

Understanding Federal Courts and Jurisdiction

LexisNexis Law School Publishing Advisory Board

Bridgette Carr

Clinical Professor of Law
University of Michigan Law School

Steven I. Friedland

Professor of Law and Senior Scholar
Elon University School of Law

Carole Goldberg

Jonathan D. Varat Distinguished Professor of Law
UCLA School of Law

Oliver Goodenough

Professor of Law
Vermont Law School

Paul Marcus

Haynes Professor of Law
William and Mary Law School

John Sprankling

Distinguished Professor of Law
McGeorge School of Law

Understanding Federal Courts and Jurisdiction

Second Edition

Linda Mullenix

*Rita and Morris Atlas Chair in Advocacy
University of Texas School of Law*

Martin Redish

*Louis and Harriet Ancel Professor of Law and Public Policy
Northwestern University School of Law*

Georgene Vairo

*Professor of Law
David P. Leonard Chair
Loyola Law School, Los Angeles*

Print ISBN: 978-1-6304-4792-2
E-book ISBN: 978-1-6304-4793-9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Mullenix, Linda S., 1950- author.

Understanding federal courts and jurisdiction / Linda Mullenix, Rita and Morris Atlas Chair in Advocacy, University of Texas School of Law; Martin Redish, Louis and Harriet Ancel Professor of Law and Public Policy, Northwestern University School of Law; Georgene Vairo, Professor of Law, David P. Leonard Chair Loyola Law School, Los Angeles. -- Second edition.

pages cm

Includes index.

ISBN 978-1-63044-792-2

1. Courts--United States. 2. Jurisdiction--United States. I. Redish, Martin H., author. II. Vairo, Georgene, author. III. Title.

KF8719.M85 2014

347.73*12--dc23

2014025390

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender and the Matthew Bender Flame Design are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2015 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

NOTE TO USERS

To ensure that you are using the latest materials available in this area, please be sure to periodically check the LexisNexis Law School web site for downloadable updates and supplements at www.lexisnexus.com/lawschool.

Editorial Offices

121 Chanlon Rd., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800

201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200

www.lexisnexus.com

Editorial Offices

630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800

201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200

www.lexisnexus.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Table of Contents

DIVISION I	FEDERAL COURTS AND JURISDICTION	1
Chapter 1	THE STRUCTURE OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM	3
§ 1.01	ARTICLE III AND THE SCOPE OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL POWER	3
§ 1.02	THE SALARY AND TENURE PROTECTIONS OF ARTICLE III JUDGES	3
§ 1.03	LIFE TENURE OF ARTICLE III JUDGES DURING “GOOD BEHAVIOR”	4
§ 1.04	ARTICLE III JUDGES’ PROTECTION AGAINST SALARY REDUCTIONS	6
[1]	Determining the Methodology of Compensation Clause Analysis	6
[2]	Prohibition of Direct Reduction in Salary of an Article III Judge	7
[3]	Indirect Reductions in Judicial Salaries: A State of Doctrinal Uncertainty	8
[4]	Provision of Cost of Living Adjustments Left to the Discretion of Congress	10
§ 1.05	CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO CONTROL LOWER FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION	11
[1]	The Madisonian Compromise: Congressional Discretion Not to Create Lower Federal Courts	11
[2]	Congress’s Broad Power to Control Lower Federal Court Jurisdiction	12
[3]	Congressional Power to Control Lower Federal Court Jurisdiction: A Brief Overview of the Scholarly Theories	13
[a]	<i>Martin v. Hunter’s Lessee</i> : The View That Judicial Power Must Be Vested in Some Federal Court	13
[b]	Theory of Mandatory Federal Judicial Review of State Court Constitutional Determinations	14
[c]	The View That Some, But Not All, Cases Must Be Heard in a Federal Forum	18
[4]	Congress May Impose Procedural Prerequisites to Federal Jurisdiction	19
§ 1.06	DUE PROCESS LIMITS ON CONGRESS’S POWER TO CONTROL LOWER FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION	20
[1]	Must Congress Provide Federal Jurisdiction to Hear Constitutional Claims?	20
[2]	The View That State Courts Provide Sufficient Independent Adjudication to Satisfy Due Process	22
[3]	Limits on Federal Jurisdiction May Violate Due Process if State	

Table of Contents

	Courts Are Unavailable or Inadequate	22
§ 1.07	CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO LIMIT FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION AND SEPARATION OF POWERS	25
[1]	Separation of Powers and Due Process Are Separate and Distinct Limitations on Congressional Power over Federal Jurisdiction	25
[2]	<i>Hayburn’s Case</i> : First Recognition of Separation of Powers Limitation	26
[3]	<i>United States v. Klein</i> : Congress May Not Dictate the Result of a Particular Case	27
[4]	<i>Yakus v. United States</i> and <i>Adamo Wrecking Company</i> : Foreclosing Review of Validity of Regulations	28
[5]	<i>United States v. Sioux Nation</i> : Congress May Waive Defense of Res Judicata in Cases against Federal Government	30
[6]	<i>Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm</i> : Congress May Not Reopen Final Judgments	31
§ 1.08	CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO VEST ARTICLE III COURTS WITH NON-ARTICLE III POWER	32
[1]	Congressional Power to Assign Non-Article III Cases to Article III Courts	32
[2]	Allocation of Non-Article III Functions to Article III Courts and Judges Is Generally Unconstitutional	35
[a]	The Unique Role of the Judiciary Precludes Performance of Nonjudicial Functions	35
[b]	<i>Morrison v. Olsen</i> : Judiciary May Appoint, Administer, and Terminate Special Counsel	37
[c]	<i>Mistretta v. United States</i> : Members of the Judiciary May Be Required to Sit on Sentencing Commission	38
§ 1.09	ARTICLE III COURTS HAVE ULTIMATE POWER TO RESOLVE QUESTIONS OF “CONSTITUTIONAL FACT”	40
§ 1.10	CONGRESS HAS POWER TO MAKE EXCEPTIONS TO THE SUPREME COURT’S APPELLATE JURISDICTION	42
[1]	The Exceptions Clause Allows Congress to Limit the Supreme Court’s Appellate Jurisdiction	42
[2]	<i>Ex parte McCardle</i> : The Supreme Court Gives the Exceptions Clause Broad Scope	42
[3]	Possible Limits on Congress’s Broad Powers Under <i>McCardle</i> and the Exceptions Clause	44
§ 1.11	CONGRESS POSSESSES LIMITED AUTHORITY TO VEST THE JUDICIAL POWER IN NON-ARTICLE III ADJUDICATORS	47
§ 1.12	THE ORIGINS OF LEGISLATIVE COURTS	48
[1]	Territorial Courts	48
[2]	Military Courts	51
[3]	Other Legislative Courts	53

