

On the following Jamboard Slides are the 15 Supreme Court cases required by the College Board. Your job is to match all four aspects of the case together correctly.

Slide 2: Case Names & Years (Yellow Post-it Note)

Slide 3: Facts of the case (Green Post-it Note)

Slide 4: Constitutional Question (Blue Post-it Note)

Slide 5: Holding and key points of majority opinion (Pink Post-it Note)

Slide 6: Significance (Orange Post-it Note)

READ THIS before you begin:

The *petitioner* is the person bringing the case to the Supreme Court. The *respondent* is the person/entity whom the case is being brought against.

"U.S." is, of course, the United States. The entity here is the federal government, and typically the Solicitor General (2 under the AG) will argue these cases.

When a case gets to the Supreme Court, it is more likely than not that it didn't start there. The order of parties listed is simply the order it came to the Supreme Court, not necessarily the order in which the case originated.

Take *U.S. v. Lopez*, for example. In this case the U.S. is the petitioner and Lopez is the respondent. This means that the U.S. brought the case to the Supreme Court. However, if you know that the case didn't originate there, it is safe to infer that the U.S. lost in the lower court and appealed the case to SCOTUS.

Directions

On another slide you will put the full case in a column. A full case includes the correct case name, facts, question, holding and key points, and significance (in that order, please).

You can take a chance and submit it before checking with me, or you can have me check it before you submit it. If you have something in the wrong spot, I'll tell you under which case it is, but not exactly which part is wrong.

Case Names and Years

**Marbury v.
Madison
(1803)**

**McCulloch
v.
Maryland
(1819)**

**Schenck
v. U.S.
(1919)**

**Brown v.
Board of
Education of
Topeka, KS
(1954)**

**Baker
v. Carr
(1961)**

**Engle v.
Vitale
(1962)**

**Gideon v.
Wainwright
(1963)**

**Tinker v.
Des
Moines
(1969)**

**NY Times
v. U.S.
(1971)**

**Wisconsin
v. Yoder
(1972)**

**Roe v.
Wade
(1973)**

**Shaw
v. Reno
(1993)**

**U.S. v.
Lopez
(1995)**

**McDonald
v. Chicago
(2010)**

**Citizens
United v.
FEC (2010)**

Facts of the Case

president. The petitioner receive his commission before Jefferson became president, but once in office, Jefferson directed his secretary of state to withhold the commission. Petitioner asked the Supreme Court to issue a writ of

a second plan creating two black-majority districts was submitted. One of these districts was, in parts, no wider than the interstate road along which it stretched. NC residents challenged

allowing public education to be segregated by race. They argued that such segregation violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Prior decisions held that racially segregated

two national newspapers from publishing materials belonging to a classified DOD study regarding the history of US activities in Vietnam. The President argued that prior restraint was necessary to protect

designed to apportion the seats for the state's General Assembly was virtually ignored. Petitioner's suit detailed how Tennessee's reapportionment efforts ignored significant economic growth and

Board of Regents of NY authorized a voluntary and non-denominational prayer to be led by a school official each day. Petitioner sued, stating that school was violating the Establishment Clause of the 1st Amendment.

Petitioner was charged with felony breaking and entering. Asked for attorney, but request was denied because Florida law only gave attorney in capital cases. Petitioner represented himself at trial and lost.

Case brought on behalf of several petitioners (named only for one) who challenged gun bans in Chicago & Oak Park, Illinois stating that the gun laws violated their 2nd amendment right to bear arms.

The petitioner sought to terminate her pregnancy by abortion. Texas law prohibited abortions except to save the pregnant woman's life.

children to attend public schools until age 16 Member of the Old Order Amish religion (respondent in case) refused to send their children to such schools after the eighth grade, arguing that high school attendance was contrary to their

leaflets declaring that the draft violated the 13th Amendment prohibition against involuntary servitude. The leaflets urged the public to disobey the draft. Was charged with trying to cause insubordination in the military (via the

national bank. Respondent imposed tax on said bank. Petitioner refused to pay tax. Respondent said Congress had no authority to establish national bank. Congress said "See the Necessary and Proper Clause,

concealed weapon (handgun) to school. Charged with firearm possession by state. Petitioner took case over and charged respondent with violation of Gun Free School Zone Act. Respondent argued that GFSZA was an overreach of the

by wearing black armbands at school. School officials made a policy that stated that any student wearing an armband would be asked to remove it, with refusal to do so resulting in suspension. Students wore their armbands

contributions, the BCRA applied a variety of restrictions to "electioneering communications," such as preventing corporations or labor unions from funding such communication from their general treasuries. Petitioner argued that Section

Constitutional Question

Does a prohibition against symbolic protest violate the students' freedom of speech protections guaranteed by the First Amendment?

