

1 **CALDARELLI HEJMANOWSKI PAGE & LEER LLP**
 2 William J. Caldarelli (SBN 149573)
 3 Lee E. Hejmanowski (SBN 166236)
 4 Ben West (SBN 251018)
 5 3398 Carmel Mountain Rd., Suite 250
 6 San Diego, CA 92121
 7 Telephone: (858) 720-8080
 8 Email: wjc@chpllaw.com; dbw@chpllaw.com; leh@chpllaw.com
 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff Ameranth, Inc.
 10 Additional counsel for Plaintiff listed below.

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 12 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 IN RE: AMERANTH PATENT
 14 LITIGATION

15 **Lead Case No. 11-cv-1810 DMS (WVG)**
 16 **AMERANTH, INC.’S NOTICE OF**
 17 **SUPREME COURT ORDER ON**
 18 **PETITION FOR WRIT OF**
 19 ***CERTIORARI* [DKT. NO. 1484]**

1 **FABIANO LAW FIRM, P.C.**

2 Michael D. Fabiano (SBN #167058)
3 12526 High Bluff Drive, Suite 300
4 San Diego, CA 92130
5 Telephone: (619) 742-9631
6 mdfabiano@fabianolawfirm.com

7 **OSBORNE LAW LLC**

8 John W. Osborne (*Appointed Pro Hac Vice*)
9 33 Habitat Lane
10 Cortlandt Manor, NY 10567
11 Telephone: (914) 714-5936
12 josborne@osborneipl.com

13 **WATTS LAW OFFICES**

14 Ethan M. Watts (SBN #234441)
15 12340 El Camino Real, Suite 430
16 San Diego, CA 92130
17 Telephone: (858) 509-0808
18 Facsimile: (619) 878-5784
19 emw@ewattslaw.com

20 **WITKOW | BASKIN**

21 Brandon J. Witkow (SBN 210443)
22 Erin C. Witkow (SBN 216994)
23 21031 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 603
24 Woodland Hills, California 91364
25 Telephone: (818) 296-9508
26 bw@witkowlaw.com
27 ew@witkowlaw.com

28 Attorneys for Plaintiff Ameranth, Inc.

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 Pursuant to the Court’s March 5, 2020 Order Regarding Stay [Dkt. No.
3 1484], plaintiff Ameranth, Inc. (“Ameranth”) hereby notifies this Court of the
4 United States Supreme Court’s decision on Ameranth’s writ of *certiorari*, and
5 provides its proposal for how to proceed with the various related cases before this
6 Court. Additionally, despite the fact that these consolidated cases have been
7 pending for nearly 10 years, including multiple multi-year stays (during CBM
8 proceedings, appeals, *etc.*), due to the significant impact of the COVID-19
9 pandemic on most of the hospitality industry Defendants, and in order to balance
10 Ameranth’s due process rights in its remaining patents and claims with the
11 interests of the Defendants, Ameranth proposes that the cases remain stayed
12 except for the limited purpose of necessary claim construction proceedings and
13 section 101 eligibility determinations (through cross-motions for summary
14 adjudication), followed by a round of mandatory judicial settlement conferences
15 with Judge Gallo. This approach is designed to attempt to efficiently resolve as
16 many cases as possible while imposing the smallest possible burdens on the
17 Defendants and the Court, especially while the COVID-19 pandemic continues to
18 negatively impact many of the Defendants and the hospitality industry with which
19 Ameranth and the Defendants operate.

20 **A. Supreme Court Decision on Ameranth’s Writ of *Certiorari***

21 On October 5, 2020, the Supreme Court issued an order denying
22 Ameranth’s writ of *certiorari*. A true and correct copy of the decision is attached
23 hereto as **Exhibit 1** (*see* p. 9).

24 **B. Status of Consolidated Cases and Remaining Valid Patent Claims**

25 As a result of the Supreme Court’s order, and the prior decision of the
26 Federal Circuit *affirming* the granting of summary judgment as to certain claims
27 of Ameranth’s ‘077 patent (Nos. 1, 6-9, 11, and 13-18) and *reversing* the decision
28

1 as to others (Nos. 4 and 5), which have unique limitations, the following six
2 claims of the ‘077 patent *remain valid*: Claim Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, and 12.

3 Although a claim construction hearing was held for the ‘077 patent and a
4 claim construction order was issued on December 28, 2017 (Dkt. No. 908), since
5 that time two additional claim construction issues arose in connection with further
6 briefing and with infringement and validity disputes. These additional claim
7 constructions issues are: (a) construction of the term “Master Menu” (*see* Dkt. No.
8 1236); and (b) the distinction between “generation,” which the Court ruled had to
9 occur outside the handheld device, and “integration,” which the Court signaled
10 may occur on the handheld device. Further, Ameranth believes that the
11 reservations and ticketing limitations of claims 4 and 5 require claim construction,
12 (as well as the reservation and ticketing claims in the related ‘060 patent).

13 Additionally, all twenty-three claims of the *other* related Ameranth patent at
14 issue in the consolidated proceedings before this Court (Ameranth’s ‘060 patent,
15 as addressed in Ameranth v. SplickIt, Case No. 17-cv-1093 DMS (WVG)) are still
16 valid and in effect. A claim construction hearing had originally been scheduled by
17 the Court for the ‘060 patent for June 2, 2020 (*see* Dkt. No. 35 in Case No. 17-cv-
18 1093), but was taken off calendar when all of the consolidated proceedings were
19 stayed. The ‘060 patent is a continuation-in-part of the ‘077 patent and utilizes
20 several similar claim terms (including ticketing and reservations limitations, but
21 without any menu generation/transmissions limitations), while also introducing
22 multiple new and significantly different inventive concepts. Consequently, there
23 are substantial efficiencies and advantages to consolidating or coordinating the
24 further claim construction proceedings for both the ‘077 and ‘060 patents.

25 In the two years since the consolidated litigation was stayed pending appeal
26 of the order granting Domino’s motion for summary judgment of unpatentability
27 (Dkt. No. 1405), Ameranth has continued to diligently analyze the Defendants’
28

1 products accused of infringing Ameranth’s patents. Over that period of time,
2 there have been substantial changes to the facts and evidence on which the
3 infringement cases were being prosecuted earlier. The scope of Ameranth’s
4 infringement cases was limited pursuant to this Court’s February 14, 2017 case
5 management order (Dkt. No. 623), which instructed Ameranth to select “one
6 representative version” of each Defendant’s accused system and to do so by
7 March 24, 2017, which Ameranth did. Over the three and one-half years that
8 have passed since then, the Defendants’ accused products have gone through
9 many revisions, modifications, and integrations, significantly changing the
10 analysis of which products, and which product versions, practice the various
11 claims of Ameranth’s patents (claims of both the ‘077 and ‘060 patents). For
12 example, Domino’s has made substantial, material changes to its system, as have
13 Starbucks, Papa Johns, OLO and many others. Reservations and ticketing
14 companies (such as OpenTable and Live Nation/Ticketmaster) have added food
15 ordering functionality to their systems, and food ordering companies, like
16 GrubHub/Seamless, have added and integrated reservations systems to their
17 products¹.

18 Ameranth has the right to assert claims for infringement both of the
19 remaining valid claims of the ‘077 patent and of the claims of the ‘060 patent,
20 against the current Defendants or others that practice those patent claims.
21 (Ameranth advised the Defendants of this position in correspondence responding
22 to the Defendants’ March 4, 2020 status report—see Exhibit 2). Such
23 infringement claims could be asserted through amended infringement contentions,
24 amended complaints, or new complaints (although, in light of the long pendency
25

26 ¹ During the same period of time, there have been numerous mergers, acquisitions,
27 and consolidations between the Defendants and within the various defendant
28 industry groups, significantly reducing the total number of Defendants and, in that
respect at least, simplifying the scope of the consolidated litigation.

1 of this action, the last alternative would seem to be the least efficient and most
2 time-consuming).

3 The length of the litigation-- including multiple detours through 17 serially
4 filed CBM petitions at the PTAB, the IPDEV “Priority of Invention” dispute, and
5 through the appellate court system-- has been burdensome on all parties and the
6 Court. Ameranth has no desire to unnecessarily or inefficiently extend or prolong
7 expensive and time-consuming litigation, especially in these very challenging
8 times. Therefore, Ameranth’s proposal for the future case management of these
9 matters seeks to fairly and reasonably take all of these factors into consideration.

10 In light of this Court’s prior ruling on section 101 ineligibility of multiple
11 claims of the ‘077 patent, and in an attempt to fairly balance the various
12 considerations and reach an equitable and legally sound outcome, Ameranth
13 outlines the following proposed case management sequence for the consolidated
14 litigation, which it believes can be completed in approximately six to eight
15 months. There should be negligible impact on or costs to any of the smaller
16 defendants, since the claim construction and section101 eligibility determinations
17 will be common to all parties.

18 **C. Proposed Case Management Structure and Schedule**

19 Ameranth suggests the following case management phases to efficiently
20 and fairly address the consolidated litigation²:

21 Phase 1: After the Defendants respond to Ameranth’s proposed Case
22 Management Structure and Schedule (assuming the Court invites and entertains
23 such response), Ameranth proposes that the Court hold a hearing to consider the
24 positions of the parties and then issue a formal case management order. This
25 phase would also include identification of the remaining Defendants in light of the

26 _____
27 ² Ameranth suggested a similar manner of proceeding in the February 28, 2020
28 hearing before this Court (see Dkt. No. 1482), and apprised the joint defense
group of its position in response to the defendant’s joint March 4, 2020 status
report in correspondence dated March 10, 2020. See Exhibit 2.

1 numerous mergers and consolidations that have occurred within the various
2 defendant industry groups.

3 Phase 2: Hold accelerated claim construction proceedings for: (a) the two
4 outstanding terms of the ‘077 patent requiring construction; and (b) no more than
5 five terms of the ‘060 patent.

6 Phase 3: Brief, hear, and rule upon cross-motions for summary
7 adjudication of the section 101 patent eligibility of the remaining six claims of the
8 ‘077 patent and all claims of the ‘060 patent.

9 Phase 4: Following the Court’s ruling on claim constructions and the cross-
10 motions regarding section 101 patent eligibility, Ameranth will select up to a
11 maximum of five valid claims per patent that it would intend to assert against each
12 remaining Defendant. At the same time, Ameranth will present a written
13 settlement offer which reflects the results from phases 2/3 to each Defendant, and
14 concurrently provide a copy of each offer to Judge Gallo in preparation for
15 mandatory settlement conferences with each Defendant.

16 Phase 5: Hold mandatory settlement conferences (presided over by Judge
17 Gallo) between Ameranth and each Defendant. (Despite the fact that the
18 consolidated litigation was first filed in 2011, to date there have been
19 comprehensive mandatory settlement conferences held between Ameranth and
20 *only two* defendants—Pizza Hut and Dominos. One of those was successful, and
21 one was not.)

22 Phase 6: If the parties’ disputes have not been resolved through the
23 mandatory settlement process, then proceed through either: (a) motions by
24 Ameranth for leave to amend existing complaints and infringement contentions;
25 (b) filing of new complaints, to assert remaining valid claims of the patents
26 against the remaining Defendants. The remaining Defendants could then file any
27 appropriate motions.

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CONCLUSION

Ameranth believes the proposal discussed above appropriately and fairly balances the competing concerns, claims and considerations that the Court must still address. While Ameranth remains entitled to defend its intellectual property and prosecute claims fairly and appropriately, it desires to do so in the most efficient and least burdensome manner in light of the Court’s prior rulings, the outcome of the appellate proceedings, the current status of this case, and the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. For this reason, Ameranth proposes that discovery and law and motion practice remain stayed and that only the requisite claim construction and section 101 patent eligibility determinations proceed in the near term. This is also less burdensome on the Court, and allows it to avoid dealing with multiple complex motions that may very well be mooted through settlements in Phase 5. Ameranth looks forward to a thorough discussion and exploration of the issues raised herein.

Dated: October 5, 2020 CALDARELLI HEJMANOWSKI & PAGE LLP

By: /s/ William J. Caldarelli
William J. Caldarelli
Lee Hejmanowski
Ben West

FABIANO LAW FIRM, P.C.
Michael D. Fabiano

OSBORNE LAW LLC
John W. Osborne

WATTS LAW OFFICE
Ethan M. Watts
Attorneys for Plaintiff Ameranth, Inc.

EXHIBIT 1

(ORDER LIST: 592 U.S.)

MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2020

CERTIORARI -- SUMMARY DISPOSITIONS

19-1046 PHAM, TONY H., ET AL. V. RAGBIR, RAVIDATH L., ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit for further consideration in light of *Department of Homeland Security v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U. S. ____ (2020).

19-8126 WILSON, GARRY W. V. OKLAHOMA

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petition for a writ of certiorari are granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the Court of Criminal Appeals of Oklahoma for further consideration in light of *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 591 U. S. ____ (2020).

19-8149 LAMBERT, NATHANIEL V. LOUISIANA

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petition for a writ of certiorari are granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the Court of Appeal of Louisiana, Fourth Circuit for further consideration in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020).

19-8337 RUFFIN, JERMAINE V. LOUISIANA

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petition for a writ of certiorari are granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the Court of Appeal of Louisiana, First Circuit for further consideration

in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020).

19-8338 MAYEUX, CHARLES P. V. LOUISIANA

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petition for a writ of certiorari are granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the Supreme Court of Louisiana for further consideration in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020).

20-5091 HORTON, PHILLIP S. V. UNITED STATES

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petition for a writ of certiorari are granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit for further consideration in light of *Davis v. United States*, 589 U. S. ____ (2020) (*per curiam*).

ORDERS IN PENDING CASES

20M1 THOMPSON, PETER V. CATTAIL CREEK COMMUNITY ASSN.

The motion to direct the Clerk to file a petition for a writ of certiorari out of time is denied.

20M3 HENNING, JUSTIN M. V. UNITED STATES

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari with the supplemental appendix under seal is granted.

20M4 WHITEHEAD, DAVID V. NETFLIX, INC., ET AL.

20M5 ALBRITTON, JOSH V. BRNOVICH, ATT'Y GEN. OF AZ

The motions for leave to proceed as a veteran are denied.

20M6 VICKERY, RUSSELL V. HALL, WARDEN, ET AL.

The motion to direct the Clerk to file a petition for a writ of certiorari out of time is denied.

20M7 CONERLY, DAVID V. UNITED STATES

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari with the supplemental appendix under seal is granted.

20M8 SAFFORD, WILLIE V. FLORIDA

20M9 TRINH, LAN TU V. DEPT. OF EDUCATION

20M10 TRINH, LAN TU V. FINEMAN, DAVID

The motions to direct the Clerk to file petitions for writs of certiorari out of time are denied.

20M11 S. O., ET AL. V. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

20M12 JACKSON, TRAVON J. V. UNITED STATES

The motions for leave to file petitions for writs of certiorari with the supplemental appendices under seal are granted.

20M13 RITH, MESA V. UNITED STATES

20M14 ELLIS, MICHAEL W. V. UNITED STATES

20M15 CESSPOOCH, ALFRED R. V. UNITED STATES

The motions to direct the Clerk to file petitions for writs of certiorari out of time are denied.

20M16 M. S. V. HOON, DAVE, ET AL.

The motion to direct the Clerk to file a petition for a writ of certiorari out of time under Rule 14.5 is denied.

20M17 HENRY, ADAM A. V. UNITED STATES

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari with the supplemental appendix under seal is granted.

20M18 KELLEY, TSHOMBE V. HERRERA, A., ET AL.

20M19 LOPEZ, AMAURY V. UNITED STATES

The motions to direct the Clerk to file petitions for writs of certiorari out of time are denied.

20M20 DAVIS, GAVIN B. V. CALIFORNIA

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* with the declaration of indigency under seal is denied.

