545 U.S. 469, 125 S.Ct. 2655, 60 ERC 1769, 162 L.Ed.2d 439, 73 USLW 4552, 35 Envtl. L. Rep. 20,134, 05 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 5466, 2005 Daily Journal D.A.R. 7475, 18 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 437, 10 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 733

(Cite as: 545 U.S. 469, 125 S.Ct. 2655)

Supreme Court of the United States
Susette KELO, et al., Petitioners,
v.
CITY OF NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT, et al.

No. 04-108.
Argued Feb. 22, 2005.
Decided June 23, 2005. Rehearing Denied Aug. 22, 2005. See 545 U.S. 1158, 126 S.Ct. 24.

Background: Owners of condemned property challenged city's exercise of eminent domain power on ground takings were not for public use. The Superior Court, Judicial District of New London, Corradino, J., granted partial relief for owners, and cross-appeals were taken. The Supreme Court, Norcott, J., 268 Conn. 1, 843 A.2d 500, upheld takings. Certiorari was granted.

Holding: The Supreme Court, Justice Stevens, held that city's exercise of eminent domain power in furtherance of economic development plan satisfied constitutional "public use" requirement.

Affirmed.

Justice Kennedy concurred and filed opinion.

Justice O'Connor dissented and filed opinion in which Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justices Scalia and Thomas joined.

Justice Thomas dissented and filed opinion.

West Headnotes

[1] Eminent Domain 148 61

148 Eminent Domain
148I Nature, Extent, and Delegation of Power
148k60 Taking for Private Use
148k61 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

Sovereign may not use its eminent domain power to take property of one private party for sole purpose of transferring it to another private party, even if first party is paid just compensation. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 5.

[2] Eminent Domain 148 13

148 Eminent Domain
148I Nature, Extent, and Delegation of Power
148k12 Public Use
148k13 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

State may use its eminent domain power to transfer property from one private party to another if purpose of taking is future use by public. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 5.

[3] Eminent Domain 148 18.5

148 Eminent Domain
148I Nature, Extent, and Delegation of Power
148k16 Particular Uses or Purposes
148k18.5 k. Urban Renewal; Blight. Most Cited Cases

City's exercise of eminent domain power in furtherance of economic development plan satisfied constitutional "public use" requirement, even though city was not planning to open condemned land to use by general public, where plan served public purpose. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 5.

[4] Eminent Domain 148 13

148 Eminent Domain
148I Nature, Extent, and Delegation of Power
148k12 Public Use
148k13 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

Eminent Domain 148 67

148 Eminent Domain
148I Nature, Extent, and Delegation of Power

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

148k65 Determination of Questions as to Validity of Exercise of Power
148k67 k. Conclusiveness and Effect of Legislative Action. Most Cited Cases

Court defines "public purpose," needed to justify exercise of eminent domain power, broadly, reflecting longstanding policy of judicial deference to legislative judgments in this field. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 5.

[5] Eminent Domain 148 ⚿18.5

148 Eminent Domain
148I Nature, Extent, and Delegation of Power
148k16 Particular Uses or Purposes
148k18.5 k. Urban Renewal; Blight. Most Cited Cases

Economic development can qualify as "public use," for eminent domain purposes. U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 5.

[6] Eminent Domain 148 ⚿65.1

148 Eminent Domain
148I Nature, Extent, and Delegation of Power
148k65 Determination of Questions as to Validity of Exercise of Power
148k65.1 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

No heightened standard of review is warranted when public purpose allegedly justifying use of eminent domain power is economic development.

[7] Eminent Domain 148 ⚿67

148 Eminent Domain
148I Nature, Extent, and Delegation of Power
148k65 Determination of Questions as to Validity of Exercise of Power
148k67 k. Conclusiveness and Effect of Legislative Action. Most Cited Cases

Once court decides question of whether exercise of eminent domain power is for public purpose, amount and character of land to be taken for project and need for particular tract to complete integrated plan rests in discretion of legislative branch.

*****2656 *469** *Syllabus* [FN*]

FN* The syllabus constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court but has been prepared by the Reporter of Decisions for the convenience of the reader. See *United States v. Detroit Timber & Lumber Co.*, 200 U.S. 321, 337, 26 S.Ct. 282, 50 L.Ed. 499.

After approving an integrated development plan designed to revitalize its ailing economy, respondent city, through its development agent, purchased most of the property earmarked for the project from willing sellers, but initiated condemnation proceedings when petitioners, the owners of the rest of the property, refused to sell. Petitioners brought this state-court action claiming, *inter alia*, that the taking of their properties would violate the "public use" restriction in the Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause. The trial court granted a permanent restraining order prohibiting the taking of some of the properties, but ****2657** denying relief as to others. Relying on cases such as *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff*, 467 U.S. 229, 104 S.Ct. 2321, 81 L.Ed.2d 186, and *Berman v. Parker*, 348 U.S. 26, 75 S.Ct. 98, 99 L.Ed. 27, the Connecticut Supreme Court affirmed in part and reversed in part, upholding all of the proposed takings.

Held: The city's proposed disposition of petitioners' property qualifies as a "public use" within the meaning of the Takings Clause. Pp. 2661-2669.

(a) Though the city could not take petitioners' land simply to confer a private benefit on a particular private party, see, *e.g., Midkiff*, 467 U.S., at 245, 104 S.Ct. 2321, the takings at issue here would be executed pursuant to a carefully considered development plan, which was not adopted "to benefit a particular class of identifiable individuals," *ibid.* Moreover, while the city is not planning to open the condemned land-at least not in its entirety-to use by the general public, this "Court long ago rejected

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

any literal requirement that condemned property be put into use for the ... public." *Id.*, at 244, 104 S.Ct. 2321. Rather, it has embraced the broader and more natural interpretation of public use as "public purpose." See, *e.g., Fallbrook Irrigation Dist. v. Bradley*, 164 U.S. 112, 158-164, 17 S.Ct. 56, 41 L.Ed. 369. Without exception, the Court has defined that concept broadly, reflecting its longstanding policy of deference to legislative judgments as to what public needs justify the use of the takings power. *Berman*, 348 U.S. 26, 75 S.Ct. 98; *Midkiff*, 467 U.S. 229, 104 S.Ct. 2321; *Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*, 467 U.S. 986, 104 S.Ct. 2862, 81 L.Ed.2d 815. Pp. 2661-2664.

(b) The city's determination that the area at issue was sufficiently distressed to justify a program of economic rejuvenation is entitled to deference. The city has carefully formulated a development plan that it believes will provide appreciable benefits to the community, including, ***470** but not limited to, new jobs and increased tax revenue. As with other exercises in urban planning and development, the city is trying to coordinate a variety of commercial, residential, and recreational land uses, with the hope that they will form a whole greater than the sum of its parts. To effectuate this plan, the city has invoked a state statute that specifically authorizes the use of eminent domain to promote economic development. Given the plan's comprehensive character, the thorough deliberation that preceded its adoption, and the limited scope of this Court's review in such cases, it is appropriate here, as it was in *Berman*, to resolve the challenges of the individual owners, not on a piecemeal basis, but rather in light of the entire plan. Because that plan unquestionably serves a public purpose, the takings challenged here satisfy the Fifth Amendment. Pp. 2664-2665.

(c) Petitioners' proposal that the Court adopt a new bright-line rule that economic development does not qualify as a public use is supported by neither precedent nor logic. Promoting economic development is a traditional and long-accepted governmental function, and there is no principled way of distinguishing it from the other public purposes the Court has recognized. See, *e.g., Berman*, 348 U.S., at 33, 75 S.Ct. 98. Also rejected is petitioners' argument that for takings of this kind the Court should require a "reasonable certainty" that the expected public benefits will actually accrue. Such a rule would represent an even greater departure from the Court's precedent. *E.g., Midkiff*, 467 U.S., at 242, 104 S.Ct. 2321. The disadvantages of a heightened form of review are especially pronounced in this type of case, where orderly implementation of a comprehensive plan requires all interested parties' legal rights to be established before ****2658** new construction can commence. The Court declines to second-guess the wisdom of the means the city has selected to effectuate its plan. *Berman*, 348 U.S., at 35-36, 75 S.Ct. 98. Pp. 2665-2669.

268 Conn. 1, 843 A.2d 500, affirmed.

STEVENS, J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which KENNEDY, SOUTER, GINSBURG, and BREYER, JJ., joined. KENNEDY, J., filed a concurring opinion, *post*, p. 2669. O'CONNOR, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which REHNQUIST, C. J., and SCALIA and THOMAS, JJ., joined, *post*, p. 2671. THOMAS, J., filed a dissenting opinion, *post*, p. 2677.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF CONNECTICUTInstitute for Justice, William H. Mellor, Scott G. Bullock, Counsel of Record, Dana Berliner, Steven Simpson, Washington, DC, Sawyer Law Firm, LLC, Scott W. Sawyer, New London, CT, Counsel for Petitioners.

Wesley W. Horton, Counsel of Record, Daniel J. Krisch, Horton, Shields & Knox, P.C., Hartford, CT, Thomas J. Londregan, Jeffrey T. Londregan, Conway & Londregan, P.C., New London, CT, Edward B. O'Connell, David P. Condon, Waller, Smith & Palmer, P.C., New London, CT, Counsel for the Respondents.

For U.S. Supreme Court briefs, see:2004 WL 2811059 (Pet.Brief)2005 WL 429976

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

(Resp.Brief)2005 WL 353691 (Reply.Brief)

Justice STEVENS delivered the opinion of the Court.

***472** In 2000, the city of New London approved a development plan that, in the words of the Supreme Court of Connecticut, was "projected to create in excess of 1,000 jobs, to increase tax and other revenues, and to revitalize an economically distressed city, including its downtown and waterfront areas." 268 Conn. 1, 5, 843 A.2d 500, 507 (2004). In assembling the land needed for this project, the city's development agent has purchased property from willing sellers and proposes to use the power of eminent domain to acquire the remainder of the property from unwilling owners in exchange for just compensation. The question presented is whether the city's proposed disposition of this property qualifies as a "public use" within the meaning of the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.[FN1]

FN1. "[N]or shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." U.S. Const., Amdt. 5. That Clause is made applicable to the States by the Fourteenth Amendment. See *Chicago, B. & Q.R. Co. v. Chicago,* 166 U.S. 226, 17 S.Ct. 581, 41 L.Ed. 979 (1897).

***473** I

The city of New London (hereinafter City) sits at the junction of the Thames River and the Long Island Sound in southeastern Connecticut. Decades of economic decline led a state agency in 1990 to designate the City a "distressed municipality." In 1996, the Federal Government closed the Naval Undersea Warfare Center, which had been located in the Fort Trumbull area of the City and had employed over 1,500 people. In 1998, the City's unemployment rate was nearly double that of the State, and its population of just under 24,000 residents was at its lowest since 1920.

These conditions prompted state and local officials to target New London, and ****2659** particularly its Fort Trumbull area, for economic revitalization. To this end, respondent New London Development Corporation (NLDC), a private nonprofit entity established some years earlier to assist the City in planning economic development, was reactivated. In January 1998, the State authorized a $5.35 million bond issue to support the NLDC's planning activities and a $10 million bond issue toward the creation of a Fort Trumbull State Park. In February, the pharmaceutical company Pfizer Inc. announced that it would build a $300 million research facility on a site immediately adjacent to Fort Trumbull; local planners hoped that Pfizer would draw new business to the area, thereby serving as a catalyst to the area's rejuvenation. After receiving initial approval from the city council, the NLDC continued its planning activities and held a series of neighborhood meetings to educate the public about the process. In May, the city council authorized the NLDC to formally submit its plans to the relevant state agencies for review.[FN2] Upon obtaining state-level approval, the NLDC ***474** finalized an integrated development plan focused on 90 acres of the Fort Trumbull area.

FN2. Various state agencies studied the project's economic, environmental, and social ramifications. As part of this process, a team of consultants evaluated six alternative development proposals for the area, which varied in extensiveness and emphasis. The Office of Policy and Management, one of the primary state agencies undertaking the review, made findings that the project was consistent with relevant state and municipal development policies. See App. 89-95.

The Fort Trumbull area is situated on a peninsula that juts into the Thames River. The area comprises approximately 115 privately owned properties, as well as the 32 acres of land formerly occupied by the naval facility (Trumbull State Park now occupies 18 of those 32 acres). The development plan encompasses seven parcels. Parcel 1 is desig-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

nated for a waterfront conference hotel at the center of a "small urban village" that will include restaurants and shopping. This parcel will also have marinas for both recreational and commercial uses. A pedestrian "riverwalk" will originate here and continue down the coast, connecting the waterfront areas of the development. Parcel 2 will be the site of approximately 80 new residences organized into an urban neighborhood and linked by public walkway to the remainder of the development, including the state park. This parcel also includes space reserved for a new U.S. Coast Guard Museum. Parcel 3, which is located immediately north of the Pfizer facility, will contain at least 90,000 square feet of research and development office space. Parcel 4A is a 2.4-acre site that will be used either to support the adjacent state park, by providing parking or retail services for visitors, or to support the nearby marina. Parcel 4B will include a renovated marina, as well as the final stretch of the riverwalk. Parcels 5, 6, and 7 will provide land for office and retail space, parking, and water-dependent commercial uses. App. 109-113.

The NLDC intended the development plan to capitalize on the arrival of the Pfizer facility and the new commerce it was expected to attract. In addition to creating jobs, generating tax revenue, and helping to "build momentum for the revitalization of downtown New London," *id.*, at 92, the plan was also designed to make the City more attractive and to create ***475** leisure and recreational opportunities on the waterfront and in the park.

The city council approved the plan in January 2000, and designated the NLDC as its development agent in charge of implementation. See Conn. Gen.Stat. § 8-****2660** 188 (2005). The city council also authorized the NLDC to purchase property or to acquire property by exercising eminent domain in the City's name. § 8-193. The NLDC successfully negotiated the purchase of most of the real estate in the 90-acre area, but its negotiations with petitioners failed. As a consequence, in November 2000, the NLDC initiated the condemnation proceedings that gave rise to this case.[FN3]

FN3. In the remainder of the opinion we will differentiate between the City and the NLDC only where necessary.

II

Petitioner Susette Kelo has lived in the Fort Trumbull area since 1997. She has made extensive improvements to her house, which she prizes for its water view. Petitioner Wilhelmina Dery was born in her Fort Trumbull house in 1918 and has lived there her entire life. Her husband Charles (also a petitioner) has lived in the house since they married some 60 years ago. In all, the nine petitioners own 15 properties in Fort Trumbull-4 in parcel 3 of the development plan and 11 in parcel 4A. Ten of the parcels are occupied by the owner or a family member; the other five are held as investment properties. There is no allegation that any of these properties is blighted or otherwise in poor condition; rather, they were condemned only because they happen to be located in the development area.

In December 2000, petitioners brought this action in the New London Superior Court. They claimed, among other things, that the taking of their properties would violate the "public use" restriction in the Fifth Amendment. After a 7-day bench trial, the Superior Court granted a permanent restraining order prohibiting the taking of the properties located***476** in parcel 4A (park or marina support). It, however, denied petitioners relief as to the properties located in parcel 3 (office space). App. to Pet. for Cert. 343-350.[FN4]

FN4. While this litigation was pending before the Superior Court, the NLDC announced that it would lease some of the parcels to private developers in exchange for their agreement to develop the land according to the terms of the development plan. Specifically, the NLDC was negotiating a 99-year ground lease with Corcoran Jennison, a developer selected from a group of applicants. The negotiations con-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

templated a nominal rent of $1 per year, but no agreement had yet been signed. See 268 Conn. 1, 9, 61, 843 A.2d 500, 509-510, 540 (2004).

After the Superior Court ruled, both sides took appeals to the Supreme Court of Connecticut. That court held, over a dissent, that all of the City's proposed takings were valid. It began by upholding the lower court's determination that the takings were authorized by chapter 132, the State's municipal development statute. See Conn. Gen.Stat. § 8-186 *et seq.* (2005). That statute expresses a legislative determination that the taking of land, even developed land, as part of an economic development project is a "public use" and in the "public interest." 268 Conn., at 18-28, 843 A.2d, at 515-521. Next, relying on cases such as *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff,* 467 U.S. 229, 104 S.Ct. 2321, 81 L.Ed.2d 186 (1984), and *Berman v. Parker,* 348 U.S. 26, 75 S.Ct. 98, 99 L.Ed. 27 (1954), the court held that such economic development qualified as a valid public use under both the Federal and State Constitutions. 268 Conn., at 40, 843 A.2d, at 527.

Finally, adhering to its precedents, the court went on to determine, first, whether the takings of the particular properties at issue were "reasonably necessary" to achieving the City's intended public use, *id.,* at 82-84, 843 A.2d, at 552-553, and, second, whether the takings were for "reasonably ****2661** foreseeable needs," *id.,* at 93-94, 843 A.2d, at 558-559. The court upheld the trial court's factual findings as to parcel 3, but reversed the trial court as to parcel 4A, agreeing with the City that the intended use of this land was sufficiently ***477** definite and had been given "reasonable attention" during the planning process. *Id.,* at 120-121, 843 A.2d, at 574.

The three dissenting justices would have imposed a "heightened" standard of judicial review for takings justified by economic development. Although they agreed that the plan was intended to serve a valid public use, they would have found all the takings unconstitutional because the City had failed to adduce "clear and convincing evidence" that the economic benefits of the plan would in fact come to pass. *Id.,* at 144, 146, 843 A.2d, at 587, 588 (Zarella, J., joined by Sullivan, C. J., and Katz, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part).

We granted certiorari to determine whether a city's decision to take property for the purpose of economic development satisfies the "public use" requirement of the Fifth Amendment. 542 U.S. 965, 125 S.Ct. 27, 159 L.Ed.2d 857 (2004).

III

[1][2] Two polar propositions are perfectly clear. On the one hand, it has long been accepted that the sovereign may not take the property of *A* for the sole purpose of transferring it to another private party *B,* even though *A* is paid just compensation. On the other hand, it is equally clear that a State may transfer property from one private party to another if future "use by the public" is the purpose of the taking; the condemnation of land for a railroad with common-carrier duties is a familiar example. Neither of these propositions, however, determines the disposition of this case.

[3] As for the first proposition, the City would no doubt be forbidden from taking petitioners' land for the purpose of conferring a private benefit on a particular private party. See *Midkiff,* 467 U.S., at 245, 104 S.Ct. 2321 ("A purely private taking could not withstand the scrutiny of the public use requirement; it would serve no legitimate purpose of government and would thus be void"); *Missouri Pacific R. Co. v. Nebraska,* ***478** 164 U.S. 403, 17 S.Ct. 130, 41 L.Ed. 489 (1896).[FN5] Nor would the City be allowed to take property under the mere pretext of a public purpose, when its actual purpose was to bestow a private benefit. The takings before us, however, would be executed pursuant to a "carefully considered" development plan. 268 Conn., at 54, 843 A.2d, at 536. The trial judge and all the members of the Supreme Court of Connecticut agreed that there was no evidence of an illegitimate purpose in this case.[FN6] Therefore, as was true of the statute****2662** challenged in *Midkiff,* 467

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

U.S., at 245, 104 S.Ct. 2321, the City's development plan was not adopted "to benefit a particular class of identifiable individuals."

> FN5. See also *Calder v. Bull*, 3 Dall. 386, 388, 1 L.Ed. 648 (1798) ("An ACT of the Legislature (for I cannot call it a law) contrary to the great first principles of the social compact, cannot be considered a rightful exercise of legislative authority.... A few instances will suffice to explain what I mean.... [A] law that takes property from A. and gives it to B: It is against all reason and justice, for a people to entrust a Legislature with SUCH powers; and, therefore, it cannot be presumed that they have done it. The genius, the nature, and the spirit, of our State Governments, amount to a prohibition of such acts of legislation; and the general principles of law and reason forbid them" (emphasis deleted)).

> FN6. See 268 Conn., at 159, 843 A.2d, at 595 (Zarella, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) ("The record clearly demonstrates that the development plan was not intended to serve the interests of Pfizer, Inc., or any other private entity, but rather, to revitalize the local economy by creating temporary and permanent jobs, generating a significant increase in tax revenue, encouraging spin-off economic activities and maximizing public access to the waterfront"). And while the City intends to transfer certain of the parcels to a private developer in a long-term lease-which developer, in turn, is expected to lease the office space and so forth to other private tenants-the identities of those private parties were not known when the plan was adopted. It is, of course, difficult to accuse the government of having taken *A*'s property to benefit the private interests of *B* when the identity of *B* was unknown.

On the other hand, this is not a case in which the City is planning to open the condemned land-at least not in its entirety-to use by the general public. Nor will the private lessees of the land in any sense be required to operate like common carriers, making their services available to all comers.***479** But although such a projected use would be sufficient to satisfy the public use requirement, this "Court long ago rejected any literal requirement that condemned property be put into use for the general public." *Id.*, at 244, 104 S.Ct. 2321. Indeed, while many state courts in the mid-19th century endorsed "use by the public" as the proper definition of public use, that narrow view steadily eroded over time. Not only was the "use by the public" test difficult to administer (*e.g.*, what proportion of the public need have access to the property? at what price?),[FN7] but it proved to be impractical given the diverse and always evolving needs of society.[FN8] Accordingly, ***480** when this Court began applying the Fifth Amendment to the States at the close of the 19th century, it embraced the broader and more natural interpretation of public use as "public purpose." See, *e.g., Fallbrook Irrigation Dist. v. Bradley*, 164 U.S. 112, 158-164, 17 S.Ct. 56, 41 L.Ed. 369 (1896). Thus, in a case upholding a mining company's use of an aerial bucket line to transport ore over property it did not own, Justice Holmes' opinion for the Court stressed "the inadequacy of use by the general public as a ****2663** universal test." *Strickley v. Highland Boy Gold Mining Co.*, 200 U.S. 527, 531, 26 S.Ct. 301, 50 L.Ed. 581 (1906).[FN9] We have repeatedly and consistently rejected that narrow test ever since.[FN10]

> FN7. See, *e.g., Dayton Gold & Silver Mining Co. v. Seawell*, 11 Nev. 394, 410, 1876 WL 4573, *11 (1876) ("If public occupation and enjoyment of the object for which land is to be condemned furnishes the only and true test for the right of eminent domain, then the legislature would certainly have the constitutional authority to condemn the lands of any private citizen for the purpose of building hotels and theaters. Why not? A hotel is used by the public as

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

much as a railroad. The public have the same right, upon payment of a fixed compensation, to seek rest and refreshment at a public inn as they have to travel upon a railroad").