Table of Contents

[4]	Administrative Agencies	54
§ 1.13	<i>PALMORE v. UNITED STATES</i> : CONGRESS MAY CREATE NON-ARTICLE III COURTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	54
§ 1.14	THE EVOLUTION OF MODERN LEGISLATIVE COURT DOCTRINE: THE BANKRUPTCY COURTS AND THE <i>NORTHERN PIPELINE</i> DECISION	57
§ 1.15	THE RISE OF THE BALANCING TEST AS THE LEGISLATIVE COURT STANDARD	61
[1]	<i>Thomas v. Union Carbide</i> : Retreat from the Public-Private Rights Dichotomy	61
[2]	<i>Commodities Futures Trading Commission v. Schor</i> : The All-But- Total Departure	64
§ 1.16	REASSERTION OF THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE RIGHTS DICHOTOMY	65
§ 1.17	THE USE OF MAGISTRATE JUDGES UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 636 DOES NOT VIOLATE ARTICLE III	68
[1]	The Role of Magistrate Judges in Federal Adjudication	68
[2]	Magistrate Judges May Conduct Suppression Hearings in Criminal Cases	69
[3]	Magistrate Judges May Conduct Full Trials with the Consent of All Parties	70
[a]	Consent Required	70
[b]	Consent May Be Inferred From Conduct	70
Chapter 2	ISSUES OF JUSTICIABILITY	73
§ 2.01	NATURE OF JUSTICIABILITY	73
§ 2.02	THE CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT OF ACTUAL CASE OR CONTROVERSY	74
§ 2.03	HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE JUSTICIABILITY DOCTRINE: THE PROHIBITION ON ADVISORY OPINIONS	75
§ 2.04	JUSTICIABILITY AS A BLEND OF CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS	76
§ 2.05	STANDING	76
[1]	Nature of Standing Doctrine	76
[2]	The Injury-in-Fact Requirement	79
[3]	Traceability	94
[4]	Redressability	95
[5]	Prudential Standing Limitations	97
[6]	Associational Standing	104
[7]	Taxpayer Standing	105
§ 2.06	RIPENESS	108
§ 2.07	MOOTNESS	113

Table of Contents

§ 2.08	POLITICAL QUESTION DOCTRINE	122
[1]	Theoretical Underpinnings of Political Question Doctrine	123
Chapter 3	DIVERSITY JURISDICTION	147
§ 3.01	HISTORICAL BASIS OF DIVERSITY JURISDICTION	147
§ 3.02	THE MODERN VIABILITY OF THE DIVERSITY JURISDICTION	148
§ 3.03	SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS OF DIVERSITY	149
§ 3.04	PARTIES OVER WHOM DIVERSITY JURISDICTION MAY BE EXERCISED	150
§ 3.05	“STATES” INCLUDES TERRITORIES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND PUERTO RICO	151
§ 3.06	THE COMPLETE DIVERSITY REQUIREMENT	151
§ 3.07	TIME OF DETERMINATION OF DIVERSITY	154
§ 3.08	28 U.S.C. § 1359 PROHIBITS DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION IF JOINDER IS COLLUSIVE	155
§ 3.09	DIVERSITY AND REMOVAL	159
§ 3.10	FRAUDULENT JOINDER	161
§ 3.11	JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURTS UNDER CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2005 (CAFA)	162
§ 3.12	DETERMINING CITIZENSHIP OF INDIVIDUALS	167
§ 3.13	DETERMINING CITIZENSHIP OF CORPORATIONS AND OTHER ENTITIES	170
§ 3.14	CITIZENSHIP OF NONCORPORATE ENTITIES IN ALL OTHER ACTIONS	174
§ 3.15	DIVERSITY ACTIONS INVOLVING ALIENS	176
§ 3.16	JUDICIALLY CREATED EXCEPTIONS TO THE DIVERSITY JURISDICTION	178
[1]	Domestic Relations Exception	178
[2]	The Probate Exception	180
§ 3.17	JURISDICTIONAL AMOUNT IN CONTROVERSY	182
Chapter 4	FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION	193
§ 4.01	NATURE AND PURPOSES OF FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION	193
§ 4.02	THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION	195
[1]	Constitutional Origins	195
[2]	The <i>Osborn</i> Decision	195
[3]	Post- <i>Osborn</i> Developments: <i>Textile Workers Union v. Lincoln Mills</i>	199
[4]	Current Status of Constitutional Scope of Federal Question Jurisdiction	200

Table of Contents

[5]	Protective Jurisdiction	207
§ 4.03	28 U.S.C. § 1331: THE FEDERAL QUESTION STATUTE	212
[1]	Constitutional and Statutory Federal Question Provisions Compared	212
[2]	Interpretation of the General Federal Question Jurisdiction Statute	213
[a]	Creation Test: Case Arises Under Law That Creates Cause of Action	214
[b]	Substantial Federal Question Test for State Law Claims	216
[c]	Supreme Court Retreats: <i>Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v.</i> <i>Thompson</i>	218
[3]	To Fall Within Federal Question Jurisdiction, the Federal Issue Must Be “Substantial”	225
§ 4.04	THE WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT RULE	226
[1]	Historical Origins	226
[2]	Rationale for Rule	226
[3]	Application in Removal Actions	229
[4]	Application to Declaratory Judgment Actions	229
[5]	Application of Well-Pleaded Complaint Rule to Defense of Federal Preemption	237
Chapter 5	SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION	243
§ 5.01	THE BACKGROUND OF SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION	243
§ 5.02	NOMENCLATURE	244
[1]	Supplemental Jurisdiction	244
[2]	Pendent Claim Jurisdiction	244
[3]	Pendent Party Jurisdiction	245
[4]	Ancillary Jurisdiction	245
§ 5.03	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION	247
[2]	Development of the Judge-Made Doctrine of Pendent Jurisdiction	248
[3]	Enactment of the Supplemental Jurisdiction Statute	251
§ 5.04	SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION STATUTE: AN OVERVIEW	252
[1]	Background	252
[2]	Subsection (a): Supplemental Jurisdiction over Claims That Are “Part of the Same Case or Controversy,” and that Involve Joinder or Intervention of Additional Parties	253
[3]	Subsection (b): Refusal to Extend Supplemental Jurisdiction to Diversity Claims Brought by Plaintiffs Under Specified Joinder Devices	254
[4]	Subsection (c): Discretionary Decline of Supplemental Jurisdiction . . .	258
[5]	Subsection (d): Statute of Limitations	259

Table of Contents

§ 5.05	SAME CASE OR CONTROVERSY UNDER ARTICLE III	259
§ 5.06	JOINDER OR INTERVENTION OF ADDITIONAL PARTIES	261
§ 5.07	DISCRETIONARY DECLINE OF SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION	265
[1]	Scope of Statutory Factors	265
[2]	Novel or Complex Issue of State Law	267
[3]	When Supplemental Claim Substantially Predominates	267
[4]	Dismissal of Jurisdiction-Conferring Claim	268
[5]	Reasons to Retain Jurisdiction	268
[6]	Compelling Reasons Under Exceptional Circumstances	269
Chapter 6	REMOVAL JURISDICTION	271
PART A	NATURE AND PURPOSE OF REMOVAL JURISDICTION	271
§ 6.01	OVERVIEW OF REMOVAL JURISDICTION	271
§ 6.02	COMPARING REMOVAL JURISDICTION TO FEDERAL COURT ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	274
§ 6.03	REMOVAL STATUTES STRICTLY CONSTRUED	275
PART B	BASIS OF REMOVAL JURISDICTION	276
§ 6.04	FOUR BASIC ELEMENTS FOR REMOVAL	276
§ 6.05	DEFENDANTS’ OPTION TO REMOVE	276
[1]	Only Defendants May Remove	276
[2]	Determining Status as Defendant	277
[a]	Federal Law Governs Determination	277
[b]	Whether Additional Counterclaim Defendants, Cross-Claim Defendants, Third-Party Defendants, or Defendant Intervenors May Remove	278
[i]	Additional Counterclaim Defendants and Cross-Claim Defendants Generally May Not Remove	278
[ii]	Third-Party Defendants	279
[iii]	Defendant Intervenors	280
[c]	Generally All Defendants Must Join in Removal	280
[3]	Removing Defendants Have Burden of Proving Removal Is Proper	283
[4]	Defendant’s Waiver of Right to Remove	284
[a]	Forum Selection Clauses	284
[b]	Other Methods of Waiving Right to Remove	285
§ 6.06	CASES ORIGINALLY FILED IN “STATE COURT” MAY BE REMOVED	287
§ 6.07	CASES MUST BE REMOVED TO FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT FOR DISTRICT AND DIVISION EMBRACING STATE COURT ACTION	289

