. v. Wantock, 323 U.S. 126 (1944), 795
- Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Ctr., 135 S. Ct. 1378 (2015), 663
- ASARCO Inc. v. Kadish, 490 U.S. 605 (1989), 643
- ASG Indus., Inc. v. CPSC, 593 F.2d 1323 (D.C. Cir. 1979), 55
- Ass'n for Women in Science v. Califano, 566 F.2d 339 (D.C. Cir. 1977), 327
- Ass'n of Am. R.R. v. U.S. Dep't of Transp., 821 F.3d 19 (D.C. Cir. 2016), 173
- Ass'n of Data Processing Serv. Orgs. v. Camp, 397 U.S. 150 (1970), 285, 649, 660, 761, 785
- Ass'n of Data Processing Serv. Orgs., Inc. v. Bd. of Governors of Federal Reserve Sys., 745 F.2d 677 (D.C. Cir. 1984), 753
- Associated Indus. of N.Y. v. Ickes, 134 F.2d 694 (2nd Cir. 1943), 651
- Astoria Federal Savings & Loan Ass'n v. Solimino, 501 U.S. 104 (1991), 608
- AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd., 525 U.S. 366 (1999), 144
- Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. v. Wichita Bd. of Trade, 412 U.S. 800 (1973), 601, 765, 773
- Athlone Industries, Inc. v. Consumer Product Safety Comm'n, 707 F.2d 1485 (D.C. Cir. 1983), 18, 395–396
- Atkins v. Parker, 472 U.S. 115 (1985), 96
- Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety & Health Review Comm'n, 518 F.2d 990 (5th Cir. 1995), 400, 408
- Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety & Health Review Comm'n, 430 U.S. 442 (1977), 400, 408
- Auer v. Robbins, 519 U.S. 452 (1997), 623, 731, 732, 789, 819–840
- Auto. Parts & Accessories Ass'n v. Boyd, 407 F.2d 330 (D.C. Cir. 1968), 288
- Avaras v. Clarkstown Central School District, 2018 WL 4103494 (S.D.N.Y. August 28, 2018), 841
- Azar v. Allina, 139 S. Ct. 1804 (2019), 149, 183
- B**
- B & B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Industries, Inc., 135 S. Ct. 1293 (2015), 608
- Baltimore Gas & Elec. Co. v. NRDC, 462 U.S. 87 (1983), 198, 779
- Bank of Am. Corp. v. City of Miami, Fla., 137 S. Ct. 1296 (2017), 29, 642
- Barlow v. Collins, 397 U.S. 159 (1970), 649
- Barnes v. Bd. of County Comm'rs, 259 P.3d 725 (Kan. 2011), 667
- Barnhart v. Walton, 535 U.S. 212 (2002), 813
- BASF Wyandotte Corp. v. Costle, 598 F.2d 637 (1st Cir. 1979), 208
- Bates v. Dow Agrisciences LLC., 544 U.S. 431 (2005), 358
- BCCA Appeal Group v. EPA, 355 F.3d 817 (5th Cir. 2003), 704
- Bd. of Health of Sturbridge v. Bd. of Health of Southbridge, 962 N.E.2d 734 (Mass. 2012), 251
- BE & K Constr. Co. v. NLRB, 536 U.S. 516 (2002), 417
- Bell v. Burson, 402 U.S. 535 (1971), 451
- Bendix Corp. v. FTC, 450 F.2d 534 (6th Cir. 1971), 509
- Bennett v. Spear, 520 U.S. 154 (1997), 651, 680, 709
- Biestek v. Berryhill, 139 S. Ct. 1148, 1154 (2019), 738
- Bi-Metallic Investment Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization, 239 U.S. 441 (1915), 91, 92, 94–103, 185, 195, 249, 431
- Bishop v. Wood, 426 U.S. 341 (1976), 444
- Blatchford v. Native Village of Noatak, 501 U.S. 775 (1991), 629
- Block v. Community Nutrition Inst., 467 U.S. 340 (1984), 666
- Blum v. Yaretsky, 457 U.S. 991 (1982), 433
- Board of Regents v. Roth, 408 U.S. 564 (1972), 436, 438, 439, 441, 442, 450
- Bond v. United States, 564 U.S. 211 (2011), 639
- Boniface v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., 613 F.3d 282 (D.C. Cir. 2010), 356

- Booth v. Churner, 532 U.S. 731 (2001), 699
- Bowen v. Am. Hosp. Ass'n, 476 U.S. 610 (1986), 214, 292
- Bowen v. Georgetown Univ. Hosp., 488 U.S. 204 (1988), 342–344
- Bowen v. Massachusetts, 487 U.S. 879 (1988), 631, 654, 659
- Bowen v. United States, 570 F.2d 1311 (7th Cir. 1978), 604
- Bowles v. Seminole Rock & Sand Co., 325 U.S. 410 (1945), 821
- Bowman Transportation, Inc. v. Arkansas Best Freight System, Inc., 419 U.S. 281 (1974), 766
- Bowsher v. Synar, 478 U.S. 714 (1986), 18, 163
- Boyle v. United Technologies Corp., 487 U.S. 500 (1988), 110
- Brand v. Miller, 487 F.3d 862 (Fed. Cir. 2007), 736
- Brem-Air Disposal v. Cohen, 156 F.3d 1002 (9th Cir. 1998), 659
- Brenner v. Commodity Futures Trading Comm'n, 338 F.3d 713 (7th Cir. 2003), 548
- Bristol-Myers Co. v. Federal Trade Comm'n, 424 F.2d 935 (D. C. Cir.1970), 268
- Buckingham v. Secretary of U.S. Dep't of Agric., 603 F.3d 1073 (9th Cir. 2010), 489
- Buckley v. Town of Wappinger, 785 N.Y.S. 2d 98 (App. Div. 2004), 521
- Bunge Corp. v. Comm'r of Revenue, 305 N.W.2d 779 (Minn. 1981), 590
- Burlington Truck Lines, Inc. v. United States, 371 U.S. 156 (1962), 757, 765, 781
- Burroughs v. Hills, 741 F.2d 1525 (7th Cir. 1984), 118
- Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc., 573 U.S. 682 (2014), 186
- Butz v. Glover Livestock Comm'n Co., 411 U.S. 182 (1973), 832, 840
- Califano v. Sanders, 430 U.S. 99 (1977), 629, 688, 754
- Camp v. Pitts, 411 U.S. 138 (1973), 285, 761, 785
- Carnation Co. v. Pac. Westbound Conf., 383 U.S. 213 (1966), 706
- Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936), 173
- Casa de Maryland v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., 924 F.3d 684 (4th Cir. 2019), 848
- Chamber of Commerce v. U.S. Dep't of Labor, 174 F.3d 206 (D.C. Cir. 1999), 232
- Chamber of Commerce v. Reich, 74 F.3d 1322 (D.C. Cir. 1996), 327
- Chamber of Commerce v. SEC, 443 F.3d 890 (D.C. Cir. 2006), 266
- Chambers v. Ohio Dep't of Human Servs., 145 F.3d 793 (6th Cir. 1998), 614
- Chao v. Virginia Dep't of Transp., 291 F.3d 276 (4th Cir. 2002), 115
- Chauffeur's Training Sch. v. Spellings, 478 F.3d 117 (2nd Cir. 2007), 552
- Chem. Waste Mgmt., Inc. v. EPA, 873 F.2d 1477 (D.C. Cir. 1989), 370
- Cheveras Pacheco v. Rivera Gonzalez, 809 F.2d 125 (1st Cir. 1987), 440
- Chevron U. S. A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. 467 U.S. 837 (1984), 279, 477, 513, 773–774, 792, 797–806, 809, 811, 815, 820
- Chocolate Manufacturers Ass'n v. Block, 755 F.2d 1098 (4th Cir. 1985), 273–275, 298
- Christensen v. Harris County, 529 U.S. 576 (2000), 811
- Christopher v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., 567 U.S. 142 (2012), 825
- Christopher Village, L.P. v. United States, 360 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2004), 659
- Chrysler Corp. v. Brown, 441 U.S. 281 (1979), 133, 335
- Ciba-Geigy Corp. v. EPA, 801 F.2d 430 (D.C. Cir. 1986), 695–696
- Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc., 505 U.S. 504 (1992), 351

