

Federal Courts

Federal Courts

Cases and Materials on Judicial Federalism and the Lawyering Process

FIFTH EDITION

Arthur D. Hellman

PROFESSOR OF LAW EMERITUS
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH SCHOOL OF LAW

David R. Stras

JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Ryan W. Scott

PROFESSOR OF LAW
INDIANA UNIVERSITY MAURER SCHOOL OF LAW

F. Andrew Hessick

JUDGE JOHN J. PARKER DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL OF LAW

Derek T. Muller

BOUMA FELLOW IN LAW AND PROFESSOR OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA COLLEGE OF LAW



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2022
Carolina Academic Press, LLC
All Rights Reserved

ISBN 978-1-5310-1775-0
eISBN 978-1-5310-1776-7
LCCN 2021943367

Carolina Academic Press, LLC
700 Kent Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701
(919) 489-7486
www.cap-press.com

Printed in the United States of America

To Diana, Jeffrey, Matthew, and Melissa, ADH

To Heather, Brandon, and Benjamin, DRS

To Cameron and Potter, RWS

To Carissa, Hattie, and Dorothy, FAH

To Emily, DTM

Contents

Preface to the Fifth Edition	xxi
Preface to the First Edition	xxiii

Part One

The Constitutional Framework and the Federal Courts

Chapter 1 · The Federal Judicial System	3
A. Development of the System	3
[1] The Constitution	3
[2] The Judiciary Act of 1789	4
[3] Evolution of the Structure	5
[4] Evolution of the Jurisdictional Arrangements	6
B. Selection of Judges	8
Rachel Brand, <i>A Practical Look at Federal Judicial Selection</i>	9
Statement of Thomas Z. Hayward, Jr., on Behalf of the American Bar Association	12
Note: The Appointment of Federal Judges	14
<i>Republican Party of Minnesota v. White</i>	15
Note: Federal and State Judicial Selection	20
C. The “Province and Duty of the Judicial Department”	20
<i>Marbury v. Madison</i>	20
Note: <i>Marbury</i> and the Federal Courts	28
Chapter 2 · The Judicial Power Under Article III	31
A. Party-Based Heads of Jurisdiction	31
Note: The “ <i>Tidewater</i> Problem”	32
Note: “Minimal” Diversity	33
B. Federal Question Jurisdiction: Foundation Cases	36
<i>Cohens v. Virginia</i>	37
Note: <i>Cohens</i> and Federal Question Jurisdiction	39
<i>Osborn v. Bank of the United States</i>	40
Note: <i>Osborn</i> , <i>Planters Bank</i> , and Federal Question Jurisdiction	46
Note: Removal Based on a Federal Question	47
C. The Boundaries of Federal Question Jurisdiction	50
<i>Verlinden B.V. v. Central Bank of Nigeria</i>	50

Note: The Implications of <i>Verlinden</i>	54
Note: Jurisdiction Based on Congressional Charters	55
<i>Mesa v. California</i>	57
Note: Suits Against Federal Officers	61
Problem: Suits Against Diplomats' Insurers	61
Problem: Nuclear "Incidents" and Liability Claims	62
Problem: Danger Invites Rescue — and Also Removal?	63
Chapter 3 · Justiciability and the Case or Controversy Requirement	65
A. Standing	66
[1] The Basic Doctrine	66
<i>Allen v. Wright</i>	66
Note: Standing and <i>Allen</i>	80
[2] Standing Under Congressional Statutes	83
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i>	84
Note: Congress's Role in Standing	95
Note: State Standing	98
Note: Legislator and Legislative Standing	101
Problems: Standing	103
[3] Prudential Standing	104
Note: Prudential Limitations on Standing	104
<i>Singleton v. Wulff</i>	107
<i>Kowalski v. Tesmer</i>	112
Note: More on Third-Party Standing	119
Problem: A Lawsuit by a Non-Custodial Parent	121
Note: The "Zone of Interests" Test	122
B. Ripeness	124
<i>Doe v. Bush</i>	124
Note: Ripeness	128
<i>Poe v. Ullman</i>	129
Problem: A Preenforcement Challenge to Voter Registration Laws	138
C. Mootness	139
<i>Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Environmental Services (TOC), Inc.</i>	140
Note: <i>Laidlaw</i> and the Voluntary Cessation Exception	146
Problem: Injunctive Relief Under the ADA	148
Note: The Exception for Cases "Capable of Repetition, Yet Evading Review"	149
Note: Mootness and the Class Action Exception	152
Note: The Collateral Consequences Exception	153
Problem: A Settlement — with a Contingent Payment	154
D. The Political Question Doctrine	155
<i>Nixon v. United States</i>	156

Note: The Political Question Doctrine	167
Problem: A Suit Against a Terrorist Organization	171