Table of Contents

§ 6.08	FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT MUST HAVE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION OVER REMOVED CASE	289
[1]	“Original Jurisdiction” Defined	289
[2]	Diversity of Citizenship Cases	290
[a]	“Diversity Jurisdiction” Defined	290
[b]	Determining Citizenship	291
[c]	Complete Diversity Generally Required	291
[d]	Time for Ascertaining Diversity of Citizenship	294
[e]	Removal Precluded if Any Defendant Is Citizen of State in Which Action Is Filed	295
[f]	Procedures for Determining Diversity of Parties	297
[g]	Satisfaction of Amount in Controversy Requirement	297
[i]	Amount Must Exceed \$75,000 in Cases Outside Class Action Fairness Act of 2005	297
[ii]	Amount Must Exceed \$5,000,000 in Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 Cases	300
[h]	Removal May Be Possible When Later Developments Create Diversity	301
[3]	Federal Question Cases	302
[a]	Federal Question Jurisdiction	302
[b]	“Federal Question” Defined	303
[c]	Plaintiff Generally Is Master of Complaint	304
[4]	Removal of Claims Under Section 1441(a) and (b) That Are Supported by Other Grants of Federal Jurisdiction	306
[5]	Removal When Federal Question Claim Is Joined to Nonremovable Claim	307
[a]	Entire Case Removed; Nonremovable Claims Remanded	307
[b]	Only Defendants to Federal Question Claim Must Consent to Removal	307
[6]	Removal of Class Actions	308
[a]	Class Actions Generally May Be Removed to Federal Court	308
[b]	CAFA Makes Removal of Class Actions More Common	310
[i]	Only Minimal Diversity Required	310
[ii]	Amount in Controversy Is to Be Aggregated	310
[c]	When CAFA Jurisdiction Will Not Be Exercised	311
[d]	“Mass Actions” May Also Be Removed	314
[e]	Actions Brought by State Attorneys General	316
[f]	Special CAFA Removal Rules	317
[i]	Any Single Defendant May Remove	317
[ii]	Defendant’s Local Citizenship Does Not Preclude Removal	317
[iii]	One-Year Limitation on Removal Does Not Apply	317
[g]	Accelerated Appellate Review of Remand Order Is Possible	318

Table of Contents

[i]	Standard for Discretionary Review	318
[ii]	Time for Application for and Resolution of Discretionary Appeal	319
	PART C REMOVAL PROCEDURES AND EFFECT OF REMOVAL	320
§ 6.09	PROCEDURES FOR REMOVAL	320
[1]	Notice of Removal	320
[2]	Time for Removal	321
[a]	When Notice of Removal Must Be Filed	321
[i]	Within 30 Days After Defendant Receives Copy or Service of Initial Pleading Showing Basis for Removal	321
[ii]	Within 30 Days After Defendant Receives Paper First Showing Basis for Removal	322
[iii]	No Later Than One Year After Commencement of Action in Diversity Case	323
[iv]	When 30-Day Period for Removal Begins to Run	324
[b]	Initial Pleading Commencing Removal Time	325
[c]	Receipt May Be by Service or “Otherwise”	326
[d]	Effect of Lack of Service on All Defendants	327
[e]	Other Paper	327
[3]	Whether Court Should Evaluate Subject Matter Jurisdiction Before Personal Jurisdiction	330
§ 6.10	EFFECT OF REMOVAL	331
[1]	Federal Court May Issue All Orders and Process Necessary	331
[2]	State Court Divested of Jurisdiction	331
[3]	Effect of Prior State Court Orders	332
[4]	Law to Be Applied in Removed Case	333
[5]	Venue Objections After Removal	333
	PART D POST-REMOVAL PROCEDURES	334
§ 6.11	PROCEDURES AFTER REMOVAL	334
[1]	Remand	334
[a]	Who May Seek Remand	334
[b]	Defects in Removal Procedure	335
[c]	Time for Making Motion for Remand	336
[d]	Denial of Remand Based on Futility Exception	337
[e]	Remand of Entire Case or Part of Case	338
[2]	Effect of Post-Removal Changes in Case	339
[a]	Federal Claims Dismissed; State Claims Remaining	339
[b]	Diversity Cases	340
[c]	Addition of Nondiverse Parties	341
[d]	When Plaintiff Dismisses Nondiverse Party	341

Table of Contents

[3]	Costs and Attorney’s Fees	342
§ 6.12	STATE COURT JURISDICTION AFTER REMAND	344
§ 6.13	APPELLATE REVIEW OF REMAND ORDER	345
[1]	Orders Denying Remand	345
[2]	Orders Granting Motion to Remand	346
[3]	Standard of Review	349

Chapter 7 PERSONAL JURISDICTION IN FEDERAL COURTS 351

§ 7.01	OVERVIEW OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION	351
[1]	Legislative and Judicial Jurisdiction Distinguished	351
[2]	Basis and Process Requirements for Personal Jurisdiction	351
[a]	Basis Establishes Required Connection with Sovereign	351
[b]	Process Establishes Required Steps to Subject Person or Thing to Court’s Power	352
[3]	Categories of Jurisdiction	352
[a]	In Personam Jurisdiction Defined	352
[b]	Jurisdiction over Property Distinguished	353
[4]	Consequences of Lack of Jurisdiction	354
[a]	Effect of Lack of Jurisdiction	354
[b]	Jurisdictional Error Can Be Grounds for Collateral Attack on Judgment	354
[c]	Defect May Be Waived	354
[5]	Jurisdiction over Persons and Property Distinguished From Related Concepts	355
[a]	Subject Matter Jurisdiction or “Competence”	355
[b]	Subject Matter Jurisdiction of Federal and State Courts Distinguished	356
[c]	Venue	357
[d]	Jurisdiction and Choice-of-Law	358
§ 7.02	PERSONAL JURISDICTION IN FEDERAL COURTS	358
[1]	Due Process Clause of Fifth Amendment Limits Federal Courts’ Exercise of Jurisdiction	358
[2]	Relation Between Jurisdiction and Rule 4 (Summons)	360
[3]	Procedures for Invoking Jurisdiction (“Process”) Under Rule 4	361
[a]	Defendant May Waive Service of Process	361
[b]	Service of Process May Be Effected by Several Methods	362
§ 7.03	LIMITATIONS ON BASES FOR PERSONAL JURISDICTION UNDER RULE 4	363
[1]	Service of Process Generally Establishes Personal Jurisdiction Only Over Defendants Who Could Be Amenable to Jurisdiction	