FN8. From upholding the Mill Acts (which authorized manufacturers dependent on power-producing dams to flood upstream lands in exchange for just compensation), to approving takings necessary for the economic development of the West through mining and irrigation, many state courts either circumvented the "use by the public" test when necessary or abandoned it completely. See Nichols, The Meaning of Public Use in the Law of Eminent Domain, 20 B.U.L.Rev. 615, 619-624 (1940) (tracing this development and collecting cases). For example, in rejecting the "use by the public" test as overly restrictive, the Nevada Supreme Court stressed that "[m]ining is the greatest of the industrial pursuits in this state. All other interests are subservient to it. Our mountains are almost barren of timber, and our valleys could never be made profitable for agricultural purposes except for the fact of a home market having been created by the mining developments in different sections of the state. The mining and milling interests give employment to many men, and the benefits derived from this business are distributed as much, and sometimes more, among the laboring classes than with the owners of the mines and mills. ... The present prosperity of the state is entirely due to the mining developments already made, and the entire people of the state are directly interested in having the future developments unobstructed by the obstinate action of any individual or individuals." *Dayton Gold & Silver Mining Co.*, 11 Nev., at 409-410, 1876 WL, at *11.

FN9. See also *Clark v. Nash*, 198 U.S. 361, 25 S.Ct. 676, 49 L.Ed. 1085 (1905) (upholding a statute that authorized the owner of arid land to widen a ditch on his neighbor's property so as to permit a nearby stream to irrigate his land).

FN10. See, *e.g., Mt. Vernon-Woodberry Cotton Duck Co. v. Alabama Interstate Power Co.*, 240 U.S. 30, 32, 36 S.Ct. 234, 60 L.Ed. 507 (1916) ("The inadequacy of use by the general public as a universal test is established"); *Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*, 467 U.S. 986, 1014-1015, 104 S.Ct. 2862, 81 L.Ed.2d 815 (1984) ("This Court, however, has rejected the notion that a use is a public use only if the property taken is put to use for the general public").

[4] The disposition of this case therefore turns on the question whether the City's development plan serves a "public purpose." Without exception, our cases have defined that concept broadly, reflecting our longstanding policy of deference to legislative judgments in this field.

In *Berman v. Parker*, 348 U.S. 26, 75 S.Ct. 98, 99 L.Ed. 27 (1954), this Court upheld a redevelopment plan targeting a blighted area of Washington, D. C., in which most of the housing for the area's 5,000 inhabitants was beyond repair. Under the plan, the area would be condemned and part of it utilized for the construction of streets, schools, and other public facilities. The remainder of the land would be leased or sold to private parties for the purpose of redevelopment, including the construction of low-cost housing.

***481** The owner of a department store located in the area challenged the condemnation, pointing out that his store was not itself blighted and arguing that the creation of a "better balanced, more attractive community" was not a valid public use. *Id.*, at 31, 75 S.Ct. 98. Writing for a unanimous Court, Justice Douglas refused to evaluate this claim in isolation, deferring instead to the legislative and

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

agency judgment that the area "must be planned as a whole" for the plan to be successful. *Id.*, at 34, 75 S.Ct. 98. The Court explained that "community redevelopment programs need not, by force of the Constitution, be on a piecemeal basis-lot by lot, building by building." *Id.*, at 35, 75 S.Ct. 98. The public use underlying the taking was unequivocally affirmed:

> "We do not sit to determine whether a particular housing project is or is not desirable. The concept of the public welfare is broad and inclusive.... The values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, aesthetic as well as monetary. It is within the power of the legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well-balanced as well as carefully patrolled. In the present case, the Congress and its authorized agencies have made determinations that take into account a wide variety of values. It is not for us to reappraise them. If those who govern the District of Columbia decide that the Nation's Capital should be beautiful as well as sanitary, there is nothing in the Fifth Amendment that stands in the way." *Id.*, at 33, 75 S.Ct. 98.

In *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff*, 467 U.S. 229, 104 S.Ct. 2321, 81 L.Ed.2d 186 (1984), the Court considered a Hawaii statute whereby fee title was taken from lessors and transferred to lessees (for just compensation) in order to reduce the concentration of land ownership. We unanimously upheld the statute and rejected the Ninth Circuit's view that it was "a naked attempt on the part of the state of Hawaii to take the property of A ***482** and ****2664** transfer it to B solely for B's private use and benefit." *Id.*, at 235, 104 S.Ct. 2321 (internal quotation marks omitted). Reaffirming *Berman's* deferential approach to legislative judgments in this field, we concluded that the State's purpose of eliminating the "social and economic evils of a land oligopoly" qualified as a valid public use. 467 U.S., at 241-242, 104 S.Ct. 2321. Our opinion also rejected the contention that the mere fact that the State immediately transferred the properties to private individuals upon condemnation somehow diminished the public character of the taking. "[I]t is only the taking's purpose, and not its mechanics," we explained, that matters in determining public use. *Id.*, at 244, 104 S.Ct. 2321.

In that same Term we decided another public use case that arose in a purely economic context. In *Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*, 467 U.S. 986, 104 S.Ct. 2862, 81 L.Ed.2d 815 (1984), the Court dealt with provisions of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act under which the Environmental Protection Agency could consider the data (including trade secrets) submitted by a prior pesticide applicant in evaluating a subsequent application, so long as the second applicant paid just compensation for the data. We acknowledged that the "most direct beneficiaries" of these provisions were the subsequent applicants, *id.*, at 1014, 104 S.Ct. 2862, but we nevertheless upheld the statute under *Berman* and *Midkiff*. We found sufficient Congress' belief that sparing applicants the cost of time-consuming research eliminated a significant barrier to entry in the pesticide market and thereby enhanced competition. 467 U.S., at 1015, 104 S.Ct. 2862.

Viewed as a whole, our jurisprudence has recognized that the needs of society have varied between different parts of the Nation, just as they have evolved over time in response to changed circumstances. Our earliest cases in particular embodied a strong theme of federalism, emphasizing the "great respect" that we owe to state legislatures and state courts in discerning local public needs. See *Hairston v. Danville & Western R. Co.*, 208 U.S. 598, 606-607, 28 S.Ct. 331, 52 L.Ed. 637 (1908) ***483** noting that these needs were likely to vary depending on a State's "resources, the capacity of the soil, the relative importance of industries to the general public welfare, and the long-established methods and habits of the people").[FN11] For more than a century, our public use jurisprudence has wisely eschewed rigid formulas and intrusive scru-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

tiny in favor of affording legislatures broad latitude in determining what public needs justify the use of the takings power.

> FN11. See also *Clark,* 198 U.S., at 367-368, 25 S.Ct. 676; *Strickley v. Highland Boy Gold Mining Co.,* 200 U.S. 527, 531, 26 S.Ct. 301, 50 L.Ed. 581 (1906) ("In the opinion of the legislature and the Supreme Court of Utah the public welfare of that State demands that aerial lines between the mines upon its mountain sides and railways in the valleys below should not be made impossible by the refusal of a private owner to sell the right to cross his land. The Constitution of the United States does not require us to say that they are wrong"); *O'Neill v. Leamer,* 239 U.S. 244, 253, 36 S.Ct. 54, 60 L.Ed. 249 (1915) ("States may take account of their special exigencies, and when the extent of their arid or wet lands is such that a plan for irrigation or reclamation according to districts may fairly be regarded as one which promotes the public interest, there is nothing in the Federal Constitution which denies to them the right to formulate this policy or to exercise the power of eminent domain in carrying it into effect. With the local situation the state court is peculiarly familiar and its judgment is entitled to the highest respect").

IV

Those who govern the City were not confronted with the need to remove blight ****2665** in the Fort Trumbull area, but their determination that the area was sufficiently distressed to justify a program of economic rejuvenation is entitled to our deference. The City has carefully formulated an economic development plan that it believes will provide appreciable benefits to the community, including-but by no means limited to-new jobs and increased tax revenue. As with other exercises in urban planning and development,[FN12] the City is endeavoring to coordinate a variety of commercial, residential, and recreational uses of land, with the hope that they will form a whole greater than the sum of its parts. To effectuate***484** this plan, the City has invoked a state statute that specifically authorizes the use of eminent domain to promote economic development. Given the comprehensive character of the plan, the thorough deliberation that preceded its adoption, and the limited scope of our review, it is appropriate for us, as it was in *Berman,* to resolve the challenges of the individual owners, not on a piecemeal basis, but rather in light of the entire plan. Because that plan unquestionably serves a public purpose, the takings challenged here satisfy the public use requirement of the Fifth Amendment.

> FN12. Cf. *Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co.,* 272 U.S. 365, 47 S.Ct. 114, 71 L.Ed. 303 (1926).

[5] To avoid this result, petitioners urge us to adopt a new bright-line rule that economic development does not qualify as a public use. Putting aside the unpersuasive suggestion that the City's plan will provide only purely economic benefits, neither precedent nor logic supports petitioners' proposal. Promoting economic development is a traditional and long-accepted function of government. There is, moreover, no principled way of distinguishing economic development from the other public purposes that we have recognized. In our cases upholding takings that facilitated agriculture and mining, for example, we emphasized the importance of those industries to the welfare of the States in question, see, *e.g., Strickley,* 200 U.S. 527, 26 S.Ct. 301; in *Berman,* we endorsed the purpose of transforming a blighted area into a "well-balanced" community through redevelopment, 348 U.S., at 33, 75 S.Ct. 98; [FN13] in *Midkiff,* ***485** we upheld the interest in breaking up a land oligopoly that "created artificial deterrents to the normal functioning of the State's residential land market," 467 U.S., at 242, 104 S.Ct. 2321; and in *Monsanto,* we accepted Congress' purpose of eliminating a "significant barrier to entry in the pesticide market," 467 U.S., at

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

1014-1015, 104 S.Ct. 2862. It would be incongruous to hold that the City's interest in the economic benefits to be derived from the development of the Fort Trumbull area has less of a public character than any of those other interests. Clearly, there is no basis for exempting economic ****2666** development from our traditionally broad understanding of public purpose.

> FN13. It is a misreading of *Berman* to suggest that the only public use upheld in that case was the initial removal of blight. See Reply Brief for Petitioners 8. The public use described in *Berman* extended beyond that to encompass the purpose of *developing* that area to create conditions that would prevent a reversion to blight in the future. See 348 U.S., at 34-35, 75 S.Ct. 98 ("It was not enough, [the experts] believed, to remove existing buildings that were insanitary or unsightly. It was important to redesign the whole area so as to eliminate the conditions that cause slums.... The entire area needed redesigning so that a balanced, integrated plan could be developed for the region, including not only new homes, but also schools, churches, parks, streets, and shopping centers. In this way it was hoped that the cycle of decay of the area could be controlled and the birth of future slums prevented"). Had the public use in *Berman* been defined more narrowly, it would have been difficult to justify the taking of the plaintiff's nonblighted department store.

Petitioners contend that using eminent domain for economic development impermissibly blurs the boundary between public and private takings. Again, our cases foreclose this objection. Quite simply, the government's pursuit of a public purpose will often benefit individual private parties. For example, in *Midkiff,* the forced transfer of property conferred a direct and significant benefit on those lessees who were previously unable to purchase their homes. In *Monsanto,* we recognized that the "most direct beneficiaries" of the data-sharing provisions were the subsequent pesticide applicants, but benefiting them in this way was necessary to promoting competition in the pesticide market. 467 U.S., at 1014, 104 S.Ct. 2862. [FN14] The owner of the department store in ***486** *Berman* objected to "taking from one businessman for the benefit of another businessman," 348 U.S., at 33, 75 S.Ct. 98, referring to the fact that under the redevelopment plan land would be leased or sold to private developers for redevelopment. [FN15] Our rejection of that contention has particular relevance to the instant case: "The public end may be as well or better served through an agency of private enterprise than through a department of government-or so the Congress might conclude. We cannot say that public ownership is the sole method of promoting the public purposes of community redevelopment projects." *Id.,* at 33-34, 75 S.Ct. 98.[FN16]

> FN14. Any number of cases illustrate that the achievement of a public good often coincides with the immediate benefiting of private parties. See, *e.g., National Railroad Passenger Corporation v. Boston & Maine Corp.,* 503 U.S. 407, 422, 112 S.Ct. 1394, 118 L.Ed.2d 52 (1992) (public purpose of "facilitating Amtrak's rail service" served by taking rail track from one private company and transferring it to another private company); *Brown v. Legal Foundation of Wash.,* 538 U.S. 216, 123 S.Ct. 1406, 155 L.Ed.2d 376 (2003) (provision of legal services to the poor is a valid public purpose). It is worth noting that in *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff,* 467 U.S. 229, 104 S.Ct. 2321, 81 L.Ed.2d 186 (1984), *Monsanto,* and *Boston & Maine Corp.,* the property in question retained the same use even after the change of ownership.
>
> FN15. Notably, as in the instant case, the private developers in *Berman* were re-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

quired by contract to use the property to carry out the redevelopment plan. See 348 U.S., at 30, 75 S.Ct. 98.

FN16. Nor do our cases support Justice O'CONNOR's novel theory that the government may only take property and transfer it to private parties when the initial taking eliminates some "harmful property use." *Post,* at 2675 (dissenting opinion). There was nothing "harmful" about the nonblighted department store at issue in *Berman,* 348 U.S. 26, 75 S.Ct. 98; see also n. 13, *supra;* nothing "harmful" about the lands at issue in the mining and agriculture cases, see, *e.g., Strickley,* 200 U.S. 527, 26 S.Ct. 301; see also nn. 9, 11, *supra;* and certainly nothing "harmful" about the trade secrets owned by the pesticide manufacturers in *Monsanto,* 467 U.S. 986, 104 S.Ct. 2862. In each case, the public purpose we upheld depended on a private party's *future* use of the concededly nonharmful property that was taken. By focusing on a property's future use, as opposed to its past use, our cases are faithful to the text of the Takings Clause. See U.S. Const., Amdt. 5. ("[N]or shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation"). Justice O'CONNOR's intimation that a "public purpose" may not be achieved by the action of private parties, see *post,* at 2675, confuses the *purpose* of a taking with its *mechanics,* a mistake we warned of in *Midkiff,* 467 U.S., at 244, 104 S.Ct. 2321. See also *Berman,* 348 U.S., at 33-34, 75 S.Ct. 98 ("The public end may be as well or better served through an agency of private enterprise than through a department of government").

It is further argued that without a bright-line rule nothing would stop a city from transferring citizen *A*'s property to ***487** citizen *B* for the sole reason that citizen *B* will put the property to a more productive****2667** use and thus pay more taxes. Such a one-to-one transfer of property, executed outside the confines of an integrated development plan, is not presented in this case. While such an unusual exercise of government power would certainly raise a suspicion that a private purpose was afoot,[FN17] the hypothetical cases posited by petitioners can be confronted if and when they arise.[FN18] They do not warrant the crafting of an artificial restriction on the concept of public use.[FN19]

FN17. Courts have viewed such aberrations with a skeptical eye. See, *e.g., 99 Cents Only Stores v. Lancaster Redevelopment Agency,* 237 F.Supp.2d 1123 (C.D.Cal.2001); cf. *Cincinnati v. Vester,* 281 U.S. 439, 448, 50 S.Ct. 360, 74 L.Ed. 950 (1930) (taking invalid under state eminent domain statute for lack of a reasoned explanation). These types of takings may also implicate other constitutional guarantees. See *Village of Willowbrook v. Olech,* 528 U.S. 562, 120 S.Ct. 1073, 145 L.Ed.2d 1060 (2000) *(per curiam).*

FN18. Cf. *Panhandle Oil Co. v. Mississippi ex rel. Knox,* 277 U.S. 218, 223, 48 S.Ct. 451, 72 L.Ed. 857 (1928) (Holmes, J., dissenting) ("The power to tax is not the power to destroy while this Court sits").

FN19. A parade of horribles is especially unpersuasive in this context, since the Takings Clause largely "operates as a conditional limitation, permitting the government to do what it wants so long as it pays the charge." *Eastern Enterprises v. Apfel,* 524 U.S. 498, 545, 118 S.Ct. 2131, 141 L.Ed.2d 451 (1998) (KENNEDY, J., concurring in judgment and dissenting in part). Speaking of the takings power, Justice Iredell observed that "[i]t is not sufficient to urge, that the power may be abused, for, such is the nature of all power,-such is the tendency of every human institution: and, it might as fairly be said, that the power of

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

> taxation, which is only circumscribed by the discretion of the Body, in which it is vested, ought not to be granted, because the Legislature, disregarding its true objects, might, for visionary and useless projects, impose a tax to the amount of nineteen shillings in the pound. We must be content to limit power where we can, and where we cannot, consistently with its use, we must be content to repose a salutory confidence." *Calder*, 3 Dall., at 400, 1 L.Ed. 648 (opinion concurring in result).

[6] Alternatively, petitioners maintain that for takings of this kind we should require a "reasonable certainty" that the expected public benefits will actually accrue. Such a rule, however, would represent an even greater departure from ***488** our precedent. "When the legislature's purpose is legitimate and its means are not irrational, our cases make clear that empirical debates over the wisdom of takings-no less than debates over the wisdom of other kinds of socioeconomic legislation-are not to be carried out in the federal courts." *Midkiff*, 467 U.S., at 242-243, 104 S.Ct. 2321. [FN20] Indeed, earlier this Term we explained why similar practical concerns (among others) undermined the use of the "substantially advances" formula in our regulatory takings doctrine. See *Lingle v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc.*, 544 U.S. 528, 544, 125 S.Ct. 2074, 2085, 161 L.Ed.2d 876 (2005) (noting that this formula "would empower-and might often require-courts to substitute their predictive judgments for those of elected legislatures and expert agencies"). The disadvantages of a ****2668** heightened form of review are especially pronounced in this type of case. Orderly implementation of a comprehensive redevelopment plan obviously requires that the legal rights of all interested parties be established before new construction can be commenced. A constitutional rule that required postponement of the judicial approval of every condemnation until the likelihood of success of the plan had been assured would unquestionably impose a significant impediment to the successful consummation of many such plans.

> FN20. See also *Boston & Maine Corp.*, 503 U.S., at 422-423, 112 S.Ct. 1394 ("[W]e need not make a specific factual determination whether the condemnation will accomplish its objectives"); *Monsanto*, 467 U.S., at 1015, n. 18, 104 S.Ct. 2862 ("Monsanto argues that EPA and, by implication, Congress, misapprehended the true 'barriers to entry' in the pesticide industry and that the challenged provisions of the law create, rather than reduce, barriers to entry.... Such economic arguments are better directed to Congress. The proper inquiry before this Court is not whether the provisions in fact will accomplish their stated objectives. Our review is limited to determining that the purpose is legitimate and that Congress rationally could have believed that the provisions would promote that objective").

[7] Just as we decline to second-guess the City's considered judgments about the efficacy of its development plan, we also decline to second-guess the City's determinations as to what ***489** lands it needs to acquire in order to effectuate the project. "It is not for the courts to oversee the choice of the boundary line nor to sit in review on the size of a particular project area. Once the question of the public purpose has been decided, the amount and character of land to be taken for the project and the need for a particular tract to complete the integrated plan rests in the discretion of the legislative branch." *Berman*, 348 U.S., at 35-36, 75 S.Ct. 98.

In affirming the City's authority to take petitioners' properties, we do not minimize the hardship that condemnations may entail, notwithstanding the payment of just compensation. [FN21] We emphasize that nothing in our opinion precludes any State from placing further restrictions on its exercise of the takings power. Indeed, many States already impose "public use" requirements that are stricter than the federal baseline. Some of these requirements

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

have been established as a matter of state constitutional law, FN22 while others are expressed in state eminent domain statutes that carefully limit the grounds upon which takings may be exercised. FN23 As the submissions of the parties and their *amici* make clear, the necessity and wisdom of using eminent domain to promote economic development are certainly matters of legitimate public debate. FN24 This Court's authority, ***490** however, extends only to determining whether the City's proposed condemnations are for a "public use" within the meaning of the Fifth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. Because over a century of our case law interpreting that provision dictates an affirmative answer to that question, we may not grant petitioners the relief that they seek.

FN21. The *amici* raise questions about the fairness of the measure of just compensation. See, *e.g.*, Brief for American Planning Association et al. as *Amici Curiae* 26-30. While important, these questions are not before us in this litigation.

FN22. See, *e.g., County of Wayne v. Hathcock*, 471 Mich. 445, 684 N.W.2d 765 (2004).

FN23. Under California law, for instance, a city may only take land for economic development purposes in blighted areas. Cal. Health & Safety Code Ann. §§ 33030-33037 (West 1999). See, *e.g., Redevelopment Agency of Chula Vista v. Rados Bros.*, 95 Cal.App.4th 309, 115 Cal.Rptr.2d 234 (2002).

FN24. For example, some argue that the need for eminent domain has been greatly exaggerated because private developers can use numerous techniques, including secret negotiations or precommitment strategies, to overcome holdout problems and assemble lands for genuinely profitable projects. See Brief for Jane Jacobs as *Amicus Curiae* 13-15; see also Brief for John Norquist as *Amicus Curiae*. Others argue to the contrary, urging that the need for eminent domain is especially great with regard to older, small cities like New London, where centuries of development have created an extreme overdivision of land and thus a real market impediment to land assembly. See Brief for Connecticut Conference of Municipalities et al. as *Amici Curiae* 13, 21; see also Brief for National League of Cities et al. as *Amici Curiae.*

****2669** The judgment of the Supreme Court of Connecticut is affirmed.

It is so ordered.

Justice KENNEDY, concurring.

I join the opinion for the Court and add these further observations.

This Court has declared that a taking should be upheld as consistent with the Public Use Clause, U.S. Const., Amdt. 5, as long as it is "rationally related to a conceivable public purpose." *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff*, 467 U.S. 229, 241, 104 S.Ct. 2321, 81 L.Ed.2d 186 (1984); see also *Berman v. Parker*, 348 U.S. 26, 75 S.Ct. 98, 99 L.Ed. 27 (1954). This deferential standard of review echoes the rational-basis test used to review economic regulation under the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses, see, *e.g., FCC v. Beach Communications, Inc.*, 508 U.S. 307, 313-314, 113 S.Ct. 2096, 124 L.Ed.2d 211 (1993); *Williamson v. Lee Optical of Okla., Inc.*, 348 U.S. 483, 75 S.Ct. 461, 99 L.Ed. 563 (1955). The determination that a rational-basis standard of review is appropriate does not, however, alter the fact that transfers intended to confer benefits on particular, favored private entities, and with only incidental or pretextual public benefits, are forbidden by the Public Use Clause.

***491** A court applying rational-basis review under the Public Use Clause should strike down a taking that, by a clear showing, is intended to favor

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

a particular private party, with only incidental or pretextual public benefits, just as a court applying rational-basis review under the Equal Protection Clause must strike down a government classification that is clearly intended to injure a particular class of private parties, with only incidental or pretextual public justifications. See *Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, Inc.*, 473 U.S. 432, 446-447, 450, 105 S.Ct. 3249, 87 L.Ed.2d 313 (1985); *Department of Agriculture v. Moreno*, 413 U.S. 528, 533-536, 93 S.Ct. 2821, 37 L.Ed.2d 782 (1973). As the trial court in this case was correct to observe: "Where the purpose [of a taking] is economic development and that development is to be carried out by private parties or private parties will be benefited, the court must decide if the stated public purpose-economic advantage to a city sorely in need of it-is only incidental to the benefits that will be confined on private parties of a development plan." App. to Pet. for Cert. 263. See also *ante*, at 2661-2662.