C

Calderon-Ramirez v. McCament, 877 F.3d 272 (7th Cir. 2017), 838

- Citizens Awareness Network, Inc. v. United States, 391 F.3d 338 (1st Cir. 2004), 516
- Citizens for Equity v. N.J. Dep't of Env'tl Protection, 599 A.2d 516 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. 1990), 340
- Citizens for Responsibility & Ethics in Washington v. Office of Admin., 566 F.3d 219 (D.C. Cir. 2009), 76
- Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. Volpe, 401 U.S. 402 (1971), 80, 280, 371, 563, 655, 656, 688, 751, 754–756, 758–762, 764, 765, 769, 777, 781, 784–786
- City of Arlington, Texas v. FCC, 569 U.S. 290 (2013), 37, 182, 813
- City of Brookings Mun. Tel. Co. v. FCC, 822 F.2d 1153 (D. C. Cir. 1987), 268
- City of Cordova v. Medicaid Rate Comm'n, 789 P.2d 346 (Alaska 1990), 344
- City of Guyton v. Barrow, 828 S.E. 2d 366 (Ga. 2019), 831
- City of New York v. U.S. Dep't of Defense, 913 F.3d 423 (4th Cir. 2019), 658, 837
- City of Rochester v. Bond, 603 F.2d 927 (D.C. Cir. 1979), 628
- City of West Chicago v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n, 701 F.2d 632 (7th Cir. 1983), 370, 488
- Clear Channel Outdoors v. Tenn. Dep't of Transp., 337 S.W.3d 801 (Tenn. Ct. App. 2010), 831
- Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, Inc., 473 U.S. 432 (1985), 593
- Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. Loudermill, 470 U.S. 532 (1985), 448, 450
- Cmtys. for a Better Env't v. EPA, 748 F.3d 333 (D.C. Cir. 2014), 314
- Coastal States Gas Corp. v. Dep't of Energy, 617 F.2d 854 (D.C. Cir. 1980), 268
- Codd v. Velger, 429 U.S. 624 (1977), 444, 461
- Cohen v. Beneficial Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949), 683
- Coit Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. & Loan Ins. Corp., 489 U.S. 561 (1989), 396
- Cole v. Barnhart, 288 F.3d 149 (5th Cir. 2002), 570
- Collord v. U.S. Dep't of the Interior, 154 F.3d 933 (9th Cir. 1998), 478
- Combs v. Commissioner of Social Security, 459 F.3d 640 (6th Cir. 2006), 340
- Comcast Corp. v. FCC, 579 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2009), 849
- Commodity Futures Trading Comm'n v. Schor, 478 U.S. 833 (1986), 378
- ConocoPhillips Co. v. U.S. Env'tl Protection Agency, 612 F.3d 822 (5th Cir. 2010), 274
- Consolidated Edison Corp. v. NLRB, 305 U.S. 197 (1938), 546
- Cook v. United States, 288 U.S. 102 (1933), 30
- Corn Prods. Co. v. FDA, 427 F.2d 511 (3rd Cir. 1970), cert. denied, 400 U.S. 957 (1970), 241
- Cowpasture River Preservation Ass'n v. Forest Serv., 911 F.3d 150 (4th Cir. 2018), 699
- Cox v. City of Dallas, 256 F.3d 281 (5th Cir. 2001), 665
- Cox v. Hart, 260 U.S. 427 (1922), 338
- Crestview Parke Care Ctr. v. Thompson, 373 F.3d 743 (6th Cir. 2004), 530
- Crowell v. Benson, 285 U.S. 22 (1932), 399, 401, 402, 405
- Cudahy Packing Co. of La. v. Holland, 315 U.S. 357 (1942), 563
- Cuozzo Speed Tech., LLC v. Lee, 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016), 668, 793, 812
- Cutler v. State Civil Serv. Comm'n, 924 A.2d 706 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2007), 424

D

- D.C. Federation of Civil Ass'ns v. Volpe, 459 F.2d 1231 (D.C. Cir. 1972), 284
- D'Alessio v. SEC, 380 F.3d 112 (2nd Cir. 2004), 833

D’Amico v. Schweiker, 698 F.2d 903 (7th Cir. 1983), 516
 Dalton v. Specter, 511 U.S. 462 (1994), 681
 Daniels v. Williams, 474 U.S. 327 (1986), 434
 Darby v. Cisneros, 509 U.S. 137 (1993), 698, 699, 710
 Delano Farms Co. v. Calif. Table Grape Comm’n, 655 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2011), 631
 Dep’t of Army v. Blue Fox, Inc., 525 U.S. 255 (1999), 631
 Dep’t of Energy v. Ohio, 503 U.S. 607 (1992), 113, 632
 Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. MacLean, 135 S. Ct. 913 (2015), 418
 Dickinson v. Zurko, 527 U.S. 150 (1999), 751
 Director, Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs, Dep’t of Labor v. Greenwich Collieries, 512 U.S. 267 (1994), 539–543, 549, 556
 Dixon v. Love, 431 U.S. 105 (1977), 452, 593
 Doe v. Purdue Univ., 928 F.3d 652 (7th Cir. 2019), 444
 Doe v. United States, 132 F.3d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1997), 547
 Dominion Energy Brayton Point, LLC v. Johnson, 443 F.3d 12 (1st Cir. 2006), 477, 479
 Doremus v. Bd. of Educ., 342 U.S. 429 (1952), 643
 Drummond v. Comm’r of Social Sec., 126 F.3d 837 (6th Cir. 1997), 604
 Dunlop v. Bachowski, 421 U.S. 560 (1975), 670

E

Earth Island Institute v. Hogarth, 494 F.3d 757 (9th Cir. 2007), 284
 Encino Motorcars, LLC v. Navarro, 136 S. Ct. 2117 (2016), 286, 292–293, 295, 774
 Andrew F. v. Douglas County School District, 137 S. Ct. 988 (2017), 841

Energy Transfer Partners, L.P. v. Federal Energy Reg. Comm’n, 567 F.3d 134 (5th Cir. 2009), 683
 Enquist v. Oregon Dep’t of Agric., 553 U.S. 591 (2008), 593
 Envirocare of Utah, Inc. v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm’n, 194 F.3d 72 (D.C. Cir. 1999), 512–513
 Env’tl Defense Fund, Inc. v. Hardin, 428 F.2d 1093 (D.C. Cir. 1970), 685
 EPA v. Cal. ex rel. State Water Resources Control Bd., 426 U.S. 200 (1976), 113
 Epic Systems Corp. v. Lewis, 138 S. Ct. 1612 (2018), 793
 Esch v. Yeutter, 876 F.2d 976 (D.C. Cir. 1989), 761

F

Fall River Dyeing & Finishing Corp. v. NLRB, 482 U.S. 27 (1987), 549
 Family Rehab., Inc. v. Azar, 886 F.3d 496, 504 (5th Cir. 2018), 699
 Fanin v. U.S. Dep’t of Veterans Affairs, 572 F.3d 868 (11th Cir. 2009), 656
 Far East Conf. v. United States, 342 U.S. 570 (1952), 706
 Farmers Ins. Exchange v. Superior Ct., 826 P.2d 730 (Cal. 1992), 706
 Farmers Union Cent. Exch., Inc. v. Federal Energy Reg. Comm’n, 734 F.2d 1486 (D.C. Cir. 1984), 294
 FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc., 556 U.S. 502 (2009), 280, 344, 421, 593, 602, 773–774
 FCC v. Pottsville Broadcasting Co., 309 U.S. 134 (1940), 720
 FCC v. Schreiber, 381 U.S. 279 (1965), 192, 195, 196
 FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 529 U.S. 120 (2000), 34, 815
 Federal Crop Insurance Corp. v. Merrill, 332 U.S. 380 (1947), 346, 347, 521, 610
 Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Mallen, 486 U.S. 230 (1988), 451

