



Slide 2



Slide 3



This table shows the different types of cases over which the Supreme Court has jurisdiction as initially specified in the Constitution. Jurisdiction means where a court has the authority to hear a trial. Original jurisdiction is where a court has the authority to hear a case for the first time it is brought to trial.

```
Slide 4
```





Chapter 9 The Judiciary How the Supreme Court Works

Sometimes cases reviewed by the Supreme Court involve highly controversial issues. The Court hears only cases from U.S. Courts of Appeal and those from state supreme courts and other courts of last resort. Since 1869, there have been eight associate justices and one chief justice who serve on the court. Each has four clerks, and the entire court employs just 400 staff members. The current Supreme Court is led by Chief Justice John Roberts. The other justices are Ruth Bader Ginsberg, Elena Kagan, Samuel A. Alito, M. Gorsuch, Anthony Kennedy, Sonia Sotomayor, Clarence Thomas, & Stephen Breyer.

https://www.supremecourt.gov/about/b iographies.aspx

The selection of federal judges is often a highly political process with important political ramifications because the president must nominate judges and the U.S. Senate must confirm them. Presidents, in general, try to select well-qualified men and women for the bench. But, these appointments also provide a president with the opportunity to put his philosophical stamp on the federal courts.

In this section we will discuss who are the judges, what are the nomination criteria, and what the appointment and confirmation process looks like.

	9.3 Who are the Justices of the the Court in 2014?										
Justice	Year of Birth	Year Appointed	Political Party	Law School	Appointing President	Religion	Prior Judicial Experience	Prior Governmen Experience			
Jaho Roberts	1855	2005	s	Hened	G.W.Buth	Raman Catholic	U.S. Dout of Appeals	Dept. of Justice, associate White House course!			
Antonio Scale	1830	1066		Hervard	Heager.	Ronan Cattolio	U.S. Dout of Appeals	Assistant altorney governi, Office of Legal Course!			
Antony Escrety	1836	1008		Harvard	Reagen	Ronan Catholic	U.S. Doort of Appendix	Nove			
Cleanos Thomax	1948	1001		-	But	Remain Catholic	U.S. Court of Accasis	Chait Equal Employment Opperturity Commission			
Ruth Backer Gradburg	1833	1983	0	Columbia!	Circe	Jeach	U.S. Court of Appendix	News			
Saphan Breyer	1939	1004	0	Head	Oras	Juish	U.S. Dours of Appeals	Chief counsel, Serate Judiciary Conneitee			
Servel Alto	1990	2006	۰.	'tele	G.W.Bash	Roman Catholic	U.S. Court of Appendix	Dept of Justice, U.S. attorney			
Sona Solorayor	1994	2000	0	101	Oturee	Haman Cattolic	U.S. Doort of Appeals	Assurant alternay general, City of New York			
Dara Kape.	1900	2010	D.	Hervest	Oberts	Javande	Nova	U.S. solicitor general annociate Write thomas on organ			

Chapter 9 The Judiciary How the Supreme Court Works

This table gives us some background on each of the Supreme Court justices serving in 2012.

Slide 7



Before a president announces a nomination, especially to the Supreme Court, the White House staff begin an investigation into the personal and professional backgrounds of potential nominees. Names are given to the FBI and the American Bar Association (ABA) for vetting, review, and, in the case of the ABA, a rating. Once the nominee has been announced, the Senate Judiciary Committee starts its own investigation, which includes asking nominees to fill out a lengthy questionnaire. The committee holds its own hearings before the matter comes to the Senate for a vote.

During this process, interest groups may become very active, especially for Supreme Court nominations. In 1987, liberal groups launched a campaign against Supreme Court nominee Robert Bork. They objected to his firing of the Watergate special prosecutor when he was solicitor general under President Richard Nixon, and to his extreme conservative views. The Senate rejected his nomination by a 42–58 vote.

JI		COMMITTEE?	DUPS SUBMIT	TESTIMONY TO THE	SENATE
Nominee	Year	Support	Oppose	ABA Rating	Senate Vot
O'Connor	1981	7	4	WelFQ	99-0
Scalia	1986	10	14	Well-Q	98-0
Bork	1987	21	17	WWH-O*	42-58
Kennedy	1967	10	14	Weito	98-0
Souter	1990	20	17	WWH-O	90-9
Thornes	1991	21	32	Q ²	52-48
Ginsburg	1993	4	6	Well-Q	99-3
Brayer	1994	3	3	WWH-Q	87-9
Roberts	2005	19	50	WHI-O	78-22
Alto	2005	0	65	UNWER D	50-42
Sotomayor	2009	210	8	WWH-O	68-31
Kegan	2010	40		WWHO	63-37

Slide 9



Chapter 9 The Judiciary How the Supreme Court Works

This table shows how many interest groups submitted testimony concerning Supreme Court nominees before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Source: Amy Harder and Charlie Szymanski, Sotomayor in Context: Unprecedented Input from Interest Groups, 'National Journal (August 5, 2009),

ninthjustice.nationaljournal.com/2009/ 08/sotomayor-in-contextrecordbre.php. Updated by the authors.