Table of Contents

	in State in Which Federal Court Sits	363
[2]	Personal Jurisdiction in Federal District Courts Is Subject to State Long-Arm Statutes	364
[a]	Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Limits Stem From Territorial Scope of State Sovereignty	365
[b]	Due Process Limits Exercise of State Court Jurisdiction	365
[3]	Statutory Exceptions Authorize Broader Personal Jurisdiction	366
[a]	100-Mile Bulge Service for Certain Parties	366
[b]	Nationwide Service of Process for Certain Claims	366
[c]	Rule 4(k)(2) Confers Jurisdiction for Claims Arising Under Federal Law When No Federal Statute Authorizes Nationwide Service and No State Authorizes Jurisdiction	368
[d]	Supplemental Personal Jurisdiction: Service Based on Nationwide Contacts May Be Available to Reach Defendant Sued on Claim Giving Rise to Supplemental Jurisdiction	369
§ 7.04	LIMITATIONS ON JURISDICTION OVER PROPERTY IN CIVIL ACTIONS	371
§ 7.05	RULE 45 (SUBPOENAS): JURISDICTION OVER WITNESS REQUIRES PROPER JURISDICTIONAL BASIS AND PROPER SERVICE OF PROCESS	372
§ 7.06	OBJECTIONS TO JURISDICTION MAY BE FORFEITED BY FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH DISCOVERY ORDERS	373
§ 7.07	COURT WILL NOT EXERCISE JURISDICTION OBTAINED BY FORCE OR FRAUD	373
§ 7.08	SOME PARTIES MAY BE IMMUNE FROM JURISDICTION	374
§ 7.09	PROCEDURES FOR CHALLENGING JURISDICTION	375
[1]	Defendant May Challenge Jurisdiction in State Court by Making Special Appearance or by Default and Collateral Attack	375
[2]	Defendant May Challenge Jurisdiction in Federal Court by Filing Rule 12 Motion to Dismiss or Raising Jurisdictional Defense in Answer or by Default and Collateral Attack	375
<hr/>		
DIVISION II	VENUE	377
<hr/>		
Chapter 8	VENUE	379
<hr/>		
§ 8.01	OVERVIEW OF VENUE	379
[1]	<i>Venue</i> Defined as Proper District Court in Which to File Action	379
[2]	Federal Statutes Control Venue of All Civil Actions in Federal Courts	380
[3]	Venue Is Determined by General Venue Statute Unless Special Statute Exists	381
[4]	Plaintiff Generally May Choose Among Proper Venues	382

Table of Contents

[5]	Pleading and Burden of Proof as to Venue	383
§ 8.02	GENERAL VENUE STATUTE GOVERNS MOST CIVIL ACTIONS	386
[1]	Overview of Venue Possibilities	386
[2]	District Where Any Defendant Resides, If All Defendants Reside in Same State	386
[3]	District Where Substantial Part of Events or Omissions Occurred or Where Property Is Situated	387
[4]	If No Other Option Applies, Where Any Defendant Is Subject to Personal Jurisdiction	388
§ 8.03	WHERE PARTY “RESIDES” DEPENDS ON NATURE OF PARTY	389
[1]	Individual Resides in District of Domicile	389
[2]	Residence of Aliens	391
[3]	Public Official Sued in Official Capacity Resides Where Official Performs Official Duties	392
[4]	Residence of Corporation or Other Legal Entity	392
[a]	Defendant That Is Corporation or Other Entity Resides Where It Is Subject to Personal Jurisdiction	392
[b]	Personal Jurisdiction Determined with Respect to Each District in Multidistrict States	393
[c]	Unincorporated Associations Are Treated as Corporations	395
[5]	Personal Jurisdiction for Residence Purposes Must Be Determined with Respect to the Civil Action in Question	396
§ 8.04	DISTRICT WHERE SUBSTANTIAL PART OF EVENTS OR OMISSIONS OCCURRED IS DETERMINED BY FACTS OF CASE	396
§ 8.05	VENUE MUST BE PROPER FOR EACH JOINED CAUSE OF ACTION	398
§ 8.06	COUNTERCLAIMS, CROSS-CLAIMS, AND THIRD-PARTY CLAIMS NOT AFFECTED BY VENUE RULES	399
§ 8.07	CLASS ACTIONS: VENUE DETERMINED AS TO NAMED PARTIES	399
§ 8.08	ACTION IS REMOVED TO DISTRICT IN WHICH STATE COURT ACTION PENDING	399
Chapter 9	CHANGE OF VENUE	401
	PART A SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES IN TRANSFER OR DISMISSAL DEVICES	401
§ 9.01	OVERVIEW OF STATUTORY TRANSFER AND COMMON LAW DISMISSAL DEVICES	401
	PART B TRANSFER WHEN VENUE IS PROPER BUT	

Table of Contents

	INCONVENIENT	403
§ 9.02	PURPOSE OF SECTION 1404(a) CONVENIENCE TRANSFER	403
§ 9.03	TRANSFEREE COURT MUST BE ONE IN WHICH ACTION “MIGHT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT” OR TO WHICH ALL PARTIES CONSENT	404
[1]	Requirements for Transferee Court	404
[a]	Transferee Court Must Have Proper Venue, Subject Matter, and Personal Jurisdiction	404
[b]	Transfer to Any District Possible Based on Consent of All Parties	404
[2]	Options When Venue in Proposed Transferee Court Is Proper as to Some Defendants and Not as to Others	405
[3]	Party Moving for Transfer Has Burden of Proving Transferee Court Proper	406
§ 9.04	TRANSFER MUST BE BASED ON “CONVENIENCE OF PARTIES AND WITNESSES, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE”	407
[1]	Courts Apply Flexible and Discretionary Analysis	407
[2]	List of Factors to Be Considered	407
[3]	Convenience Factors	408
[4]	Interest of Justice Factors	412
[5]	Forum Selection Clauses Enforced Under § 1404(a)	415
§ 9.05	STANDING TO BRING MOTION TO TRANSFER ON CONVENIENCE GROUNDS	417
[1]	Plaintiff or Defendant May Bring Motion	417
[2]	Courts Split on Whether Third-Party Defendant Has Standing to Bring Motion	418
[3]	Court May, on Its Own Motion, Transfer on Convenience Grounds . . .	419
§ 9.06	CHOICE OF LAW FOLLOWING SECTION 1404(A) CONVENIENCE TRANSFER	419
[1]	Choice of Law in Diversity Cases	419
[a]	Generally, Transferor State’s Law and Choice of Law Rules Apply	419
[i]	Rule Originated with <i>Van Dusen</i> Case	419
[ii]	<i>Ferens</i> Extended <i>Van Dusen</i> Rule to Cases in Which Plaintiff or Court Moves for Convenience Transfer	421
[b]	Transferor State’s Choice of Law Rules May Dictate Application of Another State’s Law	422
[2]	Choice of Law in Federal Question Cases: Generally, Transferee Court Follows Its Own Circuit’s Interpretation of Law	422
	PART C TRANSFER OR DISMISSAL IF VENUE IS IMPROPER	423
§ 9.07	PURPOSE OF SECTION 1406(a) IMPROPER VENUE TRANSFER STATUTE	423