Part Two

The Role of Federal Law in State-Court Litigation

Chapter 4 · State Courts in a Federal System	175
A. Supreme Court Review: Foundations	175
<i>Martin v. Hunter's Lessee</i>	176
Note: <i>Martin</i> and the Constitutionality of Section 25	181
Note: The Judiciary Act Amendments of 1867	182
<i>Murdock v. City of Memphis</i>	183
Note: <i>Murdock</i> , The Act of 1867, and the Constitution	189
B. Removal of Cases from State to Federal Court	190
Note: Federal-Question and Diversity Jurisdiction	191
C. Federal Claims and State-Court Standing	192
Note: <i>ASARCO</i> and Constitutional Litigation	192
Chapter 5 · Supreme Court Review of State-Court Decisions	195
A. Evolution of the Statutory Jurisdiction	195
Note: Operation of Certiorari Jurisdiction	196
Note: Dismissals “For Want of a Substantial Federal Question”	197
Note: “The Highest Court of a State”	198
Problem: Discretionary Review in the State’s Highest Court	198
B. The Relation Between State and Federal Law	199
[1] The Basic Doctrine	199
<i>Fox Film Corp. v. Muller</i>	199
Note: The Adequate and Independent State Ground Doctrine	201
Note: The Federal and Non-Federal Grounds in <i>Fox Film</i>	203
[2] Adequacy of State “Substantive” Grounds	203
<i>Indiana ex rel. Anderson v. Brand</i>	204
Note: State and Federal Law in <i>Anderson</i>	208
Note: Antecedent and Remedial State-Law Grounds	208
Problem: Property on a Tidal Canal	211
Problem: <i>Anderson</i> on Remand	212
[3] Adequacy of State Procedural Grounds	213
<i>James v. Kentucky</i>	214
Note: <i>James v. Kentucky</i> and Its Antecedents	217
Note: Discretionary State Procedural Rules	225
Problem: A “Lynch Mob Atmosphere”?	228
Note: Laying the Groundwork for Supreme Court Review	229
Problem: “Inadequate” Assistance of Counsel	230

[4]	Independence of State Grounds and the Rule of <i>Michigan v. Long</i>	231
	<i>Michigan v. Long</i>	232
	Note: “Over-Reading” by State Courts	239
	Note: The <i>Long</i> Presumption	242
	<i>Pennsylvania v. Labron</i>	244
	Note: <i>Labron</i> and <i>Kilgore</i> on Remand	247
	Problem: “Squarely Within State Law”?	248
C.	The Requirement of a “Final Judgment”	250
	<i>Cox Broadcasting Corporation v. Cohn</i>	251
	Note: Finality in Section 1257 and Section 1291	258
	Note: The First, Second, and Third <i>Cox</i> Categories	259
	Problem: The Fruits of a Backpack Search	262
	Note: The Fourth <i>Cox</i> Category	263
	Problem: Objection to Territorial Jurisdiction	266
Chapter 6	· Litigating Federal Claims in State Courts	267
A.	The Power of State Courts to Hear Federal Claims	267
	<i>Tafflin v. Levitt</i>	267
	Note: Rebutting the Presumption of Concurrent Jurisdiction	273
	Note: Exclusive Jurisdiction and Intellectual Property Rights	274
	Note: Reverse Exclusivity?	275
	Note: Suits Against Federal Officers	276
B.	The Duty of State Courts to Hear Federal Claims	277
	<i>Haywood v. Drown</i>	277
	Note: The Obligation to Hear Federal Claims	285
	Note: <i>Haywood</i> and Its Implications	289
	Problem: A Title VII Claim in State Court	290
C.	State Law and the Enforcement of Federal Rights	291
	<i>Johnson v. Fankell</i>	291
	Note: Preemption of State Law and the FELA Cases	295
	Note: Preemption of State Law and Section 1983	298
	Note: “Substance” Versus “Procedure”?	301
	Problem: A Prisoner’s Medical Claim	302
	Problem: Forum Selection Strategy	303

Part Three

The Power of the Federal Courts to Formulate Rules of Decision

Chapter 7	· The <i>Erie</i> Doctrine and the Obligation of Federal Courts to Follow State Law	307
A.	Foundations of the Doctrine	307
	<i>Swift v. Tyson</i>	307
	Note: Section 34 and <i>Swift v. Tyson</i>	310
	<i>Erie R. Co. v. Tompkins</i>	311
	Note: The Decision in <i>Erie</i>	318