- Federal Election Comm'n v. Akins, 524 U.S. 11 (1998), 638
- Federal Nat'l Mortg. Ass'n v. Le Crone, 868 F.2d 190 (6th Cir. 1989), 632
- Federal Power Comm'n v. Idaho Power Co., 344 U.S. 17 (1952), 849
- FERC v. Elec. Power Supply Ass'n, 136 S. Ct. 760 (2016), 293, 770
- Fidelity Federal Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. de la Cuesta, 458 U.S. 141 (1982), 353–354
- First Nat'l Bank v. Standard Bank & Trust, 172 F.3d 472 (7th Cir. 1999), 187
- Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer, 427 U.S. 445 (1976), 115
- Five Points Road Joint Venture v. Johanns, 542 F.3d 1121 (7th Cir. 2008), 479
- Florida Power & Light Co. v. Lorion, 470 U.S. 729 (1985), 285, 299, 761, 783
- Forest Guardians v. Babbitt, 174 F.3d 1178 (10th Cir. 1999), 837
- Franchise Tax Bd. v. Construction Laborers Vacation Trust, 463 U.S. 1 (1983), 629
- Frankl v. HTH Corp., 650 F.3d 1334 (9th Cir. 2011), 563
- Franklin v. Massachusetts, 505 U.S. 788 (1992), 76, 471, 664, 680, 681
- Fredericks v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue, 126 F.3d 433 (3rd Cir. 1997), 612
- Freeman v. Poling, 338 S.E.2d 415 (W. Va. 1985), 440
- Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Env'tl Servs. (TOC), Inc., 528 U.S. 167 (2000), 637
- Friends of Tims Ford v. Tenn. Valley Auth., 585 F.3d 955 (6th Cir. 2009), 325
- FTC v. Cement Institute, 333 U.S. 683 (1948), 455
- FTC v. Dean Foods, 384 U.S. 597 (1966), 843
- FTC v. Standard Oil of California, 449 U.S. 232 (1980), 468
- FTC v. Universal-Rundle, 387 U.S. 244 (1967), 833, 839
- Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1972), 434, 450
- G**
- Gade v. Nat'l Solid Waste Mg'mt, 505 U.S. 88 (1992), 353
- Gagne v. Trustees of Indiana Univ., 692 N.E.2d 489 (Ind. Ct. App. 1998), 461
- Garcia-Martinez v. Sessions, 886 F.3d 1291 (9th Cir. 2018), 592
- Gardner v. Toilet Goods Ass'n, Inc., 387 U.S. 167 (1967), 690–691
- Garner v. Jones, 529 U.S. 244 (2000), 343
- Geier v. Am. Honda Motor Co., 529 U.S. 861 (2000), 351
- General Elec. Co. v. Gilbert, 419 U.S. 125 (1976), 182
- General Motors Corp. v. Ruckelshaus, 742 F.2d 1561 (D.C. Cir. 1984), 139
- Georator Corp. v. Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n, 592 F.2d 765 (4th Cir. 1979), 468
- Gerber v. Norton, 294 F.3d 173 (D. C. Cir. 2002), 267
- Gibas v. Saginaw Min. Co., 748 F.2d 1112 (6th Cir. 1984), 402
- Gibson v. Berryhill, 411 U.S. 564 (1973), 458
- Gibson v. Nat'l Transp. Safety Bd., 118 F.3d 1312 (9th Cir. 1997), 467
- Gilbert v. Homar, 520 U.S. 924 (1997), 448, 451
- Gill v. Whitford, 138 S. Ct. 1916 (2018), 636
- Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254 (1970), 185, 366, 436, 437, 445–448, 453
- Gonzales v. Oregon, 546 U.S. 243 (2006), 815
- Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565 (1975), 448, 452, 453
- Granfinanciera v. Nordberg, 492 U.S. 33 (1989), 407
- Gray v. Powell, 314 U.S. 402 (1941), 728
- Greater Boston Television Corp. v. FCC, 444 F.2d 841 (1st Cir. 1970), 770
- Great-West Life & Annuity Ins. Co. v. Knudson, 534 U.S. 204 (2002), 631
- Green Island Power Auth. v. FERC, 577 F.3d 148 (2nd Cir. 2009), 662
- Grosjean v. American Press Co., 297 U.S. 233 (1936), 435

Guisseppi v. Walling, 144 F.2d 608 (2nd Cir. 1944), *aff'd sub nom.* Gemsco, Inc. v. Walling, 324 U.S. 244 (1945), 162
 Gundy v. United States, 139 S. Ct. 2116 (2019), 165–167, 170, 171, 175, 731, 791

H

Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 542 U.S. 507 (2004), 40, 448
 Hampton v. Mow Sun Wong, 426 U.S. 88 (1976), 185
 Hannah v. Larche, 363 U.S. 420 (1960), 467
 Hardesty v. Sacramento Metro. Air Quality Mgmt Dist., 136 Cal. Rptr. 3d 132 (Cal. App. 2011), 831
 Heckler v. Campbell, 461 U.S. 458 (1983), 550, 551
 Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985), 665, 669, 671, 779, 834, 839
 Heckler v. Community Health Servs. of Crawford County, Inc., 467 U.S. 51 (1984), 610
 Helvering v. Mitchell, 303 U.S. 391 (1938), 408
 Hercules, Inc. v. Env'tl Protection Agency, 598 F.2d 91 (D.C. Cir. 1978), 88, 101
 Highland Farms Dairy, Inc. v. Agnew, 300 U.S. 608 (1937), 171–172
 Hill v. Smith, 260 U.S. 592 (1923), 541
 Hillsborough Cnty. v. Automated Med. Labs., Inc., 471 U.S. 707 (1985), 349
 Hilton v. Braunskill, 481 U.S. 770 (1987), 847
 Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U.S. 52 (1941), 354
 Hoffman v. Solis, 636 F.3d 262 (6th Cir. 2011), 736
 Horne v. Dep't of Ag., 135 S. Ct. 2419 (2015), 791
 Hortonville Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 v. Hortonville Education Ass'n, 426 U.S. 482 (1976), 459
 Howard v. Lyons, 360 U.S. 593 (1959), 109
 Hunt v. Wash. State Apple Advertising Comm'n, 432 U.S. 333 (1977), 636

I

Idaho Farm Bureau Fed'n v. Babbitt, 58 F.3d 1392 (9th Cir. 1995), 849
 Immigration & Naturalization Serv. v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478 (1992), 738
 In re A Community Voice, 878 F.3d 779 (9th Cir. 2017), 592, 837
 In re Dep't of Pub. Serv. Respecting Application of Gen. Order 65, 632 A.2d 1373 (Vt. 1993), 274
 In re Permanent Surface Mining Regulation Litigation (Appeal of Peabody Coal Co.), 653 F.2d 514 (D.C. Cir. 1981), 49
 In re Water Use Permit Applications, 9 P.3d 409 (Haw. 2000), 590
 Independent U.S. Tanker Owners Comm'n v. Dole, 809 F.2d 847 (D.C. Cir. 1987), 291
 Indus. Union Dep't, AFL-CIO v. Hodgson, 499 F.2d 467 (D.C. Cir. 1974), 745
 Ingraham v. Wright, 430 U.S. 651 (1977), 443, 448
 Int'l Ass'n of Fire Fighters, Local 188 v. Public Employment Rel'ns Bd., 245 P.3d 845 (Cal. 2011), 667
 Int'l Council of Shopping Ctrs. v. Oregon Env'tl Quality Comm'n, 597 P.2d 847 (Or. App. 1979), 199
 Int'l Ladies' Garment Workers' Union v. Donovan, 722 F.2d 795 (D.C. Cir. 1983), 294
 Int'l Paper Co. v. Ouellette, 479 U.S. 481 (1987), 110
 Int'l Tel. & Tel. Corp v. Local 134, Int'l Bhd. of Elec. Workers, 419 U.S. 428 (1975), 467
 Int'l Union of Operating Eng'rs, Local No. 714 v. Sullivan Transfer, Inc., 650 F.2d 669 (5th Cir. 1981), 607
 Interstate Commerce Comm'n v. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 482 U.S. 270 (1987), 668
 Irshad v. Johnson, 754 F.3d 604 (8th Cir. 2014), 838