Table of Contents

§ 9.08	TRANSFEROR COURT’S PREREQUISITES FOR TRANSFER FOR IMPROPER VENUE	424
[1]	Transferor Court Needs Subject Matter Jurisdiction	424
[2]	Transferor Court Need Not Have Personal Jurisdiction	424
[3]	Venue Must Be “Wrong”	424
§ 9.09	PREREQUISITES FOR PROPOSED TRANSFEREE COURT WHEN VENUE IS IMPROPER IN TRANSFEROR COURT: TRANSFEREE COURT MUST BE ONE IN WHICH ACTION “COULD HAVE BEEN BROUGHT”	425
§ 9.10	COURT MAY TRANSFER IN INTEREST OF JUSTICE OR DISMISS WITHOUT PREJUDICE WHEN VENUE IS WRONG	425
[1]	Transfer Should Be Usual Remedy for Improper Venue	425
[2]	Court May Transfer If in Interest of Justice	426
§ 9.11	STANDING TO OBJECT TO IMPROPER VENUE	428
§ 9.12	WAIVER OF OBJECTION TO IMPROPER VENUE	428
§ 9.13	CHOICE OF LAW FOLLOWING TRANSFER FOR IMPROPER VENUE	430
	PART D TRANSFER TO COURT WITH EXCLUSIVE SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION	431
§ 9.14	SECTION 1631 IS BROADLY PHRASED TO ALLOW TRANSFER BETWEEN FEDERAL COURTS	431
§ 9.15	PREREQUISITES FOR TRANSFEREE COURT	432
	PART E APPELLATE REVIEW OF TRANSFER ORDERS	432
§ 9.16	TRANSFER ORDERS USUALLY NOT IMMEDIATELY APPEALABLE	432
§ 9.17	DETERMINATION OF PROPER CIRCUIT IN WHICH TO SEEK APPELLATE REVIEW	435
[1]	Appellate Review If Motion to Transfer Denied	435
[2]	Appellate Review If Motion to Transfer Granted	436
	PART F COMMON LAW DOCTRINE OF FORUM NON CONVENIENS DISMISSAL	436
§ 9.18	PURPOSE OF FORUM NON CONVENIENS DOCTRINE	436
§ 9.19	DOCTRINE APPLIES IN FEDERAL COURTS ONLY WHEN ALTERNATIVE FORUM IS ABROAD	436
§ 9.20	COURT MUST APPLY FEDERAL LAW OF FORUM NON CONVENIENS	437
§ 9.21	COURT WEIGHS MULTIPLE FACTORS IN DECIDING FORUM NON CONVENIENS MOTION	437
[1]	Doctrine Is Flexible	437
[2]	Two Elements Required for Dismissal	438
[a]	First Element: Alternative Forum Must Be Adequate	438
[b]	Second Element: Convenience of Parties and Ends of Justice	

Table of Contents

 Must Be Best Served by Dismissing Action 441

§ 9.22 DEFERENCE TO PLAINTIFF’S CHOICE OF FORUM 442

 [1] Courts Give Deference to American Plaintiff’s Choice of Forum 442

 [2] Foreign Plaintiff’s Choice of Forum Generally Given Less
 Deference 443

§ 9.23 COURT HAS NO POWER TO DISMISS ACTIONS ARISING
UNDER CERTAIN FEDERAL STATUTES 444

§ 9.24 FORUM SELECTION CLAUSE MAY AFFECT ANALYSIS OF
MOTION 445

 [1] Mandatory Forum Selection Clause Enforced Through Motion to
 Dismiss Under Forum Non Conveniens Principles 445

 [2] Normal Forum Non Conveniens Analysis Applies to Permissive
 Forum Selection Clause 446

§ 9.25 PROCEDURES ON FORUM NON CONVENIENS DISMISSAL
MOTION 446

 [1] Timing of Motion 446

 [2] Court May Dismiss on Forum Non Conveniens Grounds Without
 First Deciding Jurisdictional Issues 447

 [3] Defendant Has Burden of Proving All Elements 447

§ 9.26 APPELLATE REVIEW 448

 [1] Grant of Forum Non Conveniens Motion Is Appealable as Final
 Order 448

 [2] Denial of Forum Non Conveniens Motion Subject to Limited
 Review 448

 [3] Court’s Grant or Denial of Motion Subject to Abuse of Discretion
 Standard 449

Chapter 10 MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION 451

§ 10.01 CONDUCT OF MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION 451

 [1] Overview of Multidistrict Litigation Statute 451

 [a] Purpose of Multidistrict Litigation Statutory Scheme 451

 [b] Operation of Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation 452

 [c] Jurisdiction of Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation 453

 [2] Multidistrict Litigation Defined 454

§ 10.02 PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE BEFORE JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION 455

 [1] Practice Before Panel and Representation in Transferred Actions 455

 [2] Who May Seek Transfer and Consolidation 455

 [3] Conditional Transfer Orders for Tag-Along Actions 456

 [3] Termination and Remand 457

§ 10.03 BASES FOR ORDERING TRANSFER OF AN ACTION 458

 [1] Prerequisites for Transfer 458

Table of Contents

[a]	Balancing Statutory Prerequisites	458
[b]	Actions Involving Common Questions of Fact	459
[c]	Convenience of Parties and Witnesses	460
[d]	Just and Efficient Conduct of Actions	461
[e]	Mass Actions May Not Be Transferred	462
[2]	Selection of Transferee Forum	463
[3]	Selection of Transferee Judge	466
§ 10.04	JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY OF TRANSFEROR COURTS . . .	467
[1]	Orders Issued Prior to Transfer and During Pendency of Action Before Judicial Panel	467
[2]	Motions and Orders Before Court at Time of Transfer	468
[3]	Upon Remand of Action	469
§ 10.05	JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY OF TRANSFEREE COURT	470
[1]	Scope of Authority	470
[a]	Judicial Authority	470
[b]	Conduct of Pretrial Proceedings	470
[2]	Governing Substantive Law	474
[a]	Choice of Law Principles	474
[b]	State Law	474
[c]	Federal Law	475
[3]	Power to Remand, Retain, or Transfer Actions	476
[a]	Authority over Remands	476
[b]	No Power to Retain or Transfer Actions	476
[c]	Power to Retain Actions for Settlement Purposes	478
[4]	Appeal of Decisions of Transferee Court	478
<hr/>		
DIVISION III	INTERRELATIONSHIP OF STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS	481
<hr/>		
Chapter 11	DUAL FEDERAL-STATE JUDICIAL SYSTEMS	483
<hr/>		
§ 11.01	HISTORICAL BASIS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE AND FEDERAL SYSTEMS	483
[1]	Colonial Courts	483
[2]	Admiralty Courts	483
[3]	Federal Courts Under the Articles of Confederation	484
[4]	Constitutional Creation of a Federal Judiciary	485
[5]	State Courts at the Ratification of the Constitution	486
§ 11.02	THE DUAL COURT SYSTEM AND THE JUDICIARY ACTS OF 1789 AND 1875	486
§ 11.03	VARIATIONS AMONG CONTEMPORARY STATE COURT SYSTEMS	487