	Note: The Opinion in <i>Erie</i>	318
B.	Identifying and Ascertaining the Applicable State Law	320
	<i>Klaxon Co. v. Stentor Electric Mfg. Co.</i>	321
	Note: The <i>Klaxon</i> Rule	322
	Note: Ascertaining State Law	323
	Problem: An “Open and Obvious” Hazard	325
	Note: Certification of State-Law Issues	326
C.	State Law and Federal-Court Procedure	327
	[1] “Substance” and “Procedure”: Foundations	327
	Note: The Rules Enabling Act	327
	Note: <i>Guaranty Trust</i> and the “Outcome Determinative” Test	330
	Note: <i>Guaranty Trust</i> and Equitable Remedies	332
	Note: “Only Another Court of the State”	333
	Note: <i>Byrd v. Blue Ridge</i>	335
	[2] The <i>Hanna</i> Bifurcation	337
	<i>Hanna v. Plumer</i>	337
	Note: The Opinion in <i>Hanna</i>	343
	<i>Walker v. Armco Steel Corporation</i>	344
	Note: <i>Walker</i> and <i>West</i>	348
	Note: Rulemaking Under the Enabling Act	349
	Note: Enabling Act Rules and Federalism Concerns	351
	Problem: Evidence Rule 402 and State Law	353
	[3] Renewed Controversy: <i>Shady Grove</i>	354
	<i>Shady Grove Orthopedic Associates v. Allstate Insurance Co.</i>	354
	Note: The Implications of <i>Shady Grove</i>	370
	Problem: State Antitrust Actions in Federal Court	372
	Problem: Summary Judgment and the Standard of Care	373
	[4] “Unguided <i>Erie</i> ” Choices	373
	<i>Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.</i>	373
	Note: <i>Chambers</i> and Unguided <i>Erie</i> Choices	376
	Note: <i>Gasperini, Semtek</i> , and the “Unguided <i>Erie</i> Choice”	378
	Problems: Asbestos Litigation Reform Measures	381
	Chapter 8 • Federal Common Law	383
A.	Rights and Duties of the United States	383
	<i>Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States</i>	383
	Note: The Law Governing the Rights and Obligations of the United States	385
	<i>United States v. Kimbell Foods, Inc.</i>	388
	Note: Uniformity or Borrowing?	393
	Problem: Ejecting the Post Office	395
	Note: The <i>Standard Oil</i> Case	396
B.	Implied Remedies for Statutory Violations	398
	Note: The <i>Rigsby</i> Era	399
	<i>J. I. Case Co. v. Borak</i>	401

	Note: “To Make Effective the Congressional Purpose”	403
	Note: <i>Cort v. Ash</i> and the Four-Factor Test	404
	Note: From <i>Cannon</i> to <i>Sandoval</i>	407
	<i>Alexander v. Sandoval</i>	410
	Note: The Implications of <i>Sandoval</i>	419
	Note: <i>Sandoval</i> and Section 1983	419
	Problem: Unordered Merchandise	420
	Note: Interstitial Issues	421
	Note: Remedies and Standards of Liability	425
C.	Other Matters of National Concern	428
	<i>Kohr v. Allegheny Airlines</i>	428
	Note: The “Predominant” Federal Interest in “Aviation”	432
	<i>Miree v. DeKalb County</i>	432
	Note: The “Radiations” of Federal Government Transactions	437
	<i>Boyle v. United Technologies Corporation</i>	438
	Note: The Implications of <i>Boyle</i>	450
	Problems: Suits Against Government Contractors	451
	<i>Atherton v. FDIC</i>	452
	Note: Federal Common Law after <i>Atherton</i>	456
D.	Implied Remedies for Violation of Constitutional Rights	456
	<i>Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics</i>	457
	Note: The <i>Bivens</i> Cause of Action	462
	<i>Ziglar v. Abbasi</i>	463
	Note: The Demise of <i>Bivens</i> ?	475
	Note: <i>Bivens</i> Actions after <i>Ziglar</i>	477
	Problem: <i>Bivens</i> and False Accusations	478

Part Four

The Jurisdiction of the Federal District Courts

Chapter 9 · Challenges to Jurisdiction	481	
A. The “ <i>Mansfield</i> Rule”	481	
	<i>Mansfield, Coldwater & Lake Michigan Ry. Co. v. Swan</i>	481
	Note: The “ <i>Mansfield</i> Rule”	484
	Note: Appellate Scrutiny and Collateral Attack	485
	Problem: What’s Wrong with This Picture?	486
	Problem: Deliberate Concealment of Jurisdictional Facts	486
B. Jurisdiction and Merits	487	
	Note: Threshold Requirements and Subject-Matter Jurisdiction	487
	Problem: “But He Wasn’t a Participant!”	490
	Note: The Frivolous Federal Claim	491
C. Choosing Among Threshold Grounds	493	
	Note: “Hypothetical Jurisdiction” and the <i>Steel Co.</i> Case	493

