

(ORDER LIST: 590 U.S.)

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2020

CERTIORARI -- SUMMARY DISPOSITIONS

18-999 ATLANTA GAS LIGHT CO. V. BENNETT REGULATOR GUARDS, INC.

18-1027 SUPERIOR COMMUNICATIONS, INC. V. VOLTSTAR TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

The petitions for writs of certiorari are granted. The judgments are vacated, and the cases are remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit for further consideration in light of *Thryv, Inc. v. Click-to-Call Technologies, LP*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020).

18-1585 NAGI, KASSIM M. V. LOUISIANA

The petition for a writ of certiorari is 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). Justice Alito, concurring in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand: In this and in all other cases in which the Court grants, vacates, and remands in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, I concur in the judgment on the understanding that the Court is not deciding or expressing a view on whether the question was properly raised below but is instead leaving that question to be decided on remand. Justice Thomas would deny the petition for a writ of certiorari.

18-7488 LEWIS, BILLY R. V. LOUISIANA

18-8748 ALRIDGE, DAJUAN A. V. LOUISIANA

The motions of petitioners for leave to proceed *in forma*

pauperis and the petitions for writs of certiorari are granted. The judgments are vacated, and the cases are remanded to the Court of Appeal of Louisiana, Fourth Circuit for further consideration in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020). Justice Alito, concurring in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand: In these and in all other cases in which the Court grants, vacates, and remands in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, I concur in the judgment on the understanding that the Court is not deciding or expressing a view on whether the question was properly raised below but is instead leaving that question to be decided on remand.

18-8897 DYSON, CORLIOUS C. 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, Third Circuit for further consideration in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020). Justice Alito, concurring in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand: In this and in all other cases in which the Court grants, vacates, and remands in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, I concur in the judgment on the understanding that the Court is not deciding or expressing a view on whether the question was properly raised below but is instead leaving that question to be decided on remand. Justice Thomas would deny the petition for a writ of certiorari.

18-9130 DICK, SHAUN A. V. OREGON

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 Appeals of Oregon for further consideration in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020). Justice Alito, concurring in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand: In this and in all other cases in which the Court grants, vacates, and remands in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, I concur in the judgment on the understanding that the Court is not deciding or expressing a view on whether the question was properly raised below but is instead leaving that question to be decided on remand.

18-9463 BROOKS, MICHAEL J. 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). Justice Alito, concurring in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand: In this and in all other cases in which the Court grants, vacates, and remands in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, I concur in the judgment on the understanding that the Court is not deciding or expressing a view on whether the question was properly raised below but is instead leaving that question to be decided on remand. Justice Thomas would deny the petition for a writ of certiorari.

18-9693 SHEPPARD, KEVIN V. LOUISIANA

18-9787 CREHAN, JACE V. LOUISIANA

The motions of petitioners for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petitions for writs of certiorari are granted. The judgments are vacated, and the cases are remanded to the

Court of Appeal of Louisiana, First Circuit for further consideration in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020). Justice Alito, concurring in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand: In these and in all other cases in which the Court grants, vacates, and remands in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, I concur in the judgment on the understanding that the Court is not deciding or expressing a view on whether the question was properly raised below but is instead leaving that question to be decided on remand.

18-9821

HEARD, ROBERT L. 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, Third Circuit for further consideration in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020). Justice Alito, concurring in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand: In this and in all other cases in which the Court grants, vacates, and remands in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, I concur in the judgment on the understanding that the Court is not deciding or expressing a view on whether the question was properly raised below but is instead leaving that question to be decided on remand.

19-741

ESTATE OF ESTHER KLIEMAN, ET AL. V. PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY, 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 District of Columbia Circuit for further consideration in light of the Promoting Security and Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act of 2019, Pub. L. No.

116-94, div. J, tit. IX, § 903, 133 Stat. 3082. Justice Kavanaugh took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

19-764 SOKOLOW, MARK I., ET AL. V. PLO, ET AL.

The motion of Senator Charles Grassley, et al. for leave to file a brief as *amici curiae* is granted. 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 the Promoting Security and Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act of 2019, Pub. L. No. 116-94, div. J, tit. IX, § 903, 133 Stat. 3082.

19-5301 RICHARDS, AARON O. 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, Third Circuit for further consideration in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020). Justice Alito, concurring in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand: In this and in all other cases in which the Court grants, vacates, and remands in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, I concur in the judgment on the understanding that the Court is not deciding or expressing a view on whether the question was properly raised below but is instead leaving that question to be decided on remand. Justice Thomas would deny the petition for a writ of certiorari.