20M21 GOODWINE, EARL V. AMTRAK

20M22 WASHINGTON, ROBERT V. BONDS, ADM'R, SOUTH WOODS

The motions to direct the Clerk to file petitions for writs of certiorari out of time are denied.

20M23 JENKINS, MARK A. V. O'ROURKE, TIMOTHY, ET AL.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari with the supplemental appendix under seal is granted.

20M24 SHERER, QUENTIN V. UNITED STATES

The motion to direct the Clerk to file a petition for a writ of certiorari out of time is denied.

142, ORIG. FLORIDA V. GEORGIA

The Exceptions to the Second Report of the Special Master are set for oral argument in due course.

152, ORIG. MONTANA AND WYOMING V. WASHINGTON

The Acting Solicitor General is invited to file a brief in this case expressing the views of the United States.

18-1259 JONES, BRETT V. MISSISSIPPI

The motion of the Acting Solicitor General for leave to participate in oral argument as *amicus curiae* and for divided argument is granted.

19-123 FULTON, SHARONELL, ET AL. V. PHILADELPHIA, PA, ET AL.

The motion of the Acting Solicitor General for leave to participate in oral argument as *amicus curiae* and for divided argument is granted. The motion of respondents for divided argument is granted.

- 19-508) AMG CAPITAL MGMT., LLC, ET AL. V. FTC
-)
- 19-825) FTC V. CREDIT BUREAU CENTER, LLC, ET AL.
- 19-897 PHAM, TONY H., ET AL. V. CHAVEZ, MARIA A., ET AL.

The motions to dispense with printing the joint appendices are granted.

- 19-963 HENRY SCHEIN, INC. V. ARCHER AND WHITE SALES, INC.

The motion of petitioner for leave to file the joint appendix under seal with redacted copies for the public record is granted.

- 19-1328 DEPT. OF JUSTICE V. HOUSE COMM. ON JUDICIARY

The motion of petitioner to dispense with printing the joint appendix is granted.

- 19-1401 HUGHES, APRIL, ET AL. V. NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, ET AL.

The Acting Solicitor General is invited to file a brief in this case expressing the views of the United States.

- 19-8501 LIVINGSTON, JIMMY L. V. NEBRASKA
- 19-8641 HANNA, SAMIR V. CALIFORNIA
- 19-8657 JHA, MANOJ K. V. UNITED STATES
- 19-8717 FELTON, LANCE E. V. JACKSON, MS
- 19-8766 IN RE LINDA A. WRIGHT
- 19-8767 IN RE LINDA A. WRIGHT
- 19-8807 CEAN, CASSANDRA V. UNITED STATES

The motions of petitioners for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied. Petitioners are allowed until October 26, 2020, within which to pay the docketing fees required by Rule 38(a).

- 20-8 DEUTSCHE BANK TRUST CO., ET AL. V. ROBERT R. McCORMICK FOUNDATION

The Acting Solicitor General is invited to file a brief in

this case expressing the views of the United States. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration of this petition.

20-5155 COUGHLIN, CHARLES E. V. UNITED STATES

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied. Petitioner is allowed until October 26, 2020, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a). Justice Kavanaugh took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion.

20-5180 FRAWLEY, MATTHEW J. V. FRAWLEY, VICTORIA L.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied. Petitioner is allowed until October 26, 2020, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a).

CERTIORARI DENIED

- 18-942 FORGUS, ASHIDDA V. ESPER, SEC. OF DEFENSE
- 19-872 HINSON, MATTHEW R. V. BIAS, R. A., ET AL.
- 19-953 FARRAR, CHARLES V. WILLIAMS, DIR., CO DOC, ET AL.
- 19-985 NATIVE WHOLESALE SUPPLY CO. V. CA, EX REL. BECERRA, ET AL.
- 19-988 LIVING ESSENTIALS, LLC, ET AL. V. WASHINGTON
- 19-1029 AUSTIN, BETHANY V. ILLINOIS
- 19-1067 BROWDER, NEAL N., ET AL. V. NEHAD, S. R., ET AL.
- 19-1091 EVANS, STEVE R. V. SANDY CITY, UT, ET AL.
- 19-1094 DAILEY, JAMES M. V. FLORIDA
- 19-1099 BAKERSFIELD, CA, ET AL. V. CRAWFORD, LESLIE L.
- 19-1138 KNIGHT, DeWAYNE D. V. GROSSMAN, THOMAS
- 19-1147 WILLOWOOD, LLC, ET AL. V. SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION, LLC
- 19-1157 WEATHERLY, PATSY, ET AL. V. PERSHING, L.L.C.
- 19-1181 ESTATE OF STEINBECK, ET AL. V. KAFFAGA, WAVERLY S.

- 19-1203 CHILDREN'S HOSP. OF TX, ET AL. V. AZAR, SEC. OF H&HS, ET AL.
- 19-1204 ARTHREX, INC. V. SMITH & NEPHEW, INC., ET AL.
- 19-1218 ROBINSON, MARCUS L. V. COLORADO
- 19-1221 WILLIAMS, DERRICK L. V. UNITED STATES
- 19-1242 CASTRO-CHAVEZ, GERARDO V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
- 19-1246 McDANIEL, RITA V. UPSHER-SMITH LABORATORIES INC.
- 19-1248 DUNN, ELI V. HATCH, BRYCE, ET AL.
- 19-1253 SHELTON, KENNETH V. PATTERSON, ANTHONEE
- 19-1254 PENNSYLVANIA V. DAVIS, JOSEPH J.
- 19-1264 BOYKIN, DONCEY F. V. UNITED STATES
- 19-1265 FRIENDS OF DANNY DeVITO, ET AL. V. WOLF, GOV. OF PA, ET AL.
- 19-1267 FORD MOTOR CO. OF CANADA, LTD. V. BELL, GEORGE, ET AL.
- 19-1269 TCL LTD., ET AL. V. TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM, ET AL.
- 19-1276 WHITE, MICHAEL B. V. MEDTRONIC, INC., ET AL.
- 19-1277 THORPE, DAVID V. DUMAS, DEXTER, ET AL.
- 19-1278 FUSSELL, HUNTER V. LOUISIANA
- 19-1279) LaTURNER, KS STATE TREASURER V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.
- 19-1285) LEA, AR STATE AUDITOR V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.
- 19-1281 TOROMANOVA, DIMITRITZA V. SUMMIT REAL ESTATE, ET AL.
- 19-1283 TOLLE, JAMES V. NORTHAM, GOV. OF VA, ET AL.
- 19-1288 SINGER, ALAN V. MONDEX CORPORATION
- 19-1289 BENAVIDES, GEORGE A. V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN., ET AL.
- 19-1290 BENNETT, MICHAEL T. V. MARVEL ENTERTAINMENT, LLC
- 19-1292 MEITZNER, LARRY A. V. SCHUETTE, BILL, ET AL.
- 19-1296 HELIX TCS, INC. V. KENNEY, ROBERT
- 19-1299 CHAMBERLAIN GROUP, INC. V. TECHTRONIC INDUSTRIES, ET AL.
- 19-1303 WOODS, EARNEST C. V. CALIFORNIA
- 19-1304 INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FL, ET AL. V. DEPT. OF TRANSP., ET AL.

- 19-1305 GOV. OF PR, ET AL. V. FINANCIAL OVERSIGHT BD., ET AL.
- 19-1306 UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC. V. NEW YORK, ET AL.
- 19-1309 PHIPPS, KARI J. V. IDAHO
- 19-1310 JALBERT, CRAIG R. V. SEC
- 19-1311 KIRK, DOUGLAS L. V. TEXAS
- 19-1312 CHANG, WEIH S. V. CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY CENTER OF DE
- 19-1314 ANDERSON, NATALIE V. ROBITAILLE, ADAM
- 19-1317 AREIZAGA, EFRAIN V. ADW CORP.
- 19-1318 DEEM, MICHAEL A. V. DiMELLA-DEEM, LORNA M., ET AL.
- 19-1319 MORABITO, DAVID R., ET UX. V. NEW YORK, ET AL.
- 19-1320 JOHNSON, VERONICA M. V. ROCK SOLID JANITORIAL, ET AL.
- 19-1322 VAUGHN, ROBERT L. V. BRAY, WILLIAM O., ET AL.
- 19-1324 CENTER FOR IMMIGRATION STUDIES V. COHEN, RICHARD, ET AL.
- 19-1325 BOURTZAKIS, DIMITRIOS I. V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN., ET AL.
- 19-1326 SCARBOROUGH, E. THOMAS V. COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, ET AL.
- 19-1327 ZOCCO, KRIS V. V. WISCONSIN
- 19-1329 STRONG, MARY P. V. U.S. BANK TRUST N.A.
- 19-1330 MICHIGAN V. WALKER, JUAN T.
- 19-1331 SUN, XIU J. V. SANDERS, CHARLES F., ET AL.
- 19-1332 KNOWLES, TONYA V. DEPT. OF VA
- 19-1334 SIGNODE INDUS. GROUP LLC, ET AL. V. STONE, HAROLD, ET AL.
- 19-1335 DUMMER, TIMOTHY J. V. CONTRACTORS LICENSE BD., ET AL.
- 19-1336 NATIONAL RETIREMENT FUND, ET AL. V. METZ CULINARY MANAGEMENT, INC.
- 19-1337 PHILLIPPI, TODD V. HUMBLE DESIGN, ET AL.
- 19-1338 PIPER, BRILEY W. V. YOUNG, WARDEN
- 19-1339 KS CITY ROYALS BASEBALL, ET AL. V. SENNE, AARON, ET AL.
- 19-1340 TRIBBLE, DAVID, ET AL. V. FIRST SECURITY BANK, ET AL.
- 19-1342 MULCAHY, EDWARD V. ASPEN PITKIN CO. HOUSING AUTH.

19-1344 SINGH, LAHKWINDER V. UNITED STATES
19-1346 BENKOVITCH, VIKTORIA V. DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST CO.
19-1347 DOUGLAS, LaDAWN V. KONDAUR CAPITAL CORPORATION
19-1349 MILLER, GEORGE L. V. BEAR STEARNS & CO., INC., ET AL.
19-1350 GREEN, DARIUS I. V. HOOKS, BRADLEY, ET AL.
19-1351 AMERANTH, INC. V. DOMINO'S PIZZA, LLC, ET AL.
19-1353 AGI CONSULTING LLC V. AMERICAN NATIONAL INSURANCE CO.
19-1354 PHAN, TAN V. TRUONG, MINH, ET AL.
19-1355 JERNIGAN, BETZAIDA P. V. WILKIE, SEC. OF VA
19-1356 SKELTON, THOMAS J. V. SUPREME COURT OF IL
19-1358 MICHIGAN V. SHOULDERS, WILLIAM L.
19-1359 MURPHY, MICHELLE D. V. TULSA, OK
19-1360 CANNON, WILLIAM, ET AL. V. SAVORY, JOHNNIE L.
19-1361 JORDAN, RICHARD, ET AL. V. GEORGIA DOC
19-1364 HENRY, HEATHER, ET VIR V. CMBB, LLC
19-1366 HUANG, SHIYANG V. SCHULTZ, VALESKA, ET AL.
19-1367 HAVENS, VERNON L. V. O'CONNOR, CHIEF JUSTICE, OH SC
19-1369 TRUMPF, INC. V. CSI WORLDWIDE, LLC
19-1370 THAMES, KIMBERLEY V. WESTLAND, MI, ET AL.
19-1371 WALDNER, ROGER D. V. HARTKE, BRADLEY R., ET AL.
19-1372 AYALA-VAZQUEZ, ANGEL M. V. UNITED STATES
19-1373 WEI, MING V. PA CIVIL SERVICE COMM'N
19-1374 GUTIERREZ, ARTURO F. S. V. CALIFORNIA
19-1375 KATZ, AARON L. V. INCLINE VILLAGE GENERAL
19-1376 ALGIGNIS, INC. V. FERC
19-1380 OLSON, TERRY L. V. AMATUZIO, JANIS, ET AL.
19-1381 BIODELIVERY SCIENCES INT'L, INC. V. AQUESTIVE THERAPEUTICS, INC.
19-1382 STERLING JEWELERS, INC. V. JOCK, LARYSSA, ET AL.

19-1383 LEIDIG, MICHAEL, ET AL. V. BUZZFEED, INC.
19-1384 PIETRANGELO, JAMES E. V. HUDSON, CORRINNE
19-1386 D. C. V. SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA, ET AL.
19-1387 DAKER, WASEEM V. JACKSON, SHERIFF, ET AL.
19-1390 JOHNSON, MARTIN V. UNITED STATES
19-1391 WHITELEY, LARRY A. V. McCOY, WARDEN
19-1393 DAVIS, RACHELLE V. AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC., ET AL.
19-1394 ARNOLD, EDWARD R. V. SLATERY, ATT'Y GEN. OF TN
19-1395 ROGERS, RALEIGH V. DISCOVER BANK
19-1396 STEPHENS, RICHARD C. V. KENNEY, CHAD F., ET AL.
19-1397 GRAY, MICHELE V. DEPT. OF JUSTICE
19-1399 SHELBY ADVOCATES, ET AL. V. HARGETT, TRE, ET AL.
19-1400 REHABILITATION CENTER V. AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE
19-1403 VARTANIAN, MICHAEL H. V. STATE BAR OF CA, ET AL.
19-1404 LIEBERMAN, MICHAEL V. UNITED STATES
19-1405 JACOBSON, MATTHEW V. BLAISE, BUTTERFLY, ET AL.
19-1406 LORD, LEWIS & COLEMAN, LLC V. BELLACO, INC., ET AL.
19-1407 AINABE, MERCY O. V. UNITED STATES
19-1408 COPPEDGE, JAMES, ET UX. V. CHARLTON, JANET Z.
19-1409 BLOOMGARDEN, HOWARD B. V. CALIFORNIA
19-1410 BULLUCK, ROSETTA V. NEWTEK SMALL BUSINESS, ET AL.
19-1413 ABAZARI, ARMIN V. DEPT. OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
19-1416 FIJALKOWSKI, MATEUSZ V. WHEELER, M., ET AL.
19-1417 CESAR, FRANTZ V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
19-1418 ZOIE H. V. NEBRASKA
19-1419 HENRY-BEY, MICHAEL A. V. CASTRO, HECTOR, ET AL.
19-1420 HERRMANN, JARED D. V. McCARTHY, SEC. OF ARMY
19-1421 LaFLAMME, MICHAEL W. V. LUMPKIN, DIR., TX DCJ

19-1422 JACKSON, NAKISHA V. BRUN, ROY L., ET AL.
19-1423 VORTMAN, GEORGE V. UNITED STATES
19-1424 LeBEAU, KEVIN V. UNITED STATES
19-1425 PALM VALLEY HEALTH CARE V. AZAR, SEC. OF H&HS
19-1426 PECINA, PAUL V. WILKIE, SEC. OF VA
19-1428 MORIN, TINA L. V. OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
19-1429 PENA, DAVID V. TEXAS
19-1430 POLIDI, RICHARD V. LEE, MICHELLE K., ET AL.
19-1431 OLSON, DAVID E., ET AL. V. O'BRIEN, MARK, ET AL.
19-1432 SINEK, CHARLES R. V. UNITED STATES
19-1435 THOMAS, C. DOUGLASS V. IANCU, ANDREI
19-1438 ABERNATHY, GEORGE V. UNITED STATES
19-1439 JURGENSEN, JOEY V. POMPEO, SEC. OF STATE, ET AL.
19-1443 S. O. V. HINDS CTY. SCH. DISTRICT, ET AL.
19-1444 GLAXOSMITHKLINE LLC V. UNITED FOOD WORKERS, ET AL.
19-1446 KEARNEY, BING CHARLES W., ET AL. V. TRAVELERS CASUALTY
19-1448 EXCEL MODULAR SCAFFOLD & LEASING V. OSHA REVIEW COMM'N, ET AL.
19-1449 DAVIS, RONALD E. V. CIR
19-1450 RUSSELL, SAMUEL T. V. TEXAS
19-1451 SANOFI-AVENTIS DEUTSCHLAND V. MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.
19-1454 PALANIAPPAN, NARAY V. UNITED STATES
19-1455 YOUNGBLOOD-WEST, LEIGH ANN V. AFLAC INC., ET AL.
19-1457 HUDAK, MATTHEW V. ILLINOIS
19-1460 MENGEDOHT, JAN M. V. UNITED STATES
19-1462 PRINCIPAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. V. ROZO, FREDERICK
19-1463 OLIVER, SANDRA J. V. OLIVER, JAMES C., ET AL.
19-1464 PRIMBAS, CHRISTOPHER V. IANCU, ANDREI
19-1465 MARCELIS, ROBERT V. PENNSYLVANIA