Note: Personal and Subject-Matter Jurisdiction	494
Note: Other Threshold Issues	495
Problem: The “Enrolled Bill Rule”	497
Problem: A Doomed Claim and the <i>Steel Co.</i> Rule	498
Chapter 10 · The “Federal Question” Jurisdiction	499
A. The “Well Pleased Complaint” Rule	499
<i>Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. v. Mottley</i>	499
Notes and Questions: The Aftermath of <i>Mottley</i>	501
Note: <i>Gully</i> and the “Merely Possible” Federal Question	501
Problem: A Medical-Device Products Liability Suit	503
B. The State-Created Cause of Action with a Federal “Ingredient”	503
<i>American Well Works Co. v. Layne & Bowler Co.</i>	503
Note: <i>American Well Works</i> and the “Holmes Test”	504
<i>Smith v. Kansas City Title & Trust Co.</i>	505
Note: <i>Smith</i> and <i>Moore</i>	507
Note: <i>Franchise Tax Board</i> and <i>Merrell Dow</i>	509
<i>Grable & Sons Metal Products, Inc. v. Darue Engineering & Manufacturing</i>	511
Note: <i>Smith</i> and <i>Grable</i>	517
<i>Gunn v. Minton</i>	518
Note: Clarifying <i>Grable</i> — and Narrowing It?	524
Problem: A Wrongful Discharge Claim	526
Problem: Another <i>Smith</i> Case	526
Problem: Fiduciary Duty and Antitrust Law	527
Note: <i>Christianson</i> and Claims versus Theories	528
C. Preemption, Removal, and “Artful Pleading”	530
<i>Beneficial National Bank v. Anderson</i>	530
Problem: Property Damages in an Interstate Move	536
<i>Felix v. Lucent Technologies, Inc.</i>	537
Note: ERISA and Federal-Question Removal	545
Note: A Wrong Without a Remedy?	547
Problem: An On-the-Job Injury	548
Problem: ERISA and Medical Negligence	549
<i>Rivet v. Regions Bank of Louisiana</i>	550
Note: <i>Rivet</i> and “Artful Pleading”	552
Problem: Discharge of a Salesman	554
D. Jurisdiction over Declaratory Judgment Actions	555
Note: The <i>Skelly Oil</i> Case	555
<i>Franchise Tax Board of California v. Construction Laborers Vacation Trust for Southern California</i>	557
Note: Declaratory Judgments, <i>Franchise Tax Board</i> , and the <i>Shaw</i> Footnote	564
Problem: Adopting a Highway	566
Problem: A Medical Provider’s Lien	567

E.	Supplemental Jurisdiction	567
	<i>United Mine Workers of America v. Gibbs</i>	568
	<i>City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons</i>	571
	<i>Lyon v. Whisman</i>	576
	Note: The Supplemental Jurisdiction Statute	582
	Problem: A Disappointed Ex-Employee	583
	Note: Tolling and Supplemental Claims	583
Chapter 11 · Diversity Jurisdiction		585
A.	Corporations and Other Entities as Parties	586
	<i>Carden v. Arkoma Associates</i>	586
	Note: Artificial Entities as Parties	594
	Note: <i>Carden</i> Reaffirmed	596
	Problem: A Suit Against a “Professional Corporation”	597
	<i>Hertz Corp. v. Friend</i>	597
	Note: Determining a Corporation’s “Principal Place of Business”	604
	Problem: Acme’s Post-Covid “Normal”	606
B.	The Amount in Controversy Requirement	607
	<i>Ericsson GE Mobile Communications, Inc. v. Motorola Communications & Electronics, Inc.</i>	607
	Note: Whose Viewpoint?	610
	Note: The “Non-Aggregation Rule”	612
	Problem: A Pipeline across Blackacre	616
	Note: Indexing the Amount in Controversy	616
	Note: Supplemental Jurisdiction in Diversity Cases	617
Chapter 12 · Special Problems of Removal Jurisdiction		621
A.	Introduction	621
	Note: The Statutory Framework	622
	Note: A Presumption Against Removability?	623
	Note: Who May Remove?	624
B.	Federal-Question Removal and State-Law Claims	626
	[1] Supplemental Jurisdiction	626
	<i>City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons</i>	626
	Note: Authority to Remand State-Law Claims	626
	<i>Payne v. Parkchester North Condominiums</i>	628
	Note: Removal and “Manipulative Tactics”	632
	Problem: Discord in the Police Department	632
	[2] Unrelated State-Law Claims and Federal-Question Removal	633
	Note: Goodbye to the “Separate and Independent Claim” Provision	633
	Problems: Applying Rewritten § 1441(c)	635
C.	Diversity Jurisdiction, Removal, and Litigation Strategy	637

[1]	The Amount-in-Controversy Requirement	637
	Note: Removal and the Amount in Controversy	637
	Note: Litigating the “Preponderance” Standard	639
	Problem: “Disabling” Injuries from a Television Set	643
[2]	The Complete-Diversity Requirement	646
	<i>Filla v. Norfolk Southern Railway Company</i>	646
	Note: “Fraudulent Joinder”	649
	Note: The “Fraudulent Joinder Prevention Act”	651
[3]	The Forum Defendant Rule	653
	<i>Encompass Insurance Co. v. Stone Mansion Restaurant Inc.</i>	654
	Note: “Snap Removal”	659
[4]	The One-Year Limitation and the New “Bad Faith” Exception	662
	Note: Modifying the One-Year Rule	662
	<i>Shorraw v. Bell</i>	665
	Note: Applying the “Bad Faith” Exception	669
	Problems: Is This “Bad Faith” Under § 1446(c)(1)?	670
[5]	Joinder of Parties After Removal	671
	Note: Applying 28 U.S.C. § 1447(e)	671
	Problem: Joining the Insurance Agent	673
D.	Some Procedural Aspects of Removal	674
[1]	The Timing of Removal	674
	Note: The Deadline for Removal	675
	<i>Rossetto v. Oaktree Capital Management, LLC</i>	676
	Note: Untimely or Premature?	681
	Note: Removal in Multiple-Defendant Cases	682
[2]	Motions to Remand	683
	Note: The Timing of Motions to Remand	684
[3]	Appellate Review of Remand Orders	685
	Note: <i>Thermtron</i> and Its Discontents	685
	Note: Merits-Related Jurisdictional Rulings	688