J

Jackson v. Metro. Edison Co., 419 U.S. 345 (1974), 433
 JEM Broadcasting Co. v. FCC, 22 F.3d 320 (D.C. Cir. 1994), 213, 233
 Jicarilla Apache Tribe v. FERC, 578 F.2d 289 (10th Cir. 1978), 825
 Johnson v. Maryland, 254 U.S. 51 (1920), 109
 Johnson v. Robison, 415 U.S. 361 (1974), 668
 Johnson v. United States, 628 F.2d 187 (D.C. Cir. 1980), 546
 Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Comm. v. McGrath, 341 U.S. 123 (1951), 443

K

Kaho'ohanohano v. Dep't of Human Servs., 178 P.3d 538 (Hawai'i 2008), 344
 Kellas v. Dep't of Corrections, 145 P.3d 139 (Ore. 2006), 643
 Kerry v. Din, 135 S. Ct. 2128 (2015), 790, 791
 King v. Burwell, 135 S. Ct. 2480 (2015), 793, 812–814
 Kingdomware Technologies, Inc. v. United States, 136 S. Ct. 1969 (2016), 414–415
 Kirk v. U.S. Immigration & Naturalization Serv., 927 F.2d 1106 (9th Cir. 1991), 510
 Kirkendall v. Dep't of the Army, 479 F.3d 830 (Fed. Cir. 2007), 529
 Kucana v. Holder, 558 U.S. 233 (2010), 836

L

L C & S, Inc. v. Warren Cnty. Area Plan Comm'n, 244 F.3d 601 (7th Cir. 2001), 98
 Laba v. Copeland, 2016 WL 5958241 (WDNC, Oct. 13, 2016), 823
 Labor Board v. Nevada Copper Corp., 316 U.S. 105 (1942), 728
 Landgraf v. USI Film Prods., 511 U.S. 244 (1994), 338–341, 343, 356
 Lane v. Franks, 573 U.S. 228 (2014), 417

Laurels of Bon Air, LLC v. Med. Facilities of America LIV Ltd. Partnership, 659 S.E.2d 561 (Va. App. 2008), 671
 Lead Indus. Ass'n v. OSHA, 610 F.2d 70 (2nd Cir. 1979), 272
 League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Wheeler, 922 F.3d 443 (9th Cir. 2019), 838
 Legal Aid Soc'y of Alameda Cnty. v. Brennan, 381 F. Supp. 125 (N.D. Cal. 1974), 327
 Levy v. Sterling Holding Co., Inc., 544 F.3d 493 (3rd Cir. 2008), 344
 Lexmark International, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc., 572 U.S. 118 (2014), 641–642, 655, 661
 Lincoln v. Vigil, 508 U.S. 182 (1993), 127, 778
 Lion Raisins, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Agric., 2005 WL 6406066 (E.D. Cal. May 12, 2005), 510, 533–534
 Loeffler v. Frank, 486 U.S. 549 (1988), 632
 Londoner v. City & County of Denver, 210 U.S. 373 (1908), 91, 92, 249, 431
 Long Island Care at Home, Ltd. v. Coke, 551 U.S. 158 (2007), 274
 Long v. Soc. Sec. Admin., 635 F.3d 526 (Fed. Cir. 2011), 515
 Lorillard Tobacco Co. v. Reilly, 533 U.S. 525 (2001), 353
 Los Angeles v. Lyons, 461 U.S. 95 (1983), 636, 637, 639
 Love v. U.S. Dep't of Housing & Urban Development, 704 F.2d 100 (3rd Cir. 1983), 101
 Loving v. United States, 517 U.S. 748 (1996), 170
 Lubrizol Corp. v. EPA, 562 F.2d 807 (D.C. Cir. 1977), 49
 Lucia v. SEC, 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018), 515
 Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555 (1992), 633, 635, 637–639, 643, 770
 Lujan v. G&G Fire Sprinklers, Inc., 532 U.S. 189 (2001), 441
 Lujan v. Nat'l Wildlife Fed'n, 497 U.S. 871 (1990), 637, 657

M

- Mach Mining, LLC v. EEOC, 135 S. Ct. 1645 (2015), 666
- Mackey v. Montrym, 443 U.S. 1 (1979), 448, 452
- Mada-Luna v. Fitzpatrick, 813 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1987), 216
- Marathon Oil Co. v. EPA, 564 F.2d 1253 (9th Cir. 1977), 208
- Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803), 40, 621, 790, 792, 829
- Marcello v. Bonds, 349 U.S. 302 (1955), 472, 477
- Marseilles Land & Water Co. v. FERC, 345 F.3d 916 (D.C. Cir. 2003), 420
- Marshall Field & Co. v. Clark, 143 U.S. 649 (1892), 163
- Marshall v. Jerrico, Inc., 446 U.S. 238 (1980), 456–457
- Martin v. Donovan, 731 F.2d 1415 (9th Cir. 1984), 607
- Martin v. Occupational Safety & Health Review Comm'n, 499 U.S. 144 (1991), 556, 823
- Maryland v. Louisiana, 451 U.S. 725 (1981), 350
- Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. 497 (2007), 486, 834, 835, 839
- Massachusetts v. Mellon, 262 U.S. 447 (1923), 829
- Massachusetts v. United States, 522 F.2d 115 (1st Cir. 2008), 278
- Mathews v. Diaz, 426 U.S. 67 (1976), 435
- Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), 434, 444–446, 448–450, 452, 453, 461, 477
- Mayo Foundation for Medical Education & Research v. United States, 562 U.S. 44 (2011), 818
- McClelland v. Andrus, 606 F.2d 1278 (D.C. Cir. 1979), 519
- McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. 316 (1819), 107
- McGowen v. Harris, 666 F.2d 60 (4th Cir. 1981), 607
- McHugh v. Santa Monica Rent Control Bd., 777 P.2d 91 (Cal. 1989), 409
- MCI Telecomms. Corp. v. Am. Tel. & Tel. Co., 512 U.S. 218 (1994), 89
- MCI Telecomms. Corp. v. FCC, 57 F.3d 1136 (D.C. Cir.1995), 269
- Medtronic v. Lohr, 518 U.S. 470 (1996), 351
- Megibow v. Clerk of the U.S. Tax Court, 432 F.3d 387 (2nd Cir. 2005), 76
- Melton v. Pasqua, 339 F.3d 222 (4th Cir. 2003), 521
- Menendez-Donis v. Ashcroft, 360 F.3d 915 (8th Cir. 2004), 733
- Methodist Hosp. of Sacramento v. Shalala, 38 F.3d 1225 (D.C. Cir. 1994), 220
- Michigan v. EPA, 135 S. Ct. 2699 (2015), 181, 190, 279
- Michigan v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng'rs, 667 F.3d 765 (7th Cir. 2011), 852
- Miller v. DeBuono, 652 N.Y.S.2d 313 (N.Y. App. Div. 1997), 339
- Missouri v. Jenkins, 495 U.S. 33 (1990), 97
- Mistretta v. United States, 488 U.S. 361 (1989), 162, 166
- Molton, Allen & Williams, Inc. v. Harris, 613 F.2d 1176 (D.C. Cir. 1980), 611
- Monsanto v. Geertson Seed Farms, Inc., 561 U.S. 139 (2010), 615, 637
- Montana v. Kennedy, 366 U.S. 308 (1961), 357
- Moog Industries v. Federal Trade Comm'n, 355 U.S. 411 (1958), 833, 839, 845
- Morgan v. United States, 298 U.S. 468 (1936) (Morgan I), 561
- Morgan v. United States, 304 U.S. 1 (1938) (Morgan II), 566
- Morton v. Ruiz, 415 U.S. 199 (1974), 800
- Motor Vehicles Mfrs. Ass'n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 463 U.S. 29 (1983), 189, 280, 294, 295, 602, 751, 752, 762, 764, 769–774, 779, 784
- Mourning v. Family Publ'ns Serv., Inc., 411 U.S. 356 (1973), 144
- Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306 (1950), 509