Table of Contents

§ 11.04	THE CONTEMPORARY FEDERAL COURT SYSTEM	488
[1]	Courts of Limited Jurisdiction	488
[2]	Article III Courts	488
[3]	Article I Courts	489
§ 11.05	CONSEQUENCES OF A DUAL COURT SYSTEM	490
[1]	Parallel State and Federal Proceedings: Repetitive Lawsuits	490
[2]	Parallel State and Federal Proceedings: Reactive Lawsuits	491
[3]	Duplicative Litigation and Preclusion Doctrine	492
[4]	Mechanisms for Coping with Duplicative Litigation	493
Chapter 12	THE ANTI-INJUNCTION ACTS	495
§ 12.01	HISTORY OF THE ANTI-INJUNCTION ACTS	495
[1]	Early Anti-Injunction Legislation	495
[2]	Theory of the Anti-Injunction Statutes	495
[3]	Judicial Interpretation of Federal Injunctive Power Before 1948	496
[4]	The <i>Toucey</i> Decision	496
[5]	Legislative Reaction to <i>Toucey</i> Decision	497
§ 12.02	THE MODERN ANTI-INJUNCTION ACT	497
[1]	The Anti-Injunction Acts	497
[2]	Purpose of Anti-Injunction Acts	498
[3]	Broad Prohibition on Federal Injunctive Power	498
[4]	Application of Anti-Injunction Act	499
[a]	What Constitutes a Court	499
[b]	What Constitutes an “Injunction”	500
[c]	What Constitutes a “Proceeding”	500
[5]	Parties and Proceedings Beyond Scope of Act	502
[a]	United States Government	502
[b]	Federal Agencies	502
[c]	Strangers to Earlier Litigation	502
[d]	Commencement of Proceedings	503
[e]	Arbitration Proceedings	503
[f]	Suits in Foreign Countries	504
[g]	Temporary Restraining Orders	504
§ 12.03	EXCEPTIONS TO THE ANTI-INJUNCTION ACT	505
[1]	First Exception: “Expressly Authorized” by Act of Congress	505
[a]	Function of Exception	505
[b]	Recognized Express Exceptions	505
[i]	Bankruptcy Proceedings	505
[ii]	Removal Actions	506
[iii]	Civil Rights Actions	507
[iv]	Antitrust Actions	508

Table of Contents

[c]	Inconsistent Application of “Expressly Authorized” Exception	509
[2]	Second Exception: “When Necessary in Aid of” Federal Court Jurisdiction	510
[a]	Function of Exception	510
[b]	Application of the Exception	512
[i]	Removal Actions	512
[ii]	Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction	512
[iii]	Simultaneous Duplicative Litigation	513
[iv]	The <i>In Rem</i> Exception	514
[v]	Exception Does Not Apply to <i>In Personam</i> Proceedings	516
[vi]	Mischaracterization of Nature of Jurisdiction	517
[vii]	Class Actions and Complex Multidistrict Litigation	517
[3]	Third Exception: “To Protect or Effectuate Federal Court Judgments” — The Relitigation Exception	519
[a]	Function of Exception	519
[b]	Scope of the Exception	520
[c]	Relationship to Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel	521
[d]	Need for Final Judgment	523
[e]	Relationship to Full Faith and Credit Act	524
[f]	Timing Considerations	525
§ 12.04	EQUITABLE ENTITLEMENT FOR RELIEF	526
§ 12.05	THE ANTI-INJUNCTION ACT AND DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS	527
[1]	Declaratory Judgments Under Declaratory Judgment Act	527
[2]	Declaratory Relief as an Injunctive Surrogate	528
§ 12.06	THE ANTI-INJUNCTION ACT AND THE ALL WRITS STATUTE	529
§ 12.07	THE TAX ANTI-INJUNCTION ACT	530
[1]	Function of Tax Anti-Injunction Act	530
[2]	Application of the Tax Anti-Injunction Act	530
[a]	Definition of What Constitutes a Tax	530
[b]	Plain, Speedy, and Efficient State Remedy	532
[c]	Relationship to Full Faith and Credit Act	532
[d]	Declaratory Judgments Similar to Injunction	533
[e]	Exceptions to Tax Anti-Injunction Act	533
[i]	United States Government	533
[ii]	Original Supreme Court Jurisdiction	533
[iii]	Statutory Exceptions to Tax Anti-Injunction Act	534

Table of Contents

Chapter 13	THE ABSTENTION DOCTRINE	535
§ 13.01	ABSTENTION IN FEDERAL COURT PROCEEDINGS: INTRODUCTION	535
[1]	Declining the Jurisdiction of Federal Courts	535
[2]	Rationales Underlying the Abstention Doctrines: General Approaches	535
§ 13.02	ABSTENTION TO AVOID FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RULINGS: <i>PULLMAN</i> ABSTENTION	537
[1]	Origin of <i>Pullman</i> Doctrine	537
[2]	Prerequisites for <i>Pullman</i> Abstention	539
[a]	Required Elements	539
[b]	Uncertain Question of State Law	539
[c]	State Construction Limiting Need for Federal Constitutional Ruling	540
[i]	Statute Must Be Susceptible of Construction	540
[ii]	Standards for Construction	541
[iii]	Interpretive Approaches	541
[3]	Balancing Costs of Abstention	542
[a]	Considerations of Federalism Outweigh Concerns over Cost and Delay	542
[b]	Litigation Involving Fundamental Rights	543
[c]	Adequate State Procedure	544
[4]	Criticism of <i>Pullman</i> Abstention	544
§ 13.03	ABSTENTION BECAUSE OF UNCLEAR STATE LAW IN DIVERSITY CASES: <i>THIBODAUX</i> ABSTENTION	546
[1]	Diversity Jurisdiction and the Propriety of Federal Abstention	546
[2]	<i>Thibodaux</i> Case	546
[3]	The <i>Mashuda</i> Case	547
[4]	Reconciling the <i>Thibodaux</i> and <i>Mashuda</i> Decisions	548
[5]	Prerequisites for <i>Thibodaux</i> Abstention	548
[6]	Application of <i>Thibodaux</i> Abstention	549
[7]	<i>Pullman</i> Abstention Distinguished	550
§ 13.04	ABSTENTION IN DEFERENCE TO COMPREHENSIVE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES: <i>BURFORD</i> ABSTENTION	551
[1]	<i>Burford</i> Case	551
[2]	Development of Doctrine Since <i>Burford</i>	552
[a]	<i>Alabama Public Service Commission</i> Case	552
[b]	Criticism of <i>Alabama Public Service Commission</i>	553
[c]	The <i>NOPSI</i> Decision	554
[d]	Post- <i>NOPSI</i> Applications of <i>Burford</i> Abstention	555
[e]	The <i>Quackenbush</i> Decision: Application to Legal Claims	556
[3]	<i>Pullman</i> Abstention Distinguished	558