A court confronted with a plausible accusation of impermissible favoritism to private parties should treat the objection as a serious one and review the record to see if it has merit, though with the presumption that the government's actions were reasonable and intended to serve a public purpose. Here, the trial court conducted a careful and extensive inquiry into "whether, in fact, the development plan is of primary benefit to ... the developer [*i.e.*, Corcoran Jennison], and private businesses which may eventually locate in the plan area [*e.g.*, Pfizer], and in that regard, only of incidental benefit to the city." App. to Pet. for Cert. 261. The trial court considered testimony from government officials and corporate officers, *id.*, at 266-271; documentary evidence of communications between these parties, *ibid.;* respondents' awareness of New London's depressed economic condition and evidence corroborating the validity of this concern, *id.*, at 272-273, 278-279; the substantial commitment of public ***492** funds by the State to the development project before most of the private beneficiaries were known, *id.*, at 276; evidence that respondents reviewed a variety of development plans and chose a private developer from a group of applicants rather than picking out a particular transferee beforehand, *id.*, at ****2670** 273, 278; and the fact that the other private beneficiaries of the project are still unknown because the office space proposed to be built has not yet been rented, *id.*, at 278.

The trial court concluded, based on these findings, that benefiting Pfizer was not "the primary motivation or effect of this development plan"; instead, "the primary motivation for [respondents] was to take advantage of Pfizer's presence." *Id.*, at 276. Likewise, the trial court concluded that "[t]here is nothing in the record to indicate that ... [respondents] were motivated by a desire to aid [other] particular private entities." *Id.*, at 278. See also *ante*, at 2661-2662. Even the dissenting justices on the Connecticut Supreme Court agreed that respondents' development plan was intended to revitalize the local economy, not to serve the interests of Pfizer, Corcoran Jennison, or any other private party. 268 Conn. 1, 159, 843 A.2d 500, 595 (2004) (Zarella, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part). This case, then, survives the meaningful rational-basis review that in my view is required under the Public Use Clause.

Petitioners and their *amici* argue that any taking justified by the promotion of economic development must be treated by the courts as *per se* invalid, or at least presumptively invalid. Petitioners overstate the need for such a rule, however, by making the incorrect assumption that review under *Berman* and *Midkiff* imposes no meaningful judicial limits on the government's power to condemn any property it likes. A broad *per se* rule or a strong presumption of invalidity, furthermore, would prohibit a large number of government takings that have the purpose and expected effect of conferring substantial benefits on the public at large and so do not offend the Public Use Clause.

***493** My agreement with the Court that a presumption of invalidity is not warranted for economic development takings in general, or for the partic-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

ular takings at issue in this case, does not foreclose the possibility that a more stringent standard of review than that announced in *Berman* and *Midkiff* might be appropriate for a more narrowly drawn category of takings. There may be private transfers in which the risk of undetected impermissible favoritism of private parties is so acute that a presumption (rebuttable or otherwise) of invalidity is warranted under the Public Use Clause. Cf. *Eastern Enterprises v. Apfel*, 524 U.S. 498, 549-550, 118 S.Ct. 2131, 141 L.Ed.2d 451 (1998) (KENNEDY, J., concurring in judgment and dissenting in part) (heightened scrutiny for retroactive legislation under the Due Process Clause). This demanding level of scrutiny, however, is not required simply because the purpose of the taking is economic development.

This is not the occasion for conjecture as to what sort of cases might justify a more demanding standard, but it is appropriate to underscore aspects of the instant case that convince me no departure from *Berman* and *Midkiff* is appropriate here. This taking occurred in the context of a comprehensive development plan meant to address a serious city-wide depression, and the projected economic benefits of the project cannot be characterized as *de minimis.* The identities of most of the private beneficiaries were unknown at the time the city formulated its plans. The city complied with elaborate procedural requirements that facilitate review of the record and inquiry into the city's purposes. In sum, while there may be categories of cases in which the transfers are so suspicious, or the procedures employed so prone to abuse, or the purported benefits are so trivial or implausible, that courts should presume an impermissible private ****2671** purpose, no such circumstances are present in this case.

* * *

For the foregoing reasons, I join in the Court's opinion.

***494** Justice O'CONNOR, with whom THE CHIEF JUSTICE, Justice SCALIA, and Justice THOMAS join, dissenting.

Over two centuries ago, just after the Bill of Rights was ratified, Justice Chase wrote:

> "An ACT of the Legislature (for I cannot call it a law) contrary to the great first principles of the social compact, cannot be considered a rightful exercise of legislative authority .... A few instances will suffice to explain what I mean ....[A] law that takes property from A. and gives it to B: It is against all reason and justice, for a people to entrust a Legislature with SUCH powers; and, therefore, it cannot be presumed that they have done it." *Calder v. Bull*, 3 Dall. 386, 388, 1 L.Ed. 648 (1798) (emphasis deleted).

Today the Court abandons this long-held, basic limitation on government power. Under the banner of economic development, all private property is now vulnerable to being taken and transferred to another private owner, so long as it might be upgraded-*i.e.*, given to an owner who will use it in a way that the legislature deems more beneficial to the public-in the process. To reason, as the Court does, that the incidental public benefits resulting from the subsequent ordinary use of private property render economic development takings "for public use" is to wash out any distinction between private and public use of property-and thereby effectively to delete the words "for public use" from the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment. Accordingly I respectfully dissent.

I

Petitioners are nine resident or investment owners of 15 homes in the Fort Trumbull neighborhood of New London, Connecticut. Petitioner Wilhelmina Dery, for example, lives in a house on Walbach Street that has been in her family for over 100 years. She was born in the house in 1918; her husband, petitioner Charles Dery, moved into the house when they married in 1946. Their son lives next door with ***495** his family in the house he received as a wedding gift, and joins his parents in this suit. Two petitioners keep rental properties in the neighborhood.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

In February 1998, Pfizer Inc., the pharmaceuticals manufacturer, announced that it would build a global research facility near the Fort Trumbull neighborhood. Two months later, New London's city council gave initial approval for the New London Development Corporation (NLDC) to prepare the development plan at issue here. The NLDC is a private, nonprofit corporation whose mission is to assist the city council in economic development planning. It is not elected by popular vote, and its directors and employees are privately appointed. Consistent with its mandate, the NLDC generated an ambitious plan for redeveloping 90 acres of Fort Trumbull in order to "complement the facility that Pfizer was planning to build, create jobs, increase tax and other revenues, encourage public access to and use of the city's waterfront, and eventually 'build momentum' for the revitalization of the rest of the city." App. to Pet. for Cert. 5.

Petitioners own properties in two of the plan's seven parcels-Parcel 3 and Parcel 4A. Under the plan, Parcel 3 is slated for the construction of research and office space as a market develops for such space. It will also retain the existing Italian Dramatic Club (a private cultural organization) ****2672** though the homes of three plaintiffs in that parcel are to be demolished. Parcel 4A is slated, mysteriously, for " 'park support.' " *Id.*, at 345-346. At oral argument, counsel for respondents conceded the vagueness of this proposed use, and offered that the parcel might eventually be used for parking. Tr. of Oral Arg. 36.

To save their homes, petitioners sued New London and the NLDC, to whom New London has delegated eminent domain power. Petitioners maintain that the Fifth Amendment prohibits the NLDC from condemning their properties for the sake of an economic development plan. Petitioners are not holdouts; they do not seek increased compensation, and ***496** none is opposed to new development in the area. Theirs is an objection in principle: They claim that the NLDC's proposed use for their confiscated property is not a "public" one for purposes of the Fifth Amendment. While the government may take their homes to build a road or a railroad or to eliminate a property use that harms the public, say petitioners, it cannot take their property for the private use of other owners simply because the new owners may make more productive use of the property.

II

The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, made applicable to the States by the Fourteenth Amendment, provides that "private property [shall not] be taken for public use, without just compensation." When interpreting the Constitution, we begin with the unremarkable presumption that every word in the document has independent meaning, "that no word was unnecessarily used, or needlessly added." *Wright v. United States*, 302 U.S. 583, 588, 58 S.Ct. 395, 82 L.Ed. 439 (1938). In keeping with that presumption, we have read the Fifth Amendment's language to impose two distinct conditions on the exercise of eminent domain: "[T]he taking must be for a 'public use' and 'just compensation' must be paid to the owner." *Brown v. Legal Foundation of Wash.*, 538 U.S. 216, 231-232, 123 S.Ct. 1406, 155 L.Ed.2d 376 (2003).

These two limitations serve to protect "the security of Property," which Alexander Hamilton described to the Philadelphia Convention as one of the "great obj[ects] of Gov[ernment]." 1 Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, p. 302 (M. Farrand ed.1911). Together they ensure stable property ownership by providing safeguards against excessive, unpredictable, or unfair use of the government's eminent domain power-particularly against those owners who, for whatever reasons, may be unable to protect themselves in the political process against the majority's will.

***497** While the Takings Clause presupposes that government can take private property without the owner's consent, the just compensation requirement spreads the cost of condemnations and thus "prevents the public from loading upon one individual more than his just share of the burdens of

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

government." *Monongahela Nav. Co. v. United States,* 148 U.S. 312, 325, 13 S.Ct. 622, 37 L.Ed. 463 (1893); see also *Armstrong v. United States,* 364 U.S. 40, 49, 80 S.Ct. 1563, 4 L.Ed.2d 1554 (1960). The public use requirement, in turn, imposes a more basic limitation, circumscribing the very scope of the eminent domain power: Government may compel an individual to forfeit her property for the *public's* use, but not for the benefit of another private person. This requirement promotes fairness as well as security. Cf. *Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council, Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency,* 535 U.S. 302, 336, 122 S.Ct. 1465, 152 L.Ed.2d 517 (2002) ("The concepts of 'fairness and justice' ... underlie the Takings Clause").

****2673** Where is the line between "public" and "private" property use? We give considerable deference to legislatures' determinations about what governmental activities will advantage the public. But were the political branches the sole arbiters of the public-private distinction, the Public Use Clause would amount to little more than hortatory fluff. An external, judicial check on how the public use requirement is interpreted, however limited, is necessary if this constraint on government power is to retain any meaning. See *Cincinnati v. Vester,* 281 U.S. 439, 446, 50 S.Ct. 360, 74 L.Ed. 950 (1930) ("It is well established that ... the question [of] what is a public use is a judicial one").

Our cases have generally identified three categories of takings that comply with the public use requirement, though it is in the nature of things that the boundaries between these categories are not always firm. Two are relatively straightforward and uncontroversial. First, the sovereign may transfer private property to public ownership-such as for a road, a hospital, or a military base. See, *e.g., Old Dominion* ****498*** *Land Co. v. United States,* 269 U.S. 55, 46 S.Ct. 39, 70 L.Ed. 162 (1925); *Rindge Co. v. County of Los Angeles,* 262 U.S. 700, 43 S.Ct. 689, 67 L.Ed. 1186 (1923). Second, the sovereign may transfer private property to private parties, often common carriers, who make the property available for the public's use-such as with a railroad, a public utility, or a stadium. See, *e.g., National Railroad Passenger Corporation v. Boston & Maine Corp.,* 503 U.S. 407, 112 S.Ct. 1394, 118 L.Ed.2d 52 (1992); *Mt. Vernon-Woodberry Cotton Duck Co. v. Alabama Interstate Power Co.,* 240 U.S. 30, 36 S.Ct. 234, 60 L.Ed. 507 (1916). But "public ownership" and "use-by-the-public" are sometimes too constricting and impractical ways to define the scope of the Public Use Clause. Thus we have allowed that, in certain circumstances and to meet certain exigencies, takings that serve a public purpose also satisfy the Constitution even if the property is destined for subsequent private use. See, *e.g., Berman v. Parker,* 348 U.S. 26, 75 S.Ct. 98, 99 L.Ed. 27 (1954); *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff,* 467 U.S. 229, 104 S.Ct. 2321, 81 L.Ed.2d 186 (1984).

This case returns us for the first time in over 20 years to the hard question of when a purportedly "public purpose" taking meets the public use requirement. It presents an issue of first impression: Are economic development takings constitutional? I would hold that they are not. We are guided by two precedents about the taking of real property by eminent domain. In *Berman,* we upheld takings within a blighted neighborhood of Washington, D.C. The neighborhood had so deteriorated that, for example, 64.3% of its dwellings were beyond repair. 348 U.S., at 30, 75 S.Ct. 98. It had become burdened with "overcrowding of dwellings," "lack of adequate streets and alleys," and "lack of light and air." *Id.,* at 34, 75 S.Ct. 98. Congress had determined that the neighborhood had become "injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare" and that it was necessary to "eliminat[e] all such injurious conditions by employing all means necessary and appropriate for the purpose," including eminent domain. *Id.,* at 28, 75 S.Ct. 98 (internal quotation marks omitted). Mr. Berman's department store was not itself blighted. Having approved ***499** of Congress' decision to eliminate the harm to the public emanating from the blighted neighborhood, however, we did not second-guess

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

its decision to treat the neighborhood as a whole rather than lot-by-lot. *Id.*, at 34-35, 75 S.Ct. 98; see also *Midkiff*, 467 U.S., at 244, 104 S.Ct. 2321 ("[I]t is only the taking's purpose, ****2674** and not its mechanics, that must pass scrutiny").

In *Midkiff*, we upheld a land condemnation scheme in Hawaii whereby title in real property was taken from lessors and transferred to lessees. At that time, the State and Federal Governments owned nearly 49% of the State's land, and another 47% was in the hands of only 72 private landowners. Concentration of land ownership was so dramatic that on the State's most urbanized island, Oahu, 22 landowners owned 72.5% of the fee simple titles. *Id.*, at 232, 104 S.Ct. 2321. The Hawaii Legislature had concluded that the oligopoly in land ownership was "skewing the State's residential fee simple market, inflating land prices, and injuring the public tranquility and welfare," and therefore enacted a condemnation scheme for redistributing title. *Ibid.*

In those decisions, we emphasized the importance of deferring to legislative judgments about public purpose. Because courts are ill equipped to evaluate the efficacy of proposed legislative initiatives, we rejected as unworkable the idea of courts' " 'deciding on what is and is not a governmental function and ... invalidating legislation on the basis of their view on that question at the moment of decision, a practice which has proved impracticable in other fields.' " *Id.*, at 240-241, 104 S.Ct. 2321 (quoting *United States ex rel. TVA v. Welch*, 327 U.S. 546, 552, 66 S.Ct. 715, 90 L.Ed. 843 (1946)); see *Berman, supra*, at 32, 75 S.Ct. 98 ("[T]he legislature, not the judiciary, is the main guardian of the public needs to be served by social legislation"); see also *Lingle v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc.*, 544 U.S. 528, 125 S.Ct. 2074, 161 L.Ed.2d 876 (2005). Likewise, we recognized our inability to evaluate whether, in a given case, eminent domain is a necessary means by which to pursue the legislature's ends. *Midkiff, supra*, at 242, 104 S.Ct. 2321; *Berman, supra*, at 33, 75 S.Ct. 98.

***500** Yet for all the emphasis on deference, *Berman* and *Midkiff* hewed to a bedrock principle without which our public use jurisprudence would collapse: "A purely private taking could not withstand the scrutiny of the public use requirement; it would serve no legitimate purpose of government and would thus be void." *Midkiff*, 467 U.S., at 245, 104 S.Ct. 2321; *id.*, at 241, 104 S.Ct. 2321 ("[T]he Court's cases have repeatedly stated that 'one person's property may not be taken for the benefit of another private person without a justifying public purpose, even though compensation be paid' " (quoting *Thompson v. Consolidated Gas Util. Corp.*, 300 U.S. 55, 80, 57 S.Ct. 364, 81 L.Ed. 510 (1937))); see also *Missouri Pacific R. Co. v. Nebraska*, 164 U.S. 403, 417, 17 S.Ct. 130, 41 L.Ed. 489 (1896). To protect that principle, those decisions reserved "a role for courts to play in reviewing a legislature's judgment of what constitutes a public use ... [though] the Court in *Berman* made clear that it is 'an extremely narrow' one." *Midkiff, supra*, at 240, 104 S.Ct. 2321 (quoting *Berman, supra*, at 32, 75 S.Ct. 98).

The Court's holdings in *Berman* and *Midkiff* were true to the principle underlying the Public Use Clause. In both those cases, the extraordinary, precondemnation use of the targeted property inflicted affirmative harm on society-in *Berman* through blight resulting from extreme poverty and in *Midkiff* through oligopoly resulting from extreme wealth. And in both cases, the relevant legislative body had found that eliminating the existing property use was necessary to remedy the harm. *Berman, supra*, at 28-29, 75 S.Ct. 98; *Midkiff, supra*, at 232, 104 S.Ct. 2321. Thus a public purpose was realized when the harmful use was eliminated. Because each taking *directly* achieved a public benefit, it did not matter that the property was turned over to private use. Here, in ****2675** contrast, New London does not claim that Susette Kelo's and Wilhelmina Dery's well-maintained homes are the source of any social harm. Indeed, it could not so claim without adopting the absurd argument that any single-family home that might be razed to make

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

way for an apartment building, or any church ***501** that might be replaced with a retail store, or any small business that might be more lucrative if it were instead part of a national franchise, is inherently harmful to society and thus within the government's power to condemn.

In moving away from our decisions sanctioning the condemnation of harmful property use, the Court today significantly expands the meaning of public use. It holds that the sovereign may take private property currently put to ordinary private use, and give it over for new, ordinary private use, so long as the new use is predicted to generate some secondary benefit for the public-such as increased tax revenue, more jobs, maybe even esthetic pleasure. But nearly any lawful use of real private property can be said to generate some incidental benefit to the public. Thus, if predicted (or even guaranteed) positive side effects are enough to render transfer from one private party to another constitutional, then the words "for public use" do not realistically exclude *any* takings, and thus do not exert any constraint on the eminent domain power.

There is a sense in which this troubling result follows from errant language in *Berman* and *Midkiff*. In discussing whether takings within a blighted neighborhood were for a public use, *Berman* began by observing: "We deal, in other words, with what traditionally has been known as the police power." 348 U.S., at 32, 75 S.Ct. 98. From there it declared that "[o]nce the object is within the authority of Congress, the right to realize it through the exercise of eminent domain is clear." *Id.*, at 33, 75 S.Ct. 98. Following up, we said in *Midkiff* that "[t]he 'public use' requirement is coterminous with the scope of a sovereign's police powers." 467 U.S., at 240, 104 S.Ct. 2321. This language was unnecessary to the specific holdings of those decisions. *Berman* and *Midkiff* simply did not put such language to the constitutional test, because the takings in those cases were within the police power but also for "public use" for the reasons I have described. The case before us now demonstrates why, when deciding if a taking's purpose is ***502** constitutional, the police power and "public use" cannot always be equated.

The Court protests that it does not sanction the bare transfer from A to B for B's benefit. It suggests two limitations on what can be taken after today's decision. First, it maintains a role for courts in ferreting out takings whose sole purpose is to bestow a benefit on the private transferee-without detailing how courts are to conduct that complicated inquiry. *Ante*, at 2661-2662. For his part, Justice KENNEDY suggests that courts may divine illicit purpose by a careful review of the record and the process by which a legislature arrived at the decision to take-without specifying what courts should look for in a case with different facts, how they will know if they have found it, and what to do if they do not. *Ante*, at 2669-2670 (concurring opinion). Whatever the details of Justice KENNEDY's as-yet-undisclosed test, it is difficult to envision anyone but the "stupid staff[er]" failing it. See *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, 505 U.S. 1003, 1025-1026, n. 12, 112 S.Ct. 2886, 120 L.Ed.2d 798 (1992). The trouble with economic development takings is that private benefit and incidental public benefit are, by definition, merged and mutually reinforcing. In this case, for example, any boon for Pfizer or the plan's developer is difficult to disaggregate from the promised ****2676** public gains in taxes and jobs. See App. to Pet. for Cert. 275-277.

Even if there were a practical way to isolate the motives behind a given taking, the gesture toward a purpose test is theoretically flawed. If it is true that incidental public benefits from new private use are enough to ensure the "public purpose" in a taking, why should it matter, as far as the Fifth Amendment is concerned, what inspired the taking in the first place? How much the government does or does not desire to benefit a favored private party has no bearing on whether an economic development taking will or will not generate secondary benefit for

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

the public. And whatever the reason for a given condemnation, the effect is the same ***503** from the constitutional perspective-private property is forcibly relinquished to new private ownership.

A second proposed limitation is implicit in the Court's opinion. The logic of today's decision is that eminent domain may only be used to upgrade-not downgrade-property. At best this makes the Public Use Clause redundant with the Due Process Clause, which already prohibits irrational government action. See *Lingle*, 544 U.S. 528, 125 S.Ct. 2074. The Court rightfully admits, however, that the judiciary cannot get bogged down in predictive judgments about whether the public will actually be better off after a property transfer. In any event, this constraint has no realistic import. For who among us can say she already makes the most productive or attractive possible use of her property? The specter of condemnation hangs over all property. Nothing is to prevent the State from replacing any Motel 6 with a Ritz-Carlton, any home with a shopping mall, or any farm with a factory. Cf. *Bugryn v. Bristol*, 63 Conn.App. 98, 774 A.2d 1042 (2001) (taking the homes and farm of four owners in their 70's and 80's and giving it to an "industrial park"); *99 Cents Only Stores v. Lancaster Redevelopment Agency*, 237 F.Supp.2d 1123 (C.D.Cal.2001) (attempted taking of 99 Cents store to replace with a Costco); *Poletown Neighborhood Council v. Detroit*, 410 Mich. 616, 304 N.W.2d 455 (1981) (taking a working-class, immigrant community in Detroit and giving it to a General Motors assembly plant), overruled by *County of Wayne v. Hathcock*, 471 Mich. 445, 684 N.W.2d 765 (2004); Brief for Becket Fund for Religious Liberty as *Amicus Curiae* 4-11 (describing takings of religious institutions' properties); Institute for Justice, D. Berliner, Public Power, Private Gain: A Five-Year, State-by-State Report Examining the Abuse of Eminent Domain (2003) (collecting accounts of economic development takings).

The Court also puts special emphasis on facts peculiar to this case: The NLDC's plan is the product of a relatively careful deliberative process; it proposes to use eminent domain***504** for a multipart, integrated plan rather than for isolated property transfer; it promises an array of incidental benefits (even esthetic ones), not just increased tax revenue; it comes on the heels of a legislative determination that New London is a depressed municipality. See, *e.g.*, *ante*, at 2667 ("[A] one-to-one transfer of property, executed outside the confines of an integrated development plan, is not presented in this case"). Justice KENNEDY, too, takes great comfort in these facts. *Ante*, at 2670 (concurring opinion). But none has legal significance to blunt the force of today's holding. If legislative prognostications about the secondary public benefits of a new use can legitimate a taking, there is nothing in the Court's rule or in Justice KENNEDY's gloss on that rule to prohibit property transfers generated with less care, that are less comprehensive, that happen to result from less elaborate process, whose ****2677** only projected advantage is the incidence of higher taxes, or that hope to transform an already prosperous city into an even more prosperous one.