- Murphy v. Nat'l Collegiate Athletic Ass'n, 138 S. Ct. 1461 (2018), 108
- Musacchio v. United States, 136 S. Ct. 709 (2016), 570
- Mut. Pharm. Co. v. Bartlett, 570 U.S. 472 (2013), 352, 353
- Myers v. Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp., 303 U.S. 41 (1938), 506
- N
- N.Y.C. Dep't of Env'tl Protection v. N.Y.C. Civil Serv. Comm'n, 579 N.E. 2d 1385 (N.Y. 1991), 667
- Nasem v. Brown, 595 F.2d 801 (D.C. Cir. 1979), 607
- Nash v. Bowen, 869 F.2d 675 (2nd Cir. 1989), 516
- National Cable Television Ass'n v. United States, 415 U.S. 336 (1974), 169
- National Labor Relations Board v. Hearst Publications, Inc. 322 U.S. 111 (1944), 723–724, 800
- National Petroleum Refiners Ass'n v. FTC, 482 F.2d 672 (D.C. Cir. 1973), 144, 145
- Nat'l Ass'n of Home Builders v. Defenders of Wildlife, 551 U.S. 644 (2007), 770
- Nat'l Ass'n of Home Health Agencies v. Schweiker, 690 F.2d 932 (D.C. Cir. 1982), 208
- Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs. v. EPA, 750 F.3d 921 (D.C. Cir. 2014), 291
- Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs. v. Dep't of Defense, 138 S. Ct. 617 (2018), 628
- Nat'l Ass'n of Regulatory Util. Comm'rs v. FCC, 737 F.2d 1095 (D. C. Cir. 1984), 173
- Nat'l Automatic Laundry & Cleaning Council v. Shultz, 443 F.2d 689 (D.C. Cir. 1971), 601
- Nat'l Lifeline Ass'n v. FCC, 921 F.3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2019), 295
- Nat'l Maritime Safety Ass'n v. Occupational Safety & Health Admin., 649 F.3d 743 (D.C. Cir. 2011), 744
- Nat'l Mining Ass'n v. U.S. Army Corp of Eng'rs, 145 F.3d 1399 (D.C. Cir. 1998), 615
- Nat'l Park Hospitality Ass'n v. Dep't of the Interior, 538 U.S. 803 (2003), 687
- NationsBank v. Variable Annuity Life Ins. Co., 513 U.S. 251 (1995), 813
- Negusie v. Holder, 555 U.S. 511 (2009), 848
- Nevada v. United States, 463 U.S. 110 (1983), 614
- NI Indus., Inc. v. United States, 841 F.2d 1104 (Fed. Cir. 1988), 346
- Nken v. Holder, 556 U.S. 418 (2009), 843, 847
- NLRB v. Bell Aerospace Co., 416 U.S. 267 (1974), 591
- NLRB v. Interboro Contractors, Inc., 432 F.2d 854 (2nd Cir. 1970), 519
- NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 421 U.S. 132 (1975), 268
- NLRB v. Transportation Management Corp., 462 U.S. 393 (1983), 541
- NLRB v. United Food & Commercial Workers Union, Local 23, 484 U.S. 112 (1987), 525–525
- Norfolk Southern Railway Co. v. Shanklin, 529 U.S. 344 (2000), 350
- North American Cold Storage Co. v. City of Chicago, 211 U.S. 306 (1908), 451, 460
- North Dakota v. United States, 495 U.S. 423 (1990), 109
- Northern Pipeline Construction Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 458 U.S. 50 (1982), 399
- Norton v. Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, 542 U.S. 55 (2004), 657
- Norwegian Nitrogen Prods. Co. v. United States, 288 U.S. 294 (1933), 728
- O
- O'Bannon v. Town Court Nursing Ctr., 447 U.S. 773 (1980), 434
- Oceanic Butler, Inc. v. Nordahl, 842 F.2d 773 (5th Cir. 1988), 521
- Oceanic Steam Navigation Co. v. Stranahan, 214 U.S. 320 (1909), 408
- Office of Personnel Mg'mt v. Richmond, 496 U.S. 414 (1990), 610

- Ohio Bell Tel. Co. v. Pub. Utils. Comm'n of Ohio, 301 U.S. 292 (1937), 551
- Ohio Forestry Ass'n, Inc. v. Sierra Club, 523 U.S. 726 (1998), 692–694
- Oklahoma v. U.S. Civil Serv. Comm'n, 330 U.S. 127 (1947), 30
- Org. for Competitive Mkts. v. U.S. Dep't of Agriculture, 912 F.3d 455 (8th Cir. 2018), 838
- Ottman v. Town of Primrose, 796 N.W.2d 411 (Wis. 2011), 664
- Owner-Operator Indep. Drivers Ass'n, Inc. v. Federal Motor Carrier Safety Admin., 494 F.3d 188 (D.C. Cir. 2007), 267–268
- P**
- Pac. Gas & Elec. Co. v. State Energy Res. Conservation & Dev. Corp., 461 U.S. 190 (1983), 353
- Pacific States Box & Basket Co. v. White, 296 U.S. 176 (1935), 756
- Pagel, Inc. v. Securities & Exchange Comm'n, 803 F.2d 942 (8th Cir. 1986), 548
- Panama Refining Co. v. Ryan, 293 U.S. 388 (1935), 164
- Paralyzed Veterans of Am. v. D. C. Arena L. P., 117 F.3d 579 (D.C. Cir. 1997), 823
- Parker v. Motor Boat Sales, 314 U.S. 244 (1941), 729
- Parklane Hosiery Co., Inc. v. Shore, 439 U.S. 322 (1979), 617–618
- Passmore v. Astrue, 533 F.3d 658 (8th Cir. 2008), 548
- Patchak v. Zinke, 138 S. Ct. 897 (2018), 829
- Paul v. Davis, 424 U.S. 693 (1976), 443, 461
- PDR Network, LLC v. Carlton & Harris Chiropractic, Inc., 139 S. Ct. 2051 (2019), 133, 135
- Penn Dairies v. Milk Control Comm'n of Pennsylvania, 318 U.S. 261 (1943), 109
- Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp. v. The LTV Corp., 496 U.S. 633 (1990), 771
- Perez v. Mortg. Bankers Ass'n, 135 S. Ct. 1199 (2015), 216
- Periera v. Sessions, 138 S. Ct. 2105 (2018), 793
- Perry v. Sindermann, 408 U.S. 593 (1972), 437, 439, 441, 442, 460
- Philly's v. Byrne, 732 F.2d 87 (7th Cir. 1984), 173
- Pies v. IRS, 668 F.2d 1350 (D.C. Cir. 1981), 272
- Porter v. Galarneau, 911 P.2d 1143 (Mont. 1996), 340
- Portland Cement Ass'n v. Ruckelshaus, 486 F.2d 375 (D.C. Cir. 1973), 263, 266, 267, 269–272, 315
- Preminger v. Sec'y of Veterans Affairs, 632 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2011), 835
- Prime Time Int'l Co. v. Vilsack, 599 F.3d 678 (D.C. Cir. 2010), 327
- Printz v. United States, 521 U.S. 898 (1997), 108
- Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization v. Federal Labor Relations Auth., 685 F.2d 547 (D.C. Cir. 1982), 573–575, 761
- Prometheus Radio Project v. FCC, 824 F.3d 33 (3rd Cir. 2016), 837, 838
- Puerto Rico Aqueduct & Sewer Auth. v. Env't'l Protection Agency, 35 F.3d 600 (1st Cir. 1994), 529
- R**
- Rajah v. Mukasey, 544 F.3d 427 (2nd Cir. 2008), 210
- Ramspeck v. Federal Trial Examiners Conf., 345 U.S. 128 (1953), 515
- Regents of the Univ. of Calif. v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., 908 F.3d 476 (9th Cir. 2018), 215, 848
- Reich v. Youghioghney & Ohio Coal Co., 66 F.3d 111 (6th Cir. 1995), 606
- Reiter v. Cooper, 507 U.S. 258 (1993), 705
- Reno v. Flores, 507 U.S. 292 (1993), 435, 442
- Rice v. Santa Fe Elevator Corp., 331 U.S. 218 (1947), 174, 353
- Richardson v. Belcher, 404 U.S. 78 (1971), 96

- Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389 (1971), 545, 547, 548
- Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council, 490 U.S. 332 (1989), 324, 325
- Rochester Telephone Corp. v. United States, 307 U.S. 125 (1939), 729
- Rodale Press, Inc. v. Federal Trade Comm'n, 407 F.2d 1252 (D.C. Cir.1968), 509
- S
- Sackett v. United States Environmental Protection Agency, 132 S.Ct. 1367 (2012), 669, 677, 678, 685, 709
- Saginaw Broadcasting Co. v. Federal Communications Comm'n (Gross et al., Intervenor) 96 F.2d 554 (D.C. Cir. 1938), cert. denied, 305 U.S. 613 (1938), 568, 723–724, 730
- Saldin Secs., Inc. v. Snohomish County, 949 P.2d 370 (Wash. 1998), 667
- Sampson v. Murray, 415 U.S. 61 (1974), 842
- Sandin v. Conner, 515 U.S. 472 (1995), 442
- Sangamon Valley Television Corp. v. United States, 269 F.2d 221 (D.C. Cir. 1959), 99, 284
- SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018), 181, 816
- Satterfield v. Crown Cork & Seal Co., 268 S.W.3d 190 (Tex. App. 2008), 344
- Save Our Sound OBX, Inc. v. N.C. Dep't of Transp., 914 F.3d 213 (4th Cir. 2019), 418
- Schweiker v. Hansen, 450 U.S. 785 (1981), 357
- Scripps-Howard Radio, Inc. v. Federal Communications Comm'n, 316 U.S. 4 (1942), 847
- SEC v. Patell, 61 F.3d 137 (2nd Cir. 1995), 381
- Securities & Exchange Comm'n v. Chenery Corp., 318 U.S. 80 (1943), 800
- Securities & Exchange Comm'n v. Chenery Corp., 332 U.S. 194 (1947), 800
- Service v. Dulles, 354 U.S. 363 (1957), 423
- Shalala v. Guernsey Mem'l Hosp., 514 U.S. 87 (1995), 139
- Shanklin v. Norfolk S. Ry., 173 F.3d 386 (6th Cir. 1999), 351
- Shepard v. Attorney General, 567 N.E.2d 187 (Mass. 1991), 671
- Shinseki v. Sanders, 556 U.S. 396 (2009), 852
- Shively v. Stewart, 421 P.2d 65 (Cal. 1966), 200
- Sierra Club v. Costle, 657 F.2d 298 (D.C. Cir. 1981), 100, 283–285, 781
- Sierra Club v. Van Antwerp, 661 F.3d 1147 (D.C. Cir. 2011), 418
- Sikorsky Aircraft Corp. v. Comm'r of Revenue Servs., 1 A.3d 1033 (Conn. 2010), 614
- Simon v. Eastern Ky. Welfare Rights Org., 426 U.S. 26 (1976), 639
- Sims v. Apfel, 530 U.S. 103 (2000), 542, 702, 704
- Skidmore v. Swift & Co., 323 U.S. 134 (1944), 793, 794, 807
- Skinner v. Railway Labor Executives' Ass'n, 489 U.S. 602 (1989), 185
- Small Refiner Lead Phase-Down Task Force v. EPA, 705 F.2d 506 (D.C. Cir. 1983), 208, 258
- Smith v. Berryhill, 139 S. Ct. 1765 (2019), 679, 701
- Smith v. Doe, 538 U.S. 84 (2003), 343
- Smith v. United States, 508 U.S. 223 (1993), 540
- Soc'y for Propagation of the Gospel v. Wheeler, 22 F. Cas. 756 (C.C.N.H. 1814), 339
- South Carolina Wildlife Fed'n v. Limehouse, 549 F.3d 324 (4th Cir. 2008), 115
- South Chicago Coal & Dock Co. v. Bassett, 309 U.S. 251 (1940), 728
- Southern LNG, Inc. v. MacGinnitie, 719 S.E.2d 473 (Ga. 2011), 632
- Southwestern Elec. Power Co. v. EPA, 920 F.3d 999 (5th Cir. 2019), 293
- Spokeo v. Robins, 136 S. Ct. 1540 (2016), 636
- Sprint Corp. v. FCC, 315 F.3d 369 (D.C. Cir. 2003), 208
- St. Joseph Stock Yards Co. v. United States, 298 U.S. 38 (1936), 36, 828

- St. Otto's Home v. Minn. Dep't of Human Servs., 437 N.W.2d 35 (Minn. 1989), 831
- State ex rel. Cardinal Glennon Mem. Hosp. v. Gaertner, 583 S.W.2d 107 (Mo. 1979), 410
- Steadman v. Securities & Exchange Comm'n, 450 U.S. 91 (1981), 543, 737
- Stern v. Marshall, 564 U.S. 462 (2011), 402, 406, 411
- Sturgeon v. Frost, 139 S. Ct. 1066 (2019), 185
- Sun Ray Drive-In Dairy v. Oregon Liquor Control Comm'n, 517 P.2d 289 (Or. Ct. App. 1973), 594
- Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co. v. Adkins, 310 U.S. 381 (1940), 173
- Susan B. Anthony List v. Driehaus, 573 U.S. 149 (2014), 638, 778
- Sweezy v. New Hampshire, 354 U.S. 234 (1957), 171
- Szonyi v. Whitaker, 915 F.3d 1228 (9th Cir. 2019), 699
- T
- Telecommunications Research & Action Center v. Federal Communications Comm'n, 750 F.2d 70 (D.C. Cir. 1984), 838
- Tennessee Elec. Power Co. v. Tennessee Valley Auth., 306 U.S. 118 (1939), 649, 654, 659, 660
- Tennessee Valley Auth. v. Hill, 437 U.S. 153 (1978), 31
- Texas & Pacific Railway Co. v. Abilene Cotton Oil Co., 204 U.S. 426 (1907), 705
- Texas Boll Weevil Eradication Foundation, Inc. v. Lewellen, 952 S.W.2d 454 (Tex. 1997), 174
- Texas Dep't of Protective & Reg. Servs. v. Mega Child Care, Inc., 145 S.W.3d 170 (Tex. 2004), 632
- Texas v. United States, 809 F.3d 134 (5th Cir. 2015), *aff'd* by an equally divided Court, 136 S. Ct. 2271 (2017), 208, 848
- Thomas Jefferson Univ. v. Shalala, 512 U.S. 504 (1994), 830
- Thomas v. Color Country Mg'mt, 84 P.3d 1201 (Utah 2004), 339–340
- Thomas v. Union Carbide Agricultural Products Co., 473 U.S. 568 (1985), 402
- Thompson v. U.S. Dep't of Labor, 885 F.2d 551 (9th Cir. 1989), 851
- Thunder Basin Coal Co. v. Reich, 510 U.S. 200 (1994), 669
- Ticor Title Ins. Co. v. Federal Trade Comm'n, 814 F.2d 731 (D.C. Cir. 1987), 704
- Todd Shipyards Corp. v. Director, Office of Workers' Compensation, 545 F.2d 1176 (9th Cir. 1976), 82
- Toilet Goods Ass'n v. Gardner, 387 U.S. 158 (1967), 690–691
- Touby v. United States, 500 U.S. 160 (1991), 170
- Town of Brookline v. Comm'r of Dep't of Env't'l Quality Eng., 439 N.E.2d 792 (Mass. 1982), 590
- Town of Castle Rock v. Gonzales, 545 U.S. 748 (2005), 440
- Town of Greece v. Galloway, 572 U.S. 565 (2014), 639
- Town of Orangeburg v. Ruckelshaus, 740 F.2d 185 (2nd Cir. 1984), 283
- Trudeau v. FTC, 456 F.3d 178 (D.C. Cir. 2006), 631
- Trump v. Hawai'i, 138 S. Ct. 2392 (2018), 328, 664, 848
- Trump v. Int'l Refugee Assistant Project, 137 S. Ct. 2080 (2017), 847
- Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927), 457
- Turtle Island Restoration Network v. U.S. Dep't of Commerce, 438 F.3d 937 (9th Cir. 2006), 708, 709
- U
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers v. Hawkes Co., Inc., 136 S. Ct. 1807 (2016), 680
- U.S. Dep't of Energy v. Ohio, 503 U.S. 607 (1992), 632
- U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press, 489 U.S. 749 (1989), 272
- U.S. Dep't of Labor v. Kast Metals Corp., 744 F.2d 1145 (5th Cir. 1984), 232