Does non-compulsory prayer in school led by a school official violate the Establishment Clause of the 1st Amendment?

Does limiting campaign contributions from corporations violate the First Amendment?

Does the segregation of public education based solely on race violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment?

Does the 6th amendment right to counsel extend to state cases?

Does the Supreme Court have jurisdiction over questions of legislative apportionment? Also, can apportionment violate the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment?

Does the "penumbras of privacy" in the Constitution grant a woman's right to terminate her pregnancy by abortion?

Does the compulsory school attendance law violate the Free Exercise clause of the 1st Amendment?

Did the efforts to stop "classified information" from being published violate the 1st Amendment?

Did Congress have the right to enact the GFSZA under the parameters of regulating interstate commerce?

Did petitioner's conviction for criticizing the draft violate his 1st Amendment right to Freedom of Speech?

Did the residents' claim, that the State created a racially gerrymandered district, raise a valid constitutional issue under the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause?

Does Congress have the power to establish a national bank under the Necessary & Proper Clause?

Does the 2nd amendment apply to state law via the Due Process Clause of the 14th amendment?

Did the petitioner have the right to his new appointment, and could the Supreme Court issue a writ of mandamus to remedy his situation?

Holdings and Key Points of Majority opinion

Per curiam for the petitioner. Since publication would not cause an inevitable, direct, and immediate event imperiling the safety of American forces, prior restraint was unjustified.

Unanimous for petitioner. Necessary and Proper Clause allows the government to establish institutions not specifically written in the Constitution.

Unanimous for petitioner. 6th Amendment guarantee of a right to attorney applies to criminal defendants in state court through 14th Amendment

6-1 for petitioner. By providing prayer, New York was authorizing religion (violation of Establishment Clause)

Court held that although the reapportionment plan was racially neutral on its face, the resulting district shape was bizarre enough to suggest that it constituted an effort to separate voters into different districts

Unanimous for petitioner. Separate but equal educational facilities for racial minorities is inherently unequal, violating the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

5-4 for the petitioner. Fundamental constitutional right to bear arms shouldn't just apply to federal government

Under the First Amendment corporate funding of independent political broadcasts in candidate elections cannot be limited. Political speech is indispensable to a democracy, which is no less true because the speech comes

Unanimous for the respondent. 1st Amendment does not protect speech that approaches creating a clear and present danger of a significant evil

The law in question does not have "economic activity" enough to justify use of the Commerce Clause

7-2 for petitioner. Ruling defined different levels of state interest for the second and third trimesters. State laws can narrow as long as they don't cause "undue burden" for mother.

petitioner did deserve the appointment, Supreme Court could not issue a writ because Judiciary Act of 1789 (which gave authority to Supreme Court to issue writs in original jurisdiction) was in conflict with original jurisdiction

Unanimous for respondent. An individual's interests in the free exercise of religion under the 1st Amendment outweighed the state's interests in compelling school attendance beyond the eighth grade.

6-2 for petitioner. Legislative apportionment was a justiciable issue. Gerrymandering violates equal protection clause.

7-2 for petitioner. In order to justify the suppression of speech, the school officials must be able to prove that the conduct in question would "materially and substantially interfere" with the operation of the school.

Significance

"One person, one vote" SCOTUS can rule on legislative apportionment.

Reaffirmed right to privacy.

Broadened free speech. Allowed corporations and unions to donate to campaigns, allowed formation of Super PACs. "Corporations are people, too"

Shift in power away from the federal government. Commerce Clause must deal with significant economic activity.

Creating majority-minority districts is okay, racial gerrymandering (even to create majority-minority) is not.

Incorporated 2nd amendment right to bear arms to the states.

Established symbolic speech as form of protected speech. Students don't lose all free speech rights at school.

Established the concept judicial review.

Broadened the implications of the free exercise clause.

First case to start outlawing religious activities in public ceremonies.

Overtured Separate but Equal precedent. First major victory for Civil Rights.

Prior restraint is okay only in cases of direct national security concerns.

Established the concept of national supremacy. Broadened congressional powers.

Clear and present danger test: you can't yell "fire" in a crowded theater

Incorporated 6th amendment right to jury trial (criminal cases)

