15 APGoPo Required SCOTUS Cases

>>>> Comparison Cases

CON-2: Federalism reflects the dynamic distribution of power between national and state governments

*McCulloch v. Maryland* (1819)

1. *Gibbons v. Ogden* (1824)
2. *Wickard v. Filburn* (1942)
3. *United States v. Comstock* (2010)
4. *Watters v. Wachovia Bank, N.A* (2007)

*United States v. Lopez* (1995)

* 1. *Heart of Atlanta, Inc. v. US* (1964)
  2. *Gonzales v. Raich -* (2005)
  3. *United States v. Morrison* (2000)
  4. *National Foundation of Independent Business v. Sebelius* (2012)

CON-3: The republican ideal in the U.S. is manifested in the structure and operation of the legislative branch

*Baker v. Carr* (1962)

1. *Davis v Bandemer* (1986)
2. *Department of Commerce v. Montana* (1992)
3. *Shelby County v. Holder* (2013)
4. *Evenwell v. Abbott* (2016)
5. *Cooper v. Harris* (2017)
6. *Benisek v. Lamone* (2018)

*Shaw v. Reno* (1993)

1. Wright v. Rockefeller (1964)
2. *Miller v. Johnson* (1995)
3. *Bush v. Vera* (1996)
4. *Hunt v. Cromartie* (2001)
5. *Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama* (2015)
6. *Gill v. Whitford* (2018)

CON-5: The design of the judicial branch protects the Supreme Court’s independence as a branch of government, and the emergence and use of judicial review remains a powerful judicial practice

*Marbury v. Madison* (1803)

1. *Dred Scott v. Sandford* (1857)
2. *United States v. Nixon* (1974)
3. *United States v. Morrison* (2000)

LOR-2: Provisions of the U.S. Constitution’s Bill of Rights are continually being interpreted to balance the power of government and the civil liberties of individuals

*Engel v. Vitale* (1962)

* 1. *West Virginia State Board of Ed. v. Barnett* (1943)
  2. *Santa Fe Independent School Dist. v. Doe* (2000)
  3. *Good News Club v. Milford Central Schools* (2001)
  4. *Van Orden v. Perry* (2005)
  5. *Town of Greece, N.Y. v. Galloway* (2014)

*Wisconsin v. Yoder* (1972)

* 1. *Reynolds v. U.S.* (1879)
  2. *Minersville v. Gobitis* (1940)
  3. *Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah* (1993)
  4. *Gonzales v. O Centro Espirita Beneficente Uniao do Vegetal* (2006)
  5. *Masterpiece Cake v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission* (2018)

*Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District* (1969)

1. *Island Trees v. Pico* (1982)
2. *Bethel School v. Fraser* (1986)
3. *Hazelwood (Mo.) School District v. Kuhlmeier* (1988)
4. *Rosenberger v. University of Virginia* (1995)
5. *Morse v. Frederick* (2007)

*New York Times Co. v. United States* (1971)

1. *Nebraska Press Association v. Stuart* (1976)
2. *KPNX Broadcasting Co. v. Arizona Superior Court* (1982)
3. *CBS Inc., V. Davis* (1994)
4. *Greater New Orleans Broadcasting Association, Inc. v. United States* (1999)

*Schenck v. United States* (1919)

1. *Dennis v. United States* (1951)
2. *Noto v. United States* (1961)
3. *Brandenburg v. Ohio* (1969)
4. *National Association for the Advancement of Colored People v. Claiborne Hardware Co*. (1982)
5. *Texas v. Johnson* (1989)
6. *Snyder v. Phelps* (2011)

LOR-3: Protection of the Bill of Rights have been selectively incorporated by way of the Fourteenth Amendment’s due process clause to prevent state infringement of basic liberties

*Gideon v. Wainwright* (1963)

1. *Escobedo v Illinois* (1964)
2. *Miranda v Arizona* (1966)
3. *Alabama v. Shelton* (2002)
4. Chavez v. Martinez (2003)
5. *Riley v. California* (2014)
6. *McCoy v. Louisiana* (2018)

LOR-3: Protection of the Bill of Rights have been selectively incorporated by way of the Fourteenth Amendment’s due process clause to prevent state infringement of basic liberties

*Roe v. Wade* (1973)

* 1. *Planned Parenthood of Eastern Pennsylvania v. Casey* (1992)
  2. *Washington v. Glucksberg* (1997)
  3. *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003)
  4. *Whole Woman’s Health v. Hellerstedt* (2016)

LOR-3: Protection of the Bill of Rights have been selectively incorporated by way of the Fourteenth Amendment’s due process clause to prevent state infringement of basic liberties

*McDonald v. Chicago* (2010)

1. *Mapp v. Ohio* (1961)
2. *D.C. v. Heller* (2008)
3. *Caetano v. Massachusetts* (2016)

PRD-1: The 14th Amendment’s equal protection clause as well as other constitutional provisions have often been used to support the advancement of equality

*Brown v. Board of Education* (1954)

1. *Regents of University of California v. Bakke* (1978)
2. *Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003)
3. *Parents Involved in Cmty. Sch. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1* (2007)
4. *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin (Fisher II)* (2016)
5. *Obergefell v. Hodges* (2015)

PRD-2: The impact of federal policies on campaigning and electoral rules continues to be contested by both sides of the political spectrum

*Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* (2010)

1. *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976)
2. *McConnell v. FEC* (2002)
3. *Randall v. Sorrell* (2006)
4. *Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom Club PAC v. Bennett* (2011)
5. *McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission* (2014)
6. *Williams-Yulee v. The Florida Bar* (2015)