**Supreme Court Cases: 1803-2015**
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| Case Name and Year | Chief Justice | Issue | Background | Outcome |
| *Marbury v. Madison*  1803 | Marshall | Judicial Review  Checks & balances | Federalist v. Dem. Republicans  Jefferson beat Adams in the election of 1800; Adam’s Federalists tried to hold onto power with appointments of new “midnight judges” to federal courts | Marbury (Federalist appointee) lost his claim to his job. This case set the precedent of judicial review (meaning the court can interpret and rule upon the actions of Congress and the president). Established the firm role of the Supreme Court within the balanced powers for the first time |
| *Fletcher v. Peck*  1810 | Marshall | Property rights  Sanctity of contracts | The Georgia legislature was bribed by land speculators; Georgia voters elected a new legislature and sued to invalidate crooked property deeds. | The Supreme Court ruled that the land deed stands; reflecting a laissez faire approach to business. This set the precedent for the impeding regulation on big business in the 1800s |
| *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*  1819 | Marshall | Sanctity of Contract/charters | New Hampshire wanted more state/ public control over Dartmouth College, but King George III chartered the school as independent and private | The Supreme Court ruled that the charter stand; reflecting a laissez faire approach to business. This set the precedent for the impeding regulation on big business in the 1800s |
| *Mcculloch v. Maryland*  1819 | Marshall | Necessary & Proper (elastic clause)  National Supremacy  National Bank | Maryland (like many southern states was hostile to the national bank because they believed it unconstitutional  MD imposed a tax on the the Baltimore branch of the national bank, which the bank’s clerk refused to pay | The Supreme Court ruled that the national bank is constitutional based on the power of Congress to regulate commerce and the necessary and proper (elastic clause). MD cannot tax the bank because of the principle of national supremacy.  “The power to tax is the power to destroy” and MD could not be given that power over the bank |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Case Name and Year | Chief Justice | Issue | Background | Outcome |
| *Gibbons v. Ogden*  1824 | Marshall | Interstate commerce; national supremacy | Gibbons & Ogden ran steamboats ferrying passengers and goods from NY to NJ. Gibbons sued to protect his state issued monopoly license from competition from Ogden’s federally licensed operation | Gibbons lost. The Court ruled that national laws are supreme over state laws. Only the national government can regulate interstate commerce. (This case would be a precedent for later cases on the regulation of big businesses like railroads and telegraph companies) |
| *Cherokee nation v.n*  *Georgia*  1830  *Worcester v. Georgia*  1832 | Marshall | Indian Removal Act | 1830: Georgia annexed Cherokee lands, abolished their government, courts, and laws and tried to distribute their property to whites. The Cherokee Nation sought a federal injunction against laws passed by the State of Georgia depriving them of their rights and displacing them from their land within its boundaries. They asserted that the laws violated treaties the Cherokee Nation had negotiated with the U.S. In Worcester in 1832, Georgia passed a law that white people couldn’t reside with the Cheroke | In 1830 the court ruled that the Cherokee Nation did not constitute a foreign nation (under Article III of the Constitution )and therefore the court lacked jurisdiction to hear the claims. They could not strike down state laws. In 1832, the Court ruled the Cherokee Nation constituted a nation holding distinct sovereign powers. The court chastised Georgia and stated the Cherokee had the right to live free from the state’s trespasses. |
| *Dred Scott v. Sanford*  1857 | Taney | Slaves and civil rights | Dred Scott was an enslaved person who lived on free land. His enslaver had transported him across state lines to a free state and then back to a slave state. He sued his enslaver for emancipation | Scott lost the case; SC ruled that Scott “had no rights a white man was bound to respect.” This violated the Missouri compromise and prompted Lincoln to run for office |