Finally, in a coda, the Court suggests that property owners should turn to the States, who may or may not choose to impose appropriate limits on economic development takings. *Ante*, at 2668. This is an abdication of our responsibility. States play many important functions in our system of dual sovereignty, but compensating for our refusal to enforce properly the Federal Constitution (and a provision meant to curtail state action, no less) is not among them.

* * *

It was possible after *Berman* and *Midkiff* to imagine unconstitutional transfers from A to B. Those decisions endorsed government intervention when private property use had veered to such an extreme that the public was suffering as a consequence. Today nearly all real property is susceptible to condemnation on the Court's theory. In the prescient words of a dissenter from the infamous decision in *Poletown*, "[n]ow that we have author-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

ized local legislative ***505** bodies to decide that a different commercial or industrial use of property will produce greater public benefits than its present use, no homeowner's, merchant's or manufacturer's property, however productive or valuable to its owner, is immune from condemnation for the benefit of other private interests that will put it to a 'higher' use." 410 Mich., at 644-645, 304 N.W.2d, at 464 (opinion of Fitzgerald, J.). This is why economic development takings "seriously jeopardiz[e] the security of all private property ownership." *Id.*, at 645, 304 N.W.2d, at 465 (Ryan, J., dissenting).

Any property may now be taken for the benefit of another private party, but the fallout from this decision will not be random. The beneficiaries are likely to be those citizens with disproportionate influence and power in the political process, including large corporations and development firms. As for the victims, the government now has license to transfer property from those with fewer resources to those with more. The Founders cannot have intended this perverse result. "[T]hat alone is a *just* government," wrote James Madison, "which *impartially* secures to every man, whatever is his *own.*" For the National Gazette, Property (Mar. 27, 1792), reprinted in 14 Papers of James Madison 266 (R. Rutland et al. eds.1983).

I would hold that the takings in both Parcel 3 and Parcel 4A are unconstitutional, reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of Connecticut, and remand for further proceedings.

Justice THOMAS, dissenting.

Long ago, William Blackstone wrote that "the law of the land ... postpone[s] even public necessity to the sacred and inviolable rights of private property." 1 Commentaries on the Laws of England 134-135 (1765) (hereinafter Blackstone). The Framers embodied that principle in the Constitution, allowing the government to take property not for "public necessity," but instead for "public use." Amdt. 5. ***506** Defying this understanding, the Court replaces the Public Use Clause with a " '[P]ublic [P]urpose' " Clause, *ante*, at 2662-2663 (or perhaps the "Diverse and Always Evolving Needs of Society" Clause, *ante*, at 2662 (capitalization added)), a restriction that is satisfied, the Court instructs, so long as the purpose is "legitimate" and the means "not irrational," *ante*, at 2667 (internal quotation marks omitted). This deferential shift in phraseology enables the Court to hold, against all common sense, that a costly urban-renewal project whose stated purpose is a vague ****2678** promise of new jobs and increased tax revenue, but which is also suspiciously agreeable to the Pfizer Corporation, is for a "public use."

I cannot agree. If such "economic development" takings are for a "public use," any taking is, and the Court has erased the Public Use Clause from our Constitution, as Justice O'CONNOR powerfully argues in dissent. *Ante*, at 2671, 2675-2677. I do not believe that this Court can eliminate liberties expressly enumerated in the Constitution and therefore join her dissenting opinion. Regrettably, however, the Court's error runs deeper than this. Today's decision is simply the latest in a string of our cases construing the Public Use Clause to be a virtual nullity, without the slightest nod to its original meaning. In my view, the Public Use Clause, originally understood, is a meaningful limit on the government's eminent domain power. Our cases have strayed from the Clause's original meaning, and I would reconsider them.

I

The Fifth Amendment provides:

> "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb, nor shall be compelled in any ***507** criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; *nor shall private property be*

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

taken for public use, without just compensation." (Emphasis added.)

It is the last of these liberties, the Takings Clause, that is at issue in this case. In my view, it is "imperative that the Court maintain absolute fidelity to" the Clause's express limit on the power of the government over the individual, no less than with every other liberty expressly enumerated in the Fifth Amendment or the Bill of Rights more generally. *Shepard v. United States*, 544 U.S. 13, 28, 125 S.Ct. 1254, 1264, 161 L.Ed.2d 205 (2005) (THOMAS, J., concurring in part and concurring in judgment) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Though one component of the protection provided by the Takings Clause is that the government can take private property only if it provides "just compensation" for the taking, the Takings Clause also prohibits the government from taking property except "for public use." Were it otherwise, the Takings Clause would either be meaningless or empty. If the Public Use Clause served no function other than to state that the government may take property through its eminent domain power-for public or private uses-then it would be surplusage. See *ante*, at 2672 (O'CONNOR, J., dissenting); see also *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch 137, 174, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803) ("It cannot be presumed that any clause in the constitution is intended to be without effect"); *Myers v. United States*, 272 U.S. 52, 151, 47 S.Ct. 21, 71 L.Ed. 160 (1926). Alternatively, the Clause could distinguish those takings that require compensation from those that do not. That interpretation, however, "would permit private property to be taken or appropriated for private use without any compensation whatever." *Cole v. La Grange*, 113 U.S. 1, 8, 5 S.Ct. 416, 28 L.Ed. 896 (1885) (interpreting same language in the Missouri Public Use Clause). In other words, the Clause would require the government to compensate for takings done "for public use," leaving it free to take property for purely private uses without the payment of ****2679** compensation.***508** This would contradict a bedrock principle well established by the time of the founding: that all takings required the payment of compensation. 1 Blackstone 135; 2 J. Kent, Commentaries on American Law 275 (1827) (hereinafter Kent); For the National Gazette, Property (Mar. 27, 1792), in 14 Papers of James Madison 266, 267 (R. Rutland et al. eds.1983) (arguing that no property "shall be taken *directly* even for public use without indemnification to the owner"). FN1 The Public Use Clause, like the Just Compensation Clause, is therefore an express limit on the government's power of eminent domain.

FN1. Some state constitutions at the time of the founding lacked just compensation clauses and took property even without providing compensation. See *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, 505 U.S. 1003, 1056-1057, 112 S.Ct. 2886, 120 L.Ed.2d 798 (1992) (Blackmun, J., dissenting). The Framers of the Fifth Amendment apparently disagreed, for they expressly prohibited uncompensated takings, and the Fifth Amendment was not incorporated against the States until much later. See *id.*, at 1028, n. 15, 112 S.Ct. 2886.

The most natural reading of the Clause is that it allows the government to take property only if the government owns, or the public has a legal right to use, the property, as opposed to taking it for any public purpose or necessity whatsoever. At the time of the founding, dictionaries primarily defined the noun "use" as "[t]he act of employing any thing to any purpose." 2 S. Johnson, A Dictionary of the English Language 2194 (4th ed. 1773) (hereinafter Johnson). The term "use," moreover, "is from the Latin *utor*, which means 'to use, make use of, avail one's self of, employ, apply, enjoy, etc." J. Lewis, Law of Eminent Domain § 165, p. 224, n. 4 (1888) (hereinafter Lewis). When the government takes property and gives it to a private individual, and the public has no right to use the property, it strains language to say that the public is "employing" the property, regardless of the incidental benefits that might accrue to the public from the private use. The

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

term "public use," then, means that either the government or its citizens as a whole must actually ***509** "employ" the taken property. See *id.*, at 223 (reviewing founding-era dictionaries).

Granted, another sense of the word "use" was broader in meaning, extending to "[c]onvenience" or "help," or "[q]ualities that make a thing proper for any purpose." 2 Johnson 2194. Nevertheless, read in context, the term "public use" possesses the narrower meaning. Elsewhere, the Constitution twice employs the word "use," both times in its narrower sense. Claeys, Public-Use Limitations and Natural Property Rights, 2004 Mich. St. L.Rev. 877, 897 (hereinafter Public Use Limitations). Article I, § 10, provides that "the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States," meaning the Treasury itself will control the taxes, not use it to any beneficial end. And Article I, § 8, grants Congress power "[t]o raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years." Here again, "use" means "employed to raise and support Armies," not anything directed to achieving any military end. The same word in the Public Use Clause should be interpreted to have the same meaning.

Tellingly, the phrase "public use" contrasts with the very different phrase "general Welfare" used elsewhere in the Constitution. See *ibid.* ("Congress shall have Power To ... provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States"); preamble (Constitution established "to promote the general Welfare"). ****2680** The Framers would have used some such broader term if they had meant the Public Use Clause to have a similarly sweeping scope. Other founding-era documents made the contrast between these two usages still more explicit. See Sales, Classical Republicanism and the Fifth Amendment's "Public Use" Requirement, 49 Duke L.J. 339, 367-368 (1999) (hereinafter Sales) (noting contrast between, on the one hand, the term "public use" used by 6 of the first 13 States and, on the other, ***510** the terms "public exigencies" employed in the Massachusetts Bill of Rights and the Northwest Ordinance, and the term "public necessity" used in the Vermont Constitution of 1786). The Constitution's text, in short, suggests that the Takings Clause authorizes the taking of property only if the public has a right to employ it, not if the public realizes any conceivable benefit from the taking.

The Constitution's common-law background reinforces this understanding. The common law provided an express method of eliminating uses of land that adversely impacted the public welfare: nuisance law. Blackstone and Kent, for instance, both carefully distinguished the law of nuisance from the power of eminent domain. Compare 1 Blackstone 135 (noting government's power to take private property with compensation) with 3 *id.*, at 216 (noting action to remedy "*public* ... nuisances, which affect the public, and are an annoyance to *all* the king's subjects"); see also 2 Kent 274-276 (distinguishing the two). Blackstone rejected the idea that private property could be taken solely for purposes of any public benefit. "So great ... is the regard of the law for private property," he explained, "that it will not authorize the least violation of it; no, not even for the general good of the whole community." 1 Blackstone 135. He continued: "If a new road ... were to be made through the grounds of a private person, it might perhaps be extensively beneficial to the public; but the law permits no man, or set of men, to do this without the consent of the owner of the land." *Ibid.* Only "by giving [the landowner] full indemnification" could the government take property, and even then "[t]he public [was] now considered as an individual, treating with an individual for an exchange." *Ibid.* When the public took property, in other words, it took it as an individual buying property from another typically would: for one's own use. The Public Use Clause, in short, embodied the Framers' understanding that property is a natural, fundamental right, prohibiting the government from "tak[ing] *property* from A. and ***511** giv[ing] it to B." *Calder*

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

v. Bull, 3 Dall. 386, 388, 1 L.Ed. 648 (1798); see also *Wilkinson v. Leland,* 2 Pet. 627, 658, 7 L.Ed. 542 (1829); *Vanhorne's Lessee v. Dorrance,* 2 Dall. 304, 311, 1 L.Ed. 391 (C.C.D.Pa.1795).

The public purpose interpretation of the Public Use Clause also unnecessarily duplicates a similar inquiry required by the Necessary and Proper Clause. The Takings Clause is a prohibition, not a grant of power: The Constitution does not expressly grant the Federal Government the power to take property for any public purpose whatsoever. Instead, the Government may take property only when necessary and proper to the exercise of an expressly enumerated power. See *Kohl v. United States,* 91 U.S. 367, 371-372, 23 L.Ed. 449 (1876) (noting Federal Government's power under the Necessary and Proper Clause to take property "needed for forts, armories, and arsenals, for navy-yards and light-houses, for custom-houses, post-offices, and court-houses, and for other public uses"). For a law to be within the Necessary and Proper Clause, as I have elsewhere explained, it must bear an "obvious, simple, and direct relation" to an exercise ****2681** of Congress' enumerated powers, *Sabri v. United States,* 541 U.S. 600, 613, 124 S.Ct. 1941, 158 L.Ed.2d 891 (2004) (THOMAS, J., concurring in judgment), and it must not "subvert basic principles of" constitutional design, *Gonzales v. Raich, ante,* 545 U.S., at 65, 125 S.Ct. 2195, 162 L.Ed.2d 1 (2005) (THOMAS, J., dissenting). In other words, a taking is permissible under the Necessary and Proper Clause only if it serves a valid public purpose. Interpreting the Public Use Clause likewise to limit the government to take property only for sufficiently public purposes replicates this inquiry. If this is all the Clause means, it is, once again, surplusage. See *supra,* at 2678. The Clause is thus most naturally read to concern whether the property is used by the public or the government, not whether the purpose of the taking is legitimately public.

II

Early American eminent domain practice largely bears out this understanding of the Public Use Clause. This practice ***512** concerns state limits on eminent domain power, not the Fifth Amendment, since it was not until the late 19th century that the Federal Government began to use the power of eminent domain, and since the Takings Clause did not even arguably limit state power until after the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment. See Note, The Public Use Limitation on Eminent Domain: An Advance Requiem, 58 Yale L.J. 599, 599-600, and nn. 3-4 (1949); *Barron ex rel. Tiernan v. Mayor of Baltimore,* 7 Pet. 243, 250-251, 8 L.Ed. 672 (1833) (holding the Takings Clause inapplicable to the States of its own force). Nevertheless, several early state constitutions at the time of the founding likewise limited the power of eminent domain to "public uses." See Sales 367-369, and n. 137 (emphasis deleted). Their practices therefore shed light on the original meaning of the same words contained in the Public Use Clause.

States employed the eminent domain power to provide quintessentially public goods, such as public roads, toll roads, ferries, canals, railroads, and public parks. Lewis §§ 166, 168-171, 175, at 227-228, 234-241, 243. Though use of the eminent domain power was sparse at the time of the founding, many States did have so-called Mill Acts, which authorized the owners of grist mills operated by water power to flood upstream lands with the payment of compensation to the upstream landowner. See, *e.g., id.,* § 178, at 245-246; *Head v. Amoskeag Mfg. Co.,* 113 U.S. 9, 16-19, and n. 2, 5 S.Ct. 441, 28 L.Ed. 889 (1885). Those early grist mills "were regulated by law and compelled to serve the public for a stipulated toll and in regular order," and therefore were actually used by the public. Lewis § 178, at 246, and n. 3; see also *Head, supra,* at 18-19, 5 S.Ct. 441. They were common carriers-quasi-public entities. These were "public uses" in the fullest sense of the word, because the public could legally use and benefit from them equally. See Public Use Limitations 903 (common-carrier status traditionally afforded to "private beneficiaries of a state franchise***513** or another form of state monopoly, or to companies that operated in condi-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

tions of natural monopoly").

To be sure, some early state legislatures tested the limits of their state-law eminent domain power. Some States enacted statutes allowing the taking of property for the purpose of building private roads. See Lewis § 167, at 230. These statutes were mixed; some required the private landowner to keep the road open to the public, and others did not. See *id.*, § 167, at 230-234. Later in the 19th century, moreover, the Mill Acts were employed to grant rights to private manufacturing plants, in addition to grist mills that had common-****2682** carrier duties. See, *e.g.*, M. Horwitz, The Transformation of American Law 1780-1860, pp. 51-52 (1977).

These early uses of the eminent domain power are often cited as evidence for the broad "public purpose" interpretation of the Public Use Clause, see, *e.g.*, *ante*, at 2662, n. 8 (majority opinion); Brief for Respondents 30; Brief for American Planning Assn. et al. as *Amici Curiae* 6-7, but in fact the constitutionality of these exercises of eminent domain power under state public use restrictions was a hotly contested question in state courts throughout the 19th and into the 20th century. Some courts construed those clauses to authorize takings for public purposes, but others adhered to the natural meaning of "public use." [FN2] As noted above, ***514** the earliest Mill Acts were applied to entities with duties to remain open to the public, and their later extension is not deeply probative of whether that subsequent practice is consistent with the original meaning of the Public Use Clause. See *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n*, 514 U.S. 334, 370, 115 S.Ct. 1511, 131 L.Ed.2d 426 (1995) (THOMAS, J., concurring in judgment). At the time of the founding, "[b]usiness corporations were only beginning to upset the old corporate model, in which the raison d'être of chartered associations was their service to the public," Horwitz, *supra*, at 49-50, so it was natural to those who framed the first Public Use Clauses to think of mills as inherently public entities. The disagreement among state courts, and state legislatures' attempts to circumvent public use limits on their eminent domain power, cannot obscure that the Public Use Clause is most naturally read to authorize takings for public use only if the government or the public actually uses the taken property.

FN2. Compare *ante*, at 2662, and n. 8 (majority opinion) (noting that some state courts upheld the validity of applying the Mill Acts to private purposes and arguing that the " 'use by the public' test" "eroded over time"), with, *e.g.*, *Ryerson v. Brown*, 35 Mich. 333, 338-339 (1877) (holding it "essential" to the constitutionality of a Mill Act "that the statute should require the use to be public in fact; in other words, that it should contain provisions entitling the public to accommodations"); *Gaylord v. Sanitary Dist. of Chicago*, 204 Ill. 576, 581-584, 68 N.E. 522, 524 (1903) (same); *Tyler v. Beacher*, 44 Vt. 648, 652-656 (1871) (same); *Sadler v. Langham*, 34 Ala. 311, 332-334 (1859) (striking down taking for purely private road and grist mill); *Varner v. Martin*, 21 W.Va. 534, 546-548, 556-557, 566-567 (1883) (grist mill and private road had to be open to public for them to constitute public use); *Harding v. Goodlett*, 11 Tenn. 41, 3 Yer. 41, 53 (1832); *Jacobs v. Clearview Water Supply Co.*, 220 Pa. 388, 393-395, 69 A. 870, 872 (1908) (endorsing actual public use standard); *Minnesota Canal & Power Co. v. Koochiching Co.*, 97 Minn. 429, 449-451, 107 N.W. 405, 413 (1906) (same); *Chesapeake Stone Co. v. Moreland*, 126 Ky. 656, 663-667, 104 S.W. 762, 765 (1907) (same); Note, Public Use in Eminent Domain, 21 N.Y.U.L.Q. Rev. 285, 286, and n. 11 (1946) (calling the actual public use standard the "majority view" and citing other cases).

III

Our current Public Use Clause jurisprudence,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

as the Court notes, has rejected this natural reading of the Clause. *Ante,* at 2662-2664. The Court adopted its modern reading blindly, with little discussion of the Clause's history and original meaning, in two distinct lines of cases: first, in cases adopting the "public purpose" interpretation of the Clause, and second, in cases deferring to legislatures' judgments regarding what constitutes a valid public purpose. Those questionable cases converged in the boundlessly broad and deferential ***515** conception of "public use" adopted by this Court in *Berman v. Parker,* 348 U.S. 26, 75 S.Ct. 98, 99 L.Ed. 27 (1954), and *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff,* 467 U.S. 229, 104 S.Ct. 2321, 81 ****2683** L.Ed.2d 186 (1984), cases that take center stage in the Court's opinion. See *ante,* 2663-2664. The weakness of those two lines of cases, and consequently *Berman* and *Midkiff,* fatally undermines the doctrinal foundations of the Court's decision. Today's questionable application of these cases is further proof that the "public purpose" standard is not susceptible of principled application. This Court's reliance by rote on this standard is ill advised and should be reconsidered.

A

As the Court notes, the "public purpose" interpretation of the Public Use Clause stems from *Fallbrook Irrigation Dist. v. Bradley,* 164 U.S. 112, 161-162, 17 S.Ct. 56, 41 L.Ed. 369 (1896). *Ante,* at 2662-2663. The issue in *Bradley* was whether a condemnation for purposes of constructing an irrigation ditch was for a public use. 164 U.S., at 161, 17 S.Ct. 56. This was a public use, Justice Peckham declared for the Court, because "[t]o irrigate and thus to bring into possible cultivation these large masses of otherwise worthless lands would seem to be a public purpose and a matter of public interest, not confined to landowners, or even to any one section of the State." *Ibid.* That broad statement was dictum, for the law under review also provided that "[a]ll landowners in the district have the right to a proportionate share of the water." *Id.,* at 162, 17 S.Ct. 56. Thus, the "public" did have the right to use the irrigation ditch because all similarly situated members of the public-those who owned lands irrigated by the ditch-had a right to use it. The Court cited no authority for its dictum, and did not discuss either the Public Use Clause's original meaning or the numerous authorities that had adopted the "actual use" test (though it at least acknowledged the conflict of authority in state courts, see *id.,* at 158, 17 S.Ct. 56; *supra,* at 2682, and n. 2). Instead, the Court reasoned that "[t]he use must be regarded as a public use, or else it would seem to follow that no general***516** scheme of irrigation can be formed or carried into effect." *Bradley, supra,* at 160-161, 17 S.Ct. 56. This is no statement of constitutional principle: Whatever the utility of irrigation districts or the merits of the Court's view that another rule would be "impractical given the diverse and always evolving needs of society," *ante,* at 2662, the Constitution does not embody those policy preferences any more than it "enact [s] Mr. Herbert Spencer's Social Statics." *Lochner v. New York,* 198 U.S. 45, 75, 25 S.Ct. 539, 49 L.Ed. 937 (1905) (Holmes, J., dissenting); but see *id.,* at 58-62, 25 S.Ct. 539 (Peckham, J., for the Court).

This Court's cases followed *Bradley's* test with little analysis. In *Clark v. Nash,* 198 U.S. 361, 25 S.Ct. 676, 49 L.Ed. 1085 (1905) (Peckham, J., for the Court), this Court relied on little more than a citation to *Bradley* in upholding another condemnation for the purpose of laying an irrigation ditch. 198 U.S., at 369-370, 25 S.Ct. 676. As in *Bradley,* use of the "public purpose" test was unnecessary to the result the Court reached. The government condemned the irrigation ditch for the purpose of ensuring access to water in which "[o]ther land owners adjoining the defendant in error ... might share," 198 U.S., at 370, 25 S.Ct. 676, and therefore *Clark* also involved a condemnation for the purpose of ensuring access to a resource to which similarly situated members of the public had a legal right of access. Likewise, in *Strickley v. Highland Boy Gold Mining Co.,* 200 U.S. 527, 26 S.Ct. 301, 50 L.Ed. 581 (1906), the Court upheld a condemnation establishing an aerial right-of-way for a bucket line operated by a mining company, relying on little more

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

than *Clark*, see *Strickley, supra*, at 531, 26 S.Ct. ****2684** 301. This case, too, could have been disposed of on the narrower ground that "the plaintiff [was] a carrier for itself and others," 200 U.S., at 531-532, 26 S.Ct. 301, and therefore that the bucket line was legally open to the public. Instead, the Court unnecessarily rested its decision on the "inadequacy of use by the general public as a universal test." *Id.*, at 531, 26 S.Ct. 301. This Court's cases quickly incorporated the public purpose standard set forth in *Clark* and *Strickley* by barren citation. See, ***517** *e.g., Rindge Co. v. County of Los Angeles*, 262 U.S. 700, 707, 43 S.Ct. 689, 67 L.Ed. 1186 (1923); *Block v. Hirsh*, 256 U.S. 135, 155, 41 S.Ct. 458, 65 L.Ed. 865 (1921); *Mt. Vernon-Woodberry Cotton Duck Co. v. Alabama Interstate Power Co.*, 240 U.S. 30, 32, 36 S.Ct. 234, 60 L.Ed. 507 (1916); *O'Neill v. Leamer*, 239 U.S. 244, 253, 36 S.Ct. 54, 60 L.Ed. 249 (1915).