19-5989 VICTOR, ERROL 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, Fifth Circuit for further consideration in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U. S. ____ (2020). Justice Alito, concurring in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand: In this and in all other cases in which the Court grants, vacates, and remands in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, I concur in the judgment on the understanding that the Court is not deciding or expressing a view on whether the question was properly raised below but is instead leaving that question to be decided on remand. Justice Thomas would deny the petition for a writ of certiorari.

19-6679

JOHNSON, HORATIO 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). Justice Alito, concurring in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand: In this and in all other cases in which the Court grants, vacates, and remands in light of *Ramos v. Louisiana*, I concur in the judgment on the understanding that the Court is not deciding or expressing a view on whether the question was properly raised below but is instead leaving that question to be decided on remand.

ORDERS IN PENDING CASES

19M130

ROBERSON, MICHAEL C. V. JACKSON, WARDEN, ET AL.

19M131

JOHNSON, RODERICK V. MORGAN, WARDEN, ET AL.

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

19-715) TRUMP, DONALD J., ET AL. V. MAZARS USA, LLP, ET AL.
19-760) TRUMP, DONALD J., ET AL. V. DEUTSCHE BANK AG, ET AL.

The parties and the Solicitor General are directed to file supplemental letter briefs addressing whether the political question doctrine or related justiciability principles bear on the Court's adjudication of these cases. The briefs, not to exceed 15 pages, are to be filed simultaneously with the Clerk and served upon opposing counsel on or before 2 p.m., Friday, May 8, 2020.

19-6851 LASHER, LENA V. NE STATE BD. OF PHARMACY, ET AL.
19-6874 IN RE STEPHEN D. LEONARD

The motions of petitioners for reconsideration of orders denying leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied.

19-7756 IN RE FRANK DEVILLE

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied. Petitioner is allowed until May 18, 2020, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a).

CERTIORARI DENIED

19-455 ARRIS INTERNATIONAL LIMITED V. CHANBOND, LLC, ET AL.
19-586 HOLLINGSWORTH, DEVONA V. DEPT. OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
19-687 LULAC, ET AL. V. EDWARDS AQUIFER AUTH., ET AL.
19-777 ELEC. PRIVACY INFORMATION CENTER V. DEPT. OF COMMERCE, ET AL.
19-779 PIERRE-PAUL, JORDANY V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
19-789 MAGHREB PETROLEUM, ET AL. V. DeJORIA, JOHN P.
19-792 VUGO, INC. V. NEW YORK, NY
19-887 SIMON, ARYEH, ET UX. V. MARRIOTT INT'L, INC., ET AL.
19-891 LEHMANN, JOHN V. HAIMS, NICOLE

19-908 ARAUJO BULEJE, MARIA E. V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
19-995 MURRAY, MICHAEL J. V. MAYO CLINIC, ET AL.
19-1034 MITCHELL, TAMI L. V. DILLAHUNT, THOMAS M.
19-1047 WEISS, MICHAEL V. MARSH, DAMON, ET AL.
19-1149 UPMC, ET AL. V. U.S., EX REL. BOOKWALTER, ET AL.
19-1151 KUMAR, ROHIT V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN., ET AL.
19-1169 YBARRA, JONAS V. TX HEALTH & HUMAN SERV., ET AL.
19-1170 CAMPBELL, RICKY W. V. WOLF, SEC. OF HOMELAND
19-1174 KIMBROUGH, JOHN W. V. NEAL, SUPT., IN
19-7052 CALLEJAS RIVERA, JOSE A. V. UNITED STATES
19-7322 SANCHEZ-MIRANDA, GERARDO V. UNITED STATES
19-7339 JONES, VICTOR O. V. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., ET AL.
19-7388 PEREZ, AARON V. UNITED STATES
19-7410 MORA-GALINDO, VICTOR M. V. UNITED STATES
19-7508 LEISER, JEFFREY D. V. KLOTH, KAREN, ET AL.
19-7701 KERNS, LARRY D. V. WENNER, MATHEW J.
19-7702 JACKSON, DOUGLAS C. V. BEREAN, LEAH, ET AL.
19-7709 TOTH, JOHN A. V. ANTONACCI, PETER, ET AL.
19-7715 CASTILLO-REYES, ALFREDO V. INGALLS, BOBBI G., ET AL.
19-7721 PARSONS, MACHELLE V. McDANIEL, ASHTON, ET AL.
19-7741 JOHNSON, ROBERT W. V. VICTORIA FIRE & CASUALTY, ET AL.
19-7742 LEWIS, DERRICK L. V. BERRY, WARDEN
19-7769 WILSON, DEMETRIUS A. V. SHINN, DIR., AZ DOC, ET AL.
19-7772 BARRON, JOHN L. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.
19-7774 MUHAMMAD, RONALD V. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.
19-7779 GARCIA, FREDDY V. TEXAS
19-7785 WOLF, JACOB D. V. PEERY, WARDEN
19-7788 VEGA, ULISES C. V. HORTON, WARDEN

