



“SUPREME COURT PREVIEW”

Travel Bans, Same-Sex-Wedding Cakes, Cellphone Tracking, and a 'Rabbit on a Skateboard'

September 18, 2017

12:15 – 1:30 pm | Lesar Law Building - Courtroom

**Cindy Buys: *Trump v. International Refugee Assistance Project*
(Immigration and the Establishment Clause)**

In this case, the Supreme Court has agreed to review whether President Trump’s Executive Orders temporarily suspending the entry into the United States of nationals of six predominantly Muslim countries is a violation of the Establishment Clause.

Valerie Munson: *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission* (First Amendment)

In *Masterpiece Cakeshop*, the Court will consider the case of a baker who refused to make a wedding cake for a same-sex couple. The question before the Court is whether applying Colorado’s public accommodation law to compel the baker to make cakes to celebrate same-sex weddings when doing so violates the baker’s sincerely held religious beliefs about marriage, also violates the free speech or free exercise clause of the First Amendment.

Ed Dawson: *Carpenter v. United States* (Fourth Amendment)

In *Carpenter v. United States*, the Court will consider whether the government needs a warrant to seize historical cellphone records that reveal the location of a cellphone user over the course of 127 days. The case may be the most important 4th Amendment case the Court has decided in years. One reason is that the Court may use it to revisit its “third-party doctrine,” under which information that a person voluntarily shares with a third party (like a cellphone company) is not entitled to Fourth Amendment protection. Also, the Court will consider how the concept of a “reasonable expectation of privacy” applies to personal data that companies collect automatically and constantly via cellphones and other electronic devices.

Steve Macias: *Gill v. Whitford* (Gerrymandering)

"In *Gill*, the Supreme Court could decide whether the Constitution prohibits a state from deliberately drawing legislative district lines that favor one party over the other. The Court's prior case law on 'partisan gerrymandering' left open the possibility that challenges to the practice might be completely unreviewable. As more states have engaged in partisan gerrymandering in recent years, the Court's pronouncement could lead to numerous challenges to legislative districts throughout the country."