B

A second line of this Court's cases also deviated from the Public Use Clause's original meaning by allowing legislatures to define the scope of valid "public uses." *United States v. Gettysburg Electric R. Co.*, 160 U.S. 668, 16 S.Ct. 427, 40 L.Ed. 576 (1896), involved the question whether Congress' decision to condemn certain private land for the purpose of building battlefield memorials at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, was for a public use. *Id.*, at 679-680, 16 S.Ct. 427. Since the Federal Government was to use the lands in question, *id.*, at 682, 16 S.Ct. 427, there is no doubt that it was a public use under any reasonable standard. Nonetheless, the Court, speaking through Justice Peckham, declared that "when the legislature has declared the use or purpose to be a public one, its judgment will be respected by the courts, unless the use be palpably without reasonable foundation." *Id.*, at 680, 16 S.Ct. 427. As it had with the "public purpose" dictum in *Bradley*, the Court quickly incorporated this dictum into its Public Use Clause cases with little discussion. See, *e.g., United States ex rel. TVA v. Welch*, 327 U.S. 546, 552, 66 S.Ct. 715, 90 L.Ed. 843 (1946); *Old Dominion Land Co. v. United States*, 269 U.S. 55, 66, 46 S.Ct. 39, 70 L.Ed. 162 (1925).

There is no justification, however, for affording almost insurmountable deference to legislative conclusions that a use serves a "public use." To begin with, a court owes no deference to a legislature's judgment concerning the quintessentially legal question of whether the government owns, or the public has a legal right to use, the taken property. Even under the "public purpose" interpretation, moreover, it is most implausible that the Framers intended to defer to legislatures as to what satisfies the Public Use Clause, uniquely ***518** among all the express provisions of the Bill of Rights. We would not defer to a legislature's determination of the various circumstances that establish, for example, when a search of a home would be reasonable, see, *e.g., Payton v. New York*, 445 U.S. 573, 589-590, 100 S.Ct. 1371, 63 L.Ed.2d 639 (1980), or when a convicted double-murderer may be shackled during a sentencing proceeding without on-the-record findings, see *Deck v. Missouri*, 544 U.S. 622, 125 S.Ct. 2007, 161 L.Ed.2d 953 (2005), or when state law creates a property interest protected by the Due Process Clause, see, *e.g., Castle Rock v. Gonzales*, *post*, 545 U.S. 748, 125 S.Ct. 2796, 162 L.Ed.2d 658, 2005 WL 1499788 (2005); *Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564, 576, 92 S.Ct. 2701, 33 L.Ed.2d 548 (1972); *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254, 262-263, 90 S.Ct. 1011, 25 L.Ed.2d 287 (1970).

Still worse, it is backwards to adopt a searching standard of constitutional review for nontraditional property interests, such as welfare benefits, see, *e.g., Goldberg, supra*,*****2685*** while deferring to the legislature's determination as to what constitutes a public use when it exercises the power of eminent domain, and thereby invades individuals' traditional rights in real property. The Court has elsewhere recognized "the overriding respect for the sanctity of the home that has been embedded in our traditions since the origins of the Republic," *Payton, supra*, at 601, 100 S.Ct. 1371, when the issue is only whether

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

the government may search a home. Yet today the Court tells us that we are not to "second-guess the City's considered judgments," *ante,* at 2668, when the issue is, instead, whether the government may take the infinitely more intrusive step of tearing down petitioners' homes. Something has gone seriously awry with this Court's interpretation of the Constitution. Though citizens are safe from the government in their homes, the homes themselves are not. Once one accepts, as the Court at least nominally does, *ante,* at 2661, that the Public Use Clause is a limit on the eminent domain power of the Federal Government and the States, there is no justification for the almost complete deference it grants to legislatures as to what satisfies it.

***519** C

These two misguided lines of precedent converged in *Berman v. Parker,* 348 U.S. 26, 75 S.Ct. 98, 99 L.Ed. 27 (1954), and *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff,* 467 U.S. 229, 104 S.Ct. 2321, 81 L.Ed.2d 186 (1984). Relying on those lines of cases, the Court in *Berman* and *Midkiff* upheld condemnations for the purposes of slum clearance and land redistribution, respectively. "Subject to specific constitutional limitations," *Berman* proclaimed, "when the legislature has spoken, the public interest has been declared in terms well-nigh conclusive. In such cases the legislature, not the judiciary, is the main guardian of the public needs to be served by social legislation." 348 U.S., at 32, 75 S.Ct. 98. That reasoning was question begging, since the question to be decided was whether the "specific constitutional limitation" of the Public Use Clause prevented the taking of the appellant's (concededly "nonblighted") department store. *Id.,* at 31, 34, 75 S.Ct. 98. *Berman* also appeared to reason that any exercise by Congress of an enumerated power (in this case, its plenary power over the District of Columbia) was *per se* a "public use" under the Fifth Amendment. *Id.,* at 33, 75 S.Ct. 98. But the very point of the Public Use Clause is to limit that power. See *supra,* at 2679.

More fundamentally, *Berman* and *Midkiff* erred by equating the eminent domain power with the police power of States. See *Midkiff, supra,* at 240, 104 S.Ct. 2321 ("The 'public use' requirement is ... coterminous with the scope of a sovereign's police powers"); *Berman, supra,* at 32, 75 S.Ct. 98. Traditional uses of that regulatory power, such as the power to abate a nuisance, required no compensation whatsoever, see *Mugler v. Kansas,* 123 U.S. 623, 668-669, 8 S.Ct. 273, 31 L.Ed. 205 (1887), in sharp contrast to the takings power, which has always required compensation, see *supra,* at 2679, and n. 1. The question whether the State can take property using the power of eminent domain is therefore distinct from the question whether it can regulate property pursuant to the police power. See, *e.g., Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council,* 505 U.S. 1003, 1014, 112 S.Ct. 2886, 120 L.Ed.2d 798 (1992); *Mugler, ***520** supra,* at 668-669, 8 S.Ct. 273. In *Berman,* for example, if the slums at issue were truly "blighted," then state nuisance law, see, *e.g., supra,* at 2680; *Lucas, supra,* at 1029, 112 S.Ct. 2886, not the power of eminent domain, would provide the appropriate remedy. To construe the Public Use Clause to overlap****2686** with the States' police power conflates these two categories. FN3

FN3. Some States also promoted the alienability of property by abolishing the feudal "quit rent" system, *i.e.,* long-term leases under which the proprietor reserved to himself the right to perpetual payment of rents from his tenant. See Vance, The Quest for Tenure in the United States, 33 Yale L.J. 248, 256-257, 260-263 (1923). In *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff,* 467 U.S. 229, 104 S.Ct. 2321, 81 L.Ed.2d 186 (1984), the Court cited those state policies favoring the alienability of land as evidence that the government's eminent domain power was similarly expansive, see *id.,* at 241-242, and n. 5, 104 S.Ct. 2321. But they were uses of the States' regulatory power, not the takings power, and therefore were irrelevant to the issue in *Midkiff.*

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

> This mismatch underscores the error of conflating a State's regulatory power with its taking power.

The "public purpose" test applied by *Berman* and *Midkiff* also cannot be applied in principled manner. "When we depart from the natural import of the term 'public use,' and substitute for the simple idea of a public possession and occupation, that of public utility, public interest, common benefit, general advantage or convenience ... we are afloat without any certain principle to guide us." *Bloodgood v. Mohawk & Hudson R. Co.*, 18 Wend. 9, 60-61 (N.Y.1837) (opinion of Tracy, Sen.). Once one permits takings for public purposes in addition to public uses, no coherent principle limits what could constitute a valid public use-at least, none beyond Justice O'CONNOR's (entirely proper) appeal to the text of the Constitution itself. See *ante*, at 2671, 2675-2677 (dissenting opinion). I share the Court's skepticism about a public use standard that requires courts to second-guess the policy wisdom of public works projects. *Ante*, at 2666-2668. The "public purpose" standard this Court has adopted, however, demands the use of such judgment, for the Court concedes that the Public Use Clause would forbid a purely private taking. ***521** *Ante*, at 2661-2662. It is difficult to imagine how a court could find that a taking was purely private except by determining that the taking did not, in fact, rationally advance the public interest. Cf. *ante*, at 2675-2676 (O'CONNOR, J., dissenting) (noting the complicated inquiry the Court's test requires). The Court is therefore wrong to criticize the "actual use" test as "difficult to administer." *Ante*, at 2662. It is far easier to analyze whether the government owns or the public has a legal right to use the taken property than to ask whether the taking has a "purely private purpose"-unless the Court means to eliminate public use scrutiny of takings entirely. *Ante*, at 2661-2662, 2667-2668. Obliterating a provision of the Constitution, of course, guarantees that it will not be misapplied.

For all these reasons, I would revisit our Public Use Clause cases and consider returning to the original meaning of the Public Use Clause: that the government may take property only if it actually uses or gives the public a legal right to use the property.

IV

The consequences of today's decision are not difficult to predict, and promise to be harmful. So-called "urban renewal" programs provide some compensation for the properties they take, but no compensation is possible for the subjective value of these lands to the individuals displaced and the indignity inflicted by uprooting them from their homes. Allowing the government to take property solely for public purposes is bad enough, but extending the concept of public purpose to encompass any economically beneficial goal guarantees that these losses will fall disproportionately on poor ****2687** communities. Those communities are not only systematically less likely to put their lands to the highest and best social use, but are also the least politically powerful. If ever there were justification for intrusive judicial review of constitutional provisions that protect "discrete and insular minorities," *United States v. Carolene Products Co.*, 304 U.S. ***522** 144, 152, n. 4, 58 S.Ct. 778, 82 L.Ed. 1234 (1938), surely that principle would apply with great force to the powerless groups and individuals the Public Use Clause protects. The deferential standard this Court has adopted for the Public Use Clause is therefore deeply perverse. It encourages "those citizens with disproportionate influence and power in the political process, including large corporations and development firms," to victimize the weak. *Ante*, at 2677 (O'CONNOR, J., dissenting).

Those incentives have made the legacy of this Court's "public purpose" test an unhappy one. In the 1950's, no doubt emboldened in part by the expansive understanding of "public use" this Court adopted in *Berman*, cities "rushed to draw plans" for downtown development. B. Frieden & L. Sagalyn, Downtown, Inc. How America Rebuilds Cities 17 (1989). "Of all the families displaced by urban

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

renewal from 1949 through 1963, 63 percent of those whose race was known were nonwhite, and of these families, 56 percent of nonwhites and 38 percent of whites had incomes low enough to qualify for public housing, which, however, was seldom available to them." *Id.,* at 28, 75 S.Ct. 98. Public works projects in the 1950's and 1960's destroyed predominantly minority communities in St. Paul, Minnesota, and Baltimore, Maryland. *Id.,* at 28-29, 75 S.Ct. 98. In 1981, urban planners in Detroit, Michigan, uprooted the largely "lower-income and elderly" Poletown neighborhood for the benefit of the General Motors Corporation. J. Wylie, Poletown: Community Betrayed 58 (1989). Urban renewal projects have long been associated with the displacement of blacks; "[i]n cities across the country, urban renewal came to be known as 'Negro removal.' " Pritchett, The "Public Menace" of Blight: Urban Renewal and the Private Uses of Eminent Domain, 21 Yale L. & Pol'y Rev. 1, 47 (2003). Over 97 percent of the individuals forcibly removed from their homes by the "slum-clearance" project upheld by this Court in *Berman* were black. 348 U.S., at 30, 75 S.Ct. 98. Regrettably, the predictable consequence of the Court's decision will be to exacerbate these effects.

***523** * * *

The Court relies almost exclusively on this Court's prior cases to derive today's far-reaching, and dangerous, result. See *ante,* at 2662-2664. But the principles this Court should employ to dispose of this case are found in the Public Use Clause itself, not in Justice Peckham's high opinion of reclamation laws, see *supra,* at 2683. When faced with a clash of constitutional principle and a line of unreasoned cases wholly divorced from the text, history, and structure of our founding document, we should not hesitate to resolve the tension in favor of the Constitution's original meaning. For the reasons I have given, and for the reasons given in Justice O'CONNOR's dissent, the conflict of principle raised by this boundless use of the eminent domain power should be resolved in petitioners' favor. I would reverse the judgment of the Connecticut Supreme Court.

U.S.Conn.,2005.
Kelo v. City of New London, Conn.
545 U.S. 469, 125 S.Ct. 2655, 60 ERC 1769, 162 L.Ed.2d 439, 73 USLW 4552, 35 Envtl. L. Rep. 20,134, 05 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 5466, 2005 Daily Journal D.A.R. 7475, 18 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 437, 10 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 733

END OF DOCUMENT

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

Date of Printing: Mar 07, 2011

KEYCITE

Kelo v. City of New London, Conn., 545 U.S. 469, 125 S.Ct. 2655, 162 L.Ed.2d 439, 73 USLW 4552, 60 ERC 1769, 35 Envtl. L. Rep. 20,134, 05 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 5466, 2005 Daily Journal D.A.R. 7475, 18 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 437, 10 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 733 (U.S.Conn.,Jun 23, 2005) (NO. 04-108)

History

Direct History

1 Kelo v. City of New London, 2002 WL 500238 (Conn.Super. Mar 13, 2002) (NO. 557299)

Judgment Affirmed in Part, Reversed in Part by

2 Kelo v. City of New London, 268 Conn. 1, 843 A.2d 500 (Conn. Mar 09, 2004) (NO. 16742)

Certiorari Granted by

3 Kelo v. City of New London, Conn., 542 U.S. 965, 125 S.Ct. 27, 159 L.Ed.2d 857, 73 USLW 3077, 73 USLW 3178, 73 USLW 3204 (U.S.Conn. Sep 28, 2004) (NO. 04-108)

AND Affirmed by

=> 4 **Kelo v. City of New London, Conn.,** 545 U.S. 469, 125 S.Ct. 2655, 162 L.Ed.2d 439, 73 USLW 4552, 60 ERC 1769, 35 Envtl. L. Rep. 20,134, 05 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 5466, 2005 Daily Journal D.A.R. 7475, 18 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 437, 10 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 733 (U.S.Conn. Jun 23, 2005) (NO. 04-108), rehearing denied (Aug 22, 2005)

Rehearing Denied by

5 Kelo v. City of New London, Conn., 545 U.S. 1158, 126 S.Ct. 24, 162 L.Ed.2d 922, 74 USLW 3113 (U.S.Conn. Aug 22, 2005) (NO. 04-108)

Negative Citing References (U.S.A.)

Superseded by Statute as Stated in

6 Planned Indus. Expansion Authority of Kansas City v. Ivanhoe Neighborhood Council, 316 S.W.3d 418 (Mo.App. W.D. Apr 27, 2010) (NO. WD70655), as modified (Jun 01, 2010), transfer denied (Aug 31, 2010) ★★

Not Followed on State Law Grounds

7 Norwood v. Horney, 110 Ohio St.3d 353, 853 N.E.2d 1115, 36 Envtl. L. Rep. 20,161, 2006-Ohio-3799 (Ohio Jul 26, 2006) (NO. 2005-0227, 2005-0228, 2005-1210, 2005-1211) ★★ ★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

Declined to Extend by

8 Cornerstone Group XXII, L.L.C. v. Wheat Ridge Urban Renewal Authority, 151 P.3d 601 (Colo.App. Aug 10, 2006) (NO. 05CA0279) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

9 Providence and Worcester R.R. Co. v. Energy Facilities Siting Bd., 453 Mass. 135, 899 N.E.2d

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

829, Util. L. Rep. P 27,040 (Mass. Jan 27, 2009) (NO. SJC-10214) ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

H 10 Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority to Increase Electric Rates and Charges to Recover Smart Grid Costs Relating to Compressed Air Energy Storage Demonstration Project under American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (U39E)., 2010 WL 3611362 (Cal.P.U.C. Sep 02, 2010) (NO. 09-09-019, D. 10-09-018) ★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 11 Uptown Holdings, LLC v. City of New York, 77 A.D.3d 434, 908 N.Y.S.2d 657, 2010 N.Y. Slip Op. 07227 (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Oct 12, 2010) (NO. 2882) ★★ **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

Distinguished by

12 HTK Management, L.L.C. v. Seattle Popular Monorail Authority, 155 Wash.2d 612, 121 P.3d 1166 (Wash. Oct 20, 2005) (NO. 76462-0) ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

H 13 Pima County v. Clear Channel Outdoor, Inc., 212 Ariz. 48, 127 P.3d 64, 470 Ariz. Adv. Rep. 5 (Ariz.App. Div. 2 Jan 25, 2006) (NO. 2 CA-CV 2005-0025), review dismissed (Sep 06, 2006) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

14 Rhode Island Economic Development Corp. v. The Parking Co., L.P., 892 A.2d 87 (R.I. Feb 23, 2006) (NO. 2004-357-APPEAL) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 15 Board of County Com'rs of Muskogee County v. Lowery, 136 P.3d 639, 2006 OK 31, 21 A.L.R.6th 855 (Okla. May 09, 2006) (NO. 531FOROFFICIALPUBLIC, 531NO98, 98,361, 98,362, 98,363, 98,531, ANDTHEMUSKOGEECOUNTY, BANKOFCHEROKEECOUNTY, DEFENDANTS) ★★★★ **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 16 Century Land Group, LLC v. Mayor and Council of Borough of Keyport, 2006 WL 2457846 (N.J.Super.L. Aug 22, 2006) (NO. MON-L-1869-05, MON-L-5192-05) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 17 Mayor and City Council of Baltimore City v. Valsamaki, 397 Md. 222, 916 A.2d 324 (Md. Feb 08, 2007) (NO. 55 SEPT.TERM 2006) ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

18 Franco v. National Capital Revitalization Corp., 930 A.2d 160 (D.C. Jul 12, 2007) (NO. 06-CV-645) ★★★★ **HN: 1,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

H 19 Whittaker v. County of Lawrence, 2007 WL 3053310 (W.D.Pa. Oct 15, 2007) (NO. CIV.A. 04-1092) ★★

H 20 Aspen Creek Estates, Ltd. v. Town of Brookhaven, 47 A.D.3d 267, 848 N.Y.S.2d 214, 2007 N.Y. Slip Op. 09583 (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Dec 04, 2007) (NO. 2006-03815) ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

H 21 Middletown Tp. v. Lands of Stone, 595 Pa. 607, 939 A.2d 331 (Pa. Dec 27, 2007) (NO. 64 MAP 2006) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 22 Board of County Com'rs of County of Morgan v. Kobobel, 176 P.3d 860 (Colo.App. Dec 27, 2007) (NO. 06CA1006) ★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

H 23 Matsuda v. City and County of Honolulu, 512 F.3d 1148, 08 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 406, 2008 Daily Journal D.A.R. 515 (9th Cir.(Hawai'i) Jan 14, 2008) (NO. 06-15337) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

H 24 County of Hawai%7fi v. C & J Coupe Family Ltd. Partnership, 119 Hawai'i 352, 198 P.3d 615 (Hawai'i Dec 24, 2008) (NO. 28822) ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

25 Kaur v. New York State Urban Development Corp., 72 A.D.3d 1, 892 N.Y.S.2d 8, 252 Ed. Law Rep. 394, 2009 N.Y. Slip Op. 08976 (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Dec 03, 2009) (NO. 777, 778) ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

26 International Metal Trading Inc. v. City of Romulus, Mich., 2010 WL 446100 (E.D.Mich. Jan 27,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2010) (NO. 08-11605) ★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

27 New England Estates, LLC v. Town of Branford, 294 Conn. 817, 988 A.2d 229 (Conn. Feb 16, 2010) (NO. 18132) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

28 Fideicomiso De La Tierra Del Cano Martin Pena v. Fortuno, 604 F.3d 7, 70 ERC 1545 (1st Cir.(Puerto Rico) Apr 28, 2010) (NO. 09-2569) ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

29 Baltimore v. District of Columbia, 10 A.3d 1141 (D.C. Jan 06, 2011) (NO. 09-CV-759, 09-CV-760, 09-CV-761) ★★★ **HN: 1,4 (S.Ct.)**

Related References

30 Susette KELO; Thelma Brelesky; Pasquale and Margherita Cristofaro; Wilhelmina and Charles Dery; James and Laura Guretsky; Pataya Construction Limited Partnership; and William Von Winkle, all of New London, v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, New London Development Corporation and the City of New London Redevelopment Agency, all of New London., 2002 WL 34201393 (Trial Order) (Conn.Super. Apr 09, 2002) (NO. CV010557299S)

31 Kelo v. City of New London, Conn., 543 U.S. 1135, 125 S.Ct. 1241, 160 L.Ed.2d 1093, 73 USLW 3493 (U.S.Conn. Feb 18, 2005) (NO. 04-108)

32 Kelo v. City of New London, Conn., 546 U.S. 807, 126 S.Ct. 326, 163 L.Ed.2d 40, 74 USLW 3201 (U.S. Oct 03, 2005) (NO. 04-108)

33 Kelo v. City of New London, 2006 WL 1738571 (Conn.Super. Jun 13, 2006) (NO. 557299)

Court Documents

Appellate Court Documents (U.S.A.)