- U.S. Sugar Corp. v. EPA, 844 F.3d 268 (D.C. Cir. 2016), 849
- Underwriters Labs., Inc. v. NLRB, 147 F.3d 1048 (9th Cir. 1988), 548
- United States ex rel. Director v. Idaho Dep't of Water Resources, 508 U.S. 1 (1993), 632
- United States v. Alcan Aluminum Corp., 315 F.3d 179 (2nd Cir. 2003), 343
- United States v. Allegheny-Ludlum Steel Corp., 406 U.S. 742 (1972), 192, 242
- United States v. City of St. Paul, 285 F.3d 750 (8th Cir. 2001), 118
- United States v. Eaton, 169 U.S. 331 (1898), 823
- United States v. Florida East Coast R. Co., 410 U.S. 224 (1973), 192, 195, 242, 248, 249, 251
- United States v. Gould, 568 F.3d 459 (4th Cir. 2009), 220
- United States v. Grimaud, 220 U.S. 506 (1911), 134, 170
- United States v. Kimbell Foods, Inc., 440 U.S. 715 (1979), 110–111, 119
- United States v. Little Lake Misere Land Co., 412 U.S. 580 (1973), 111
- United States v. Mead Corp., 533 U.S. 218 (2001), 49, 348, 600, 793, 806–809, 812, 813, 816, 824
- United States v. Mendoza, 464 U.S. 154 (1984), 613
- United States v. Mendoza-Lopez, 481 U.S. 828 (1987), 673
- United States v. Morgan, 313 U.S. 409 (1941), 362, 758, 761, 786
- United States v. Nixon, 418 U.S. 683 (1974), 135
- United States v. Northernair Plating Co., 685 F. Supp. 1410 (W.D. Mich. 1988), aff'd, 889 F.2d 1497 (6th Cir. 1989), 854
- United States v. Nova Scotia Food Prods. Corp., 568 F.2d 240 (2nd Cir. 1977), 268
- United States v. O'Hagen, 521 U.S. 642 (1997), 170
- United States v. Palmer, 956 F.2d 189 (9th Cir. 1992), 113
- United States v. Shimer, 367 U.S. 374 (1961), 350, 800
- United States v. Stanchich, 550 F.2d 1294, 1300 (2d Cir. 1977), 783
- United States v. Stauffer Chemical Co., 464 U.S. 165 (1984), 612–614
- United States v. Storer Broadcasting Co., 351 U.S. 192 (1956), 551, 595, 596, 820, 839
- United States v. Tennessee Air Pollution Control Bd., 185 F.3d 529 (6th Cir. 1999), 112
- United States v. Utah Construction & Mining Co., 384 U.S. 394 (1966), 605
- United States v. W. Pac. R.R., 352 U.S. 59 (1956), 706
- United Steel v. Mine Safety & Health Admin., 925 F.3d 1279 (D.C. Cir. 2019), 292
- United Steelworkers of Am. v. Marshall, 647 F.2d 1189 (D.C. Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 453 U.S. 913 (1981), 744
- Univ. of Tennessee v. Elliott, 478 U.S. 788 (1986), 608
- Universal Camera Corp. v. National Labor Relations Bd., 340 U.S. 474 (1951), 738, 740, 743
- Usery v. Turner Elkhorn Mining Co., 428 U.S. 1 (1976), 343
- Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA, 573 U.S. 302 (2014), 182, 815, 816

V

- Virginia Petroleum Jobbers Ass'n v. Federal Power Comm'n, 259 F.2d 921 (D.C. Cir. 1958), 847
- Van Lare v. Hurley, 421 U.S. 338 (1975), 186
- Vitarelli v. Seaton, 359 U.S. 535 (1959), 423
- Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 435 U.S. 519 (1978), 99, 190, 192, 269, 271, 594, 767, 781

W

Walters v. Nat'l Ass'n of Radiation Survivors, 473 U.S. 305 (1985), 448
 Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57 (1972), 457
 Warth v. Seldin, 422 U.S. 490 (1975), 640
 Weaver v. City of Montebello, 370 F. Supp. 3d 1130 (C.D. Cal. 2019), 25
 Webster v. Doe, 486 U.S. 592 (1988), 665, 668, 669, 779
 Weinberger v. Hynson, Westcott & Dunning, Inc., 412 U.S. 609 (1973), 348, 529
 Weng v. Holder, 593 F.3d 66 (1st Cir. 2010), 746
 West Va. Highlands Conservancy, Inc. v. Norton, 343 F.3d 239 (4th Cir. 2003), 825
 Western Watersheds Project v. Kraayenbrink, 632 F.3d 472 (9th Cir. 2011), 324
 Weyerhaeuser Co. v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Serv., 139 S. Ct. 361 (2018), 666
 Whitman v. American Trucking Ass'ns, Inc., 531 U.S. 457 (2001), 167, 279, 328, 694
 Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 555 U.S. 7 (2008), 844
 Wisconsin v. City of New York, 517 U.S. 1 (1996), 778
 Withrow v. Larkin, 421 U.S. 35 (1975), 454–456, 458, 459, 515, 572

WJG Tel. Co., Inc. v. Federal Communications Comm'n, 675 F.2d 386 (D.C. Cir. 1982), 266
 Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539 (1974), 452
 Women's & Children's Hosp. v. State Dep't of Health & Hosps., 2 So. 3d 397 (La. 2009), 831
 Wong Wing v. United States, 163 U.S. 228 (1896), 407
 Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath, 339 U.S. 33 (1950), 67, 192, 476–478, 496, 498, 542
 Woodby v. Immigration & Naturalization Serv., 385 U.S. 276 (1966), 543
 Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81 (2006), 700
 Woodland v. Mich. Citizens Lobby, 378 N.W.2d 337 (Mich. 1985), 30
 Wyoming v. U.S. Dep't of Interior, 839 F.3d 938 (10th Cir. 2016), 837

Y

Yakus v. United States, 321 U.S. 414 (1944), 166, 673
 Yellow Freight Sys., Inc. v. Martin, 954 F.2d 353 (6th Cir. 1992), 508–509
 Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 343 U.S. 579 (1952), 29, 40

Z

ZPR Inv. Mgmt., Inc. v. SEC, 861 F.3d 1239 (11th Cir. 2017), 832

Series Editor's Preface

Welcome to a new type of casebook. Designed by leading experts in law school teaching and learning, Context and Practice casebooks assist law professors and their students to work together to learn, minimize stress, and prepare for the rigors and joys of practicing law. **Student learning and preparation for law practice are the guiding ethics of these books.**

Why would we depart from the tried and true? Why have we abandoned the legal education model by which we were trained? Because legal education can and must improve.