Part Five

Challenging State Official Action

Chapter 13 · State Sovereign Immunity	693
Introductory Note	693
A. Origins and Early Interpretation of the Eleventh Amendment	693
Note: <i>Chisholm</i> and Its Aftermath	694
<i>Hans v. Louisiana</i>	696
Note: <i>Hans v. Louisiana</i>	700
B. Enforcing the Constitution Through Suits Against State Officers	701
[1] Suits for Injunctions	701
<i>Ex parte Young</i>	701
Note: The Significance of <i>Ex parte Young</i>	708
[2] Suits for Damages	711

	<i>Edelman v. Jordan</i>	711
	Note: <i>Ex parte Young</i> and <i>Edelman</i>	719
	Problems: The Eleventh Amendment and Permissible Remedies	721
C.	Congressional Power and State Sovereign Immunity	722
	<i>Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida</i>	722
	Note: The Source of State Sovereign Immunity After <i>Seminole Tribe</i>	740
	Note: Congressional Abrogation of State Sovereign Immunity After <i>Seminole Tribe</i> and <i>Alden</i>	746
D.	Consent and Waiver by the State	752
	Note: State Consent and State Waiver of Immunity	752
E.	The Future of the Immunity	755
	[1] Injunctive Relief: The Scope of the <i>Ex parte Young</i> Exception	755
	<i>Virginia Office for Protection and Advocacy v. Stewart</i>	756
	Note: <i>VOPA v. Stewart</i> and the Future of <i>Ex parte Young</i>	766
	[2] Damages Actions and Congress's Spending Power	766
	[3] Recap: Exceptions to State Sovereign Immunity	769
F.	Sovereign Immunity in Litigation	770
	[1] Sovereign Immunity and Jurisdictional Doctrines	770
	[2] Sovereign Immunity and Removal	771
	Chapter 14 · The Section 1983 Cause of Action	773
A.	Conduct "Under Color of" State Law	774
	<i>Monroe v. Pape</i>	774
	Note: The Impact of <i>Monroe v. Pape</i>	782
B.	Section 1983 and Constitutional Claims	785
	[1] State Tort Law, State of Mind, and Section 1983	785
	[2] Exhaustion and Section 1983	789
C.	Section 1983 and Statutory Claims	791
	<i>Maine v. Thiboutot</i>	791
	Note: The Aftermath of <i>Thiboutot</i>	796
	<i>Gonzaga University v. Doe</i>	797
	Note: "Unambiguously Conferred Rights"	805
	Problem: A "Right" to Transport Firearms?	808
	Note: The "Sea Clammers" Doctrine	809
D.	Governmental Liability	814
	<i>Monell v. Department of Social Services of the City of New York</i>	815
	Note: The Aftermath of <i>Monell</i>	820
	Note: Identifying a Municipal "Policy"	823
	Note: <i>Canton</i> and Failure to Train	828
	Note: <i>Iqbal</i> and "Supervisory Liability"	830

	Problem: Conditions of Confinement	833
	Problem: A Nurse with a Deadly Touch	834
E.	Official Immunities	835
	[1] Absolute Immunity	836
	[2] Qualified Immunity	838
	<i>Harlow v. Fitzgerald</i>	838
	Note: Qualified Immunity after <i>Harlow</i>	843
	Note: Qualified Immunity, General Standards, and “Unique Facts”	845
	Note: Qualified Immunity Reform	847
	Note: Litigating Qualified Immunity and the “Order of Battle”	851
	Problem: A Taser Too Far?	856
	Note: Qualified Immunity and Intercircuit Conflicts	856
Chapter 15	Federal Habeas Corpus	859
A.	Introduction to Federal Habeas Corpus	859
	[1] History and Purposes of the Writ	859
	[2] Federal-Court Review of State Court Judgments of Conviction	860
B.	The Scope and Standard of Review on Collateral Attack	863
	[1] Cognizable Claims	863
	<i>Withrow v. Williams</i>	865
	Note: Constitutional Claims Cognizable in Habeas	874
	[2] Retroactivity of New Rules of Constitutional Law	876
	<i>Teague v. Lane</i>	876
	Note: <i>Teague</i> and “New Rules”	885
	Note: The <i>Teague</i> Exceptions	887
	[3] The Effect of AEDPA	893
	<i>Harrington v. Richter</i>	894
	Note: Unreasonable Applications of Clearly Established Federal Law Under AEDPA	902
	[4] Successive and Abusive Petitions	907
C.	State Processes and Federal Habeas Review	908
	[1] Exhaustion of State Remedies	908
	[2] Effect of State Procedural Default	911
	<i>Wainwright v. Sykes</i>	911
	Note: Procedural Foreclosure of Constitutional Claims and the “Cause and Prejudice” Standard	920
	[3] Harmless Error	924
	[4] State-Court Factfinding	925
D.	The Relevance of Innocence	927
	<i>Herrera v. Collins</i>	927
	Note: The Role of Innocence	938