19-1466 KORTHALS, TAMMY V. STROZESKI, BRADLEY
19-1467 ORTLOFF, ROBERT S. V. BRNOVICH, ATT'Y GEN. OF AZ
19-1468 WILEY, BRIAN A. V. TENNESSEE
19-1469 HASBROUCK, ERIC V. STATE BAR OF NV
19-1470 GURROLA, SAMUEL A. V. WALGREEN CO.
19-1471 TKACZ, JESSICA L. V. BOGDEN, DANIEL G., ET AL.
19-1472 DAVIS, PHILLIP A. V. CROW, DIR., OK DOC
19-1473 HARTSFIELD, PHILLIP V. DORETHY, WARDEN
19-1474 HERNDON, TYLER V. PENNSYLVANIA
19-1478 LARSGARD, JOHN K. V. ARIZONA
19-6804 HELMS, MICHAEL V. WELLS FARGO BANK, ET AL.
19-7191 BAKER, JANICE V. MACY'S FLORIDA STORES, LLC
19-7426 NJONGE, JOSEPH V. GILBERT, SUPT.
19-7501 LIVADITIS, STEVEN V. DAVIS, WARDEN
19-7621 BENTON, ALLANAH V. BREWER, WARDEN
19-7731 HERROLD, MICHAEL V. UNITED STATES
19-7778 HILL, JAMES W. V. UNITED STATES
19-7825 GONZALEZ, GUSTAVO V. UNITED STATES
19-7904 BONDS, JASON V. UNITED STATES
19-7939 POPE, ROBERT J. V. WISCONSIN
19-8006 GREINER, JOHN P. V. MACOMB COUNTY, MI, ET AL.
19-8009 PANAH, HOOMAN A. V. BROOMFIELD, WARDEN
19-8039 CLARK, JEFFREY V. LOUISIANA
19-8062 LeBOUEF, TROY A. V. VANNOY, WARDEN
19-8105 ANDERSON, JUSTIN V. PAYNE, DIR., AR DOC
19-8197 FURNISH, FRED V. KENTUCKY
19-8221 FAGATELE, FEUU V. UNITED STATES
19-8262 ALGARIN, MIGUEL V. UNITED STATES

19-8296 MILLA-PEREZ, HECTOR N. V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
19-8300 HYDEN, CLARK M. V. GEORGIA
19-8341 KNIGHT, RICHARD V. FL DOC
19-8378 HOWELL, JOSEPH V. GARMAN, SUPT., ROCKVIEW, ET AL.
19-8386 CULVERHOUSE, DAVID L. V. TEXAS
19-8388 WILLIAMS, TERRENCE J. V. BURT, WARDEN
19-8392 BALDERAS, JUAN V. TEXAS
19-8396 HILL, ROBERT R. V. JOHNSON, ADM'R, NJ, ET AL.
19-8398 WHITE, JOSEPH V. DETROIT E. COM. MENTAL, ET AL.
19-8403 LOPEZ, JUAN M. V. SHERMAN, WARDEN
19-8405 REYES, IRVIN V. KAISER PERMANENTE
19-8407 RAMIREZ, MAURO V. FLORIDA
19-8409 PHUONG, THANKSNIKEY V. HILL, WARDEN
19-8414 SIMMONS, ASHFORD J. V. UNITED STATES
19-8418 STAMPS, RUPERT V. CAPALUPO, PARIS, ET AL.
19-8419 TRACZYK, ERIK W. V. VANNOY, WARDEN
19-8420 WILSON, CHARLES V. WISCONSIN
19-8421 TELLO, GILBERT V. TEXAS
19-8424 YEYILLE, JOSé V. MIAMI-DADE CTY. SCH., ET AL.
19-8425 ANDERSON, CHAYCE A. V. COLORADO
19-8427 McNELEY, DILLARD J. V. SHEPPARD, MULLIN, ET AL.
19-8428 WYATT, MARC V. LUMPKIN, DIR., TX DCJ
19-8429 MAQBOOL, TARIQ V. HICKS, COMM'R, NJ DOC, ET AL.
19-8430 LaTOUCHE, VALERY V. NEW YORK
19-8432 LaFLAMME, DONALD R. V. CALIFORNIA
19-8433 JOHN, ANTHONY P. V. FLORIDA
19-8434 UKKERD, AUDREY J. V. STATE BAR OF CA
19-8435 WILLIAMS, JEROME L. V. DUFFY, WENDY, ET AL.

19-8438 EMIL, RODNEY L. V. NEVADA
19-8441 VIEIRA, RICHARD J. V. CALIFORNIA
19-8442 WALKER, ERICA J. V. FLORIDA
19-8443 YOUNG, GEORGE R. V. JACKSON-MITCHELL, WARDEN
19-8444 ZACKE, CLARENCE V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC
19-8446 TWITTY, ANTHONY S. V. SMITH, SUPT., HOUTZDALE, ET AL.
19-8448 DANTZLER, LAMONT V. ILLINOIS
19-8452 STRICKLAND, WILLIAM V. ILLINOIS
19-8454 BOYKIN, MICHAEL V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.
19-8455 BRUZZONE, MICHAEL A. V. McMANIS, JAMES, ET AL.
19-8457 ALLEN, DERRICK M. V. MINE, ALICE N., ET AL.
19-8458 ALLEN, DERRICK M. V. JORDAN, PHILLIP, ET AL.
19-8460 GOMEZ, NEXIS R. V. BRAUN, D., ET AL.
19-8462 PEREZ, JUAN F. V. JONES, JULIE L., ET AL.
19-8465 MOORE, EARL T. V. JOHNSON, ADM'R, NJ, ET AL.
19-8471 VAUGHN, EDDIE G. V. HAWKINS, TIMOTHY, ET AL.
19-8472 YOUNG, WYTE V. ARIZONA
19-8473 ROGERS, SHAWN V. FLORIDA
19-8476 YERTON, ROBERT R. V. OKLAHOMA
19-8481 VETETO, RONALD D. V. ESTES, WARDEN, ET AL.
19-8482 GRAY, GRAYLIN V. FRAKES, DIR., NE DOC, ET AL.
19-8484 MEHDIPOUR, ALI V. MIDWEST CITY, OK, ET AL.
19-8487 BERGER, JERRELL V. ADAMS, WARDEN
19-8488 BROWN, CRYSTAL W. V. SAUL, COMM'R OF SSA
19-8490 STEVENS, TIMMY V. COLLINS, WARDEN
19-8495 ABDUL-KAREEM, MISBAH V. VERMONT DEPT. OF HEALTH
19-8496 C. K. J. V. M. J. T.
19-8498 DIGGS, WINNIE V. GALLUCCI, NEIL

19-8499 HOYT, RYAN J. V. CALIFORNIA
19-8502 BEVERLY, DAVID V. ILLINOIS
19-8505 TOLBERT, GEORGE V. WAGGONER, STEPHANIE, ET AL.
19-8507 TAYLOR, DOMINIQUE R. V. CORPORATION WORLDWIDE
19-8511 MORRISON, HERBERT W. V. HALE, ANDREW J.
19-8514 POPAL, FARID V. NEW YORK
19-8516 MRAZEK, CRAIG V. ILLINOIS
19-8517 NOVOTNYI, EDWARD F. V. PLEXUS CORP., ET AL.
19-8518 NEWSON, DEXTER C. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.
19-8519 MYERS, JAMES E. V. NEBRASKA
19-8521 DANIELS, AARON V. KOWALSKI, WARDEN
19-8522 FELTON, RICHARD V. MASSACHUSETTS
19-8526 TALLEY, QUINTEZ V. MAZZOCCA, TIMOTHY, ET AL.
19-8527 EAVES, RODNEY D. V. CO DOC, ET AL.
19-8528 RUSSELL, MELVIN V. UNITED STATES
19-8529 CAIN, DARRYL V. REWERTS, WARDEN
19-8532 LYNCH, LESTER B. V. CABELL, WARDEN
19-8533 LAJEUNESSE, MICHAEL A. V. CHAMBERS, MEGAN A., ET AL.
19-8538 SMILES, JEFFREY W. V. BERKS COUNTY, PA, ET AL.
19-8539 SPENCER, TONY V. ILLINOIS
19-8541 ABDULRAZZAK, HAIDER S. V. SD BD. OF PARDONS AND PAROLES
19-8545 BLAKE, DUANE V. FLORIDA
19-8547 BLUEFORD, JOSEPH D. V. HOOPER, WARDEN
19-8549 ADEYINKA, EMMANUEL A. V. BARRS, BRADY, ET AL.
19-8550 NICOLAISON, WAYNE C. V. MINNESOTA
19-8551 PATTERSON, LONDRO E. V. KANSAS
19-8552 McTIZIC, CURTIS V. ILLINOIS
19-8553 PHILLIPS, DEVIAN V. OHIO

19-8554 SUTHERLAND, KAREN V. SAUL, COMM'R OF SSA
19-8556 ELEBUTE, KEHINDE A. V. VILLAGE CAPITAL & INVESTMENT
19-8561 CORONA-PEREZ, JESUS J. V. UNITED STATES
19-8565 ANDERSEN, CHRISTOPHER S. V. TAYLOR, JERI
19-8571 KING, DERRICK M. V. OH DEPT. OF JOB AND FAMILY SERV.
19-8573 KONEPACHIT, DAVID V. CALIFORNIA
19-8574 LATIMER, CALVIN G. V. NC DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
19-8577 ROSCOE, SHANE V. HORTON, WARDEN
19-8580 PLUMLEE, LARY J. V. BACA, WARDEN
19-8581 HARMON, MARLON D. V. SHARP, WARDEN
19-8583 HECHAVARRIA, JOSEPH E. V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
19-8587 YOUNG, REGINALD V. UNITED STATES
19-8590 MARR, TIMOTHY A. V. DOYLE, JOSHUA E.
19-8591 PENNINGTON, FREDERICK V. PAYNE, DIR., AR DOC, ET AL.
19-8592 ALMONTE, MARIA S. V. UNITED STATES
19-8593 CRIM, DAMON C. V. OHIO
19-8595 WILLIAMS, BRANDON V. HOGAN, GOV. OF MD, ET AL.
19-8596 VANDYCK, RYAN G. V. UNITED STATES
19-8599 PRATT, HENRY V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
19-8600 TORRES, MARCO E. V. NEBRASKA
19-8601 WALKER, WILLIAM C. V. MINNESOTA
19-8602 WASHINGTON, EUGENE V. SANTA RITA JAIL
19-8604 HALL, DONTARIUS M. V. UNITED STATES
19-8605 BARNES, COURTLAND V. UNITED STATES
19-8606 THORSON, ROBERT D. V. UNITED STATES
19-8607 THOMPSON, DERRICK V. GRIFFIN, SUPT., SULLIVAN
19-8608 ROBERTSON, KISON V. UNITED STATES
19-8609 SAMEER, MADHU V. KHERA, SAMEER, ET AL.

19-8611 SCOTT, ADAM V. UNITED STATES
19-8612 STAMPER, EDWARD R. V. UNITED STATES
19-8613 SHABAZZ WIGGINS, ABDUL V. VIRGINIA
19-8615 ZHIRY, VERA, ET AL. V. UNITED STATES
19-8616 HELTON, ANTHONY V. UNITED STATES
19-8617 CHAVEZ, HOMAR P. V. UNITED STATES
19-8618 DANIELS, KAREEM V. GEORGIA
19-8619 COBB, DEON C. V. CLARKE, DIR., VA DOC
19-8620 PRIOR, ASHLEY T. V. SOUTH CAROLINA, ET AL.
19-8622 McQUEARY-LAYNE, KIMBERLEY V. LA BD. OF NURSING, ET AL.
19-8623 MOSELEY, JOSHUA V. CLARKE, DIR., VA DOC
19-8624 DeFREITAS, MIGUEL V. CALLADO, SUPT., SHAWANGUNK
19-8625 DAVIS, DEDRIC V. FLORIDA
19-8627 CARDENAS, ISAAC V. TEXAS
19-8628 NORMAN, DERE E. J. V. TEMPLE UNIV. HEALTH SYSTEM
19-8629 NYENKOR, CARPEAH R. V. UNITED STATES
19-8630 LUSSY, RICHARD C. V. LUSSY, HENRY, ET AL.
19-8631 SIMPSON, CLAUDE V. UNITED STATES
19-8632 RUMANEK, SANDRA V. FALLON, SHERRY R., ET AL.
19-8633 RODRIGUEZ, WEYLIN O. V. UNITED STATES
19-8634 BEY, TEHIB M. V. DOUGHTERY CTY. STATE CT.
19-8636 PETERSON, SILAS B. V. UNITED STATES
19-8637 REEVES, ROBERT V. STODDARD, WARDEN
19-8638 BRZOWSKI, WALTER V. EXECUTIVE COMM. OF USDC ND IL
19-8639 ALLEN, DERRICK V. WIRE, TED, ET AL.
19-8640 LITTLES, PAUL N. V. UNITED STATES
19-8642 DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER V. UNITED STATES
19-8643 EVATT, WALLACE E. V. STEPHAN, WARDEN

19-8644 KING, MICHAEL L. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.
19-8645 ROSS, JOE C. V. UNITED STATES
19-8646 GRIFFIN, LEONARD V. UNITED STATES
19-8647 DIEZ, MARTIN V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.
19-8648 McNEAL, VERNON W. V. FLEMING, C/O, ET AL.
19-8649 JOHNSON, ANGELO V. UNITED STATES
19-8651 REMILLARD, KEVIN V. OHIO
19-8652 SANCHEZ, IMMANUEL F. V. REAL, JUDGE, USDC CD CA, ET AL.
19-8653 RAMIREZ, JOSE H. V. UNITED STATES
19-8654 SENESE, RICHARD V. UNITED STATES
19-8655 BARRIOS-ALVARADO, MILTON V. UNITED STATES
19-8658 KING, GARIAN V. UNITED STATES
19-8659 SEGOVIA, STEVEN A. V. UNITED STATES
19-8660 RILEY, THOMAS M. V. ARIZONA
19-8662 SCOTT, JASON P. V. UNITED STATES
19-8663 KEITH, TESA V. UNITED STATES
19-8664 KIRVIN, CHARLES T. V. CALIFORNIA, ET AL.
19-8665 JACKSON, ANTHONY V. SUPREME COURT OF IL
19-8666 MAYES, LOUIS V. LEBO, WARDEN
19-8667 ALFRED, DIAMANTE V. UNITED STATES
19-8669 TYSON, WILLIAM M. V. UNITED STATES
19-8670 TAPIA, ROSALIO R. V. UNITED STATES
19-8672 BRIDGES, TERRY V. ILLINOIS
19-8673 BURRESS-EL, ANTUAN V. BORN, JOHN, ET AL.
19-8674 PAEZ, ROLANDO G. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC
19-8675 CHANDLER, ISSAC O. V. UNITED STATES
19-8676 SMALL, FATOU V. UNITED STATES
19-8677 ASHEN, DAVID V. DISTEFANO, DAVID, ET AL.