Table of Contents

§ 13.05	ABSTENTION TO AVOID INTERFERENCE WITH PENDING STATE PROCEEDINGS: “OUR FEDERALISM”	
	— <i>YOUNGER v. HARRIS</i>	558
[1]	Pre- <i>Younger</i> Doctrine	558
[2]	<i>Younger</i> Decision and Rationale	559
[3]	Relationship of <i>Younger</i> Doctrine to Anti-Injunction Act	561
[4]	Criticism of <i>Younger</i> Doctrine	562
[5]	Expansion of <i>Younger</i> Doctrine	563
[a]	Pending State Proceedings: Availability of Declaratory and Monetary Relief	563
[i]	Availability of Declaratory Relief	563
[ii]	Availability of Monetary Relief	564
[b]	Absence of Pending State Proceedings: Availability of Declaratory and Injunctive Relief	565
[i]	Availability of Declaratory Relief	565
[ii]	Nature and Timing of State Proceedings	565
[iii]	Availability of Injunctive Relief	567
[c]	Pending State Civil Proceedings	568
[i]	Civil Enforcement Proceedings	568
[ii]	Proceedings Involving Important State Interests	569
[d]	Application to Pending State Administrative Proceedings	571
[e]	Application to Executive Branches of State and Local Governments	574
[6]	Exceptions to <i>Younger</i> Doctrine	574
[a]	Bad Faith Prosecutions	574
[b]	Patently Unconstitutional Laws	576
[c]	Unavailability of Adequate State Forum	576
[d]	Waiver	577
§ 13.06	ABSTENTION FOR REASONS OF SOUND JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION: <i>COLORADO RIVER</i> ABSTENTION	578
[1]	Parallel, Duplicative Litigation, and Judicial Efficiency	578
[2]	Inroads on the Problem of Duplicative Litigation	579
[3]	The <i>Colorado River</i> Decision: Exceptional Circumstances Defined	579
[4]	The <i>Will</i> Decision: Exceptional Circumstances Revisited	581
[5]	The <i>Moses Cone</i> Decision: Exceptional Circumstances Expanded	582
[a]	Six Factors Considered	583
[6]	Prerequisites for Colorado River Abstention	584
[a]	Parallel State Proceedings	584
[b]	Exceptional Circumstances	585
[7]	Appropriateness in Declaratory Judgment Suits	585
[a]	<i>Wilton</i> Decision: District Court Has Discretion	585
[b]	Appellate Review for Abuse of Discretion	588

Table of Contents

[8] Unresolved Questions in *Colorado River* Abstention Stay of Proceedings — Retention of Federal Court Jurisdiction 588

[a] Defining and Balancing Exceptional Circumstances 588

[b] Claims Within Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction 589

§ 13.07 PROCEDURAL OPTIONS IN ABSTENTION PROCEEDINGS 590

[1] Stay of Proceedings, Retention of Federal Court Jurisdiction, or Dismissal 590

[a] *Pullman* Abstention 590

[b] *Thibodaux* Abstention 591

[c] *Burford* Abstention 591

[d] *Younger* Abstention 591

[e] *Colorado River* Abstention 592

[2] Dismissal without Prejudice 592

[3] Certification of Questions to State Court 593

[4] Appeal of Abstention Orders 594

[5] Standard of Review 595

Chapter 14 THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT AND STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY 597

§ 14.01 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY IN ENGLAND 597

§ 14.02 THE EARLY AMERICAN EXPERIENCE 600

[1] Nineteenth Century Views on Sovereign Immunity 600

[2] The Doctrine of *Ex Parte Young* 601

§ 14.03 MODERN STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT FOR FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS 601

§ 14.04 BASIS AND RATIFICATION OF ELEVENTH AMENDMENT 604

[1] *Chisholm v. Georgia* 604

[2] Reaction to *Chisholm*; Ratification of Eleventh Amendment 605

§ 14.05 SCOPE OF CONSTITUTIONAL IMMUNITY: INTERPRETIVE THEORIES OF ELEVENTH AMENDMENT 605

[1] Significance of Interpretive Theories 605

[2] Constitutional Limitation on Subject Matter Jurisdiction 606

[3] Restoration of Common-Law Immunity From Suits 607

[4] Restriction of Federal Diversity Jurisdiction 609

[5] Literal Reading of Eleventh Amendment 610

[6] *Alden v. Maine* 611

§ 14.06 APPLICATION OF THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT: ACTIONS BARRED 612

[1] Suits Against State by Citizens of Another State 612

[2] Suits Against State by Citizens of Foreign Country 612

Table of Contents

[3]	Suits Against State by Its Own Citizens	612
[4]	Suits Against States in Admiralty	613
[5]	Suits Against States by Foreign Countries	614
[6]	Suits Against States by Native American Tribes	614
[7]	Suits Against Persons and Entities Other Than State Governments	616
[a]	Suit Against State Officer in Official or Representative Capacity	616
[b]	Supplemental (Pendent) State-Law Claim Against State Officer	617
[c]	Suit Against Political Subdivision That Acts as Arm of State	618
[d]	Suits Against State Agencies and Boards Acting as Arm of State	619
[1]	General Rule	619
[2]	Tests for Determining Whether Agency or Board Is Acting as Arm of State	620
[3]	Source of Payment and Legal Liability Are Critical Factors	621
[4]	Federal Law Controls	621
[e]	Administrative Actions	621
§ 14.07	ACTIONS PERMITTED CONSISTENT WITH ELEVENTH AMENDMENT SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY	624
[1]	Suits by United States Government Against State	624
[2]	Suits by One State Against Another	625
[3]	Suits Against States in State Courts	626
[a]	Suits in Courts of Defendant State	626
[b]	Suits in Other States' Courts	626
[c]	Supreme Court Review	626
[4]	Suits Against Political Subdivisions Such as Municipalities and Counties	627
§ 14.08	EXCEPTIONS TO THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT	627
[1]	Suits Against State Officers in Individual Capacity	627
[a]	Distinction Between Official and Individual Capacity	627
[b]	Determining Whether Officer Is Being Sued in Individual Capacity	628
[2]	Suits Against State Officers in Official Capacity	629
[a]	Suits for Monetary Relief Barred	629
[b]	Suits for Injunctive Relief Permitted	629
[c]	Enforcement of Federal Consent Decree Permitted	630
[3]	Suits Against Individual State Officers for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief	631
[a]	<i>Ex parte Young</i> Doctrine	631
[i]	Suits Permitted for Prospective Relief	631
[ii]	<i>Ex parte Young</i> Case	633
[iii]	Ongoing Violation of Federal Law Required	634
[b]	Consequences of <i>Ex Parte Young</i>	635
[4]	Suits Against State Officers in Individual Capacity for Monetary	