| Case Name and Year | Chief Justice | Issue | Background | Outcome |
| *Ex parte Milligan*  1866 | Chase | Military tribunals | Lincoln suspended Habeas Corpus & arrested Milligan for plot against Indiana state government during the Civil War | The Supreme Court ruled that citizens cannot be tried in military tribunals. Court case that found that President Lincoln went beyond his legal powers to suppress dissenters during the American Civil War. The decision also helped establish the tradition that presidential and military action "based on war" had limits. |
| *Slaughterhouse Cases*  1873 | Chase | Civil rights; 14th Amendment | State of Louisiana granted a monopoly to a slaughterhouse company | The court ruled that citizen’s “privileges and immunities,” as protected by the Constitution’s 14th Amendment against the states, were limited to those spelled out in the Constitution and did not include many rights given by the individual states |
| *Munn v. Illinois*  1876 | Waite | State regulation of business | IL Grangers (Farmers advocates ) passed laws to regulate RR industry | States may regulate grain elevators on railroad because they are *intrastate* commerce |
| *Wabash v. Illinois*  1886 | Waite | Interstate regulation of business | Illoinis grangers passed laws to regulate interstate RR commerce | The court overrule Illinois law because states can’t regulate interstate commerce; Federal government later passed Interstate Commerce Act |
| *US v. EC Knight Co.*  1895 | Fuller | State regulation of monopolies | State tried to regulate oil monopoly (antitrust law) | The court overruled state antitrust law because oil company was an interstate business |
| *Plessy v. Ferguson*  1896 | Fuller | African American rights; 14th amendment | Creole man refused to move from his seat on RR; He was arrested under segregation law | Court ruled that segregation is legal; “separate but equal” overturned by Brown v. Board |
| Case Name and Year | Chief Justice | Issue | Background | Outcome |
| *Insular Cases*  1901-1905 | Fuller | Rights for residents of annexed territories | In late 1800s, the US gained control over Guam, Puerto Rico, Philippines, Alaska and Hawaii | SC ruled full citizenship rights for Alaska and Hawaii, limited rights in other territories |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Northern Securities v. US*  1904 | Fuller | Trust busting | T. Roosevelt used Sherman to bust RR trust | Northern securities were dissolved…victory for progressives |
| *Lochner v. NY*  1905 | Fuller | Labor Laws | Bakers wanted to reduce hours (10 hrs/ day no more than 60/week | SC overturned the labor law; said 14th amendment did not provide hr limitations; blow to progressive movement |
| *Schenck v. US*  1919 | White | Freedom of speech in wartime | WWI-Schenck tried to convince young men to resist the draft in violation of the Espionage and Sedition Acts. | SC ruled that freedom of speech can be restricted in wartime… clear and present danger… falsely shouting fire in a crowded theater |
| *US v.. Butler*  1936 | Hughes | Gov regulation of industry | NIRA (National Industrial Recovery Act) created partial employment, fair wages, etc | SC overturned NIRA  Led to FDR’s court packing scheme |
| *Schechter Poultry v US*  1936 | Huges | Gov regulation of industry | AAA-gov. Paid subsidies to p farmers to cut production; $ came from tax on producers  Taking from rich & giving to poor | SC overturned AAA led to court packing scheme |
| *Korematsu v. US*  1944 | Stone | Wartime powers; 14th amendment | Japanese American internment after Pearl Harbor | SC rule the internment did not violate 14th amendment wartime crisis; federal government later apologized & paid reparations to survivors |
| *Mendez v. Westminster*  1947 | Vinson | Segregation, 14th amendment | Mexican American family sued to integrate children in to white CA schools unter 14th amendment | SC ruled that schools had to be integrated  Mexican Brown v. Board |
| Case Name and Year | Chief Justice | Issue | Background | Outcome |
| *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education*  1954 | Warren | 14th Amendment; equal protection | Brown’s parents sued to integrate their daughter into a white school | SC ruled that separate is inherently unequal. Public schools must be integrated; some southern states put up massive resistance to the decision |