19-8678 FALL, ROBERT M. V. UNITED STATES
19-8680 ZITALPOPOCA-HERNANDEZ, ADRIAN V. UNITED STATES
19-8681 HONG, SUNG, ET UX. V. UNITED STATES
19-8682 FULMER, CHARLES R. V. UNITED STATES
19-8683 GRANDE, EDGARDO V. UNITED STATES
19-8684 HILL, BRIAN D. V. USDC MD NC
19-8686 HARRIS, BEVERLEY M. V. BOZZUTO GROUP, ET AL.
19-8687 GHAZAVI, HAMIDREZA V. VIRGINIA
19-8688 INGRAM, RICHARD D. V. UNITED STATES
19-8689 LAWRENCE, REBECA V. MEDTRONIC
19-8690 WHEELER, JIMMY L. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC
19-8691 INFANTE-CABALLERO, JARDIEL V. UNITED STATES
19-8692 SHIELDS, ROBERT L. V. UNITED STATES
19-8693 TRUJILLO, NATHAN T. V. UNITED STATES
19-8694 ROUSE, JOSEPH D. V. UNITED STATES
19-8696 DiTOMASSO, FRANK V. UNITED STATES
19-8697 DAVIS, SHIRON D. V. OKLAHOMA
19-8698 STONE, NEAL S. V. UNITED STATES
19-8699 SPENCER, JEREMY P. V. LIEUTENANT MINTER, ET AL.
19-8700 STRODTMAN, CODY V. FRAKES, DIR., NE DOC
19-8701 RAYMOND, ROGER A. V. USDC SD
19-8702 SEDBERRY, BILLY E. V. UNITED STATES
19-8703 SOSA-BALADRON, DAVID, ET UX. V. UNITED STATES
19-8704 ALVARADO, ROLANDO Q. V. HORTON, WARDEN
19-8705 ARKIM, BARRY V. NOETH, SUPT., ATTICA
19-8706 BUTCHER, LESTER T. V. TEXAS
19-8710 FRAZIER, WILLIAM V. UNITED STATES
19-8713 BAILEY, MICHAEL K. V. WAINWRIGHT, WARDEN

19-8714 TREE, BODHI V. ROBERTSON, WARDEN
19-8715 TREFFINGER, TIMOTHY R. V. UNITED STATES
19-8716 PEPKE, ERIC M. V. UNITED STATES
19-8718 MILLER, JAMES V. CAPRA, WARDEN
19-8719 LASTER, BROWN V. UNITED STATES
19-8720 PURI, ANKIT V. UNITED STATES
19-8721 ARGENTINO, VINCENT A. V. STAMPS, RUANNE, ET AL.
19-8722 MORRIS-CALDERON, MARGARET V. JAMES RANDI ED. FOUND.
19-8723 IRISH, SHANE P. V. OHIO
19-8724 GARRY, MICHAEL V. TRANE CO.
19-8725 GLENN, JARVIS L. V. MICHIGAN
19-8726 GOODMAN, TERRANCE D. V. UNITED STATES
19-8727 HUMPHRIES, FELTON L. V. SHERMAN, WARDEN
19-8728 HARRELL, JOSHUA V. CALIFORNIA
19-8729 GILBERT, MAURICE V. BARRIOS-GILBERT, ISABEL
19-8730 KENNEDY, WESTLEY V. UNITED STATES
19-8731 GELIN, EDSON V. UNITED STATES
19-8732 HERNANDEZ, EFRAIN L. V. UNITED STATES
19-8736 CLARK, LINDA R. V. WASHINGTON
19-8737 STEINER, JAMES V. UNITED STATES
19-8738 CLARK, CHARLES V. LAUGHLIN, WARDEN
19-8739 WOMACK, CARL V. FINKELSTEIN, JOHANNA
19-8742 NICHOLS, HAROLD W. V. TENNESSEE
19-8743 GUERRA, JEREMIAH L. V. UNITED STATES
19-8744 CASTRO, APRIL V. UNITED STATES
19-8745 SCOTT, BERNARD V. UNITED STATES
19-8746 GROUP, SCOTT A. V. OHIO
19-8747 CORONADO, ROBERT N. V. STINSON, WARDEN, ET AL.

19-8748 KNUTH, NATHAN D. V. COLORADO
19-8749 CRAYTON, PAUL A. V. LUMPKIN, DIR., TX DCJ
19-8751 BASRA, PARAMJIT S. V. WASHINGTON
19-8752 ALLEN, DERRICK M. V. MOORE, ANNETTE, ET AL.
19-8754 MARTINEZ, FRANCISCO A. V. UNITED STATES
19-8755 WEST, LEVI V. UNITED STATES
19-8756 INGRAM, KEVIN V. UNITED STATES
19-8757 GIBBS, GEORGE W. V. LeGRAND, WARDEN, ET AL.
19-8758 QIN, LI, ET AL. V. 99 CENTS ONLY STORES, ET AL.
19-8759 RAY, TERRY D. V. UNITED STATES
19-8760 STEWART, STEFAN V. FLORIDA
19-8761 RIASCOS, NIVALDO V. USDC SD WV
19-8762 ST. GEORGE, PERCY V. RANSOM, SUPT., DALLAS, ET AL.
19-8763 DELGLYN, JAMES V. BARROS, PAULINO, ET AL.
19-8764 BURNEY, JAMES W. V. FLORIDA
19-8765 AREGA, TIZAZU F. V. SADLER, LISA L., ET AL.
19-8768 ALBRITTON, JOSH V. BRNOVICH, ATT'Y GEN. OF AZ
19-8769 SHUMAKE, DARYLL V. VIRGINIA
19-8770 ST. PREUX, CARL V. UNITED STATES
19-8771 RISENHOOVER, MICHAEL A. V. MUNIZ, WARDEN
19-8772 TORRES, MARIO V. HANSEN, MIKE, ET AL.
19-8773 HARRISON, QUINCY V. LAUGHLIN, WARDEN
19-8774 GUTIERREZ, BENJAMIN J. V. TX HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
19-8775 GARDNER, KIRBY V. TEXAS
19-8776 HATTER, TIMOTHY W. V. CLARKE, DIR., VA DOC
19-8778 ALLEN, JOHN M. V. ARIZONA
19-8779 ELHUZAYEL, NADER S. V. UNITED STATES
19-8781 FRANCIS, EGBERT V. SUPERIOR COURT OF NC

19-8782 GRAHAM, LISA V. ALABAMA
19-8783 GONZALEZ, ALFREDO V. UNITED STATES
19-8784 BROWN, CHESTER V. VANNOY, WARDEN
19-8785 WILLIAMS, BRANDON V. COOPER, GOV. OF NC, ET AL.
19-8786 JONES, QUAMINE V. MAYS, WARDEN
19-8787 JAMES, WAYNE A. V. UNITED STATES
19-8788 JOB, TRAVIS V. UNITED STATES
19-8789 VERDUZCO, SUSANA E. V. UNITED STATES
19-8790 WHICHARD, CHRISTINA A. V. UNITED STATES
19-8791 VASQUEZ-SOTO, JOSE A. V. UNITED STATES
19-8792 HUMMEL, JOHN V. LUMPKIN, DIR., TX DCJ
19-8793 R. W. V. DAUPHIN CTY. SOCIAL SERV.
19-8794 TYLER, CASEY R. V. HOOKS, WARDEN
19-8795 LOPER, JEREMIA J. V. KNUTSON, WARDEN
19-8796 RODGERS, GARY D. V. McINTYRE, R., ET AL.
19-8798 SALAHUDDIN, RAFEEQ V. SHINN, DIR., AZ DOC
19-8800 KNIGHT, JUSTICE J. V. ALABAMA
19-8801 JONES, TICHINIA, ET AL. V. LAMAR CO., LLC
19-8802 LEWIS, REGINA V. UNITED STATES
19-8803 ADAMS, BENNIE V. OHIO
19-8804 A. M. V. INDIANA
19-8805 BRUCE, SHANE V. GREAT BRITAIN, ET AL.
19-8806 DIXON, DAVID L. V. AMES, SUPT., MOUNT OLIVE
19-8808 ASHFORD, RANDOLPH V. STEPHAN, WARDEN
19-8809 ALEXANDER, BRANDON L. V. UNITED STATES
19-8810 DAVIDSON, JONATHAN M. V. UNITED STATES
19-8811 CRANE, MICHAEL L. V. SHINN, DIR., AZ DOC, ET AL.
19-8812 PINEDA-HERNANDEZ, ALFONSO V. UNITED STATES

19-8813 FRANKS, TOM M. V. KIRK, DEPUTY SHERIFF, ET AL.
19-8815 NUNEZ-LOPEZ, JOSE A. V. UNITED STATES
19-8817 HARRELL, BARRY L. V. UNITED STATES
19-8818 JOHNSON, SHARON V. SUPERIOR COURT OF CA, ET AL.
19-8819 RIVERA, HECTOR V. UNITED STATES
19-8820 VELAZQUEZ, CESAR V. UNITED STATES
19-8822 MONTERO, EDDIE V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.
19-8823 PEDRIN, ALEX J. V. UNITED STATES
19-8824 NEWTON, KENNETH V. ALABAMA
19-8825 NAVARRO, EDGARDO V. UNITED STATES
19-8826 GENRETTE, ANDREA V. BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON TRUST
19-8827 FOWLER, DAVID V. INDYMAC BANK, FSB, ET AL.
19-8828 LEGGETT, MICHAEL J. V. UNITED STATES
19-8829 PURNELL, ANASTASIA V. UNITED STATES
19-8830 OXENDINE, JUSTIN M. V. UNITED STATES
19-8833 MANN, CHRISTOPHER V. MARYLAND
19-8834 DUTTA-ROY, MONOSIJ V. JYSK BED'N LINEN
19-8836 CULPEPPER, BOBBY R. V. TEXAS
19-8837 NIPPER, DONNIE W. V. UNITED STATES
19-8839 MORROW, CLAYTON D. V. FLORIDA
19-8840 COOPER, DARNELL V. WEXFORD HEALTH, INC., ET AL.
19-8841 MOORE, GREGORY V. ORANGE COUNTY, CA, ET AL.
19-8842 PRADO, ANGEL V. UNITED STATES
19-8843 PUSHKAROVYCH, OLEKSANDR V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
19-8844 PICCONE, LOUIS A. V. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
19-8845 BRANT, CHARLES G. V. FLORIDA
19-8846 NOWAKOWSKI, DAVID V. PENNSYLVANIA
19-8847 NIXON, MICHAEL D. V. UNITED STATES

19-8848 PHILLIPS, CURTIS V. OBERLANDER, DEREK, ET AL.
19-8849 PEDROZA, LINDA V. FLORIDA
19-8851 SZANTO, PETER V. JURGENS, ALYCE A.
19-8852 SAMEER, MADHU V. KHERA, SAMEER
19-8853 SAJOUS, ALAN R. V. UNITED STATES
19-8855 JOHNSON, ROBERT H. V. TESTER, EDDIE, ET AL.
19-8856 BROWN, JASON L. V. BROWN, LISA M.
19-8858 LYMAS, XAVIER D. V. UNITED STATES
19-8859 MAUS, BRIAN A. V. ECKSTEIN, WARDEN
19-8861 APTILIASIMOV, FIKRI V. PENNSYLVANIA
19-8862 ALLEN, DERRICK M. V. TOTAL VISA, ET AL.
19-8863 STRAUSBAUGH, MICHAEL V. UNITED STATES
19-8864 WILLIAMS, CALVIN D. V. SAMSON RESOURCES CORPORATION
19-8865 SCHULTZ, ALEXANDER M. V. WISCONSIN
19-8866 CHUM, YARA V. COYNE-FAGUE, DIR., RI DOC
19-8867 BRADLEY, LEONARD L. V. UNITED STATES
19-8868 TIMS, RODRECAS V. UNITED STATES
19-8869 WADE, ROBERT V. MONROE CTY. DIST. ATT'Y, ET AL.
19-8870 RECIO, DANIEL V. V. VASQUEZ, RUDY, ET AL.
19-8871 SCHULTE, JOSHUA A. V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN., ET AL.
19-8872 SIMPSON, JAMES H. V. CLARKE, DIR., VA DOC
19-8874 SCULLY, ROBERT W. V. UNITED STATES
19-8876 JALLOH, SOLOMON V. UNITED STATES
19-8877 LOMAS, PATRICK D. V. UNITED STATES
19-8878 RICHARDSON, FRANK V. UNITED STATES
19-8879 SEKHON, GURMINDER V. CALIFORNIA
19-8880 HARMAN, DAVID V. ZATECKY, SUPT., PENDLETON
19-8881 FOOTE, GEORGE A. V. INDIANA

19-8882 HATT, GEORGE D. V. WASHINGTON
19-8883 GUNDY, NATHAN E. V. UNITED STATES
19-8884 GRAY, SAMUEL V. UNITED STATES
19-8885 CADENAS-URENA, JUAN L. V. UNITED STATES
19-8886 ERICKSON, JON E. V. COLLINS, JUDGE, ETC., ET AL.
19-8887 PENA-RIVERA, MARIA V. UNITED STATES
19-8888 OVIEDO, HENRY V. WMATA
19-8890 HODGE, RICHARD A. V. UNITED STATES
19-8891 HOWARD, JEFFERY L. V. MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING CORP.
19-8892 PEREZ-CUBERTIER, EDWIN G. V. UNITED STATES
19-8893 HENRY, DARRYL V. UNITED STATES
19-8894 HALLIBURTON, MICHAEL V. BD. OF PROF'L RESPONSIBILITY
19-8895 RODRIGUEZ, DARIO M. V. LAWSON, JUSTICE, ETC., ET AL.
19-8896 REYES, MELODIO V. UNITED STATES
19-8897 SMITH, DAVID L. V. NORTH CAROLINA
19-8901 ROSAS, FABIAN F. V. FILSON, WARDEN, ET AL.
19-8902 PATINO-VILLALOBOS, RAFAEL A. V. UNITED STATES
19-8906 KINARD, NATHAN M. V. HOFFMAN, MICHAEL, ET AL.
19-8907 BOYER, JONATHAN V. VANNOY, WARDEN
19-8908 POPE, PRESTON V. UNITED STATES
19-8909 HAZE, GRANT R. V. POOLE, ADM'R, SCOTLAND
19-8911 THOMPSON, LEE M. V. UNITED STATES
19-8912 ARCE-CALDERON, GIEZI V. UNITED STATES
19-8913 ABBASSI, WASFI V. UNITED STATES
19-8914 FERGUSON, BOBBY W. V. UNITED STATES
19-8915 GLASSGOW, ROBERT E. V. UNITED STATES
19-8916 HAMILTON, ADAM L. V. RAMEY, WARDEN
19-8917 HALE, MELODY J. V. IN DEPT. OF CHILD SERVICES

19-8918 DAVIS, DONOVAN G. V. UNITED STATES
19-8919 CLEVINGER, SCOTT V. PHILLIPS, WARDEN
19-8920 COLBERT, DESHAWN V. BURT, WARDEN
19-8922 CRAKER, AMBER R. V. TEXAS
19-8923 LEGGETT, BRYANT O. V. UNITED STATES
19-8925 LUNDBERG, ROBERT T. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC
19-8926 GOVEA, ROBERTO C. V. UNITED STATES
19-8927 MITCHELL, ALFRED B. V. SHARP, WARDEN
19-8928 CAMPOS-LAGUNAS, OSCAR V. UNITED STATES
19-8930 DUNAHUE, REGINALD L. V. KELLEY, DIR., AR DOC, ET AL.
20-1 DAVIS, NICHOLAS E. V. UNITED STATES
20-2 VALENTIN, HECTOR L. V. ROCHESTER, NY, ET AL.
20-3 BALVIN, TERRY V. RAIN AND HAIL, LLC
20-4 WOODROOF, ROSANNE L. V. CUNNINGHAM, JOSEPH F., ET AL.
20-6 BURKE, WILLIAM V. PROGRESSIVE GULF INS.
20-7 BERKA, GEORGE V. MIDDLETOWN, CT
20-9 PURI, BIBIJI, ET AL. V. KHALSA, SOPURKH K., ET AL.
20-12 SPEER, SHERI V. SEAPORT CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC
20-13 LAVERGNE, BRANDON S. V. CAIN, WARDEN, ET AL.
20-15 PENNYMAC FINANCIAL SERV., ET AL. V. HEIDRICH, ERICH, ET AL.
20-16 BINNS, EDWARD W. V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.
20-17 ROBERTSON, WADE V. HONN, RICHARD A., ET AL.
20-21 FLESHNER, BILLY D. V. TIEDT, MATTHEW, ET AL.
20-24 GREAT LAKES MINERALS, LLC V. OHIO, ET AL.
20-25 RODRIGUEZ, ISIDORO V. VIRGINIA STATE BAR
20-29 DISCEPOLO, SARA V. DEPT. OF JUSTICE
20-30 MARTIN, NIGEL C. V. UNITED STATES
20-32 MORSA, STEVE V. IANCU, ANDRE