	Note: “Innocence” and Procedural Default	939
E.	The Suspension Clause and “Adequate Substitutes” for Habeas Corpus	945

Part Six

Systemic Issues in Federal Litigation

Chapter 16	Parallel Proceedings in State and Federal Court	949
A.	Injunctions Against Suits in State Court	950
	<i>Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company v. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers</i>	950
	Note: The Anti-Injunction Act and Its Exceptions	957
	Note: “Expressly Authorized” Exceptions	958
	Note: “Necessary in Aid of Jurisdiction”	963
	Note: The “Relitigation” Exception	964
	Note: Other Issues Under the Anti-Injunction Act	966
	Note: Other Acts Prohibiting Federal Injunctions	967
B.	Abstention Doctrines	968
[1]	<i>Pullman</i> Abstention	968
	<i>Railroad Commission of Texas v. Pullman Co.</i>	968
	Note: The Rationale of <i>Pullman</i> Abstention	970
	Problem: An Anti-Loitering Ordinance	972
[2]	<i>Burford</i> Abstention	973
	<i>Quackenbush v. Allstate Insurance Company</i>	973
	Note: <i>Burford</i> Abstention	982
[3]	<i>Younger</i> Abstention	983
	<i>Younger v. Harris</i>	983
	Note: Equitable Restraint and <i>Younger</i> Abstention	990
	Note: <i>Younger</i> and Threatened Prosecutions	993
	Note: The Timing of the Federal and State Proceedings	995
	<i>Sprint Communications, Inc. v. Jacobs</i>	995
	Note: The Extension of <i>Younger</i> Beyond Criminal Proceedings	1000
C.	Deference to State Proceedings	1002
	<i>Colorado River Water Conservation District v. United States</i>	1002
	Note: Deference to Parallel State Proceedings	1008
	Note: Federal Declaratory Judgment Suits	1010
	Problem: Parallel Age Discrimination Suits	1013
D.	Implied Subject-Matter Exclusions from Federal Jurisdiction	1014
[1]	The Domestic Relations Exception	1014
[2]	The Probate Exception	1016
	<i>Marshall v. Marshall</i>	1016
	Note: Reining in the Probate Exception	1020
	Problem: A Quarrel Over Probate Property	1021

Chapter 17 · Inter-System Preclusion and the <i>Rooker-Feldman</i> Doctrine	1023
A. Federal Courts and the Preclusive Effect of State-Court Judgments	1023
<i>Migra v. Warren City School District Board of Education</i>	1023
Note: Preclusion in Federal Courts	1028
Problem: Section 1983 Damages Following a State Mandamus Action	1030
B. The <i>Rooker-Feldman</i> Doctrine	1031
<i>Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp.</i>	1031
Note: Parties, Preclusion, and the <i>Rooker-Feldman</i> Doctrine	1036
<i>Mo’s Express, LLC v. Sopkin</i>	1039
Note: Developments in the <i>Rooker-Feldman</i> Doctrine after <i>Saudi Basic</i> and <i>Lance</i>	1044
Problem: Religious Land Use and <i>Rooker-Feldman</i>	1046
Problem: A Section 1983 Suit Challenging a Biased Judge	1047
Chapter 18 · Appellate Review in the Federal System	1049
A. Review of “Final Decisions” of the District Courts	1049
<i>Mohawk Industries, Inc. v. Carpenter</i>	1050
Note: The Collateral Order Doctrine	1056
B. Review of Interlocutory Orders of the District Courts	1059
[1] Appeals as of Right	1059
Note: Appellate Review of Injunction Orders	1060
[2] Discretionary Appeals	1063
Note: Discretionary Review Under § 1292(b)	1063
<i>Cole v. United States District Court for the District of Idaho</i>	1065
Note: Mandamus and Appellate Review	1071
Problem: Finality, Mandamus, and the Political Question Doctrine	1073

Part Seven

The Constitutional Framework Revisited

Chapter 19 · Congressional Power to Curtail the Jurisdiction of the Federal Courts	1077
A. The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court	1078
<i>Ex Parte McCardle</i>	1079
Note: The Implications of <i>Ex Parte McCardle</i>	1083
<i>United States v. Klein</i>	1086
Note: The Import of <i>Klein</i>	1090
Note: “External” Limitations	1090
Note: The “Essential Functions” Thesis	1091
Note: The “Marriage Protection Act”	1093
Problems: The “Constitution Restoration Act”	1094