U.S. Appellate Petitions, Motions and Filings

34 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 1659558 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul. 19, 2004) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari and Appendix Volume I, Pages 1 to 190** (NO. 04-108)

35 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 1877787 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug. 18, 2004) **Brief in Opposition** (NO. 04-108)

36 Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut, 2004 WL 1882158 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug. 19, 2004) **Brief Amicus Curiae of James M. Buchanan and Gordon Tullock and Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 04-108)

37 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 1900737 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug. 23, 2004) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the Property Rights Foundation of America, Inc. in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 04-108)

38 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 1950427 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug. 30, 2004) **Reply Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 04-108)

39 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2803448 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Amicus Curiae King Ranch Inc. in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 04-108)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

40 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2812099 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Amici Curi%CA New London Landmarks, Inc., the Coalition to Save the Fort Trumbull Neighborhood, and New England Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners on the Merits** (NO. 04-108)

41 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2825827 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Amicus Curiae King Ranch Inc. in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 04-108)

U.S. Appellate Briefs

42 Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut, 2004 WL 2605096 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov. 10, 2004) **Amicus Curiae Brief of The Rutherford Institute in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 04-108)

43 Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut, 2004 WL 2750340 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov. 30, 2004) **Brief of Amici Curiae America's Future Inc. and Somerset Transmission & Repair Center in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

44 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2787138 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 01, 2004) **Brief Amici Curiae of the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Farm Bureau Federations of the Following States: California, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, New Hav** (NO. 04-108)

45 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2802967 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 02, 2004) **Brief Amici Curiae of Robert Nigel Richards, Charles William Coupe, Joan Elizabeth Coupe, and Joan Coupe Supporting Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

46 Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut, 2004 WL 2802972 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 02, 2004) **Brief of the Cato Institute as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

47 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2811123 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 02, 2004) **Brief of Amicus Curiae K. Hovnanian Companies, LLC in Support of Respondents%tc** (NO. 04-108)

48 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2787137 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the Property Rights Foundation of America, Inc. in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

49 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2787139 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Amici Curiae the National Association of Home Builders and the National Association of Realtors(R) in Support of the Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

50 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2787140 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief for Reason Foundation as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

51 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2787141 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Amicus Curiae the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

52 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2787142 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Amici Curiae Better Government Association, Citizen Advocacy Center, DKT Liberty Project, National Institute for Urban Entrepreneurship, and Office of the Community Lawyer in Support of Petit** (NO. 04-108)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

53 Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut, 2004 WL 2802968 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Amicus Curiae Brief on the Merits of Mountain States Legal Foundation and Defenders of Property Rights in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

54 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2802969 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Cascade Policy Institute, American Association of Small Property Owners, Grassroot Institute of Hawaii, James Madison Institute, John Locke Foundation, Illinois Policy Institute, Indiana Poli** (NO. 04-108)

55 Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut, 2004 WL 2802970 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief Amici Curiae of Laura B. Kohr and Leon P. Haller, Esquire, Trustee, Owners of Lauxmont Farms, in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

56 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2802971 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Amicus Curiae The Claremont Institute Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence In Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

57 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2802973 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New London R.R. Co., Inc. in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

58 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2803190 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Amicus Curiae Brief of the Tidewater Libertarian Partyon the Merits in Support of the Appellants%tc** (NO. 04-108)

59 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2803191 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Jane Jacobs as Amica Curiae in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

60 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2803192 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Professors David L. Callies, James T. Ely, Paula A. Franzese, Nicole Stelle Garnett, James E. Krier, Daniel R. Mandelker, John Copeland Nagle, John Nolon, J.B. Ruhl, Shelley Ros** (NO. 04-108)

61 Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut, 2004 WL 2803193 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of the Goldwater Institute, Bluegrass Institute for Public Policy Solutions, Center of the American Experiment, Commonwealth Foundation for Public Policy Alternatives, Ethan Allen Institute, Eve** (NO. 04-108)

62 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2811055 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief Amicus Curiae of John Norquist, President, Congress for New Urbanism in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

63 Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut, 2004 WL 2811056 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief Amici Curiae of Mary Bugryn Dudko, Frank Bugryn, Jr., Michael J. Dudko, Harry Pappas, Curtis Blanc, Pacific Legal Foundation, and Center for Individual Freedom in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

64 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2811057 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Amici Curiae National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, AARP, Hispanic Alliance of Atlantic County, Inc., Citizens in Action, Cramer Hill Resident Association, Inc., and the** (NO. 04-108)

65 Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut, 2004 WL 2811058 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief Amici Curiae of Develop Don't Destroy (Brooklyn), Inc. and The West Harlem Business Group in Support of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

66 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2811059 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **Brief of Petitioners%tc** (NO. 04-108)

67 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 154142 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 19, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of New York State Urban Development Corporation d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation in Opposition to Petition%tc** (NO. 04-108)

68 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 154143 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief Amici Curiae of Brooklyn United for Innovative Local Development (BUILD), Rev. Herbert Daughtry, and The New York City and Vicinity Carpenters Labor-Management Corporation in Support of Responde** (NO. 04-108)

69 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 154144 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief for the Massachusetts Chapter of the National Association of Industrial and Office Properties as Amicus Curiae in Support of Respondents%tc** (NO. 04-108)

70 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 166929 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief of the American Planning Association, the Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association, and the National Congress for Community Economic Development as Amici Curiae in Support of Res** (NO. 04-108)

71 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 166931 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief of the National League of Cities, National Conference of State Legislatures, U.S. Conference of Mayors, Council of State Governments, National Association of Counties, International Municipal La** (NO. 04-108)

72 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 166938 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief of the State of Connecticut, through its Attorney General Richard Blumenthal, as Amicus Curiae in Support of the Respondents%tc** (NO. 04-108)

73 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 166940 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Mayor and City Council of Baltimore in Support of Respondents%tc** (NO. 04-108)

74 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 166942 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of California Redevelopment Association in Support of Respondents%tc** (NO. 04-108)

75 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 166943 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the City of New York in Support of Respondents%tc** (NO. 04-108)

76 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 166945 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief of the States of Vermont, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, Montana, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota and Tennessee, and the District of Columbia, As Amici Curiae in Su** (NO. 04-108)

77 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 176426 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief Of Amici Curiae Connecticut Conference Of Municipalities And The State Municipal Leagues Of Alabama; Arkansas; California; Colorado; Florida; Georgia; Illinois; Indiana; Iowa; Kansas; Kentucky;** (NO. 04-108)

78 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 176672 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief of Law Professors Robert H. Freilich, Richard Briffault, Julie Cheslik, Janice C. Griffith, Tim Iglesias, Julian Conrad Juergensmayer, Anita Miller, Thomas E. Roberts, Patricia E.**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Salkin, Edward (NO. 04-108)

79 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 429976 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan. 21, 2005) **Brief of the Respondents%tc** (NO. 04-108)

80 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 353691 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb. 11, 2005) **Reply Brief of Petitioners** (NO. 04-108)

81 Kelo v. City of New London, 2005 WL 1688323 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul. 18, 2005) **Petition for Rehearing** (NO. 04-108)

Conn. Appellate Briefs

82 Susette KELO, et al., v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, et al., 2002 WL 34155033 (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Jul. 2, 2002) **Brief of the Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. 16742)

83 Susette KELO, et al., v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, et al., 2002 WL 34155034 (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Aug. 1, 2002) **Brief of the Defendant-Appellee, City of New London, on the Appeal and as Cross-Appellants with Appendix** (NO. 16742)

84 Susette KELO, et al, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2002 WL 34155035 (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Aug. 1, 2002) **Brief of the Defendant-Appellee/Cross-Appellant New London Development Corporation with Appendix** (NO. 16742)

85 Susette KELO, et al., v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, et al., 2002 WL 34155036 (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Sep. 3, 2002) **Reply Brief of the Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. 16742)

86 Susette KELO, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2002 WL 34155037 (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Sep. 20, 2002) **Reply Brief of the Cross-Appellant New London Development Corporation** (NO. 16742)

87 Susette KELO, et al., v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, et al., 2002 WL 34155038 (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Sep. 23, 2002) **Reply Brief of the Cross-Appellant City of New London Defendant-Appellee** (NO. 16742)

U.S. Joint Appendices

88 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2921787 (Joint Appendix) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **JOINT APPENDIX, VOL. II** (NO. 04-108)

89 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 2967525 (Joint Appendix) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **JOINT APPENDIX, VOL. I** (NO. 04-108)

90 Kelo v. City of New London, 2004 WL 3017675 (Joint Appendix) (U.S. Dec. 03, 2004) **JOINT APPENDIX, VOL. III** (NO. 04-108)

U.S. Oral Arguments

91 Kelo v. City of New London, Conn., 2005 WL 529436 (Oral Argument) (U.S. Feb. 22, 2005) **Oral Argument** (NO. 04-108)

Dockets (U.S.A.)

U.S.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

92 SUSETTE KELO, ET AL. v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT, ET AL., NO. 04-108 (Docket) (U.S. Jul. 22, 2004)

Conn.Super.

93 KELO, SUSETTE v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, NO. KNL-CV-01-0557299-S (Docket) (Conn.Super. Dec. 20, 2000)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Date of Printing: Mar 07, 2011

KEYCITE

Kelo v. City of New London, Conn., 545 U.S. 469, 125 S.Ct. 2655, 162 L.Ed.2d 439, 73 USLW 4552, 60 ERC 1769, 35 Envtl. L. Rep. 20,134, 05 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 5466, 2005 Daily Journal D.A.R. 7475, 18 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 437, 10 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 733 (U.S.Conn. Jun 23, 2005) (NO. 04-108)

Citing References

Negative Cases (U.S.A.)

Superseded by Statute as Stated in

H 1 Planned Indus. Expansion Authority of Kansas City v. Ivanhoe Neighborhood Council, 316 S.W.3d 418, 426 (Mo.App. W.D. Apr 27, 2010) (NO. WD70655) ★★

Not Followed on State Law Grounds

2 Norwood v. Horney, 853 N.E.2d 1115, 1122+, 110 Ohio St.3d 353, 355+, 36 Envtl. L. Rep. 20,161, 20161+, 2006-Ohio-3799, 3799+ (Ohio Jul 26, 2006) (NO. 2005-0227, 2005-0228, 2005-1210, 2005-1211) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

Declined to Extend by

C 3 Uptown Holdings, LLC v. City of New York, 908 N.Y.S.2d 657, 659+, 77 A.D.3d 434, 435+, 2010 N.Y. Slip Op. 07227, 07227+ (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Oct 12, 2010) (NO. 2882) ★★ **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

H 4 Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority to Increase Electric Rates and Charges to Recover Smart Grid Costs Relating to Compressed Air Energy Storage Demonstration Project under American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (U39E)., 2010 WL 3611362, *3+ (Cal.P.U.C. Sep 02, 2010) (NO. 09-09-019, D. 10-09-018) ★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

5 Cornerstone Group XXII, L.L.C. v. Wheat Ridge Urban Renewal Authority, 151 P.3d 601, 607+ (Colo.App. Aug 10, 2006) (NO. 05CA0279) " ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

Distinguished by

6 Baltimore v. District of Columbia, 10 A.3d 1141, 1154+ (D.C. Jan 06, 2011) (NO. 09-CV-759, 09-CV-760, 09-CV-761) " ★★★ **HN: 1,4 (S.Ct.)**

H 7 Fideicomiso De La Tierra Del Cano Martin Pena v. Fortuno, 604 F.3d 7, 17+, 70 ERC 1545, 1545+ (1st Cir.(Puerto Rico) Apr 28, 2010) (NO. 09-2569) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

8 International Metal Trading Inc. v. City of Romulus, Mich., 2010 WL 446100, *3 (E.D.Mich. Jan 27, 2010) (NO. 08-11605) ★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

9 Kaur v. New York State Urban Development Corp., 892 N.Y.S.2d 8, 11+, 72 A.D.3d 1, 3+, 252 Ed. Law Rep. 394, 394+, 2009 N.Y. Slip Op. 08976, 08976+ (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Dec 03, 2009) (NO. 777, 778) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

H 10 County of Hawai%7fi v. C & J Coupe Family Ltd. Partnership, 198 P.3d 615, 638+, 119 Hawai'i 352, 375+ (Hawai'i Dec 24, 2008) (NO. 28822) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

H 11 Matsuda v. City and County of Honolulu, 512 F.3d 1148, 1154+, 08 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 406, 406+, 2008 Daily Journal D.A.R. 515, 515+ (9th Cir.(Hawai'i) Jan 14, 2008) (NO. 06-15337) ★ ★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 12 Board of County Com'rs of County of Morgan v. Kobobel, 176 P.3d 860, 863+ (Colo.App. Dec 27, 2007) (NO. 06CA1006) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

H 13 Middletown Tp. v. Lands of Stone, 939 A.2d 331, 338+, 595 Pa. 607, 617+ (Pa. Dec 27, 2007) (NO. 64 MAP 2006) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

H 14 Aspen Creek Estates, Ltd. v. Town of Brookhaven, 848 N.Y.S.2d 214, 220+, 47 A.D.3d 267, 275+, 2007 N.Y. Slip Op. 09583, 09583+ (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Dec 04, 2007) (NO. 2006-03815) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

H 15 Whittaker v. County of Lawrence, 2007 WL 3053310, *4 (W.D.Pa. Oct 15, 2007) (NO. CIV.A. 04-1092) ★★

16 Franco v. National Capital Revitalization Corp., 930 A.2d 160, 167+ (D.C. Jul 12, 2007) (NO. 06-CV-645) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 17 Mayor and City Council of Baltimore City v. Valsamaki, 916 A.2d 324, 334+, 397 Md. 222, 239+ (Md. Feb 08, 2007) (NO. 55 SEPT.TERM 2006) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 18 Century Land Group, LLC v. Mayor and Council of Borough of Keyport, 2006 WL 2457846, *9+ (N.J.Super.L. Aug 22, 2006) (NO. MON-L-1869-05, MON-L-5192-05) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 19 Board of County Com'rs of Muskogee County v. Lowery, 136 P.3d 639, 646+, 2006 OK 31, 31+, 21 A.L.R.6th 855, 855+ (Okla. May 09, 2006) (NO. 531FOROFFICIALPUBLIC, 531NO98, 98,361, 98,362, 98,363, 98,531, ANDTHEMUSKOGEECOUNTY, BANKOFCHEROKEE-COUNTY, DEFENDANTS) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

20 Rhode Island Economic Development Corp. v. The Parking Co., L.P., 892 A.2d 87, 103+ (R.I. Feb 23, 2006) (NO. 2004-357-APPEAL) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

H 21 Pima County v. Clear Channel Outdoor, Inc., 127 P.3d 64, 66+, 212 Ariz. 48, 50+, 470 Ariz. Adv. Rep. 5, 5+ (Ariz.App. Div. 2 Jan 25, 2006) (NO. 2 CA-CV 2005-0025) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

22 HTK Management, L.L.C. v. Seattle Popular Monorail Authority, 121 P.3d 1166, 1168+, 155 Wash.2d 612, 616+ (Wash. Oct 20, 2005) (NO. 76462-0) ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

Positive Cases (U.S.A.)

★★★★ **Examined**

23 Goldstein v. Pataki, 516 F.3d 50, 55+ (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Feb 01, 2008) (NO. 07-2537-CV) " **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

H 24 Carole Media LLC v. New Jersey Transit Corp., 550 F.3d 302, 309+ (3rd Cir.(N.J.) Dec 22, 2008) (NO. 07-3966) " **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

H 25 Western Seafood Co. v. U.S., 202 Fed.Appx. 670, 673+ (5th Cir.(Tex.) Oct 11, 2006) (Table, text in WESTLAW, NO. 04-41196) " **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

H 26 MHC Financing, Ltd. v. City of San Rafael, 2008 WL 440282, *1+ (N.D.Cal. Jan 29, 2008) (NO.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C-00-03785 VRW) " **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

H 27 MHC Financial Ltd. Partnership v. City of San Rafael, 2006 WL 3507937, *1+ (N.D.Cal. Dec 05, 2006) (NO. C 00-3785 VRW) " **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

H 28 CBS Outdoor Inc. v. New Jersey Transit Corp., 2007 WL 2509633, *8+ (D.N.J. Aug 30, 2007) (NO. CIV.A.06-2428HAA) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

29 Goldstein v. Pataki, 488 F.Supp.2d 254, 276+ (E.D.N.Y. Jun 06, 2007) (NO. 06-CV-5827(NGG)(RML), 07-CV-152(NGG)(RML)) " **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

H 30 Whittaker v. County of Lawrence, 674 F.Supp.2d 668, 676+ (W.D.Pa. Dec 07, 2009) (NO. CIV. A. 04-1092) " **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 31 U.S. v. 0.28 Acre of Land, More or Less, Situate in Washington County, Penn., 2009 WL 4408194, *4+ (W.D.Pa. Nov 25, 2009) (NO. 09CV0583) " **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

H 32 Banks v. U.S., 78 Fed.Cl. 603, 614+ (Fed.Cl. Sep 28, 2007) (NO. 00-301;, 00-365L, 00-379L, 00-380L, 00-381L, 00-382L, 00-383L, 00-384L, 00-385L) " **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 33 Duk Hea Oh v. National Capital Revitalization Corp., 7 A.3d 997, 1002+ (D.C. Nov 12, 2010) (NO. 09-CV-1267, 10-CV-144) "

34 Ricci v. City of Overland Park, 2010 WL 3253937, *3253937+ (Trial Order) (Kan.Dist.Ct. 2010) **Order on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 10CV2934) " **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

H 35 New Orleans Redevelopment Authority v. Burgess, 16 So.3d 569, 578+, 2008-1020 (La.App. 4 Cir. 7/8/09), 12+ (La.App. 4 Cir. Jul 08, 2009) (NO. 2008-CA-1020) " **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

H 36 HOUSING and Redevelopment Authority in and for the City of Bloomington, Petitioner, v. BLOOMINGTON PROFESSIONAL BUILDING, LLC; Wells Fargo Bank, National Association; Premier Bank, Minnesota; Foreman & Airhart, Ltd.; G. Martin Johnson, Ltd.; J/COM Technologies, Inc.; Kruger Financial Services, Inc.; MN Loan Processing, Inc.; Maximum Marketing, Inc.; Independence Coin Services, Inc.; County of Hennepin; City of Bloomington, and all other persons unknown, 2005 WL 4991307, *4991307+ (Trial Order) (Minn.Dist.Ct. Nov 28, 2005) **Order** (NO. CD-2783) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

37 Harrison Redevelopment Agency v. DeRose, 942 A.2d 59, 77+, 398 N.J.Super. 361, 391+ (N.J.Super.A.D. Feb 25, 2008) (NO. A-0382-07T2, A-0958-06T2) " **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 38 Vineland Const. Co., Inc. v. Township of Pennsauken, 928 A.2d 856, 866+, 395 N.J.Super. 230, 247+ (N.J.Super.A.D. Jul 27, 2007) (NO. A-3136-05T2) " **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

39 City of Long Branch v. Brower, 2006 WL 1746120, *4+ (N.J.Super.L. Jun 22, 2006) (NO. MON-L-141-06, MON-L-309-06, MON-L-313-06, MON-L-317-06, MON-L-320-06, MON-L-4987-05, MON-L-4996-05, MON-L-5551-05, MON-L-5552-05) " **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

40 49 WB, LLC v. Village of Haverstraw, 839 N.Y.S.2d 127, 129+, 44 A.D.3d 226, 228+, 2007 N.Y. Slip Op. 05506, 05506+ (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Jun 19, 2007) (NO. 2006-00605) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 41 In re New York State Urban Development Corp., 907 N.Y.S.2d 438+, 26 Misc.3d 1228(A), 1228(A)+, 2010 N.Y. Slip Op. 50301(U), 50301(U)+ (N.Y.Sup. Mar 01, 2010) (Table, text in WESTLAW, NO. 32741/09) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 42 Litva v. Richmond, 874 N.E.2d 1243, 1250+, 172 Ohio App.3d 349, 357+, 2007-Ohio-3499, 3499+ (Ohio App. 7 Dist. Jun 29, 2007) (NO. 05-JE-26) " *(in dissent)* **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

H 43 In re Opening Private Road for Benefit of O'Reilly, 5 A.3d 246, 250+ (Pa. Sep 30, 2010) (NO. 10 WAP 2009) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

H 44 In re Condemnation of Land for South East Cent. Business Dist. Redevelopment Area No.1 (405 Madison Street, City of Chester), 946 A.2d 1154, 1158+ (Pa.Cmwlth. Apr 22, 2008) (NO. 651 C.D. 2007) " *(in dissent)* **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

★★★ **Discussed**

H 45 RLR Investments, LLC v. Town of Kearny, 386 Fed.Appx. 84, 86+ (3rd Cir.(N.J.) Jul 02, 2010) (Table, text in WESTLAW, NO. 09-3100) " **HN: 3,4 (S.Ct.)**

46 Severance v. Patterson, 566 F.3d 490, 511+ (5th Cir.(Tex.) Apr 23, 2009) (NO. 07-20409) *(in dissent)* **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

H 47 Dahlen v. Shelter House, 598 F.3d 1007, 1011+ (8th Cir.(Iowa) Mar 24, 2010) (NO. 09-1909) " **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

48 Guggenheim v. City of Goleta, 582 F.3d 996, 1021+, 09 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 12,218, 12218+, 2009 Daily Journal D.A.R. 14,205, 14205+ (9th Cir.(Cal.) Sep 28, 2009) (NO. 06-56306) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

H 49 U.S. v. 14.02 Acres of Land More or Less in Fresno County, 547 F.3d 943, 952+, Util. L. Rep. P 14,720, 14720+, 08 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 13,501, 13501+, 2008 Daily Journal D.A.R. 16,189, 16189+ (9th Cir.(Cal.) Oct 24, 2008) (NO. 05-17347) " **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

50 U.S. v. 14.02 Acres of Land More or Less in Fresno County, 530 F.3d 883, 891+, 08 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 7785, 7785+, 2008 Daily Journal D.A.R. 9418, 9418+ (9th Cir.(Cal.) Jun 24, 2008) (NO. 05-17347) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

51 Action Apartment Ass'n, Inc. v. Santa Monica Rent Control Bd., 509 F.3d 1020, 1023+, 07 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 13,692, 13692+, 2007 Daily Journal D.A.R. 17,779, 17779+ (9th Cir.(Cal.) Dec 03, 2007) (NO. 05-56533) " **HN: 1,4 (S.Ct.)**

H 52 The Forty-Niner Lease v. Department of Transp., 2007 WL 2362364, *7+ (E.D.Cal. Aug 14, 2007) (NO. CV-F-07406) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 53 Southeast Land Development Associates, L.P. v. District of Columbia, 2005 WL 3211458, *3+ (D.D.C. Nov 01, 2005) (NO. CIV.A. 05-1413RWR)

54 Matsuda v. City and County of Honolulu, 378 F.Supp.2d 1249, 1256+ (D.Hawai'i Jul 19, 2005) (NO. CV 0500125DAELEK) " **HN: 1,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

55 Hsiung v. City and County of Honolulu, 378 F.Supp.2d 1258, 1265+ (D.Hawai'i Jul 19, 2005) (NO. CV 05-00104DAE-LEK) " **HN: 1,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

H 56 City of Joliet v. Mid-City Nat. Bank of Chicago, 2007 WL 2298403, *3+ (N.D.Ill. Aug 03, 2007) (NO. 05 C 6746) " **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

H 57 Williams v. City of Detroit, 2008 WL 4239220, *8+ (E.D.Mich. Sep 11, 2008) (NO. CIV.06-CV-12809) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

H 58 Faith Temple Church v. Town of Brighton, 405 F.Supp.2d 250, 256+ (W.D.N.Y. Dec 19, 2005) (NO. 04-CV-6355L) **HN: 3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 59 Calhoun Realty, Inc. v. City of Cincinnati, 2005 WL 2000664, *2+ (S.D.Ohio Aug 19, 2005) (NO. 1:03-CV-00198) " **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

60 City of Guymon v. Cal Farley's Boys Ranch, 2005 WL 3590942, *3+ (W.D.Okla. Dec 30, 2005) (NO. CIV-04-457-BA) " **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

61 In re El Comandante Management Co., LLC, 358 B.R. 1, 14+ (Bankr.D.Puerto Rico Jun 08, 2006) (NO. 04-10938 (ESL)) " **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

62 Community Redevelopment Agency of City of Los Angeles v. Kramer Metals, 2010 WL 1633817, *11+ (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Apr 23, 2010) (NO. B208726) " **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

63 Steamboat Lake Water and Sanitation Dist. v. Halvorson, 2011 WL 32489, *7+ (Colo.App. Jan 06, 2011) (NO. 09CA2393) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

64 Wardman Investor, L.L.C. v. District of Columbia, 2010 WL 2642643, *2642643+ (Trial Order) (D.C.Super. Apr 09, 2010) **Omnibus Memorandum Opinion and Order** (NO. 2009CA006427B) " **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