20-33 GRACE INT'L ASSEMBLY OF GOD V. FESTA, GENNARO, ET AL.
20-34 GRIMES, ANTHONY T. V. KENTUCKY
20-35 FRANKEL, JOSHUA E. V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.
20-36 MCGOWAN, MICHAEL J. V. UNITED STATES
20-41 WEXLER, WARREN V. UNITED STATES
20-42 SOLARES MIJANGOS, ADELINA V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
20-43 REICH, AMANDA N., ET AL. V. ELIZABETHTOWN, KY, ET AL.
20-46 PORT OF CORPUS CHRISTI AUTHORITY V. SHERWIN ALUMINA CO., ET AL.
20-49 MYMA, PETER N. V. WROE, WENDY A.
20-51 BENEVIDES, PEDRO P. V. UNITED STATES
20-52 APONTE-BERMEDEZ, YEITZA M. V. COLÓN, ELIGIO, ET AL.
20-55 ANDERSON, WILLIAM A. V. AM. GENERAL LIFE INS. CO.
20-56 YEH, WEN CHIANN V. NC STATE UNIV., ET AL.
20-59 CAMPBELL, CHARLES R. V. BENNETT, HOLLIE, ET AL.
20-61 MELVIN, JOAN O. V. ZAPPALA, STEPHEN D., ET AL.
20-63 PIERCE, SAMUEL V. YALE UNIVERSITY, ET AL.
20-64 McMAHON, DAVID, ET AL. V. HARTZELL, JAY, ET AL.
20-65 REINHAUS, WALTER V. ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
20-66 G&M REALTY L.P., ET AL. V. CASTILLO, MARIA, ET AL.
20-67 SMITH, DELANEY E. V. COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL.
20-68 CHEETAH OMNI LLC V. AT&T SERVICES, INC., ET AL.
20-69 FULLER, WILLIAM O. V. BANCO BILBAO VIZCAYA ARGENTARIA
20-70 MAHADEVAN, JAGAN V. BIKKINA, PREM
20-71 BROWN, STEPHEN P. V. UNITED STATES
20-72 HIMSEL, JANET L., ET AL. V. 4/9 LIVESTOCK, LLC, ET AL.
20-73 IV SOLUTIONS, INC. V. PACIFICARE LIFE & HEALTH INS.
20-75 HESTON, JEFFREY G. V. G. B. CAPITAL HOLDINGS
20-76 HAGE, GHASSAN V. MHANNA, FIDA

20-77 IVEY, STEVEN V. CORCORAN, RICHARD
20-79 DANIELS, CEDRIC L. V. DAVEY, WARDEN
20-80 BLODGETT, DIANE S., ET AL. V. UNITED STATES
20-81 BERBER, DIANA V. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., ET AL.
20-84 CANUTO, TERESITA A. V. ALEXANDER, TROY, ET AL.
20-85 DIMPS, SHIRLEY V. TACONIC CORRECTIONAL, ET AL.
20-87 NOBLES, GEORGE L. V. NORTH CAROLINA
20-89 RHODES, THOMAS D. V. SMITH, WARDEN
20-90 SLONE, EUGENE V. UNITED STATES
20-91 MARTIN, JOSEPH H. V. DEPT. OF HOMELAND SEC.
20-93 DOE, JANE V. HUNTER, ATT'Y GEN. OF OK, ET AL.
20-94 DEKOM, MARTIN V. NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC
20-95 HICKS-WASHINGTON, CAROLYN V. HOUSING AUTHORITY
20-99 SCHUCHARDT, ELLIOTT V. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF U.S., ET AL.
20-103 STOCKMAN, STEPHEN E. V. UNITED STATES
20-104 SMITH, BRIAN V. WASHINGTON
20-108 POUPART, PAUL V. LANDRY, ATT'Y GEN. OF LA, ET AL.
20-110 KANNRY, JACK S., ET UX. V. CIR
20-113 HAMMANN, JERALD V. WELLS FARGO BANK
20-115 KINNEY, CHARLES G. V. USCA 9
20-116 ROBLES RODRIGUEZ, BLAS V. V. SAUL, ANDREW M.
20-117 SEQUEIRA, JAIRO V. NICARAGUA, ET AL.
20-118 GREER, GREGORY V. GENERAL DYNAMICS INFO. TECH.
20-119 RUGGIERO, LOUIS V. UNITED STATES
20-121 SPIEGAL, MARSHALL V. KIM, MICHAEL C.
20-123 RHEINSTEIN, JASON E. V. ATT'Y GRIEVANCE COMM'N OF MD
20-127 WAY, DOUGLAS J. V. UNITED STATES
20-129 BADAWI, MUHANAD E. V. UNITED STATES

20-130 DANG, HUNG V. WA DEPT. OF HEALTH
20-133 DIAZ, JOSEPH M. V. UNITED STATES
20-137 McCURDY, PRESCOTT V. MAINE
20-143 LOWMAN, MICHAEL H. V. UNITED STATES
20-145 SKIDMORE, CARL V. LIZARRAGA, WARDEN
20-146 BENAVIDES, MARK H. V. TEXAS
20-155 NEW ENGLAND TEAMSTERS & TRUCKING V. SUN CAPITAL PARTNERS, ET AL.
20-158 SRAM, LLC V. FOX FACTORY, INC.
20-160 HALIM, AHMED V. UNITED STATES
20-162 CLAIBORNE, DAMON J. V. McCARTHY, SEC. OF ARMY
20-167 MICHELSON, LILIBETH V. DEPT. OF ARMY
20-169 METSCH, LAWRENCE R. V. HAJDASZ, TIMOTHY
20-173 HEFFLIN, JAMES R., ET UX. V. CIR
20-174 BAEHR, PATRICK, ET UX. V. CREIG NORTHROP TEAM, ET AL.
20-181 MILES, DANIEL L. V. SVINICKI, KRISTINE, ET AL.
20-189 BARNES, ROBERT V. STANGE, WARDEN
20-191 SILVA, PATRICK R. V. UNITED STATES
20-198 WILLIAMS, TAMATRICE V. SHERWOOD, AR
20-203 DEGAN, LaDONNA, ET AL. V. BOARD OF TRUSTEES
20-205 Z. B. V. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
20-206 ALBRITTEN, WANDA V. CAL FIRE, ET AL.
20-214 FARD, AKBAR G. V. UNITED STATES
20-221 FLORES DE FREITAS, FRANQUI F. V. UNITED STATES
20-226 RATLIFF, KENNETH V. ARANSAS COUNTY, TX, ET AL.
20-238 CHANGZHOU SINOTYPE TECHNOLOGY V. ROCKEFELLER TECHNOLOGY INV.
20-266 BIEGANSKI, BRADLEY V. ARIZONA
20-282 CARMON, SHELDON V. CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC.
20-286 U.S., EX REL. JANSSEN V. LAWRENCE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

20-292 PINDER, JOHN V. CROWTHER, WARDEN
20-5001 NORRIS, MARK V. UNITED STATES
20-5002 AYUN-FLORES, GILBERTO V. UNITED STATES
20-5004 ZERONI, MICHAEL J. V. UNITED STATES
20-5005 WILLIAMS, ARCHIE V. UNITED STATES
20-5006 OLIVAS-GUEVARA, MANUEL V. UNITED STATES
20-5007 FOLEY, ANTHONY R. V. UNITED STATES
20-5008 GARZA, EMILIO V. UNITED STATES
20-5009 WIGGINS, CURTIS V. GOLDEN CORRAL CORP.
20-5010 WARNER, DANNY L. V. MONTANA
20-5011 WANNIARACHCHI, THARANGA V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
20-5013 NEWSON, RAFEAL D. V. SUPERIOR COURT OF CA, ET AL.
20-5014 PERALTA, DARWIN J. V. NORTH CAROLINA
20-5015 SUMTER, JAMES L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5016 BUTLER, ASHTON C. V. UNITED STATES
20-5017 MODISETTE, JERRY G. V. UNITED STATES
20-5018 MIDDLETON, ROY H. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC
20-5019 BARRERA-VELASQUEZ, RAUL V. UNITED STATES
20-5020 ALLEN, DERRICK M. V. TRI-LIFT NORTH CAROLINA, ET AL.
20-5021 ALLEN, DERRICK M. V. NORTH CAROLINA, ET AL.
20-5022 ALLEN, DERRICK M. V. GLINES, SARA, ET AL.
20-5023 ANDERSON, CARTER V. V. VANNOY, WARDEN
20-5024 BROWN, CALVIN E. V. WILLIAMS, BLAIR
20-5025 AMOS, EDDIE M. V. BOWEN, TOMMY
20-5026 ARBAUGH, JAMES D. V. UNITED STATES
20-5027 ALLRED, CHRISTOPHER V. UTTECHT, WARDEN
20-5031 RAMIREZ-ARROYO, ARTEMIO V. UNITED STATES
20-5033 MARRON, TRAVIS J. V. CLARKE, DIR., VA DOC

20-5034 MARTIN, DONN D. V. LUMPKIN, DIR., TX DCJ
20-5035 McLENDON, OCTAVIUS, ET AL. V. UNITED STATES
20-5036 PERRY, JERMOND V. WOODS, JEFFREY
20-5038 OLANGIAN, REZA V. UNITED STATES
20-5039 SPENCER, ANTWOYN T. V. UNITED STATES
20-5041 SAIN, JUSTIN L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5042 SILVA-AGUILAR, JULIAN V. UNITED STATES
20-5043 RIZK, JIPING V. DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING
20-5044 LIVIZ, ILYA V. SUPREME COURT OF MA
20-5048 BOWMAN, JOSH L. V. BOYD, WARDEN
20-5049 MARTIN, KEVIN L. V. GALIPEAU, WARDEN
20-5050 LESLIE, EZRA V. NEW YORK
20-5051 STAGGERS, ANDRE P. V. UNITED STATES
20-5052 LEWIS, JEREMY E. V. UNITED STATES
20-5053 BROWN, DEANDRE L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5054 DAVIS, MICHAEL L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5055 CASTELLANOS MURATELLA, JUAN C. V. UNITED STATES
20-5056 CORTEZ, GEORGE V. UNITED STATES
20-5057 CHAVEZ, LEDINSON V. UNITED STATES
20-5058 ESTEVEZ, RANDY V. UNITED STATES
20-5059 GOODIN, CHRISTOPHER V. UNITED STATES
20-5061 EMIABATA, PHILIP V. BB&T, ET AL.
20-5062 BYRD, PAUL V. FLORIDA
20-5063 BLACKBURN, RALEIGH P. V. SAUL, ANDREW M.
20-5065 BOGLE, BRETT A. V. FLORIDA
20-5066 SPILLARD, EVERETT L. V. SUPERIOR COURT OF CA, ET AL.
20-5067 RIGGS, JAMES A. V. CASSADY, WARDEN
20-5068 QIN, LI V. KONG-BROWN, BARBARA

20-5069 ROSADO-SANCHEZ, PABLO E. V. BANCO SANTANDER PUERTO RICO
20-5070 RAMS, JOAQUIN S. V. VIRGINIA
20-5071 MORAN, DAVID P. V. FLORIDA
20-5073 MARTINEZ-HERNANDEZ, GILBERTO V. UNITED STATES
20-5076 CEJA-VALDEZ, JORGE A. V. UNITED STATES
20-5077 CIPRIANO-ORTEGA, JOAQUIN M. V. UNITED STATES
20-5078 ADZHEMYAN, VAGAN V. UNITED STATES
20-5079 FINCHUM, CHARLES M. V. UNITED STATES
20-5080 WIGGIN, CHRISTOPHER G. V. UNITED STATES
20-5081 HOFFERT, CLARENCE V. UNITED STATES
20-5082 SCHWARTZ, ROBERT D. V. MADDEN, WARDEN
20-5083 KAVANTZAS, TELLY V. FLORIDA
20-5084 ELLIS, PRISCILLA A. V. UNITED STATES
20-5086 CALHOUN, JOHNNY M. S. V. FLORIDA
20-5088 PONCE-MARES, FRANCISCO J. V. UNITED STATES
20-5092 CORTEZ-HERNANDEZ, SEBASTIAN V. CLARKE, DIR., VA DOC
20-5093 CLAYBORN, DION V. UNITED STATES
20-5095 CLAIRVOYANT, JETHRO L. V. FL DOC, ET AL.
20-5097 WILKERSON, ROBERT E. V. TEXAS
20-5098 TSUKERMAN, MIKHAIL V. W. COM. UNIT SCH. DIST. NO. 12
20-5099 WILSON, LANTREL D. V. UNITED STATES
20-5101 VISAGE, TIMOTHY V. WOODALL, R. E., ET AL.
20-5102 HAILE, MAKEDA V. CONTEH, ABDUL
20-5103 HAILE, MAKEDA V. KAISER PERMANENTE
20-5104 TAPP, JUSTIN V. UNITED STATES
20-5105 TEMPLE, DAVID S. V. VANNOY, WARDEN
20-5106 WHITTEN, ANTWON G. V. CLARKE, DIR., VA DOC
20-5107 MONTGOMERY, VERNON V. DELAWARE

20-5108 OJEDA-AMARILLAS, SALVADOR V. UNITED STATES
20-5109 OTGOO, GANAA V. ILLINOIS
20-5110 CARDONA-RAMIREZ, GABRIEL V. UNITED STATES
20-5111 SANDERS, JAMES E. V. LUMPKIN, DIR., TX DCJ
20-5112 ROBINSON, DAVID W. V. POLIS, GOV. OF CO, ET AL.
20-5113 ROBERTSON, JEREMIAS V. UNITED STATES
20-5114 ROMERO-OCHOA, LEONEL V. WASHINGTON
20-5115 SERRANO-RAMIREZ, GERSON V. UNITED STATES
20-5116 ANDERSON, STEVEN B. V. WINN, WARDEN
20-5117 RODGERS, JEREMIAH M. V. FLORIDA
20-5120 COTTO, GIOVANNI V. UNITED STATES
20-5121 GUTIERREZ-DIAZ, BRAYAN V. UNITED STATES
20-5122 FLORES-LEZAMA, MAXIMO V. UNITED STATES
20-5127 ESPINOZA, THOMAS E. V. COLORADO, ET AL.
20-5128 CHAPMAN, VERNON V. UNITED STATES
20-5129 SHEER, DAVID A. V. WARREN, WARDEN
20-5130 SOLIS, ANTONIO L. V. SHINN, DIR., AZ DOC, ET AL.
20-5131 KIMBREW, MICHAEL V. UNITED STATES
20-5134 BARREN, DONALD R. V. DANIELS, DIR., NV DOC, ET AL.
20-5135 BOWELL, JAMES V. STATE BAR OF CA
20-5137 MYLES, ANTOINE D. V. UNITED STATES
20-5139 JONES, ALGERE V. UNITED STATES
20-5140 TORRES, WILFREDO V. NEW YORK, NY, ET AL.
20-5141 WILLIFORD, DANIEL H. V. UNITED STATES
20-5142 WARD, GLEN JONES V. CORIZON
20-5143 WARD, GLEN JONES V. IDAHO, ET AL.
20-5144 LEVATTE, RYKEITH A. V. UNITED STATES
20-5146 WARENBACK, DOUGLAS H. V. NEVEN, WARDEN, ET AL.

