

Honors AP Government
End of Quarter Case Review

Choose one of the Supreme Court cases that we've discussed up to this point and write an in-depth review of the case. Use the following outline as a basis for your paper.

I. Case Background

Write about all of the relevant facts to the case. You can find the facts of the case and the history of the case through the courts (with the decisions of the lower courts) in the *Preview* article and the petitioner merit brief in the case.

II. Summary of previous Supreme Court decisions on the topic

This is where you discuss the history of the issue from the Supreme Court's decisions. The *Preview* article will list some of the cases relevant to the issue. For an exhaustive list, see the petitioner merit brief and the respondent merit brief. In this section, you will also need to outline the basic arguments of each side in this case.

III. Analysis of Oral Arguments

FOR CASES NOT YET DECIDED: The transcripts of the oral arguments are available at supremecourtus.gov. In this section, you need to analyze the questions from the justices. What questions were asked? Which justices questioned which side more aggressively? What can the questions help us in understanding what the justices are thinking?

FOR CASES ALREADY DECIDED: After reviewing how the justices voted in the case, find out why they voted they voted the way they did in the case. Look for key questions/comments from the justices in the oral arguments that allow us to understand the way they voted in the case.

IV. Overview of media reports

Find what the media wrote about this case. The USA Today, New York Times, Bloomberg News, The Associated Press, Washington Post all have reporters that are at the oral arguments and have read the case's merit briefs or opinions of the justices. In addition, SCOTUSblog.com (the preeminent online blog that follows the Court) will have analysis of every case before the Court.

V. Conclusions

In this section, you will need to predict how each of the nine justices will vote based on your research into the case. Or, for cases already decided, explain why you believe the justices voted they way they did. You will need to discuss the implications of a decision for the petitioner and the implications of a decision for the respondent.

UP TO THIS POINT IN THE PAPER, YOU NEED TO SUPPRESS YOUR DESIRE TO USE YOUR OWN OPINIONS. THE FIRST FIVE SECTIONS ARE A *FACTUAL* REPRESENTATION OF THE CASE FROM THE LOWER COURTS THROUGH ORAL ARGUMENTS. THERE SHOULD BE NO HINT OF BIAS IN THESE SECTIONS.

VI. Your Decision

This section has been reserved for your opinions on the case. If you were a justice, how would you vote? Please remember to justify your decision based on previous Court decisions and the important facts in this case.

ALL PAPERS MUST HAVE IN-TEXT CITATIONS AND AN END-OF-PAPER REFERENCE PAGE

Example in-text citation

The petitioner in this case has argued that the Constitutional was not violated (Slavin, 2009). However, in the oral argument of the case, Justice Alito questioned the petitioner heavily (Supreme Court of the United States, 2009). Interestingly, Bikuspic (2009) wrote that the oral argument revealed that Justice Alito is favoring the petitioner by asking questions designed to trap the liberal wing of the Court. However, Christensen (2009a) posits the questioning from the liberal wing indicated Justice Alito's attempts failed.

This split on the Court could lead to a plurality decision, especially considering the Solicitor General's Amicus Brief that attempts to find a middle road on the question at hand (Christensen, 2009b).

Reference Page Sample

Bikuspic, J. (2009). The supreme court question sixth amendment rights of immigrants. *USA Today*, 14 October 2009, A6.

Christensen, A. (2009a). *Padilla v. Commonwealth of Kentucky: Interpreting Strickland's Applicability to Misadvice Regarding Immigration Consequences (Argument Recap) (Argument Recap)*. Washington DC: www.scotusblog.com/wp/padilla-v-commonwealth-of-kentucky-interpreting-stricklands-applicability-to-misadvice-regarding-immigration-consequences-argument-recap. Accessed on 22 October 2009.

Christensen, A. (2009b). *Padilla v. Commonwealth of Kentucky*. Washington DC: www.scotuswiki.com/index.php?title=Padilla_v._Commonwealth_of_Kentucky. Accessed on 22 October 2009.

Slavin, J.E. (2009). Was a lawful permanent resident deprived of effective counsel? *PREVIEW of United States Supreme Court Cases*, 37 (1), 24-27.

Supreme Court of the United States. (2009) *Padilla v Kentucky (08-65) Oral Argument Transcript*. Washington DC; www.supremecourtus.gov/oral_arguments/argument_transcripts/08-651.pdf. Accessed on 22 October 2009.

WARNING: Some of the sources here have been made up in order to give you a sample of what the reference page and the in-text citations might look like. However, the scotusblog.com is real and can be a great help on any case chosen to write the in-depth review. scotusblog.com and scotuswiki.com have become the preeminent sites for people who study the Court to use and learn about the happenings of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Name: _____ Case Discussed: _____

I. Case Background /5
Comments:

II. Summary of previous Supreme Court decisions on the topic /20
Comments:

III. Analysis of Oral Arguments /20
Comments:

IV. Overview of media reports /10
Comments:

V. Conclusions /20
Comments:

VI. Your Decision /15
Comments:

Style, Grammar, Presentation /10

TOTAL: _____/100