B.	The Jurisdiction of the Federal District Courts	1095
	<i>Sheldon v. Sill</i>	1095
	Note: Congress and the Lower Federal Courts	1097
	<i>Webster v. Doe</i>	1098
	Note: Eliminating Jurisdiction over Constitutional Claims	1105
	Problem: Removing Jurisdiction over “Abortion-Related” Cases	1105
	Problems: The “Pledge Protection Act”	1106
Chapter 20	· Congressional Power to Control Judicial Decision Making	1109
	<i>United States v. Klein</i>	1110
	<i>Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc.</i>	1110
	Note: Congress and the Exercise of “Judicial Power”	1126
	<i>Bank Markazi v. Peterson</i>	1128
	Note: Congress’s Power to Control Decisionmaking After <i>Bank Markazi</i>	1138
	Problem: Save Mount Rushmore	1138
	Note: The Import of <i>Dickerson</i>	1139
	Problem: The Constitution Restoration Act	1140
	Note: The Judicial Conduct Act	1141
	Problem: The Constitutionality of AEDPA	1142
Chapter 21	· Non-Article III Courts and Judges	1145
	<i>Stern v. Marshall</i>	1146
	Note: The Decisions in <i>Northern Pipeline</i> and <i>Stern</i>	1163
	Note: <i>Crowell v. Benson</i> and Administrative Agencies	1165
	Note: The Decisions in <i>Stern</i> and <i>Schor</i>	1165
	<i>Wellness International Network, Ltd. v. Sharif</i>	1167
	Note: Consent and Structural Protections	1176
	Problem: Mandatory Arbitration in Bankruptcy	1177
	Note: Magistrate Judges in the Federal Judicial System	1178
Appendix A	· The Constitution of the United States	1181
Appendix B	· The Justices of the United States Supreme Court, 1946–2020 Terms	1195
	Table of Cases	1199
	Index	1215

Preface to the Fifth Edition

In the Preface to the First Edition (reprinted immediately following), we explained our basic approach in writing a new Federal Courts casebook. We would build on the traditional model of the Federal Courts course — a model that focuses on issues of federalism, separation of powers, and institutional competency — but would place equal emphasis on a second component: giving students the grounding they need to be effective lawyer-litigators. In this Fifth Edition, we continue that approach, but we have made a number of modest changes in implementing it.

The most significant changes in this edition are in Chapter 8, on federal common law, and Chapter 12, on removal jurisdiction. In Chapter 8, we have replaced *Minneeci v. Pollard* with *Ziglar v. Abbasi* as a principal case on the availability of *Bivens* actions. *Ziglar* reverses the presumption announced in *Bivens* in favor of recognizing implied rights of action to recover damages for violations of constitutional rights. Going forward, federal courts typically should not recognize new *Bivens* actions.

In Chapter 12, we have added a new subsection, including a new principal case, on the practice that has been referred to as “snap removal.” At the time of the Fourth Edition, the practice was not widely known, and no court of appeals had considered whether the statute allows it. In 2018, the Third Circuit upheld the permissibility of the stratagem; two other circuits soon followed suit. The issue is of substantial practical importance, and it also provides a pointed illustration of the conflict between “textual” and “purposive” approaches to statutory interpretation. To make room for the new subsection, we omitted the material on stipulations to the amount in controversy.

We have also made other, more modest changes throughout the Fifth Edition. We have revised Chapter 3 to account for the Court’s change of focus in addressing justiciability. We trimmed some of the taxpayer standing coverage, and we expanded sections discussing state standing and legislator and legislative standing.

In Chapter 14, we have added a new Note on “Qualified Immunity Reform,” which discusses the host of proposals in Congress—none of which has yet become law—to modify or eliminate qualified immunity by amending Section 1983. The Note also examines the most prominent criticisms of current qualified immunity doctrine, which have grown even more forceful as part of broader calls for police reform.

In Chapter 15, the discussion of the two exceptions to the retroactivity bar of *Teague v. Lane* has been updated to reflect that the Court has declared the exception

for watershed rules to be “moribund,” while struggling to offer a consistent definition of the exception for substantive rules.

We have also updated Chapter 21, on non-Article III tribunals, to highlight the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene’s Energy Group, LLC*, which extended the public-rights doctrine to patents.

The small number of new principal cases may appear surprising, but we emphasize that we have not replaced older cases simply because a new decision has come down on the same topic. When an existing case presents the issues in a way that makes for an effective classroom experience, we have kept it, even though a more recent case might add an interesting new wrinkle.

* * *

There have been three changes in the membership of the Supreme Court since publication of the Fourth Edition: In 2017, Justice Neil Gorsuch was appointed to fill the seat made vacant by the sudden death of Justice Antonin Scalia early in the 2015 Term. In 2018, Justice Anthony Kennedy retired; he was replaced by Justice Brett Kavanaugh. Finally, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg died shortly before the start of the 2020 Term. President Trump appointed Justice Amy Coney Barrett to fill that seat. Appendix B provides an updated table of the Justices.

* * *

There has also been a change in the authorship of the casebook. The authors of the Fourth Edition welcome Professor Derek T. Muller of the University of Iowa College of Law as a new co-author. At the same time, all of the current authors join in acknowledging the many contributions to the structure, content, and approach of the casebook made by Provost Lauren Robel (Indiana University-Bloomington), one of the two founding authors of the book (along with Professor Hellman).