20-5147 TAEBEL, MITCHELL V. ORTEGA, ALANE, ET AL.
20-5148 WOOD, ROBERT J. O. V. CALIFORNIA
20-5149 MALACHOWSKI, MARCEL V. UNITED STATES
20-5150 JENKINS, ERNEST R. V. CLARKE, WARDEN
20-5151 REED, ANTOINE D. V. PARAMO, WARDEN
20-5152 ARREDONDO-MORENO, JOEL V. UNITED STATES
20-5153 SIMS, JAMIELL V. UNITED STATES
20-5154 SALGUERO, JORGE A. H. V. CALIFORNIA
20-5156 SAUCEDO, MANUEL C. V. UNITED STATES
20-5158 SILVERS, ALEXANDER J. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.
20-5159 ROYBAL, KRISTOPHER L. V. MINNESOTA
20-5160 HENDERSON, KEITH V. MILES, WARDEN
20-5161 GONZALEZ-GATICA, ROBERTO V. UNITED STATES
20-5162 TERRY, JOSEPH S. V. UNITED STATES
20-5163 WELSH, LONNIE K. V. TEXAS
20-5164 WELSH, LONNIE K. V. TEXAS
20-5165 WELSH, LONNIE K. V. TEXAS
20-5167 McINTOSH, JEAN V. UNITED STATES
20-5168 WILSON, JAMES V. NORTH CAROLINA
20-5169 THOMAS, RANDY A. V. OHIO
20-5170 WILLIAMS, WILLIAM R. V. MICHIGAN
20-5171 WATKINS, CEDRIC V. HUTCHISON, WARDEN, ET AL.
20-5173 VELAZQUEZ, JUAN D. V. TEXAS
20-5174 THOMAS, RONALD D. V. MUNIZ, WARDEN
20-5175 WILSON, JOHN D. V. FLORIDA
20-5176 HARRIS, NICHOLAS V. CALIFORNIA
20-5177 FELIX-CARRAZCO, ROLANDO V. UNITED STATES
20-5178 FERNETUS, JIMMY V. UNITED STATES

20-5179 GUILLEN, ALBERTO V. McTIGHE, PATRICK, ET AL.
20-5181 VANG, CHONGNENGWT V. SAUL, ANDREW M.
20-5182 WILLIAMS, JESSE V. WELLS, WARDEN
20-5183 HOGLUND, KEITH V. NEAL, WARDEN
20-5185 NELSON, JOSHUA J. V. TEXAS
20-5186 BUTLER, JOHN E. V. NORTH CAROLINA
20-5187 BRENNAN, THOMAS L. V. STEIN, ATT'Y GEN. OF NC
20-5188 BARNES, ADELSON V. DOWLING, WARDEN
20-5190 RODRIGUEZ, CHRISTIAN V. USDC NV, ET AL.
20-5191 EDWARDS, JOSHUA V. UNITED STATES
20-5192 MOSER, SCOTT A. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.
20-5193 McWHORTER, MOLLEE M. V. UNITED STATES
20-5195 CARRASCO, GILBERT V. UNITED STATES
20-5196 McCONNELL, DAVID V. FLORIDA
20-5197 MOORE, LAMAR V. UNITED STATES
20-5199 SIMMS, ROBERT L. V. CALIFORNIA
20-5200 SANFORD, GERALD A. V. TN DOC, ET AL.
20-5201 CRAWFORD, TRAVARIS V. UNITED STATES
20-5203 JIM, DERRICK I. V. UNITED STATES
20-5204 LERNER, LYUDMILA V. COWEN, STANLEY
20-5205 LEWIS, JAMAAL A. V. JOYNER, WARDEN
20-5206 KNUTH, NATHAN D. V. COLORADO
20-5207 LONG, WILLIAM J. V. JAIME, WARDEN
20-5208 JONES, WILLIAM M. V. LUMPKIN, DIR., TX DCJ
20-5210 DUNN, ASHLEY L. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC., ET AL.
20-5211 DOBSON, MICHAEL A. V. STOLLE, COLIN D., ET AL.
20-5213 CODY, JOHN V. SLUSHER, KAREN, ET AL.
20-5214 HAYNES, RICARDO A. V. WILKIE, SEC. OF VA

20-5215 LANG, JESSICA V. NEBRASKA
20-5218 PAGE, DANIEL V. BAKER, WARDEN, ET AL.
20-5219 NGUYEN, BINH V. UNITED STATES
20-5220 GROOMES, GERALD L. V. ARKANSAS
20-5221 MARTIN, ARTHUR J. V. FLORIDA
20-5222 JOHNSON, TRAVON N. V. UNITED STATES
20-5223 MADRID-URIARTE, JORGE V. UNITED STATES
20-5224 CLARK, KENNETH V. DIAZ, SEC., CA DOC
20-5225 ALEXANDER, DION V. UNITED STATES
20-5226 FLORES-DOMINGUEZ, JOSE V. UNITED STATES
20-5227 HERNANDEZ-MEDRANO, JESUS V. UNITED STATES
20-5231 S. T., ET AL. V. VT DEPT. FOR CHILDREN, ET AL.
20-5232 ANDERSON, IRIS L. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.
20-5233 BURNS, MICHAEL R. V. UNITED STATES
20-5234 BRYANT, JEREMIAH V. DC OFFICE HUMAN RIGHTS, ET AL.
20-5238 HAYES, WILBERT V. UNITED STATES
20-5239 GRIFFIN, JUNIOR V. UNITED STATES
20-5240 GILMORE, CYNTHIA V. UNITED STATES
20-5241 POTTS, DEWOYNE C. V. GARZA, JOHN
20-5242 MILES, MAURICE V. CDC CORR. OFFICERS, ET AL.
20-5244 LOPEZ, DAVID V. UNITED STATES
20-5245 WALKER, VICTOR J. V. UNITED STATES
20-5246 LUKE, JERRY V. UNITED STATES
20-5247 BURNSIDE, AVERN L. V. REWERTS, WARDEN
20-5248 BERNAL, ROBERT V. UNITED STATES
20-5250 AVILA-JAIMES, OSCAR A. V. UNITED STATES
20-5251 HARRIOT, MICHAEL O. V. UNITED STATES
20-5252 GRACE, GARRY V. UNITED STATES

20-5253 FARRAR, DOUGLAS V. UNITED STATES
20-5255 MASHAK, DON V. CIR
20-5257 MOORE, JIMMY M. V. UNITED STATES
20-5258 HUNTER, NIKOLE M. V. GEICO
20-5259 HOOD WHO, ROBIN V. DEPT. OF TREASURY
20-5262 HENDERSON, STEPHEN V. UNITED STATES
20-5265 SAYED, HAZHAR A. V. COLORADO
20-5267 RICHARDSON, KOLONGI V. UNITED STATES
20-5268 RAMIREZ, LUIS F. V. UNITED STATES
20-5272 WASHINGTON, JOMIAH V. CHAPMAN, WARDEN
20-5273 HARGETT, ANDREW V. UNITED STATES
20-5274 HARRIS, JAMES S. V. KORNEMAN, WARDEN
20-5276 THOMPSON, STAFON E. V. MINNESOTA
20-5280 WILLIAMS, RAHIM V. UNITED STATES
20-5281 ROBINSON, STEVEN V. UNITED STATES
20-5283 LEMUS, MAURICIO V. UNITED STATES
20-5284 LAM, TONY V. UNITED STATES
20-5286 INFANTE, TOMAS R. V. MARTEL, WARDEN, ET AL.
20-5290 PEREZ, ERIC J. V. UNITED STATES
20-5291 JOHNSON, DEXTER L. V. MARLAR, JOHN
20-5292 CHAUDHARI, ASHVINBHAI V. UNITED STATES
20-5293 BATES, STANLEY P. V. UNITED STATES
20-5294 BECTON, BYRON V. PHILLIPS, WARDEN
20-5299 BENSON, ANTONIO V. TENNESSEE
20-5300 SANTANA-GONZALEZ, VICTOR V. UNITED STATES
20-5301 SHANKS, DAVID L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5302 GONGORA, EDWIN V. UNITED STATES
20-5306 HORRELL, PHILLIP L. V. GOMEZ, WARDEN

20-5309 HARRIOT, MICHAEL O. V. DEPT. OF JUSTICE, ET AL.
20-5312 BROWN, SHARRIEFF V. CA DOC
20-5315 STABNOW, ROBERT L. V. HARPSTEAD, JODI
20-5317 RODGERS, JEREMIAH V. FLORIDA
20-5319 AVILA-GONZALEZ, JUAN C. V. UNITED STATES
20-5320 BURKS, JOHNATHAN L. V. MICHIGAN
20-5321 WADENA, MICHAEL W. V. UNITED STATES
20-5323 WRIGHT, ALFRED D. V. UNITED STATES
20-5325 WOODARD, MAURICE V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC
20-5326 GARCIA, JOSE A. V. UNITED STATES
20-5327 HUGGINS, THYOCHUS A. V. CALIFORNIA
20-5329 SCYPHERS, DOUGLAS D. V. WASHINGTON
20-5334 KIEREN, DENNIS K. V. FORD, ATT'Y GEN. OF NV
20-5335 JOHNSON, DUSTIN V. UNITED STATES
20-5337 MEZA, DAVID E. V. UNITED STATES
20-5338 McCANTS, IBRAHIM V. UNITED STATES
20-5339 JENNINGS, LEANDRE R. V. NEBRASKA
20-5340 MAJID, TANVEER S. V. CIA
20-5343 BROME, JAMES V. UNITED STATES
20-5345 TAYLOR, CLARENCE V. UNITED STATES
20-5346 THOMPSON, JERRY L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5347 McCANT, BAKARI V. UNITED STATES
20-5348 MILLER, CHAZDIN V. UNITED STATES
20-5351 WADE, TERRY A. V. WILLIAMS, WARDEN
20-5353 WRIGHT, RAMONE L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5357 COLLYMORE, ANTHONY V. CONNECTICUT
20-5358 FUENTES, DAVID V. UNITED STATES
20-5359 EUSTICE, BRANDON S. V. UNITED STATES

20-5361 TORRES-MARQUEZ, LUIS V. UNITED STATES
20-5362 ALLEN, DAVID W. V. MITCHELL, WARDEN
20-5364 KAMINSKI, JOHN S. V. SEMPLE, COMM'R, CT DOC, ET AL.
20-5369 FARMER, DON V. BOOKER, WARDEN
20-5372 GAMAGE, MELVIN V. MISSISSIPPI
20-5373 HAWKINS, DON N. V. UNITED STATES
20-5376 ESTRADA-EUGENIO, ALFREDO V. UNITED STATES
20-5377 BUCKLES, BRANDON R. V. UNITED STATES
20-5380 PITT, ANTONIO D. V. UNITED STATES
20-5382 GRAHAM, WILLIAM C. V. UNITED STATES
20-5385 HARMON, JUDY V. UNITED STATES
20-5388 BUCK, MICHAEL J. V. TEXAS
20-5389 BAYISA, MILKIYAS V. UNITED STATES
20-5390 BETTS, MICHAEL V. UNITED STATES
20-5391 LAMBERT, INEZ V. PAERSSON, ROB
20-5392 JONES, JERMAINE T. V. UNITED STATES
20-5393 McCULLOUGH, TIMOTHY V. DENNISON, WARDEN
20-5394 MONA, EUGENE V. UNITED STATES
20-5402 SAVICKI, JOSEPH G. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC
20-5403 SANCHEZ, DIMARZIO S. V. UNITED STATES
20-5405 HARDY, JARODERICK V. UNITED STATES
20-5408 JODOIN, ROBERT R. V. UNITED STATES
20-5409 KEEN, JOHNATHAN S. V. UNITED STATES
20-5410 APARICIO-LEON, KEVIN R. V. UNITED STATES
20-5411 ANDERSON, KWAME V. UNITED STATES
20-5412 BLUEW, KENNETH T. V. HORTON, WARDEN
20-5415 LONG, GILLMAN R. V. UNITED STATES
20-5418 VELOZ, DANNY V. UNITED STATES

20-5423 PERALTA-CASTRO, EDWIN J. V. UNITED STATES
20-5424 HANZY, ALFRED L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5427 PORTER, JOSIAH D. V. ILLINOIS
20-5428 MORALES-MERCADO, JOSE R. V. UNITED STATES
20-5429 NEVILLE, DERRICK T. V. UNITED STATES
20-5432 BARNES, MICHAEL J. V. UNITED STATES
20-5433 WIND, GREGORY V. UNITED STATES
20-5435 LLOYD, GARNETT V. UNITED STATES
20-5436 SANTIAGO, CHRISTY V. UNITED STATES
20-5437 TAYLOR, WENDELL V. UNITED STATES
20-5439 SANTIBANEZ, JESSE V. UNITED STATES
20-5440 TEJADA, JOSE V. MASSACHUSETTS
20-5441 SAUNDERS, CRAIG V. GARMEN, SUPT., ROCKVIEW, ET AL.
20-5442 SMITH, CONDRA L. V. DEPT. OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
20-5444 SANDERS, MARK L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5445 WALKER, JELANI V. SHELDON, WARDEN
20-5446 ZHENG, JIN H. V. UNITED STATES
20-5450 WASHINGTON, DARNELL P. V. FLORIDA
20-5457 SMITH, DENNIS A. V. UNITED STATES
20-5470 MILLA-RODRIGUEZ, GERMAN V. UNITED STATES
20-5472 DAILEY, HENRY V. UNITED STATES
20-5473 CHAVEZ, ANDRES V. UNITED STATES
20-5474 CLAYTON, MONTEZ L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5478 HERNANDEZ, FERNANDO V. UNITED STATES
20-5479 BENITEZ, SANTOS M. V. UNITED STATES
20-5481 BROWN, FREDRICK V. UNITED STATES
20-5488 TOALA, FRANKLIN R. L. V. UNITED STATES
20-5490 PAYTON, WILLIAM J. V. UNITED STATES

20-5527 BENTON, MARK V. CAPOZZA, SUPT., FAYETTE, ET AL.

The petitions for writs of certiorari are denied.

19-847 REISMAN, JONATHAN V. ASSOCIATED FACULTIES, ET AL.

The motion of Freedom Foundation for leave to file a brief as *amicus curiae* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

19-1220 SZONYI, ISTVAN V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.

The motion of Pacific Legal Foundation for leave to file a brief as *amicus curiae* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

19-1252 CAMPBELL, CALLAN, ET AL. V. UNITED STATES

The motion of Center for Auto Safety for leave to file a brief as *amicus curiae* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

19-1255 BAKER, WARDEN, ET AL. V. ROSE, JEFF N.

19-1307 THOMAS, WARDEN V. BARNES, WILLIAM L.

The motions of respondents for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are granted. The petitions for writs of certiorari are denied.

19-1341 VAN AUKEN, RICHARD A. V. CATRON, FLETCHER R., ET AL.

The motion of The Center for Estate Administration Reform, et al. for leave to file a brief as *amici curiae* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

19-1415 DIERLAM, JOHN J. V. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF U.S., ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari before judgment is denied.

19-1440 AMMONS, MELVIN, ET AL. V. WISCONSIN CENTRAL, LTD.