65 Wardman Investor, L.L.C. v. Dist. of Columbia, 2010 WL 1607491, *1607491+ (Trial Order) (D.C.Super. Mar 29, 2010) **Omnibus Memorandum Opinion and Order** (NO. 2009CA006427B) " **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

66 City of Hollywood Community Redevelopment Agency v. 1843, LLC, 980 So.2d 1138, 1144+, 33 Fla. L. Weekly D860, D860+ (Fla.App. 4 Dist. Mar 26, 2008) (NO. 4D06-4016) **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

67 Fulmore v. Charlotte County, 928 So.2d 1281, 1284+, 31 Fla. L. Weekly D1490, D1490+ (Fla.App. 2 Dist. May 31, 2006) (NO. 2D04-3179, 2D04-3283, 2D04-3293, 2D04-3429, 2D04-3430, 2D05-13, 2D05-13RAYMOND, 2D05-17, 2D05-24) " **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

68 Talley v. Housing Authority of Columbus, 630 S.E.2d 550, 551+, 279 Ga.App. 94, 94+, 6 FCDR 1172, 1172+ (Ga.App. Apr 05, 2006) (NO. A06A0393) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

69 County of Hawaii v. C & J Coupe Family Ltd. Partnership, 242 P.3d 1136, 1148+, 124 Hawai'i 281, 293+ (Hawai'i Nov 10, 2010) (NO. 29887) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

70 Providence and Worcester R.R. Co. v. Energy Facilities Siting Bd., 899 N.E.2d 829, 835+, 453 Mass. 135, 142+, Util. L. Rep. P 27,040, 27040+ (Mass. Jan 27, 2009) (NO. SJC-10214) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

71 City of Baltimore Development Corp. v. Carmel Realty Associates, 910 A.2d 406, 416+, 395 Md. 299, 316+ (Md. Nov 03, 2006) (NO. 14 SEPT.TERM 2006) " **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

72 Housing and Redevelopment Authority ex rel. City of Bloomington v. Bloomington Professional Bldg., LLC, 2007 WL 224272, *5+ (Minn.App. Jan 30, 2007) (NO. A06-159) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

73 Allright Properties, Inc. v. Tax Increment Financing Com'n of Kansas City, 240 S.W.3d 777, 780+ (Mo.App. W.D. Dec 18, 2007) (NO. WD68406) " **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

74 Kafka v. Montana Dept. of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, 201 P.3d 8, 39+, 348 Mont. 80, 126+, 2008 MT 460, 460+ (Mont. Dec 31, 2008) (NO. 05-146) *(in dissent)*

75 Prosser v. Kennedy Enterprises, Inc., 179 P.3d 1178, 1198+, 342 Mont. 209, 240+, 2008 MT 87, 87+ (Mont. Mar 12, 2008) (NO. DA 06-0073) *(in dissent)* **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

76 City of Omaha v. Tract No. 1, 2009 WL 7195743, *7195743+ (Trial Order) (Neb.Dist.Ct. Feb 23, 2009) **Order on Appellee's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment** (NO. 1074812) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

77 City of Omaha v. Tract No 1, 2008 WL 8168446, *8168446+ (Trial Order) (Neb.Dist.Ct. Apr 09,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2008) **Order on Appellants' Motion for Temporary and Permanent Njunction** (NO. 1074812) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

H 78 Nevadans for the Protection of Property Rights, Inc. v. Heller, 141 P.3d 1235, 1244+, 122 Nev. 894, 907+ (Nev. Sep 08, 2006) (NO. 47825) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

H 79 Carolyn EVANS and Rivco Group, LLC, Plaintiffs, v. TOWNSHIP OF MAPLEWOOD, Township Committee of the Township of Maplewood and the Planning Board of the Township of Maplewood, Defendants., 2007 WL 2227123, *2227123+ (Trial Order) (N.J.Super.L. Jul 27, 2007) **Opinion** (NO. L-6910-06) " **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 80 Evans v. Township of Maplewood, 2007 WL 4239952, *4239952+ (Trial Order) (N.J.Super.L. Jul 27, 2007) **Opinion** (NO. L-6910-06) " **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

H 81 Aspen Creek Estates, Ltd. v. Town of Brookhaven, 876 N.Y.S.2d 680, 681+, 904 N.E.2d 816, 817+, 12 N.Y.3d 735, 736+, 2009 N.Y. Slip Op. 01153, 01153+ (N.Y. Feb 17, 2009) (NO. 19) " **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 82 East Harlem Alliance of Responsible Merchants v. City of New York, 2010 WL 147156, *147156+, 2010 N.Y. Slip Op. 30023(U), 30023(U)+ (Trial Order) (N.Y.Sup. Jan 07, 2010) **Decision and Order** (NO. 117242/08) " **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

83 Moore v. Middletown, 2010 WL 2573817, *7+, 2010-Ohio-2962, 2962+ (Ohio App. 12 Dist. Jun 28, 2010) (NO. CA2009-08-205) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

H 84 Bd. of Trustees of Sinclair Community College Dist. v. Farra, 2010 WL 597098, *4+, 2010-Ohio-568, 568+ (Ohio App. 2 Dist. Feb 19, 2010) (NO. 22886) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

H 85 In re Redevelopment Authority of City of Philadelphia, 938 A.2d 341, 345+, 595 Pa. 241, 247+ (Pa. Dec 27, 2007) (NO. 36 EAP 2006) " **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

H 86 In re Condemnation by Redevelopment Authority of Lawrence County, Absolute Title of Land of Hamilton, 962 A.2d 1257, 1263+ (Pa.Cmwlth. Dec 22, 2008) (NO. 1293 C.D. 2007, 1294 C.D.2007, 1323 C.D. 2007, 1324 C.D. 2007) " **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

87 In re Opening Private Road ex rel. O'Reilly, 954 A.2d 57, 61+ (Pa.Cmwlth. Jul 11, 2008) (NO. 2214 CD 2007) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

H 88 In re Condemnation of Land for the South East Cent. Business District Redevelopment Area #1, 946 A.2d 1143, 1152+ (Pa.Cmwlth. Apr 22, 2008) (NO. 478 C.D. 2007) " *(in dissent)* **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

89 In re Redevelopment Authority of City of Philadelphia, 891 A.2d 820, 825+ (Pa.Cmwlth. Feb 06, 2006) (NO. 150 C.D. 2005) **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

90 Benson v. State, 710 N.W.2d 131, 146+, 36 Envtl. L. Rep. 20,023, 20023+, 2006 S.D. 8, 8+ (S.D. Jan 24, 2006) (NO. 23492) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

H 91 Ex parte Lewis, 219 S.W.3d 335, 375+ (Tex.Crim.App. Jan 10, 2007) (NO. PD-0577-05) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

92 City of Midlothian, Texas v. ECOM Real Estate Management, Inc., 2010 WL 311433, *11+ (Tex.App.-Waco Jan 27, 2010) (NO. 10-09-00039-CV) *(in dissent)* **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

H 93 Hoffman Family, L.L.C. v. City of Alexandria, 634 S.E.2d 722, 731+, 272 Va. 274, 290+ (Va. Sep 15, 2006) (NO. 052506) **HN: 2,3 (S.Ct.)**

★★ **Cited**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

H 94 Haywood v. Drown, 129 S.Ct. 2108, 2124, 173 L.Ed.2d 920, 920, 77 USLW 4409, 4409, 09 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 6247, 6247, 2009 Daily Journal D.A.R. 7329, 7329, 21 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 871, 871 (U.S.N.Y. May 26, 2009) (NO. 07-10374) *(in dissent)* **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

H 95 Kelo v. City of New London, Conn., 126 S.Ct. 326, 326, 546 U.S. 807, 807, 163 L.Ed.2d 40, 40, 74 USLW 3201, 3201 (U.S. Oct 03, 2005) (NO. 04-108)

96 Buffalo Teachers Federation v. Tobe, 464 F.3d 362, 373, 180 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2666, 2666, 153 Lab.Cas. P 60,274, 60274, 213 Ed. Law Rep. 83, 83, 11 Wage & Hour Cas.2d (BNA) 1623, 1623 (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Sep 21, 2006) (NO. 05-4744-CV) " **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

H 97 Didden v. Village of Port Chester, 173 Fed.Appx. 931, 933+ (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Apr 05, 2006) (Table, text in WESTLAW, NO. 04-3485-CV) " **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

98 Brody v. Village of Port Chester, 434 F.3d 121, 134+ (2nd Cir.(N.Y.) Dec 05, 2005) (NO. 05-0446-CV) " **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 99 Ash v. Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia, 143 Fed.Appx. 439, 442 (3rd Cir.(Pa.) Aug 01, 2005) (Table, text in WESTLAW, NO. 04-4356) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

100 Presley v. City Of Charlottesville, 464 F.3d 480, 486 (4th Cir.(Va.) Sep 22, 2006) (NO. 05-2344)

H 101 McCarthy v. City of Cleveland, 626 F.3d 280, 287 (6th Cir.(Ohio) Nov 09, 2010) (NO. 09-4149)

H 102 Mann v. Calumet City, Ill., 588 F.3d 949, 952 (7th Cir.(Ill.) Dec 07, 2009) (NO. 09-1681, 09-2481)

103 River of Life Kingdom Ministries v. Village of Hazel Crest, 585 F.3d 364, 376 (7th Cir.(Ill.) Oct 27, 2009) (NO. 08-2819) "

104 St. John's United Church of Christ v. City of Chicago, 502 F.3d 616, 639 (7th Cir.(Ill.) Sep 13, 2007) (NO. 05-4418, 05-4450, 05-4451)

C 105 Cormack v. Settle-Beshears, 474 F.3d 528, 531 (8th Cir.(Ark.) Jan 23, 2007) (NO. 06-2069)

H 106 Surf and Sand, LLC v. City of Capitola, 377 Fed.Appx. 662, 664 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Apr 26, 2010) (Table, text in WESTLAW, NO. 08-16481) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

H 107 Vacation Village, Inc. v. Clark County, Nev, 497 F.3d 902, 915, 07 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 9524, 9524, 2007 Daily Journal D.A.R. 12,240, 12240 (9th Cir.(Nev.) Aug 10, 2007) (NO. 05-16173, 05-16389, 05-16406, 05-16554)

108 Tal v. Hogan, 453 F.3d 1244, 1257, 2006-1 Trade Cases P 75,319, 75319, RICO Bus.Disp.Guide 11,095, 11095 (10th Cir.(Okla.) Jun 29, 2006) (NO. 03-6293)

109 Casitas Mun. Water Dist. v. U.S., 543 F.3d 1276, 1292, 67 ERC 1769, 1769 (Fed.Cir. Sep 25, 2008) (NO. 2007-5153)

H 110 Rumber v. District of Columbia, 487 F.3d 941, 943, 376 U.S.App.D.C. 255, 257 (D.C.Cir. May 25, 2007) (NO. 06-7004) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

H 111 Hope For Families & Community Service, Inc. v. Warren, 721 F.Supp.2d 1079, 1141, RICO Bus.Disp.Guide 11,898, 11898 (M.D.Ala. Jun 30, 2010) (NO. 3:06-CV-1113-WKW) "

H 112 Two Tennessee, LLC v. City of North Little Rock, Ark., 2006 WL 2460926, *4 (E.D.Ark. Aug 23, 2006) (NO. 3:06CV00063 JLH) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

H 113 U.S. v. Bahna, 2010 WL 4916584, *2 (C.D.Cal. Nov 24, 2010) (NO. CR 05-982 ABC, CV 08-1249 ABC)

H 114 Rotroff v. Ahlin, 2010 WL 2902502, *7 (E.D.Cal. Jul 22, 2010) (NO.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1:09CV02021AWIGSAPC)

H 115 Slider v. City of Oakland, 2010 WL 2867807, *8 (N.D.Cal. Jul 19, 2010) (NO. C 08-4847 SI)

H 116 Allen v. Mayberg, 2010 WL 500467, *7 (E.D.Cal. Feb 08, 2010) (NO. 1:06-CV-01801-BLWLMB, 1:07-CV-00427-BLW, 1:07-CV-00834-BLW) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

H 117 Lee v. Scribner, 2009 WL 1211400, *9 (E.D.Cal. May 01, 2009) (NO. 105CV-00802OWW-WMWPC)

H 118 Mullins v. Wenciker, 2009 WL 1099905, *2 (E.D.Cal. Apr 23, 2009) (NO. 107CV00108LJODLBPC) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

H 119 Jackson v. Robinson, 2009 WL 981202, *2 (E.D.Cal. Apr 10, 2009) (NO. 1:07-CV-01699OWWDLBP)

C 120 Bey v. Sardariani, 2009 WL 235043, *3 (C.D.Cal. Jan 26, 2009) (NO. CV08-07547GAF(EX)) " **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

H 121 Allen v. Mayberg, 2008 WL 5135629, *6 (E.D.Cal. Dec 08, 2008) (NO. 106CV01801AWIGSA(PC)) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 122 McNeal v. Mayberg, 2008 WL 5114650, *6 (E.D.Cal. Dec 04, 2008) (NO. 1:07CV00851GSA(PC)) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

H 123 Jackson v. Robinson, 2008 WL 4826123, *2 (E.D.Cal. Nov 05, 2008) (NO. 107CV01699OWWDLBPC) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

H 124 Richardson v. Bryant, 2007 WL 4524827, *9 (E.D.Cal. Dec 19, 2007) (NO. 199CV06575OWWGSA)

H 125 Curtis v. Buckley, 2007 WL 1345490, *3 (E.D.Cal. May 08, 2007) (NO. 106CV00230OWWDLBPC) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

H 126 Waldon v. Ramirez, 2007 WL 763710, *1 (E.D.Cal. Mar 09, 2007) (NO. CIV S-06-2139MCEGGHP) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

127 Griggs v. Strumpfer, 2006 WL 1523124, *3+ (E.D.Cal. May 30, 2006) (NO. CVF 05-1313RECSMS) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

H 128 Los Altos El Granada Investors v. City of Capitola, 2005 WL 1774247, *8 (N.D.Cal. Jul 26, 2005) (NO. C045138JFPVT) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

H 129 TI Training Corp. v. FAAC, Inc., 2010 WL 2490535, *2 (D.Colo. Jun 15, 2010) (NO. 1:09CV00973-WYD-MER)

130 Rumber v. District of Columbia, 598 F.Supp.2d 97, 114+ (D.D.C. Feb 26, 2009) (NO. CIV. A. 04-1170 RMU) " **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

131 Franco v. District of Columbia, 456 F.Supp.2d 35, 39+ (D.D.C. Oct 10, 2006) (NO. CIV.A.05-1058 RMU) " **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

H 132 Franco v. District of Columbia, 422 F.Supp.2d 216, 218+, 36 Envtl. L. Rep. 20,058, 20058+ (D.D.C. Mar 22, 2006) (NO. CIV. 05-1058) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

H 133 Autozone Development Corp. v. District of Columbia, 2006 WL 522437, *3 (D.D.C. Mar 02, 2006) (NO. CIV.A.05-0476(RMU))

134 Rumber v. District of Columbia, 427 F.Supp.2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. Dec 12, 2005) (NO. CIV.A. 04-1170 (RMU)) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

135 George Washington University v. District of Columbia, 391 F.Supp.2d 109, 114 (D.D.C. Sep 16, 2005) (NO. CIV.A.01-0895 LFO) "

136 Rumber v. District of Columbia, 2005 WL 1903727, *1 (D.D.C. Jul 19, 2005) (NO. CIV.A. 04-1170(RMU))

137 Lewis v. Wilcox, 2007 WL 3102189, *3 (M.D.Ga. Oct 23, 2007) (NO. 3:06-CV-29 (CDL))

138 Niemeyer v. Williams, 2008 WL 906051, *8+ (C.D.Ill. Mar 31, 2008) (NO. 07-CV-1103) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

139 Cochran v. Folger, 740 F.Supp.2d 923 (E.D.Ky. Sep 16, 2010) (NO. CIV.A. 5:09-302-JMH) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

140 Pagani-Gallego v. Sabol, 2008 WL 886032, *2 (D.Mass. Mar 27, 2008) (NO. CIVA 07-40016-PBS)

141 Jarvis v. Astrue, 2007 WL 2332694, *10 (D.Md. Jul 31, 2007) (NO. CIV CCB 05-2950)

142 Kircher v. Charter Tp. of Ypsilanti, 2007 WL 1839895, *1 (E.D.Mich. Jun 27, 2007) (NO. 06-14801) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

143 U.S. v. Santoyo, 2007 WL 1343798, *1 (E.D.Mich. May 07, 2007) (NO. 92-CR-20076)

144 Hale v. North Dakota, 2010 WL 1254924, *3 (D.N.D. Mar 24, 2010) (NO. 1:09-CV-60) "

145 Memo Money Order Co., Inc. v. Sidamon-Eristoff, 2010 WL 4807063, *10 (D.N.J. Nov 18, 2010) (NO. CIV 10-5460 FLW) **HN: 1,7 (S.Ct.)**

146 American Exp. Travel Related Services Co., Inc. v. Sidamon-Eristoff, 2010 WL 4722209, *15+ (D.N.J. Nov 13, 2010) (NO. CIV 10-4890 FLW, CIV 10-5059 FLW, CIV 10-5123 FLW, CIV 10-5206 FLW) **HN: 4,7 (S.Ct.)**

147 Merrick Gables Ass'n, Inc. v. Town of Hempstead, 691 F.Supp.2d 355, 360 (E.D.N.Y. Mar 10, 2010) (NO. 09-CV-4415(ADS)(WDW))

148 Brody v. Village of Port Chester, 2008 WL 3398111, *5 (S.D.N.Y. Aug 11, 2008) (NO. 00CV7481 (HB)) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

149 Goldstein v. Pataki, 2007 WL 1695573, *17+ (E.D.N.Y. Feb 23, 2007) (NO. 06 CV 5827 NGG RML) "

150 Buffalo Southern R.R. Inc. v. Village of Croton-on Hudson, 434 F.Supp.2d 241, 254 (S.D.N.Y. Jun 12, 2006) (NO. 06 CIV. 3755 (CM)) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

151 Buffalo Teachers Federation v. Tobe, 446 F.Supp.2d 134, 151, 213 Ed. Law Rep. 175, 175 (W.D.N.Y. Aug 18, 2005) (NO. 04-CV-457S) "

152 Howard v. U.S., 2009 WL 2524542, *3 (S.D.Ohio Aug 14, 2009) (NO. 1:03-CR-00079, 1:06-CV-00216)

153 Painesville Mini Storage, Inc. v. City of Painesville, 2008 WL 1752139, *3 (N.D.Ohio Apr 14, 2008) (NO. 1:07CV3853)

154 Howard v. U.S., 2007 WL 708618, *2 (S.D.Ohio Mar 02, 2007) (NO. 1:03-CR-00079, 1:06-CV-00216)

155 Lytle v. Potter, 480 F.Supp.2d 986, 990 (N.D.Ohio Oct 06, 2006) (NO. 3:05CV7254) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

156 Mangino v. Pennsylvania Turnpike Com'n, 2008 WL 4412159, *4, 185 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2074

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

(W.D.Pa. Sep 25, 2008) (NO. CIV.A. 07-00370)

H 157 Gary v. Braddock Cemetery, 2008 WL 3914269, *5+ (W.D.Pa. Aug 25, 2008) (NO. 2:05CV1438) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 158 MCQ's Enterprises, Inc. v. Philadelphia Parking Authority, 2007 WL 127728, *4 (E.D.Pa. Jan 11, 2007) (NO. CIV.A.07-0067) " **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

H 159 Benckini v. Upper Saucon Tp., 2005 WL 2649316, *6+ (E.D.Pa. Oct 17, 2005) (NO. CIV.A. 04-4304) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

160 FMC Corp. v. AMVAC Chemical Corp., 379 F.Supp.2d 733, 739 (E.D.Pa. Aug 01, 2005) (NO. CIV.A. 05-CV-2593)

161 Demos v. State of Washington, 2010 WL 479089, *1 (D.S.C. Feb 04, 2010) (NO. C.A. 8:09-3160HMHBHH)

H 162 Enclave Arlington Associates Ltd. Partnership v. City of Arlington, Tex., 669 F.Supp.2d 735, 745 (N.D.Tex. Nov 10, 2009) (NO. 4:09-CV-155-A) " **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

H 163 Hatch v. Boulder Town Council, 2007 WL 2985001, *15 (D.Utah Oct 10, 2007) (NO. 2:01-CV-00071 PGC)

C 164 Mustard v. Lehman, 2006 WL 3692639, *6 (E.D.Wash. Dec 12, 2006) (NO. CV-05-103 RHW) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 165 Johnson v. Manitowoc County, 2010 WL 1905014, *4 (E.D.Wis. May 11, 2010) (NO. 09-C-248) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

H 166 Garcia-Rubiera v. Fortuno, 2010 WL 4608752, *7 (D.Puerto Rico Nov 15, 2010) (NO. CIV. 02-1179 GAG) " **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

H 167 In re El Comandante Management Co., LLC, 359 B.R. 410, 420 (Bankr.D.Puerto Rico May 29, 2006) (NO. 04-10938 (ESL))

168 Cienega Gardens v. U.S., 67 Fed.Cl. 434, 470+ (Fed.Cl. Aug 29, 2005) (NO. 94-10004C, 94-10009C, 94-10013C, 94-10029C, 94-1C, 98-3911C, 98-3912C, 98-39C) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

169 McDowell Residential Properties, L.L.C. v. City of Avondale, 2010 WL 2602047, *4 (Ariz.App. Div. 1 Jun 29, 2010) (NO. 1 CA-CV 09-0301)

H 170 MHC Financing Ltd. Partnership Two v. City of Santee, 107 Cal.Rptr.3d 87, 94, 182 Cal.App.4th 1169, 1177, 10 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 3321, 3321, 10 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 4523, 4523, 2010 Daily Journal D.A.R. 3936, 3936, 2010 Daily Journal D.A.R. 5360, 5360 (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Mar 15, 2010) (NO. D053345, D054298) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

171 City of Riverside v. Stansbury, 66 Cal.Rptr.3d 862, 867, 155 Cal.App.4th 1582, 1588, 07 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 12,246, 12246, 2007 Daily Journal D.A.R. 15,728, 15728 (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Oct 12, 2007) (NO. E040125, E040973)

172 Friends of Riverside's Hills v. City of Riverside, 2007 WL 2729673, *5 (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Sep 20, 2007) (NO. E041576)

H 173 Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. v. Helliker, 42 Cal.Rptr.3d 191, 218, 138 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1172, 06 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 3403, 3403, 2006 Daily Journal D.A.R. 4947, 4947 (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Apr 25, 2006) (NO. B175450) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

174 Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. v. Helliker, 40 Cal.Rptr.3d 278, 304, 136 Cal.App.4th 1464, 1464, 36 Envtl. L. Rep. 20,046, 20046, 06 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 1678, 1678, 2006 Daily Journal

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

D.A.R. 2345, 2345 (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Feb 27, 2006) (NO. B175450) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