Table of Contents

	Relief	636
[a]	Prospective vs. Retroactive Relief	636
[b]	Determining Whether Relief Sought Is Prospective or Retroactive	638
[5]	Ancillary Relief	639
§ 14.09	WAIVER AND CONSENT	640
[1]	Explicit Waivers	640
[2]	Waiver by Removal	642
[3]	Participating in Federal Program Expressly Conditioned on Waiver . . .	643
[4]	Implicit or Constructive Waivers Barred	645
§ 14.10	SUITS PURSUANT TO FEDERAL STATUTES	646
[1]	Statutes Adopted Pursuant to Section 5 of Fourteenth Amendment . . .	646
[a]	Congressional Power to Abrogate State Sovereign Immunity	646
[b]	Determining Congressional Intent to Abrogate Eleventh Amendment Immunity	647
[c]	Enactment Must Fall Within Congress’s Section 5 Enforcement Powers Under Fourteenth Amendment	649
[i]	Abrogation Only Pursuant to Section 5	649
[ii]	Legislation Must Enforce Not Expand Rights	650
[a]	Statutes Abrogating State Sovereign Immunity	652
[b]	Statutes Not Abrogating State Sovereign Immunity	653
[2]	Statutes Adopted Under Other Congressional Powers	654
Chapter 15	APPLICABLE LAW IN FEDERAL COURT: THE <i>ERIE</i> DOCTRINE	657
	PART A DEVELOPMENT OF THE <i>ERIE</i> DOCTRINE	657
§ 15.01	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE APPLICABLE LAW PROBLEM	657
[1]	Section 34 of Judiciary Act of 1789 and Doctrine of <i>Swift v. Tyson</i>	657
[2]	The <i>Erie</i> Decision	659
[a]	Facts and Holdings	659
[b]	Is <i>Erie</i> A Constitutionally Based Decision?	659
[c]	Purposes of <i>Erie</i> Doctrine: The “Twin Aims” of <i>Erie</i>	660
[d]	Promulgation of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	660
§ 15.02	EARLY EFFORTS TO DISTINGUISH SUBSTANCE FROM PROCEDURE; OUTCOME-DETERMINATION ANALYSIS	661
[1]	The Outcome-Determination Test: The <i>Guaranty Trust</i> Decision	661
[2]	Refinement of the Outcome-Determination Test	662
§ 15.03	BALANCING OF COMPETING STATE AND FEDERAL INTERESTS: THE <i>BYRD</i> TEST	663

Table of Contents

§ 15.04	<i>HANNA v. PLUMER</i> : DETERMINING WHETHER TO APPLY STATE LAW OR FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE	665
[1]	General <i>Hanna</i> Analytical Approach: Federal Rule Applies if Pertinent and Valid Under Rules Enabling Act	665
[2]	Rules Enabling Act, Not Outcome-Determination, Is Test for Federal Rules	665
[3]	Determining Scope (Pertinence) of Federal Rule Under Rules Enabling Act	666
[a]	Federal Rule Must Be Sufficiently Broad to Control Situation	666
[b]	Rule Must Regulate Procedure	668
[c]	Rule May Not Abridge or Enlarge Substantive Rights	669
§ 15.05	ACCOMMODATION OF COMPETING STATE AND FEDERAL INTERESTS; <i>GASPERINI v. CENTER FOR HUMANITIES</i>	671
	PART B SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS OF ERIE DOCTRINE	673
§ 15.06	RULE 3 DOES NOT DISPLACE STATE LAW GOVERNING TOLLING OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS	673
§ 15.07	RULE 4 DOES NOT DISPLACE STATE LAW GOVERNING PERSONAL JURISDICTION	674
§ 15.08	RULE 15(c) INCORPORATES STATE RELATION-BACK RULES	675
§ 15.09	RULE 23.1 AND STATE SECURITY REQUIREMENTS IN SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE SUITS	676
§ 15.10	RULE 68 AND STATE LAW ON ATTORNEYS' FEES OR PENALTIES ON LOSING DEFENDANTS	676
§ 15.11	STATE LAWS AFFECTING ACCESS TO STATE COURTS: STATE DOOR-CLOSING STATUTES	677
§ 15.12	SANCTIONS UNDER FEDERAL COURT'S INHERENT POWER	678
§ 15.13	JURISDICTION AND VENUE ISSUES: CONTRACT CLAUSES PURPORTING TO CONFER PERSONAL JURISDICTION	679
§ 15.14	FORUM NON CONVENIENS	679
§ 15.15	FUNCTIONS OF JUDGE AND JURY	680
[1]	Federal Policy Favoring Jury Trial Applies	680
[2]	Federal Law Generally Governs Review of Jury Verdicts	680
§ 15.16	FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE AND STATE EVIDENTIARY PROVISIONS	681
[1]	Federal Rules Generally Apply in Federal Court	681
[2]	Some State Evidentiary Rules Are Substantive and Are Applied in Federal Court	682
	PART C DETERMINING THE CONTENT OF STATE LAW	682
§ 15.17	BINDING EFFECT OF STATE COURT DECISIONS	682
[1]	Decisions of State's Highest Court Are Binding on Federal Courts	682
[2]	Decisions of Intermediate State Appellate Courts Usually Must Be Followed	684

Table of Contents

[3]	Trial Court Decisions Usually Are Not Binding	685
§ 15.18	APPELLATE COURTS MUST APPLY CHANGE IN STATE LAW THAT OCCURS WHILE APPEAL IS PENDING	686
§ 15.19	DETERMINING STATE LAW WHEN IT IS UNSETTLED	687
[1]	Difficulty in Determining State Law Does Not Justify Dismissal	687
[2]	Federal Court Must Predict How State’s Highest Court Would Rule	688
[3]	Policy Against Expanding State Law	690
[4]	Interpreting Statutes Never Construed by State Court	690
§ 15.20	COURT OF APPEALS <i>DE NOVO</i> REVIEW OF STATE LAW DETERMINATION	691
	PART D CHOICE OF STATE SUBSTANTIVE LAW	692
§ 15.21	DETERMINING WHICH STATE LAW APPLIES IN DIVERSITY CASES	692
[1]	The <i>Klaxon</i> Rule: Court Generally Must Apply Choice of Law Rules of State in Which It Sits	692
[2]	After Transfer of Venue for Convenience, Transferor State’s Choice of Law Rules Apply: The <i>Van Dusen</i> and <i>Ferens</i> Rules	693
[3]	After Transfer Because of Improper Venue, Transferee Court Applies Choice of Law Rules of State in Which it Sits	695
[4]	Applicable Law When Transferor Court Lacks Personal Jurisdiction	696
	PART E FEDERAL COMMON LAW	697
§ 15.22	AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL COURTS TO CREATE FEDERAL COMMON LAW	697
[1]	General Principles	697
[2]	Areas in Which Federal Courts Create Common Law	698
[a]	Interstitial Federal Common Law	698
[b]	Suits Involving Proprietary Interests of United States	700
[i]	Federal Common Law Is Not Applied to Private Litigation Not Affecting Rights and Duties of United States	700
[ii]	Federal Common Law Is Not Applied to Private Litigation Not Affecting Rights and Duties of United States	701
[iii]	Adopting State Law as Federal Common Law in Interstitial and Proprietary Interest Cases	702
[iv]	Borrowing State Statutes of Limitations	703
[c]	Application of Federal Common Law in Suits Between States	705
[d]	Federal Common Law and International Relations	707
[e]	Federal Common Law in Maritime and Admiralty Cases	708
[f]	Federal Common Law and Native American Relations and Land Rights	709

Table of Contents

PART F APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW IN STATE COURTS 710

§ 15.23 STATE COURTS MUST HEAR FEDERAL CLAIMS IF THEY
HAVE APPROPRIATE JURISDICTION UNDER STATE LAW 710

§ 15.24 STATE COURTS MAY REFUSE JURISDICTION OVER
FEDERAL CLAIMS UNDER NEUTRAL STATE
PROCEDURAL RULES 711

§ 15.25 STATE COURTS MAY NOT APPLY STATE LAW IN FEDERAL
CLAIMS TO DEFEAT FEDERAL RIGHTS 712

Appendix **SELECTED PROVISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES
CONSTITUTION, THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL
PROCEDURE, AND TITLE 28, UNITED STATES
CODE 713**

TABLE OF CASES TC-1

TABLE OF STATUTES TS-1

INDEX I-1