The motion of The Sheet Metal, Air, Rail Transportation Workers-Transportation Division, et al. for leave to file a brief as *amici curiae* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

19-7688 NOBLE, RICARDO V. PENNSYLVANIA

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

19-8383 SORO, LUIS A. V. LOPEZ, PEDRO

19-8450 CARMELL, SCOTT L. V. LUMPKIN, DIR., TX DCJ

The motions of petitioners for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied, and the petitions for writs of certiorari are dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

19-8480 CATERBONE, STANLEY J. V. NSA

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

19-8531 HALL, MARC P. V. INCH, M., ET AL.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly

abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*). Justice Kagan took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion and this petition.

19-8534 JOHNSON, ROBERT W. V. PERFORMANT RECOVERY, ET AL.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

19-8560 NOBLE, RICARDO V. PENNSYLVANIA

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

19-8610 SANCHO, ALFREDO M. V. EBNER FAMILY TRUST

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

19-8614 FIELDS, EDWARD L. V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Gorsuch took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

19-8621 PETERSON, STEVEN D. V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Kagan took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

19-8656 JACOBY, MICHAEL V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Gorsuch took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

19-8671 ARUNACHALAM, LAKSHMI V. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.

19-8707 ARUNACHALAM, LAKSHMI V. APPLE, INC., ET AL.

19-8708 ARUNACHALAM, LAKSHMI V. PRESIDIO BANK

The motions of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied, and the petitions for writs of certiorari are dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*). The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of these motions and these petitions.

19-8735 JACKSON, MICHAEL A. V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Alito and Justice Kagan took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

19-8750 ARUNACHALAM, LAKSHMI V. SAP AMERICA, INC.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner

unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*). The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion and this petition.

19-8753 BANKS, FREDERICK H. V. USDC WD PA

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

19-8780 GLICK, RON V. GUIFFRIDA, MARA

19-8797 SHOVE, THEODORE C. V. McDONALD, CAPTAIN, ET AL.

The motions of petitioners for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied, and the petitions for writs of certiorari are dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

19-8814 DAVIS, NICHOLAS A. V. SHARP, INTERIM WARDEN

19-8857 JONES, JOSEPH L. V. DOUGLAS COUNTY JAIL

The petitions for writs of certiorari are denied. Justice Gorsuch took no part in the consideration or decision of these petitions.

19-8924 JENKINS, WILLIAM R. V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

20-57 MCGINNIS, MAURICE V. PERDUE, SEC. OF AGRIC., ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Kavanaugh took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

20-98 WOOD, THOMAS V. BOEING CO.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

20-106 VILAR, ALBERTO, ET AL. V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Sotomayor took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

20-122 TAYLOR, ERIC E. V. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF U.S., ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari before judgment is denied.

20-142 SKIDMORE, MICHAEL V. LED ZEPPELIN, ET AL.

The motion of The Pullman Group, LLC, et al. for leave to file a brief as *amici curiae* is granted. The motion of California Society of Entertainment Lawyers for leave to file a brief as *amicus curiae* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

20-220 VBS DISTRIBUTION, INC., ET AL. V. NUTRIVITA LABORATORIES, ET AL.

The motion of The Law Office of J. Edward Niehaus for leave to file a brief as *amicus curiae* is granted. The motion of

Erwin Chemerinsky for leave to file a brief as *amicus curiae* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

20-265 RAMIREZ, LEON O., ET AL. V. CONOCOPHILLIPS CO., ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

20-5028 LUSSY, RICHARD C. V. DAHOOD, WADE J.

20-5029 LUSSY, RICHARD C. V. LUSSY, HENRY P.

The petitions for writs of certiorari are denied. The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of these petitions.

20-5094 LAUX, ANITA V. MENTOR WORLDWIDE, LLC

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

20-5100 TURNER, STEVEN D. V. USDC CD CA

The petition for a writ of certiorari before judgment is denied.

20-5118 DONAHUE, SEAN M. V. PENNSYLVANIA

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

20-5124 CALTON, ALLEN F. V. TEXAS

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

20-5126 DAY, ROGER C. V. WATSON, WARDEN

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

20-5138 McCOLM, PATRICIA A. V. CALIFORNIA, ET AL.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

20-5166 J. J. H. V. WAUKESHA COUNTY, WI

The motion of National Association of the Deaf and Disability Rights Wisconsin for leave to file a brief as *amicus curiae* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

20-5198 SMITH, FRANKLIN C. V. NURSE MAYFIELD, ET AL.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept

any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

20-5209 CLARK, ROBERT L. V. FYE, CHIQUITA A., ET AL.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

20-5229 LOPEZ, ARTHUR V. COSTA MESA POLICE DEPT., ET AL.

20-5230 LOPEZ, ARTHUR V. NEWPORT BEACH POLICE DEPT.

The motions of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied, and the petitions for writs of certiorari are dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

20-5235 BIKUNDI, MICHAEL D. V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Kavanaugh took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

20-5275 TORRES, MARCO M. V. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF U.S., ET AL.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

20-5311 HOLLIHAN, RICHARD V. PENNSYLVANIA

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion and this petition.

20-5336 JONES, MATTHEW V. BRUMBLEY, ALICE

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

20-5431 ACKERMAN, WALTER V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Gorsuch took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

20-5469 LEE, ALFONZO T. V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Kagan took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

20-5475 CABELLO, ARCHIE V. UNITED STATES

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

HABEAS CORPUS DENIED

19-8685 IN RE GIGI FAIRCHILD-LITTLEFIELD

20-78 IN RE SCOTT L. YOUNGBEAR

20-5145 IN RE CHARLES TALBERT

20-5189 IN RE KHAYREE SMITH

20-5194 IN RE KEVIN D. MOORE

20-5287 IN RE EDDIE A. JACKSON

- 20-5349 IN RE DARYL L. ZIMMER
- 20-5573 IN RE ABDUL M. UNDERWOOD
- 20-5582 IN RE KARL-HEINZ DUPUY
- 20-5605 IN RE ERIC W. KOEHL
- 20-5607 IN RE BILLIE J. ALLEN
- 20-5609 IN RE GARY W. BARNES

The petitions for writs of habeas corpus are denied.

- 19-8777 IN RE GARVESTER BRACKEN

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

- 20-5125 IN RE ALLEN F. CALTON

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

MANDAMUS DENIED

- 19-1321 IN RE CHERYL A. WOLF, ET AL.
- 19-8374 IN RE SHA'RON A. SIMS
- 19-8734 IN RE REN Y. DENG
- 19-8854 IN RE REGINALD S. STROTHER
- 19-8905 IN RE FRANK J. MATYLINSKY
- 20-5040 IN RE ANTWOYN T. SPENCER

20-5096 IN RE SHAVEZ EVANS

20-5136 IN RE ABDUL MOHAMMED

20-5324 IN RE JEREMIAH YBARRA

The petitions for writs of mandamus are denied.

19-1286 IN RE NINA SHAHIN

19-1287 IN RE ROBERT SARHAN, ET UX.

The petitions for writs of mandamus and/or prohibition are denied.

19-1343 IN RE EDWARD STARLING

The petition for a writ of mandamus is denied. Justice Kavanaugh took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

19-1377 IN RE NINA SHAHIN

The petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition is denied.

19-8384 IN RE LEVON SPAULDING

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of mandamus is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

19-8436 IN RE MICHAEL A. YOUNG

The petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition is denied.

19-8491 IN RE TIM SUNDY

19-8492 IN RE TIM SUNDY

The motions of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied, and the petitions for writs of mandamus and/or prohibition are dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

19-8860 IN RE LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of mandamus is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*). The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion and this petition.

20-44 IN RE DAVID A. GOLDEN

20-5012 IN RE JEANETTE WOOLSEY-ROSS

The petitions for writs of mandamus and/or prohibition are denied.

20-5045 IN RE DANIEL H. JONES

20-5046 IN RE DANIEL H. JONES

20-5047 IN RE DANIEL H. JONES

The motions of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied, and the petitions for writs of mandamus and/or prohibition are dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in

noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

20-5212 IN RE ALLEN F. CALTON

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of mandamus is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

PROHIBITION DENIED

20-5465 IN RE FRANCISCO FELIX

The petition for a writ of prohibition is denied.

REHEARINGS DENIED

19-7319 WATERS, THOMAS B. V. STEWART, JOHN, ET AL.

19-7592 McALLISTER, JOHN D. V. MALFITANO, TIMOTHY, ET AL.

19-8061 WANG, WEIXING V. MARCOTTE, ROBERT

19-8119 WILLIAMS, WALTER E. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC

19-8251 TALKINGTON, KEVIN D. V. LUMPKIN, DIR., TX DCJ

19-8380 MONDS, SAMORY A. V. UNITED STATES

19-8493 STINSON, MARK V. HENDRIX, WARDEN

The petitions for rehearing are denied.

19-8305 ONONUJU, KINSLEY V. VIRGINIA

The motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing is denied.

Cite as: 592 U. S. ____ (2020)

1

Statement of THOMAS, J.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

KIM DAVIS *v.* DAVID ERMOLD, ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

No. 19–926. Decided October 5, 2020

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Statement of JUSTICE THOMAS, with whom JUSTICE ALITO joins, respecting the denial of certiorari.

In *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U. S. 644 (2015), the Court read a right to same-sex marriage into the Fourteenth Amendment, even though that right is found nowhere in the text. Several Members of the Court noted that the Court’s decision would threaten the religious liberty of the many Americans who believe that marriage is a sacred institution between one man and one woman. If the States had been allowed to resolve this question through legislation, they could have included accommodations for those who hold these religious beliefs. *Id.*, at 711 (ROBERTS, C. J., dissenting); *id.*, at 734 (THOMAS, J., dissenting). The Court, however, bypassed that democratic process. Worse still, though it briefly acknowledged that those with sincerely held religious objections to same-sex marriage are often “decent and honorable,” *id.*, at 672, the Court went on to suggest that those beliefs espoused a bigoted worldview, *ibid.* See also *id.*, at 670 (noting that such a view of marriage is “demean[ing]” to gays and lesbians because it “teach[es] that gays and lesbians are unequal”); *id.*, at 671 (describing the view of marriage dictated by the religious beliefs of many as “impos[ing] stigma and injury”); *id.*, at 675 (characterizing the traditional view of marriage as “disrespect[ful]” to gays and lesbians). The dissenting Justices predicted that “[t]hese . . . assaults on the character of fair-minded people will have an effect, in society and in court,” *id.*, at 712 (opinion of ROBERTS, C. J.), allowing “governments, employers, and schools” to “vilify” those with these

Statement of THOMAS, J.

religious beliefs “as bigots,” *id.*, at 741 (opinion of ALITO, J.). Those predictions did not take long to become reality.

Kim Davis, a former county clerk in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, was responsible for authorizing marriage licenses. Davis is also a devout Christian. When she began her tenure as clerk, Davis’ sincerely held religious beliefs—that marriage exists between one man and one woman—corresponded with the definition of marriage under Kentucky law. See Ky. Rev. Stat. §402.005 (1998); Ky. Const. §233A (2004). Within weeks of this Court granting certiorari in *Obergefell*, Davis began lobbying for amendments to Kentucky law that would protect the free exercise rights of those who had religious objections to same-sex marriage. But those efforts were cut short by this Court’s decision in *Obergefell*.

As a result of this Court’s alteration of the Constitution, Davis found herself faced with a choice between her religious beliefs and her job. When she chose to follow her faith, and without any statutory protection of her religious beliefs, she was sued almost immediately for violating the constitutional rights of same-sex couples.

Davis may have been one of the first victims of this Court’s cavalier treatment of religion in its *Obergefell* decision, but she will not be the last. Due to *Obergefell*, those with sincerely held religious beliefs concerning marriage will find it increasingly difficult to participate in society without running afoul of *Obergefell* and its effect on other antidiscrimination laws. It would be one thing if recognition for same-sex marriage had been debated and adopted through the democratic process, with the people deciding not to provide statutory protections for religious liberty under state law.* But it is quite another when the Court

* Under this Court’s precedents, “the right of free exercise does not relieve an individual of the obligation to comply with a valid and neutral law of general applicability on the ground that the law proscribes (or pre-

Cite as: 592 U. S. ____ (20__)

3

Statement of THOMAS, J.

forces that choice upon society through its creation of atextual constitutional rights and its ungenerous interpretation of the Free Exercise Clause, leaving those with religious objections in the lurch.

Moreover, *Obergefell* enables courts and governments to brand religious adherents who believe that marriage is between one man and one woman as bigots, making their religious liberty concerns that much easier to dismiss. For example, relying on *Obergefell*, one member of the Sixth Circuit panel in this case described Davis’ sincerely held religious beliefs as “anti-homosexual animus.” 936 F. 3d 429, 438 (2019) (Bush, J., concurring in part and concurring in judgment). In other words, *Obergefell* was read to suggest that being a public official with traditional Christian values was legally tantamount to invidious discrimination toward homosexuals. This assessment flows directly from *Obergefell*’s language, which characterized such views as “disparag[ing]” homosexuals and “diminish[ing] their personhood” through “[d]ignitary wounds.” 576 U. S., at 672, 678. Since *Obergefell*, parties have continually attempted to label people of good will as bigots merely for refusing to alter their religious beliefs in the wake of prevailing orthodoxy. See *Campaign for Southern Equality v. Bryant*, 197 F. Supp. 3d 905, 910 (SD Miss. 2016) (recognizing the plaintiffs’ argument equating an accommodation allowing religious objectors to recuse themselves from signing same-sex licenses with impermissible discrimination); *Brush & Nib Studio, LC v. Phoenix*, 244 Ariz. 59, 66, 418 P. 3d 426, 434

scribes) conduct that his religion proscribes (or prescribes).” *Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith*, 494 U. S. 872, 879 (1990) (internal quotation marks omitted). As a result of *Smith*, accommodations for those with sincerely held religious beliefs have generally been viewed as the domain of positive state and federal law. See, e.g., *Klein v. Oregon Bureau of Labor & Industries*, 289 Ore. App. 507, 543–546, 410 P. 3d 1051, 1074–1076 (2017) (rejecting a Free Exercise claim under *Smith*).

Statement of THOMAS, J.

(2018) (describing owners of wedding studio who declined to participate in same-sex weddings for religious reasons as treating homosexuals like “social outcasts” (quoting *Mastertpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Comm’n*, 584 U. S. ___, ___ (2018) (slip op., at 9))).

* * *

This petition implicates important questions about the scope of our decision in *Obergefell*, but it does not cleanly present them. For that reason, I concur in the denial of certiorari. Nevertheless, this petition provides a stark reminder of the consequences of *Obergefell*. By choosing to privilege a novel constitutional right over the religious liberty interests explicitly protected in the First Amendment, and by doing so undemocratically, the Court has created a problem that only it can fix. Until then, *Obergefell* will continue to have “ruinous consequences for religious liberty.” 576 U. S., at 734 (THOMAS, J., dissenting).

Cite as: 592 U. S. ____ (2020)

1

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

RAMINDER KAUR v. MARYLAND

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF
SPECIAL APPEALS OF MARYLAND

No. 19–1045. Decided October 5, 2020

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Statement of JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR respecting the denial of certiorari.

Although I join the Court’s decision to deny certiorari, I write separately to address a concerning feature of this petition: The prosecutors who tried this case had extensive knowledge of defense counsel’s confidential communications with the defendant, petitioner Raminder Kaur. For the reasons stated below, I fear that, in this case, the criminal justice system failed to live up to its highest ideals.

In 2014, Kaur was convicted of first-degree murder by a Maryland jury. Shortly thereafter, she moved for a new trial on the ground that her defense attorney had provided her with ineffective assistance of counsel. The trial court ordered Kaur to turn over her “entire defense file” so that prosecutors could respond adequately to her motion. 2019 WL 2407997, *5 (Md. Ct. Spec. App., June 7, 2019). After holding a multiday hearing, the court concluded that “the interests of justice required granting Ms. Kaur a new trial.” *Id.*, at *6; see Md. Rule 4–331(a) (2020).