* * *

In preparing this new edition, we have continued the approach followed in the four prior editions. First, we have concentrated on the main lines of doctrinal development and their implications for future disputes. In doing so, we have emphasized elements of litigation strategy and the practical application of Federal Courts doctrines and rules, as well as the underlying policy and institutional-competence issues.

Second, we have edited the cases with a relatively light hand. We have also attempted to keep the decisions readable; thus, some brackets and internal quotation marks have been omitted from quoted material within cases.

* * *

The authors express their appreciation to the staff of the University of Pittsburgh School of Law Document Technology Center for their dedicated efforts in preparing the manuscript. Professor Hessick would like to thank Kendall Williams for excellent research assistance.

Preface to the First Edition

This book is the product of our rethinking of what a Federal Courts course should accomplish in the twenty-first century. The traditional course focuses on issues of federalism, separation of powers, and institutional competency. That focus provides a powerful intellectual model for organizing the materials that make up the field of study, and we have built on its insights. But the traditional model falls short in giving students the grounding they need to be effective lawyer-litigators.

Lawyers are goal-oriented. From their perspective, the American system of judicial federalism is important because it sets up four possible goals: getting into federal court; staying out of federal court; gaining the benefit of federal law; or avoiding the detriment of federal law. This book concentrates on providing the doctrinal and practical education that will enable lawyers to identify and pursue these goals effectively in the service of their clients, while assuring that they understand the underlying tensions and issues that will shape the law in the future. The emphasis of the book as well as its organization flows from this principle.

Emphasis. As one would expect, there is a core of material that is common to all Federal Courts casebooks. However, there is also wide latitude for differences in emphasis. Two major themes set this book apart from others.

First, we provide a comprehensive and unified treatment of the litigation of federal questions in state courts. To appreciate the issues involved in choosing between federal and state court, a lawyer must have an understanding of how federal questions are litigated in a state judicial system. In Part Two, we give sustained and systematic attention to the role of state courts as a forum for litigation of federal issues.

Second, the book is grounded in the realities of litigation today, rather than the assumptions that prevailed during the Civil Rights Era. Of particular importance is the strong tendency of defendants in civil litigation to prefer federal over state court. As a consequence of this development, the statutory device of removal now occupies a central place in litigation strategy. It is no accident that during the last 20 years virtually all of the Supreme Court's decisions on district court jurisdiction have come in cases in which the plaintiff has challenged the defendant's removal of the suit from state to federal court. This casebook treats removal pervasively, with an emphasis on the issues that dominate litigation practice today.

Features. In many law schools, Federal Courts has a reputation as a difficult course. This is not surprising; to some degree, difficulty is inherent in the subject. But the authors believe that the law of Federal Courts can be made understandable without

sacrificing either depth or the intellectual rigor that is the hallmark of this area of study. Three features of the book promote this goal.

First, the book concentrates on the main lines of development and their implications for future disputes rather than traveling down every byway of doctrinal refinement. Major cases are set forth in full or in extended excerpts. The note material is extensive, but without a proliferation of citations to lesser cases that would only distract students from the important points. Nor is there a profusion of bibliographic references to secondary sources. In short, the book aims for depth rather than detail.

Second, to enable students to understand difficult material, it is essential that the various topics be organized into larger, well-defined units of study. The organization of a Federal Courts casebook should not simply reflect considerations of convenience; it should serve a pedagogical purpose. To that end, the organization of this book reflects a functional, *task-oriented* approach. For example, one task lawyers undertake is that of litigating federal questions in a state court. Part Two of the book presents the material relevant to that task. Another task is that of persuading a federal court to apply a rule of decision other than state law—the default law in our system of limited national government. That is the subject of Part Three. Another task is that of using federal court as a forum for challenging state official action. In Part Six, that task receives unified treatment.

Third, in addition to cases, notes, and questions, the book makes use of problems. Not all topics lend themselves to the problem method, but many do. The problems in the various chapters have been carefully designed to zero in on (a) points settled by the cases students have read; and (b) questions left unanswered or falling between precedents. Many are based on recent cases that did not go to the Supreme Court.

The best way to get a feel for the book's approach is to peruse the Table of Contents. We particularly invite attention to the sequence of topics, which has been carefully designed to reinforce learning. At the same time, the material has been subdivided into numerous smaller units to allow for maximum flexibility in choice of coverage.

Editing of cases. Cases have been edited for readability and as teaching tools; they should not be used for research purposes. Omissions are indicated by brackets or ellipses; alterations are indicated by brackets. Most footnotes have been omitted; however, footnotes in opinions and other quoted material retain their original numbers. Citations to cases other than those in the Casebook have generally been deleted. Brackets and internal quotation marks have been omitted from quoted material within cases. Lengthy paragraphs have sometimes been broken up to promote readability. References to “petitioner” and “respondent” have sometimes been replaced with party names or positions in the lower court.