In Spring 2007, the Carnegie Foundation published *Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Practice of Law* and the Clinical Legal Education Association published *Best Practices for Legal Education*. Both works reflect in-depth efforts to assess the effectiveness of modern legal education, and both conclude that legal education, as presently practiced, falls quite short of what it can and should be. Both works criticize law professors' rigid adherence to a single teaching technique, the inadequacies of law school assessment mechanisms, and the dearth of law school instruction aimed at teaching law practice skills and inculcating professional values. Finally, the authors of both books express concern that legal education may be harming law students. Recent studies show that law students, in comparison to all other graduate students, have the highest levels of depression, anxiety and substance abuse.

The problems with traditional law school instruction begin with the textbooks law teachers use. Law professors cannot implement *Educating Lawyers* and *Best Practices* using texts designed for the traditional model of legal education. Moreover, even though our understanding of how people learn has grown exponentially in the past 100 years, no law school text to date even purports to have been designed with educational research in mind.

The Context and Practice Series is an effort to offer a genuine alternative. Grounded in learning theory and instructional design and written with *Educating Lawyers* and *Best Practices* in mind, Context and Practice casebooks make it easy for law professors to change.

I welcome reactions, criticisms, and suggestions; my e-mail address is mschwartz@pacific.edu. Knowing the author(s) of these books, I know they, too, would appreciate your input; we share a common commitment to student learning. In fact, students,

if your professor cares enough about your learning to have adopted this book, I bet s/he would welcome your input, too!

Michael Hunter Schwartz, Series Designer and Editor
Consultant, Institute for Law Teaching and Learning
Dean and Professor of Law, McGeorge School of Law,
University of the Pacific

Preface

Thank you for opening this book. This preface explains the book's organizing theme, its premises, and its major features.

The book's organizing theme is **power**. Every action by an administrative agency must rest on a valid grant of power and must obey all limits on, and requirements for exercising, that power. Lawyers solve most administrative law problems by identifying and analyzing the laws granting and limiting an agency's power to take some action; and marshalling facts to persuade the agency to exercise its power favorably to the client. When an agency has failed to act within its powers—or failed to obey limits on, or requirements for exercising, those powers—the administrative lawyer must determine what court has power to remedy the agency's failure. The courts' power has special importance because it includes authority to review agency action for abuses of power in the many, many matters as to which agencies have discretion. Besides invoking judicial power, the lawyer may usefully tap other sources of power to control agency action: namely, the executive and legislative branches, and last but not least, the People, who are of course the ultimate source of all this power and the ultimate source of its control.

The book rests on two premises about administrative law. The premises concern (1) the practice of administrative law and (2) preparation for the practice of administrative law:

1. The practice of administrative law mostly involves (a) identifying and analyzing the **laws** (primarily statutes) governing a particular matter involving an administrative agency; (b) identifying and gathering the **facts** relevant to the matter and properly presenting them to the agency (or on behalf of the agency); and (c) identifying and dealing with the **people** in the agency responsible for the matter.
2. To prepare law students for the practice of administrative law, a course on administrative law should systematically (a) introduce students to (i) the variety of **laws** relevant to solving administrative law problems; and (ii) frameworks for analyzing those laws; (b) help students learn to (i) identify what **facts** are relevant to a particular administrative law problem; and (ii) present facts favorable to the client in accordance with legally required procedures; and (c) introduce students to the ways in which authority given to an administrative agency is exercised by ordinary **people** within that agency, and to the ways in which a lawyer may effectively and ethically influence those people's decision making.

These two premises underlie the following features that distinguish this book from traditional casebooks:

- A. Rather than excerpting innumerable appellate court opinions, the book excerpts many statutes, agency rules, and other executive-branch material, with the aim of helping students learn to analyze the main ingredients of administrative law.
- B. Rather than focusing on judicial review of agency proceedings, the book focuses on how lawyers can participate in agency proceedings in ways designed to produce outcomes favorable to clients (recognizing that the agency itself may be the lawyer's client). This focus requires careful examination of agency procedures, including procedures for presenting relevant facts and for settling matters or otherwise resolving them informally.
- C. Rather than limiting itself to the inclusion of problems, the book includes many ways of prompting active learning, to prepare students for the self-education process that they must develop to practice administrative law competently. Specifically, Chapter 2 sets out a problem solving framework that provides the architecture for the book and for organizing student learning. Besides that broad framework, the book includes chapter problems at the beginning of each chapter, exercises and graphics within each chapter, and professional development reflection questions at the end of each chapter. All aim to help students organize the material and learn analytic frameworks for solving problems.

The book is meant to be easy for students and teachers to use, especially teachers who are new to the teaching of administrative law or who wish an "off the shelf" product that they do not need to supplement with their own material. Here are the features meant to make the book easy to use:

- i. What you see is what you get. The book has a transparent, logical organization and explicit objectives, and the writing aims to be exceptionally clear.
- ii. This is not a casebook; it's a course book. The book relies mainly on author-created material, instead of judicial opinions, to teach the law. This minimizes the need to use class time to extract the relevant legal principles from judicial opinions, so that class time can be used instead on other activities, such as discussion of the chapter problems, exercises, graphics, and professional development questions. I've been told that this book can be used for a reversed-classroom approach, and that is rather close to the way I've come to use it.
- iii. The book's questions generally have answers, and its problems generally have solutions. At least, the answers and solutions are governed by material presented in the book. Complete answers, solutions, and explanations are found in the teacher's manual, which also includes detailed advice for presenting the material on a day-to-day basis.

- iv. The book is clean. It is not cluttered by exhaustive citation of primary law (e.g., case law) or secondary material (e.g., law review articles). The teacher's manual includes citations to selected, additional primary and secondary material where it might be helpful.
- v. The book is progressive. It gets more challenging as students get ready for more challenging material. Thus, the book is organized (A) to present more accessible subjects first, saving less accessible ones for later in the book; and (B) to provide more structure and repetition of key concepts at the beginning of the book than in later chapters, where students are expected to supply their own structure and do their own review of key concepts.

It will help users of this book, and those considering using it, to know two last things. First, the book uses one agency, the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), to illustrate various administrative law issues throughout the book. Dozens of other agencies are mentioned as well. But the CPSC serves as the "go to" agency, primarily because it regulates a matter with which people are familiar and it has a fairly compact, fairly typical organic statute. Second, almost every chapter begins with at least one chapter problem. The chapter problems have two purposes: (1) to orient students to the material that follows, so they have a sense of what kinds of problems the material can be used to analyze; and (2) to help students review and deepen their understanding of the chapter's material after they have finished studying that material. A teacher can have students skip any or all chapter problems entirely or have students read them only for orientation to the material. Except for a handful of exercises, nothing else in the book depends on students' having read the chapter problems. The exercises, too, are free standing, to give teachers flexibility in how and whether to use them.

I hope you like the book. I welcome your comments, especially your suggestions for improvement. Please email them to me at richard@uidaho.edu. Thank you.

Acknowledgments

I thank the wonderful folks at Carolina Academic Press, including Ryland Bowman, Linda Lacy, Rachael Meier, Steve Oliva, and Scott Sipe.

I thank Michael Hunter Schwartz for inviting me to be part of this pioneering casebook series (even though this is not really a casebook); for his patience with my delay in finishing it; and for his insightful editorial comments. Mostly, I thank him for being so wise, enthusiastic, and inspirational.

I thank two law school colleagues: Don Burnett, dean emeritus, for giving me research funding and moral support; and Jacob Johnson, for painstaking research assistance and cite checking.

I thank student-colleagues, now too many to name, who have given me excellent feedback that I've tried to use in writing this second edition.

Lastly, I thank John H. Reese for writing an administrative law casebook that was ahead of its time and inviting me to participate in its second edition. *See* John H. Reese and Richard H. Seamon, *Administrative Law: Principles and Practice* (2nd ed. 2003). Whatever virtues this book may have are traceable to John and his work.