| *Gideon v Wainwright*  1963 | Warren | Rights of the accused; 6th amendment | Gideon was arrested for burglary; lost case because he couldn’t afford a lawyer; he studied law and appealed case to SC | SC ruled that states must provide an attorney to poor defendants |
| *Griswold V. Connecticut* 1965 | Warren | 9th amendment | CT law prohibited married couples from using condoms and birth control pills | Laws criminalizing the use of contraceptives violated marital privacy. Privacy established as key right under the 9th amendment. Later used as precedent for Roe v. Wade and other privacy cases |
| *Miranda v Arizona*  1966 | Warren | Rights of the accused; 5th amendment | Ernesto Mirando was an accused rapist; confessed to police when he was taken to jail | SC ruled that police officers must inform suspects of their rights |
| *Tinker v. Des Moines*  1969 | Warren | 1st amendment | High school students wore black armbands with peace symbols on them to protest the Vietnam War during school | The 1st amendment does not permit public schools to punish students for expressing beliefs, so long as student behavior does not create interference with school discipline or the rights of other |
| *New York Times v US*  1971 | Burger | 1st amendment | Daniel Ellsberg leaked the “Pentagon Papers” to nYT and Washington Post; US gov sued to prevent publication | SC rejected government’s argument b/c the Pentagon Papers were mostly “historical” and government cannon exercise a “prior restraint on the press; support for Vietnam War continued to decline |
| Case Name and Year | Chief Justice | Issue | Background | Outcome |
| *Roe v. Wade*  1973 | Burger | Right to privacy; Abortion | Roe was an unmarried young woman who couldn’t get an abortion in Texas | SC ruled that women have right to abortion as right to privacy; also esatblished restrictions on when over the course of a pregnancy abortion can occur |
| *US v. Nixon*  1974 | Burger | Executive privilege | Watergate Scandal; Nixon had evidence on audiotapes; investigators wanted him to turn over evidence; Nixon claimed exec. privilege | SC ruler that Nixon had to turn tapes; Nixon resigned to avoid impeachment |
| *Regents v. Bakke*  1978 | Burger | Affirmative Action; 14th amendment | Bakke was rejected by US Medical School; he claimed violation of 14th amendment b/c affirmative action discriminates against white men | SC ruled that affirmative action was constitutional but no quotas; encouraged diversity in education and the workplace |
| *Texas v. Johnson*  1989 | Burger | 1st amendment; Symbolic speech | Johnson burned flag outside Republican National Convention in Dallas; arrested for “desecration of the flag” | SC ruled that gov cannot restrict ideas simply because they are offensive; protected freedom of “symbolic speech” |
| *Bush v. Gore*  2000 | Rehnquist | 2000 election | 2000 election was very close; winner of Florida would determine outcome of electoral college; Gore sued for a hand recount | In 5-4 decision along party lines; SC ordered stop to recount; Bush won |
| *Hamadan v. Rumsfeld*  2006 | Roberts | International Law | After 9/11 foreign terrorists sustspects were held at Guntanamo Bay Prison and faced military tribunals with very restricted rights | SC ruled that tribunals violated the Geneva Convention and military regulations; however many Guantanao suspects have yet to released or tried |
| Case Name and Year | Chief Justice | Issue | Background | Outcome |
| *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*  2010 | Roberts | 1st amendment; Campaign finance | Congress passed law to restrict corporate, PAC, and union contributions to political campaigns | SC ruled that restrictions violate 1st amendment; “money is speech” severe blow to campaign finance reform |
| *US v. Windsor*  2013  *Obergefell v. Hodges*  2015 | Roberts | Same sex marriage | In 1966, Congress paste the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) which denied federal benefits to same-sex couples and ensure that states that ban gay marriage do not have to recognize such marriages performed in other states | In *Windsor,* the SC struck down the section of DOMA denying federal benefits to same-se couples. In *Obergefell,*  the court declare same-sex marriage a protected constitutional right, striking down all states bands on same-sex marriage |