Because she had disclosed “a considerable amount of privileged information, including communications between [her] and her lawyers, communications between her lawyers and their support staff, and her lawyers’ investigative and strategic work-product,” Kaur asked the court for a protective order barring the prosecutors who had personally reviewed her defense file from retrying her case. 2019 WL 2407997, *1. The court agreed to prohibit the State from

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

making use of Kaur’s privileged information at trial, but it denied her request to be tried by an untainted prosecution team. As a result, the same lawyers who were “exposed to all of Ms. Kaur’s privileged information” tried Kaur a second time. *Id.*, at *17. Kaur was again convicted, and she was sentenced to life imprisonment.

Kaur appealed to the Court of Special Appeals of Maryland, arguing (as relevant here) that the State violated her Sixth Amendment right to counsel by permitting attorneys who had reviewed her privileged information to prosecute her case. As an initial matter, the court rejected the State’s contention that, by disclosing confidential information in the course of seeking a new trial, Kaur had effectively waived her attorney-client privilege for all purposes. But the court also rejected Kaur’s contention that the prosecutors’ knowledge of her defense strategy was presumptively prejudicial. Instead, the court concluded that Kaur had to demonstrate a realistic possibility that she was harmed in the second trial by the prosecutors’ access to her privileged information or that the prosecutors used such information to their advantage. After comparing the records of Kaur’s two trials, the court determined that Kaur had failed to make the requisite showing.

The Court of Appeals of Maryland, the State’s highest court, denied further review. Kaur then filed a petition for a writ of certiorari in this Court.

“[I]t has long been recognized that the essence of the Sixth Amendment right is privacy of communication with counsel.” *Weatherford v. Bursey*, 429 U. S. 545, 563 (1977) (Marshall, J., dissenting) (internal quotation marks and ellipsis omitted). In *Weatherford*, this Court considered whether a defendant’s Sixth Amendment right had been violated when, at the defendant’s invitation, an undercover agent attended a meeting between the defendant and his lawyer. *Id.*, at 550–551, 558. Based in part on the fact that there had been “no communication of defense strategy to

Cite as: 592 U. S. ____ (2020)

3

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

the prosecution,” the Court rejected the defendant’s claim. *Id.*, at 558. But the Court noted that the defendant “would have [had] a much stronger case” “had the prosecution learned . . . the details of the [lawyer-client] conversations about trial preparations.” *Id.*, at 554.

Since *Weatherford*, many federal and state courts have struggled to define what burden, if any, a defendant must meet to demonstrate prejudice from a prosecutor’s wrongful or negligent acquisition of privileged information. Unlike the defendants in those cases, however, Kaur disclosed (albeit at the trial court’s direction) privileged information to the prosecutors for the limited purpose of vindicating her right to effective assistance of counsel. The prosecutors did not obtain Kaur’s information surreptitiously. Few courts have had occasion to opine on whether the Sixth Amendment bars prosecutors from retrying a defendant in such circumstances. Cf. *Bittaker v. Woodford*, 331 F. 3d 715, 722 (CA9 2003) (holding that a waiver of attorney-client privilege for purposes of raising an ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim does not extend to retrial, in part because “[e]xtending the waiver . . . would immediately and perversely skew the second trial in the prosecution’s favor”). Because this question could benefit from further consideration by the lower courts, I agree with the decision to deny certiorari in this case.

But three important points bear mention. First, it is deeply disconcerting that the State has suggested that defendants who raise ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claims during the trial phase must forfeit their right to privileged communications with counsel. To vindicate the past denial of her Sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of counsel, a defendant should not have to waive her Sixth Amendment right to attorney-client confidentiality for purposes of any retrial to which she is entitled. See *Simmons v. United States*, 390 U. S. 377, 394 (1968) (“[W]e find it intolerable that one constitutional right should have to be

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

surrendered in order to assert another”).

Second, this case demonstrates the many insidious ways that potential Sixth Amendment violations can affect the course of a trial. Take, for example, Kaur’s ability to testify in her own defense. After the trial court denied her motion to be tried by new prosecutors, Kaur filed a motion “to limit the scope of the State’s cross-examination in the event that [she] chose to testify.” 2019 WL 2407997, *19. Kaur’s concern that the State might use her privileged information for its own advantage was hardly hypothetical: One of the prosecutors had, in fact, already informed the court that she had taken the opportunity to “scour” Kaur’s defense file and that she had “made a list of all the negatives that [would] befall the defendant” should she choose to testify. *Id.*, at *18 (some alterations omitted). After a “three-way discussion between counsel and the trial court,” it was agreed that the prosecutor would “rely solely upon her recollection of Ms. Kaur’s prior testimony” from the hearing on her motion for a new trial, but that one of the prosecutor’s assistants could review the transcript “for exact wording.” *Id.*, at *19. The court then “reserved any ruling on the scope of possible cross-examination until Ms. Kaur completed her direct testimony.” *Ibid.* Perhaps unsurprisingly, Kaur declined to testify.

This is just one example of the many ways in which the prosecutors’ possession of Kaur’s privileged information could have subtly but indelibly affected the course of her trial. One can think of many others. The prosecutors, either intentionally or subconsciously, may have selected a different mix of jurors. They may have changed their pre-trial preparation, perhaps by emphasizing different parts of the State’s case or focusing on different weaknesses in the defense. Or they may have considered different lines of questioning, brainstormed different objections, or anticipated different arguments. The trouble with all of these scenarios is that, while the Court of Special Appeals no

Cite as: 592 U. S. ____ (2020)

5

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

doubt dutifully reviewed the record, it is exceedingly difficult to prove a negative. It would be an impossible task for any court, no matter how diligent, to identify and assess all potential sources of prejudice simply by comparing the records of two trials.

Finally and crucially, the decision whether to allow the original prosecution team to retry Kaur was not the court's alone to make. The prosecutors, too, had a choice. And in making that choice, as with all prosecutorial decisions, those lawyers acted as "the representative[s] not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty . . . whose interest . . . in a criminal prosecution is not that it shall win a case, but that justice shall be done." *Berger v. United States*, 295 U. S. 78, 88 (1935). Prosecutors wield an immense amount of power, and they do so in the name of the State itself. That unique privilege comes with the exceptional responsibility to ensure that the criminal justice system indeed serves the ends of justice. Prosecutors fall short of this task, and therefore do a grave disservice to the people in whose name they litigate, when they permit themselves to enjoy unfair trial advantages at defendants' expense. Here, regardless of the reason for their acquisition of Kaur's privileged information, and regardless of whatever minimum conduct was required of them by the Sixth Amendment, the prosecutors should have recused themselves from participating in Kaur's second trial as a matter of professional conscience. Their failure to do so casts a troubling and unnecessary shadow over Kaur's conviction and sentence to life imprisonment.

Cite as: 592 U. S. ____ (2020)

1

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WARREN K. HENNESS *v.* MIKE DEWINE, ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

No. 20–5243. Decided October 5, 2020

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Statement of JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR respecting the denial of certiorari.

The State of Ohio plans to execute petitioner using a three-drug protocol of midazolam, a paralytic agent, and potassium chloride. Petitioner challenges this method of execution as unconstitutional, partly on the ground that midazolam is very likely to induce sensations of suffocation and drowning, terror, and panic (akin to that produced by waterboarding). After holding a 4-day evidentiary hearing in which it considered the testimony of 18 witnesses, the District Court agreed, noting that the scientific case against midazolam had grown “much stronger” over the past few years. App. to Pet. for Cert. 159a. The District Court ultimately rejected petitioner’s challenge, however, concluding that petitioner had failed to identify a feasible and readily implemented alternative method of execution, a showing that this Court has required since its decision in *Glossip v. Gross*, 576 U. S. 863 (2015).

The Sixth Circuit affirmed the District Court’s separate holding that petitioner had failed to identify an appropriate alternative method of execution. But, parting ways with the District Court, the Sixth Circuit concluded that, even if petitioner is made to feel as if he is drowning as he dies, Ohio’s midazolam-based protocol would not cause petitioner unconstitutionally severe pain. I write to address the Sixth Circuit’s novel and unsupported conclusion that pain is constitutionally tolerable so long as it is no worse than

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

the suffering caused by a botched hanging.¹

The Sixth Circuit began its reasoning from the premise that pain, to be constitutionally cognizable, must reach a certain level of severity. Severe enough for constitutional recognition, in the court’s view, would be the pain caused by “breaking on the wheel, flaying alive, [and] rending asunder with horses.” *In re Ohio Execution Protocol Litig.*, 946 F. 3d 287, 290 (2019) (quoting *Bucklew v. Precythe*, 587 U. S. ___, ___ (2019) (slip op., at 10); alteration omitted). Not severe enough, in contrast, would be the pain caused by a botched hanging in which the prisoner “slowly” died of “suffocation” over the course of “several minutes,” instead of dying instantly as a result of the sudden drop. 946 F. 3d, at 290 (quoting *Bucklew*, 587 U. S., at ___ (slip op., at 11)).

¹Elsewhere I have written about the mounting evidence that midazolam-based protocols may cause a prisoner to feel as though he is suffocating to death, an excruciating process that could last as long as 18 minutes, and about the troubling failure of courts of appeals to defer to district courts’ well-supported findings as to the risk of such pain. See *Irick v. Tennessee*, 585 U. S. ___, ___ (2018) (SOTOMAYOR, J., dissenting from denial of application for stay) (slip op., at 1); *Otte v. Morgan*, 582 U. S. ___, ___–___ (2017) (SOTOMAYOR, J., dissenting from denial of application for stay and denial of certiorari) (slip op., at 1–2); *Arthur v. Dunn*, 580 U. S. ___, ___–___ (2017) (SOTOMAYOR, J., dissenting from denial of certiorari) (slip op., at 15–17). I have also separately written about this Court’s “perverse requirement that inmates offer alternative methods for their own executions” and addressed the serious barriers inmates face in so doing. *McGehee v. Hutchinson*, 581 U. S. ___, ___ (2017) (SOTOMAYOR, J., dissenting from denial of application for stay and denial of certiorari) (slip op., at 2); see *Zagorski v. Parker*, 586 U. S. ___, ___–___ (2018) (same) (slip op., at 4–6); *Glossip v. Gross*, 576 U. S. 863, 969–978 (2015) (SOTOMAYOR, J., dissenting). The Sixth Circuit’s opinion reflected many of these problems. And as I write here, the court erred in enshrining hanging as a categorical measure of constitutionally tolerable suffering. Because the Sixth Circuit’s separate analysis that petitioner had failed to identify a “feasible and readily implemented alternative method of execution” is not clearly wrong under this Court’s recent precedent, *Bucklew v. Precythe*, 587 U. S. ___, ___ (2019) (slip op., at 13), however, I concur in the denial of certiorari.

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

Even assuming, then, that Ohio’s three-drug protocol will cause petitioner to feel a sensation of “drowning and suffocation” as he dies, the court concluded that such pain is constitutionally acceptable because it looks “a lot like the risks of pain associated with hanging.” 946 F. 3d, at 290. The Sixth Circuit thus appears to have created a categorical rule that a method of execution passes constitutional muster so long as it poses no greater risk of pain than the slow suffocation of a hanging gone wrong.² See *Campbell v. Wood*, 511 U. S. 1119, 1122 (1994) (Blackmun, J., dissenting from denial of certiorari) (describing the experience of “[a] person who slowly asphyxiates or strangulates while twisting at the end of a rope” during a botched hanging).

The Sixth Circuit erred in enshrining hanging as a permanent measure of constitutionally tolerable suffering. Its decision conflicts with this Court’s recent precedent, which makes clear that the proper inquiry is comparative, not categorical. See *Bucklew*, 587 U. S., at ____ (slip op., at 13); *Glossip*, 576 U. S., at 878. Since *Glossip*, this Court has held that a risk of pain raises constitutional problems if it is “substantial when compared to a known and available alternative” that is “feasible and readily implemented.” *Bucklew*, 587 U. S., at ____ (slip op., at 13). If such an alternative exists, and a State nonetheless refuses to adopt it without a legitimate penological reason, then the State’s chosen method “cruelly” (and unconstitutionally) “superadds pain to [a] death sentence.” *Ibid.*

Although the Sixth Circuit cited *Bucklew* in support of its

² Even on the Sixth Circuit’s own terms, it is not at all clear that midazolam’s risk of pain is no worse than that of a botched hanging. The Sixth Circuit and this Court have described such a hanging as involving “several minutes” of suffocation. 946 F. 3d, at 290 (quoting *Bucklew*, 587 U. S., at ____ (slip op., at 11)). By contrast, midazolam poses a risk that a condemned inmate will “experience sensations of drowning, suffocating, and being burned alive from the inside out,” for at least 10 and as many as 18 minutes. *Irick*, 585 U. S., at ____ (SOTOMAYOR, J., dissenting from denial of application for stay) (slip op., at 1).

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

novel standard, nowhere did this Court suggest that the pain caused by a faulty hanging creates a constitutional floor for “cruel and unusual” punishment under the Eighth Amendment. Applying its comparative standard, *Bucklew* merely noted that a traditional method of execution like hanging is not “*necessarily* rendered unconstitutional as soon as an arguably more humane method . . . becomes available.” *Id.*, at ___–___ (slip op., at 13–14) (emphasis added). But that is only because a State could have a legitimate reason for not immediately adopting the more humane method. *Bucklew* does not provide a categorical safe harbor for methods of execution that, in a court’s estimation, will cause no greater suffering than that caused by certain traditional methods. See *ibid.* If there were a feasible and readily implemented method of execution that would prevent petitioner from experiencing a sensation akin to drowning as he dies, it would be cruel and unusual for Ohio to refuse to adopt it.

EXHIBIT 2

From: William Caldarelli
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2020 10:53 AM
To: Zembek, Richard
Cc: Ethan Watts (emw@ewattslaw.com); Ben West; John Osborne; Michael Fabiano
Subject: Ameranth- Pizza Hut-- Defendants' Response to Continued Stay

Hi Rich,

We received the Defendants' Status Report Regarding Stay Requested by Ameranth (Dkt. No. 1483) filed last week.

The Court's order requesting the status report did not provide for any response by Ameranth. Nonetheless, there were a few things in the defendants' report with which Ameranth disagrees. To avoid any potential future misunderstandings, I felt I should point out some issues Ameranth has regarding the defendants' list of "Remaining Claims" in the status report.

As you know, in the Federal Circuit's November 1, 2019 decision affirming in part and overruling in part the District Court's order granting summary judgment for Domino's, the Federal Circuit found that a case or controversy existed not only as to the 5 claims of the '077 patent set forth in Ameranth's most recent amended infringement contentions against Domino's (pursuant to the District Court's order that only 5 claims be selected), but also as to other patent claims that Ameranth had identified in any earlier versions of its infringement contentions against Domino's.

In light of this determination by the Federal Circuit, and for other reasons as well, Ameranth believes that, when the stay ends, it is entitled to seek leave of court to assert surviving claims of the '077 Patent against the remaining defendants beyond those claims included in its last amended infringement contentions. I anticipate that the defendants likely feel otherwise and will oppose any such request, but in order to avoid any misunderstandings and to make clear that Ameranth is preserving its rights in this respect, I wanted to make sure you and the remaining defendants were aware of Ameranth's position.

Regards, Bill

William J. Caldarelli
Caldarelli Hejmanowski Page & Leer LLP
3398 Carmel Mountain Road
Suite 250
San Diego, CA 92121
858 720-8080 (main)
858 764-8105 (direct)

www.chplaw.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to controlling General Orders, and in accordance with the local rules and procedures of this court, I filed the foregoing document(s) through the court’s CM/ECF system, which will generate and send a Notice of Electronic Filing and hyperlink to the document to all registered users in the case listed above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under laws of the United States of America that the above is true and correct and that such service was made at the direction of a member of the Bar of this court.

Executed on October 5, 2020, at San Diego, California.

CALDARELLI HEJMANOWSKI PAGE & LEER LLP

By: /s/ William J. Caldarelli
William J. Caldarelli