The Senate Judiciary Committee plays an important role in the process of advice and consent on presidential nominees to the judiciary. As part of this process, they hold confirmation hearings where potential justices appear before the committee. Here, Clarence Thomas testifies before the committee following his nomination in 1991. He was confirmed to serve on the Supreme Court, but not without controversy as a former co-worker, Anita Hill, alleged that Thomas made repeated and unwanted inappropriate comments towards her.



Slide 11





Chapter 9 The Judiciary How the Supreme Court Works

Despite the tremendous power and influence the Supreme Court has over the policy and laws that affect Americans' lives, very few Americans have any real depth of knowledge about the Court. This may be due in large part to lack of interest, but the Court itself has taken great pains to maintain privacy and decorum. It does not televise hearings, for example, and utmost secrecy surrounds the deliberation process.

The modern Supreme Court is asked to hear over 7,500 cases per year (represented by orange bars); of these cases, it reaches a final decision in about one percent, or 80 cases (represented by red bars). This is about half of the total number of decisions the Court handed down 20 years ago.

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts; Supreme Court Public Information Office.

More than 7,500 cases are filed at the Supreme Court each term; approximately 80 cases are orally argued and decided. As you can see, only a fraction of cases requesting Supreme Court review are ever considered. [PREVIOUS NOTE STATED 7,000 / 75 CASES ?]

The Supreme Court controls its own caseload, deciding which cases it wants to hear and rejecting the rest. Litigants wanting their case to be heard send a petition for a writ of certiorari (Latin for "to be informed") to the Supreme Court, requesting a review of a lower court's ruling. Those

Slide 12



petitions are sent first to the chief justice, and then to the other justices. Under the "**Rule of Four**," a case will get a hearing if at least four justices agree.

The Clerks of the Supreme Court are very important in this process. They generally graduate at the top of their class from top law schools. They review cases and make recommendations to their bosses. Since the Court started hiring more clerks for each justice, the length of opinions has increased as well.

This figure illustrates both how cases get on the Court's docket and what happens after a case is accepted for review. A case may take several years to wind its way through the federal judiciary and another year or two to be heard and decided by the Supreme Court, if the justices decide to grant *certiorari, to be informed*.

Slide 13



Slide 14



Supreme Court clerkships are awarded to a small number of elite law school graduates each year. In addition to providing valuable experience at the Court, clerkships can open doors to opportunities in government and private practice. Justice Elena Kagan (right, seated with former Justice Sandra Day O'Connor) served as a law clerk to Justice Thurgood Marshall. She later went on to serve as White House counsel, Harvard Law School dean, solicitor general, and, ultimately, Supreme Court justice.

Slide 15

Slide 16





So which cases tend to get a hearing? Among the cues are the following: •The federal government is the party asking for review.

•The case involves conflict among the courts of appeals.

•The case presents a civil rights or civil liberties question.

•The case involves the ideological or policy preferences of the justices.

•The case has significant social or political interest, as evidenced by the presence of interest group *amicus curiae* briefs.

After the Court accepts a case and each side has submitted briefs and *amicus* briefs, the oral arguments begin. Generally, attorneys are given half an hour to argue their case, including time required to answer questions from the bench. Court observers have tried to predict the ruling of a case based on justices' questions, but that is an imperfect art.

After arguments, the justices meet behind closed doors twice a week. They start each conference with a handshake. The chief justice begins the

```
Slide 17
```



discussion of the case, and each justice speaks in order of seniority. Discussions are followed by a vote on the case.

Once a decision has been made, the opinion must be written. If the chief justice is in the majority, he will assign a justice to write the majority opinion. The opinion is important because it sets out the legal reasoning justifying the decision, and this legal reasoning becomes a precedent for deciding future cases. Justices who disagree with the majority may write a dissenting opinion. Justices who agree with the vote but not the reasoning may submit a concurring opinion.

Once the court has ruled—especially if it has reversed an earlier court decision or an action by a branch of government-policy must follow in order to implement the decision. This is called judicial implementation. In considering judicial implementation, policy makers must be aware of the implementing population-those responsible for carrying out the decision, such as lawyers, judges, public officials, government agencies-and the consumer population. Those are people who might be directly affected by a decision.

In the photo Kim Davis of Kentucky Rowan spent five days in jail in September 2015 after refusing to issue marriage licenses after the Supreme Court's decision legalizing same-sex marriage. Davis claimed same-sex marriage went against her Apostolic Christian beliefs.