19-7789 KLEIN, STEVEN V. CALIFORNIA, ET AL.
19-7793 DEUSCHEL, MICHAEL V. LONG BEACH, CA
19-7803 WILLIAMS, BRANDON V. KEMP, GOV. OF GA, ET AL
19-7808 TAYLOR, RICHARD W. V. TEXAS
19-7818 BENJAMIN, KRISTOPHER E. V. MCGINLEY, SUPT., COAL TOWNSHIP
19-7837 SLAVIN, FRANCINE V. RESIDENTIAL RENTALS
19-7840 JONES, VICTOR D. V. ERRINGTON, JOE
19-7859 BLACHER, MARLON V. CALIFORNIA
19-7883 HARRIS, TYRONE V. ARKANSAS
19-7889 ROSARIO-COLON, WALTER V. LOUISIANA
19-7891 ROGERS, SYL V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.
19-7893 ROOS, NICHOLAS V. ARKANSAS
19-7997 PIERRE, JEAN-GESPERE V. IRIZARRY, CHIEF JUDGE, ET AL.
19-8040 MEAS, JERRY V. VIDAL, SUPT., SOUZA
19-8046 CERVANTES, MICHAEL A. V. MONTGOMERY, WARDEN
19-8067 MOHAMMED, ABDUL V. DuPAGE LEGAL, ET AL.
19-8076 GALINDO, ALFREDO V. CAIN, SUPT.
19-8089 JENKINS, MICHAEL W. V. AMSBERRY, BRIGITTE
19-8104 GONZALEZ-ARIAS, JUAN V. UNITED STATES
19-8106 ARTEAGA ARAGON, SALVADOR V. UNITED STATES
19-8109 BOGAN, ANTONIO V. BROOKHART, WARDEN
19-8110 ALBRITTON, DeVINCHE J. V. CLARKE, DIR., VA DOC
19-8111 BROXMEYER, TODD J. V. ORMOND, WARDEN
19-8113 ANDOE, JOHNNY R. V. BIDEN, ET AL.
19-8120 THOMAS, JARVIS R. V. UNITED STATES
19-8121 THOMPSON, NIKKOLAS V. UNITED STATES
19-8129 BOUNDS, CHARLES B. V. UNITED STATES
19-8130 AL-AMIN, RAQIB A. V. STIRLING, DIR., SC DOC, ET AL.

19-8137 POSADAS-GONZALEZ, RAFAEL V. UNITED STATES
19-8144 PADGETT, FRANCO N. V. UNITED STATES
19-8145 CRUZ, SANTIAGO V. BETANCOURT, C.
19-8147 MURILLO-MORALES, ROMULO V. UNITED STATES
19-8148 COLE, BRENT D. V. UNITED STATES
19-8160 RUTLEDGE, EDDIE V. V. FLORIDA

The petitions for writs of certiorari are denied.

19-7806 FOX, CHERUNDA L. V. USPS, 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*).

19-8133 MARTINEZ, JORGE A. 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

19-7393 IN RE DAVID GULBRANDSON
19-8163 IN RE MARIE J. TANAMOR-STEFFAN
19-8207 IN RE DAVID D. BROWN

The petitions for writs of habeas corpus are denied.

MANDAMUS DENIED

19-7727 IN RE CHAKAKHAN R. DAVIS

The petition for a writ of mandamus is denied.

PROHIBITION DENIED

19-7770 IN RE MARCUS WILLIAMS

The petition for a writ of prohibition is denied.

REHEARINGS DENIED

19-898 COLLINS, KIMBERLY D. V. THORNTON, GWENDOLYN

19-929 SHUMAN, LOUIS S., ET UX. V. CIR

19-6767 TRUE, DOUGLAS D. V. KELLEY, DIR., AR DOC

19-6833 ROWE, GREGORY A. V. CLARK, SUPT., ALBION, ET AL.

19-6869 JEFFERSON, MICHAEL A. V. SHINN, DIR., AZ DOC, ET AL.

19-6909 ROSA, EFRAIN J. V. RHODES, WARDEN

19-7058 IN RE RAMSEY RANDALL

19-7065 BRASPENICK, CARRIE A. V. JOHNSON LAW PLC

19-7096 SMITH, DAVID L. V. JACKSON, RICK

19-7135 PARK, HYE-YOUNG V. SECOLSKY, CHARLES, ET AL.

19-7150 WALTON, MICHAEL J. V. KOWALSKI, WARDEN

19-7154 IN RE COREY D. EATON

19-7498 SANDERS, JAMES E. V. UNITED STATES

19-7502 PETERS, SCOTT V. ILLINOIS

The petitions for rehearing are denied.