175 Inland Valley Development Agency v. Patel, 2005 WL 1693683, *8 (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Jul 21, 2005) (NO. E034937) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

176 The Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles v. Metals, 2005 WL 6290335, *6290335 (Trial Order) (Cal.Superior Nov 15, 2005) **Statement of Decision After Legal Issues Trial** (NO. BC318563) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

177 Sinclair Transp. Co. v. Sandberg, 228 P.3d 198, 206 (Colo.App. Sep 17, 2009) (NO. 08CA1249)

178 New England Estates, LLC v. Town of Branford, 988 A.2d 229, 253+, 294 Conn. 817, 854+ (Conn. Feb 16, 2010) (NO. 18132) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

179 State, Office of Health Care Access v. Housatonic Valley Radiology Associates, P.C., 2009 WL 1424662, *5+ (Conn.Super. Apr 28, 2009) (NO. CV074034061) " **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

180 City of Shelton v. Wiacek Farms, LLC, 2009 WL 765398, *2 (Conn.Super. Feb 24, 2009) (NO. 4001956) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

181 Dibble Edge Partners, LLC v. Town of Wallingford, 2008 WL 4038946, *14, 46 Conn. L. Rptr. 250, 250 (Conn.Super. Aug 06, 2008) (NO. CV064006084S) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

182 Franco v. Dist. of Columbia, 2009 WL 7063042, *7063042+ (Trial Order) (D.C.Super. Feb 10, 2009) **Order Granting Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 2008CA002690B) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

183 Key Properties Group, LLC v. City of Milford, 995 A.2d 147, 152 (Del.Supr. Mar 11, 2010) (NO. 247,2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

184 Bradsheer v. Florida Dept. of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, 20 So.3d 915, 929, 34 Fla. L. Weekly D1955, D1955 (Fla.App. 1 Dist. Sep 25, 2009) (NO. 1D07-6610) *(in dissent)*

185 Forest Preserve Dist. of Du Page County v. First Nat. Bank of Franklin Park, 930 N.E.2d 477, 497, 401 Ill.App.3d 966, 988, 341 Ill.Dec. 267, 287 (Ill.App. 2 Dist. May 27, 2010) (NO. 2-08-0565)

186 Turnipseed v. Brown, 908 N.E.2d 546, 549, 391 Ill.App.3d 88, 92, 330 Ill.Dec. 358, 361 (Ill.App. 1 Dist. May 04, 2009) (NO. 1-08-2571) " **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

187 Murray v. City of Lawrenceburg, 925 N.E.2d 728, 731 (Ind. Apr 20, 2010) (NO. 15S04-0907-CV-310) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

188 State v. Kimco of Evansville, Inc., 902 N.E.2d 206, 212 (Ind. Mar 04, 2009) (NO. 82S01-0806-CV-308) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

189 Wymberley Sanitary Works v. Batliner, 904 N.E.2d 326, 334+ (Ind.App. Apr 14, 2009) (NO. 22A01-0802-CV-55) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

190 Young Partners, LLC v. Board of Educ., Unified School Dist. No. 214, Grant County, 160 P.3d 830, 839, 284 Kan. 397, 407, 220 Ed. Law Rep. 912, 912 (Kan. Jun 22, 2007) (NO. 97,087) " **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

191 YOUNG PARTNERS, LLC, Plaintiff, v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, Unified School District No. 214, Grant County, Kansas, Defendant., 2005 WL 5154810, *5154810 (Trial Order) (Kan.Dist.Ct. Jul 18, 2005) **Journal Entry of Decision By the Court** (NO. 05CV55) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

192 Sapero v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 920 A.2d 1061, 1076, 398 Md. 317, 343 (Md. Apr 12, 2007) (NO. 72 SEPT.TERM 2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

193 Lambert v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 2008 WL 6087348, *6087348 (Trial Order) (Md.Cir.Ct. Jan 30, 2008) **Memorandum of Decision** (NO. 24-C-04-009153)

194 City of Granite Falls v. Soo Line R. Co., 742 N.W.2d 690, 698 (Minn.App. Dec 24, 2007) (NO. A07-417, A07-418) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

195 In re Daniels for Establishment of a Cartway in Glenwood Tp., 2007 WL 48763, *3+ (Minn.App. Jan 09, 2007) (NO. A06-571) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

196 Housing and Redevelopment Authority of City of Saint Paul v. ExxonMobil Oil Corp., 2006 WL 997699, *3+ (Minn.App. Apr 18, 2006) (NO. A05-511)

197 Centene Plaza Redevelopment Corp. v. Mint Properties, 225 S.W.3d 431, 435+ (Mo. Jun 12, 2007) (NO. SC 88487) **HN: 3,4 (S.Ct.)**

198 GREAT RIVERS HABITAT ALLIANCE, et al., Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF ST. PETERS, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 4583537, *4583537 (Trial Order) (Mo.Cir. May 17, 2006) **Amended Order and Final Judgment** (NO. 04CV-326900)

199 Buhmann v. State, 201 P.3d 70, 112, 348 Mont. 205, 269, 2008 MT 465, 465 (Mont. Dec 31, 2008) (NO. 05-473) *(in dissent)*

200 Kellogg v. Dearborn Information Services, LLC, 119 P.3d 20, 24, 328 Mont. 83, 89, 2005 MT 188, 188 (Mont. Jul 28, 2005) (NO. 04-623) " *(in dissent)*

201 City of Omaha v. Tract No. 1, 778 N.W.2d 122, 127, 18 Neb.App. 247, 252 (Neb.App. Jan 26, 2010) (NO. A-09-323) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

202 McCarran Intern. Airport v. Sisolak, 137 P.3d 1110, 1126, 122 Nev. 645, 669 (Nev. Jul 13, 2006) (NO. 41646) "

203 Township of Readington v. Solberg Aviation Co., 976 A.2d 1100, 1122+, 409 N.J.Super. 282, 319+ (N.J.Super.A.D. Aug 19, 2009) (NO. A-1537-08T3, A-3083-07T3)

204 Delanco Tp. v. 325 Delaware Ave., LLC, 2009 WL 1118767, *2+ (N.J.Super.A.D. Apr 28, 2009) (NO. A-2836-07T3) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

205 City of Long Branch v. Anzalone, 2008 WL 3090052, *11+ (N.J.Super.A.D. Aug 07, 2008) (NO. A-0067-06T2, A-0191-06T2, A-0192-06T2, A-0195-06T2, A-0196-06T2, A-0197-06T2, A-0198-06T2, A-0654-06T2) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

206 City of South Amboy v. Lower main Street Development, LLC, 2007 WL 2012370, *3 (N.J.Super.A.D. Jul 13, 2007) (NO. A-0501-05T1) " **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

207 Township of Bloomfield v. 110 Washington Street Associates, 2006 WL 2472993, *2 (N.J.Super.A.D. Aug 29, 2006) (NO. A-6770-04T5)

208 Asbury Park Bd. of Educ. v. City of Asbury Park, 2006 WL 870986, *2+ (N.J.Super.A.D. Apr 06, 2006) (NO. A-1076-04T1, A-1216-04T1)

209 The Borough Of Fort Lee v. Hudson Terrace Realty Management Corp., 2005 WL 3108187, *10 (N.J.Super.A.D. Nov 22, 2005) (NO. A-0334-04T2) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

210 Mount Laurel Tp. v. Mipro Homes, L.L.C., 878 A.2d 38, 48, 379 N.J.Super. 358, 375 (N.J.Super.A.D. Aug 02, 2005) (NO. A-3201-03T1, A-6766-02T1) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

211 State v. The General's Group, L.L.C., 2010 WL 4876902, *4876902+ (Trial Order) (N.J.Super.L. Jul 21, 2010) **Opinion** (NO. BER-L-4853-10, BER-L-4854-10) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

212 Uptown Holdings, LLC v. City of New York, 2011 WL 553392, *1, 2011 N.Y. Slip Op. 01071,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

01071 (N.Y. Feb 17, 2011) (NO. SSD 6) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

H 213 Syracuse University v. Project Orange Associates Services Corp., 897 N.Y.S.2d 335, 337, 71 A.D.3d 1432, 1432, 255 Ed. Law Rep. 344, 2010 N.Y. Slip Op. 02225, 02225 (N.Y.A.D. 4 Dept. Mar 19, 2010) (NO. 09-01732, 208)

H 214 Goldstein v. New York State Urban Development Corp., 879 N.Y.S.2d 524, 532+, 64 A.D.3d 168, 178+, 2009 N.Y. Slip Op. 03903, 03903+ (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. May 12, 2009) (NO. 2008-07064) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

215 GRA V, LLC v. Srinivasan, 862 N.Y.S.2d 358, 367+, 55 A.D.3d 58, 69+, 2008 N.Y. Slip Op. 06432, 06432+ (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Jul 29, 2008) (NO. 1036/06, 2951) " *(in dissent)* **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

H 216 People ex rel. Spitzer v. Grasso, 861 N.Y.S.2d 627, 649, 54 A.D.3d 180, 208, 2008 N.Y. Slip Op. 05970, 05970 (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Jul 01, 2008) (NO. 401620/04, 82) "

H 217 C/S 12th Ave. LLC v. City of New York, 815 N.Y.S.2d 516, 525, 32 A.D.3d 1, 10, 2006 N.Y. Slip Op. 04172, 04172 (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. May 25, 2006) (NO. 7926, 7927, 7928, 7929, 7930, M-6210, M-6216, M-6217, M-6230) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 218 10 Garvies Point Road Corp. v. Glen Cove Indus. Development Agency, 812 N.Y.S.2d 357, 358, 28 A.D.3d 569, 569, 2006 N.Y. Slip Op. 02769, 02769 (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Apr 10, 2006) (NO. 02575/05, 2005-02575)

H 219 Steel Los III, LP v. Power Authority of State, 864 N.Y.S.2d 749, 755, 21 Misc.3d 707, 715, 2008 N.Y. Slip Op. 28367, 28367 (N.Y.Sup. Sep 15, 2008) (NO. 5662/05) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 220 Western New York Dist., Inc. of Wesleyan Church v. Village of Lancaster, 841 N.Y.S.2d 740, 755+, 17 Misc.3d 798, 818+, 2007 N.Y. Slip Op. 27354, 27354+ (N.Y.Sup. Aug 28, 2007) (NO. 2007-4296) " **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

H 221 In re City of New York, 828 N.Y.S.2d 756, 761, 14 Misc.3d 258, 265, 2006 N.Y. Slip Op. 26433, 26433 (N.Y.Sup. Oct 25, 2006) (NO. 4020/04) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 222 State ex rel. Citizen Action for a Livable Montgomery v. Hamilton Cty. Bd. of Elections, 875 N.E.2d 902, 909, 115 Ohio St.3d 437, 444, 2007-Ohio-5379, 5379 (Ohio Oct 08, 2007) (NO. 2007-1732, 3457) " **HN: 4,7 (S.Ct.)**

H 223 Bd. of Trustees of Sinclair Community College Dist. v. Farra, 929 N.E.2d 1105, 1109, 186 Ohio App.3d 662, 667, 258 Ed. Law Rep. 394, 394, 2010-Ohio-1130, 1130 (Ohio App. 2 Dist. Mar 19, 2010) (NO. 23340)

H 224 In re Initiative Petition No. 382, 142 P.3d 400, 408+, 2006 OK 45, 45+ (Okla. Jun 20, 2006) (NO. O-103,021)

H 225 Oklahoma Gas and Elec. Co. v. Beecher, 2010 WL 5617273, *3+, 2011 OK CIV APP 1, 1+ (Okla.Civ.App. Div. 4 Oct 19, 2010) (NO. 107647, 107648, 107649, 107650, 107651, 107839) **HN: 2,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 226 Portland General Elec. Co. v. Mead, 234 P.3d 1048, 1051+, 235 Or.App. 673, 677+ (Or.App. Jun 16, 2010) (NO. 062137, A139931)

H 227 Conti v. Rhode Island Economic Development Corp., 900 A.2d 1221, 1231+ (R.I. Jul 11, 2006) (NO. 2004-109-APPEAL) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

H 228 Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County v. Allen Family Trust, 2009 WL 837731, *4 (Tenn.Ct.App. Mar 27, 2009) (NO. M200800886COAR3CV) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

229 Universal Outdoor, Inc. v. Tennessee Dept. of Transp., 2008 WL 4367555, *9 (Tenn.Ct.App. Sep 24, 2008) (NO. M2006-02212COA-R3CV) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

230 Consolidated Waste Systems, LLC v. Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, 2005 WL 1541860, *8 (Tenn.Ct.App. Jun 30, 2005) (NO. M2002-02582-COA-R3CV) **HN: 2,7 (S.Ct.)**

231 Public Utility Dist. No. 2 of Grant County v. North American Foreign Trade Zone Industries, LLC, 151 P.3d 176, 200, 159 Wash.2d 555, 605 (Wash. Feb 01, 2007) (NO. 76755-6) *(in dissent)*

232 City of Milwaukee Post No. 2874 Veterans of Foreign Wars of U.S. v. Redevelopment Authority of City of Milwaukee, 768 N.W.2d 749, 757, 319 Wis.2d 553, 570, 2009 WI 84, 84 (Wis. Jul 17, 2009) (NO. 2006AP2866)

233 City of Janesville v. CC Midwest, Inc., 734 N.W.2d 428, 435, 302 Wis.2d 599, 613, 2007 WI 93, 93 (Wis. Jul 11, 2007) (NO. 2004AP267) " **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

234 Van Stelle v. Wisconsin Dept. of Transp., 2010 WL 4769457, *4769457 (Wis.App. Nov 24, 2010) (NO. 2010AP972) "

235 Gronberg v. Teton County Housing Authority, 2008 WL 7780396, *7780396 (Trial Order) (Wyo.Dist. Feb 04, 2008) **Order on Motions** (NO. 14336) " **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

236 Castro ex rel. Castro v. Castro, 2009 WL 2461681, *7+ (N. Mariana Islands Aug 07, 2009) (NO. 05-0010-GA, 05-0171)

237 E.L.A. v. Sucesion, 166 D.P.R. 700, 710+, 2006TSPR3, 3+ (P.R. Jan 11, 2006) (NO. CC-2004-1105)

238 Puerto Rico v. Adquisicion de una Estructura localizada en la Calle el Nene Num. 604 Interior, 2010 WL 3282661, *3+ (TCA May 20, 2010) (NO. KEF2008-0171, KLAN20090200)

239 Municipio Autonomo De Guaynabo v. Adquisicion de 2,595.1893 metros cuadrados de terrero radicados en la Bda. Maine, 2008 WL 5611700, *5 (TCA Dec 11, 2008) (NO. KEF2005-0601, KLCE200601471)

240 Municipio Autonomo De Guaynabo v. Adquisicion de 197.8817 metros cuadrados de terrero radicados en la Bda. Maine, 2008 WL 5586715, *5+ (TCA Dec 09, 2008) (NO. KEF2006-0160, KEF20060156, KLCE20060103, KLCE200801412, KLCE200801413, KLCE200801414)

241 Sistemas Urbanos Inc. v. Autoridad De Energia Electrica, 2008 WL 5759752, *6 (TCA Sep 05, 2008) (NO. KAC20057932, KLAN0800808)

242 Municipio Autonomo de Guaynabo v. Adquisicion de 103.6566 metros cuadrados de terrero radicados en la Bda. Maine, 2008 WL 3626476, *4+ (TCA Jun 30, 2008) (NO. KEF2006-0021, KEF2006-0225, KLCE200601436, KLCE200601437)

243 Municipio Autonomo de Guaynabo, representado por su O'Neill Garcia v. Adquisicion de 276.0540 metros cuadrados de terrero radicados en la Bda. Maine, Barrio Los Frailes, Guaynabo, P.R., 2008 WL 3823037, *5+ (TCA Jun 30, 2008) (NO. KEF2006-0268, KLCE200601448)

244 Municipio De Vega Baja v. Rodriguez Rodriguez, 2007 WL 5011098, *2 (TCA Oct 29, 2007) (NO. KEF2007-0191(1003), KLCE200701470)

245 Autoridad De Acueductos Y Alcantarillados De Puerto Rico v. Compania De Parques Nacionales De Puerto Rico, 2006 WL 2265298, *3 (TCA May 30, 2006) (NO. KEF2005-03221002, KLCE2006-0251)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

246 Government of Virgin Islands v. Approx. 21.5969 Acres of Land, 2006 WL 559238, *7 (V.I.Super. Feb 23, 2006) (NO. CIV. 435/2005) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

★ Mentioned

247 M&A Gabaee v. Community Redevelopment Agency of City of Los Angeles, 419 F.3d 1036, 1038, 05 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 7332, 7332, 2005 Daily Journal D.A.R. 9993, 9993 (9th Cir.(Cal.) Aug 17, 2005) (NO. 04-56134, 04-56740)

248 Burns v. Mukasey, 2009 WL 3756489, *5 (E.D.Cal. Nov 06, 2009) (NO. CIVS090497MCECMK) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

249 Korsinsky v. Godici, 2005 WL 2312886, *5 (S.D.N.Y. Sep 22, 2005) (NO. 05 CIV. 2791 (DLC)) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

250 Resource Investments, Inc. v. U.S., 85 Fed.Cl. 447, 471 (Fed.Cl. Jan 23, 2009) (NO. 98-419 L) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

251 Mt. San Jacinto Community College Dist. v. Superior Court, 54 Cal.Rptr.3d 752, 761, 151 P.3d 1166, 1172, 40 Cal.4th 648, 660, 07 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 1863, 1863 (Cal. Feb 22, 2007) (NO. S132251) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

252 City of Stockton v. Marina Towers LLC, 88 Cal.Rptr.3d 909, 916, 171 Cal.App.4th 93, 104, 09 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 1848, 1848, 2009 Daily Journal D.A.R. 2187, 2187 (Cal.App. 3 Dist. Feb 13, 2009) (NO. C054495) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

253 Brooks v. Sweeney, 9 A.3d 347, 362, 299 Conn. 196, 219 (Conn. Dec 14, 2010) (NO. 18459)

254 Town of Branford v. Santa Barbara, 988 A.2d 221, 226, 294 Conn. 803, 812 (Conn. Feb 16, 2010) (NO. 18090)

255 State v. Fernando A., 981 A.2d 427, 435, 294 Conn. 1, 13 (Conn. Nov 03, 2009) (NO. 18045, 18103)

256 Envirotest Systems Corp. v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, 978 A.2d 49, 61, 293 Conn. 382, 400 (Conn. Sep 08, 2009) (NO. 18156) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

257 In re Melody L., 962 A.2d 81, 110, 290 Conn. 131, 178 (Conn. Jan 20, 2009) (NO. 18085, 18086, 18087)

258 Testa v. Geressy, 943 A.2d 1075, 1091, 286 Conn. 291, 318 (Conn. Apr 01, 2008) (NO. 17970) **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

259 City of Bristol v. Ocean State Job Lot Stores of Connecticut, Inc., 931 A.2d 837, 847, 284 Conn. 1, 15 (Conn. Sep 18, 2007) (NO. 17819)

260 Small v. Going Forward, Inc., 915 A.2d 298, 306, 281 Conn. 417, 430 (Conn. Feb 20, 2007) (NO. 17522)

261 Town of Wallingford v. Werbiski, 877 A.2d 749, 756, 274 Conn. 483, 493 (Conn. Jul 19, 2005) (NO. 17376) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

262 C & H Associates Ltd. Partnership v. Town of Stratford, 998 A.2d 833, 837, 122 Conn.App. 198, 204 (Conn.App. Jun 29, 2010) (NO. 30215)

263 Host America Corp. v. Ramsey, 947 A.2d 957, 961, 107 Conn.App. 849, 855, 27 IER Cases 1188, 1188 (Conn.App. May 20, 2008) (NO. 28488)

264 Bryn v. Bryn, 944 A.2d 442, 443, 107 Conn.App. 207, 208 (Conn.App. Apr 22, 2008) (NO.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

27765)

265 Electrical Wholesalers, Inc. v. M.J.B. Corp., 912 A.2d 1117, 1126, 99 Conn.App. 294, 309 (Conn.App. Jan 23, 2007) (NO. 26757)

266 Commissioner of Transp. v. Larobina, 882 A.2d 1265, 1274, 92 Conn.App. 15, 28 (Conn.App. Oct 18, 2005) (NO. 24780) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

267 Cornfield Point Ass'n v. Town of Old Saybrook, 882 A.2d 117, 135, 91 Conn.App. 539, 564 (Conn.App. Sep 27, 2005) (NO. 25316, 25317, 25318)

268 Xplore Technologies Corp. v. Killion, 2010 WL 4277765, *3 (Conn.Super. Oct 08, 2010) (NO. FSTCV105013459S)

269 Oshno Intern. Foundation v. O'Neill, 2010 WL 3960802, *2 (Conn.Super. Sep 08, 2010) (NO. FSTCV106004365S)

270 Rapoport v. Cox, 2009 WL 5698118, *4+ (Conn.Super. Dec 29, 2009) (NO. FSTCV094016796S)

271 Burbank v. Canton Bd. of Educ., 2009 WL 3366272, *3, 48 Conn. L. Rptr. 587, 587 (Conn.Super. Sep 14, 2009) (NO. CV094043192S)

272 J.E.M., Inc. v. Meriden Economic Resources Group, Inc., 2007 WL 4634038, *26 (Conn.Super. Dec 06, 2007) (NO. NNICV990269962S)

273 State v. Rosario, 2007 WL 2702922, *1 (Conn.Super. Aug 30, 2007) (NO. CR05138326, CR05138327)

274 Vegliante v. Town of East Haven, 2007 WL 1120565, *8 (Conn.Super. Mar 29, 2007) (NO. CV064021562) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

275 West v. New Haven Housing Authority, 2006 WL 1680067, *9, 41 Conn. L. Rptr. 531, 531 (Conn.Super. May 23, 2006) (NO. CV044002185S)

276 Singhaviroj v. Town of Fairfield Bd. of Educ., 2005 WL 2083003, *2083003 (Conn.Super. Aug 10, 2005) (NO. CV054006524)

277 DeSilva v. District of Columbia, 2011 WL 650384, *8 (D.C. Feb 24, 2011) (NO. 10-CV-1069)

278 Aaron v. Boston Redevelopment Authority, 850 N.E.2d 1105, 1109, 66 Mass.App.Ct. 804, 809 (Mass.App.Ct. Jul 21, 2006) (NO. 05-P-1115) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

279 LBK Associates, LLC v. Borough of Lodi, 2007 WL 2089275, *1 (N.J.Super.A.D. Jul 24, 2007) (NO. A-1829-05T2) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

280 Goldstein v. New York State Urban Development Corp., 893 N.Y.S.2d 472, 497+, 921 N.E.2d 164, 189+, 13 N.Y.3d 511, 550+, 2009 N.Y. Slip Op. 08677, 08677+ (N.Y. Nov 24, 2009) (NO. 178) *(in dissent)*

281 Sogg v. White, 860 N.E.2d 163, 170, 139 Ohio Misc.2d 58, 66, 2006-Ohio-4223, 4223 (Ohio Com.Pl. Aug 07, 2006) (NO. 04CVG-08-8028)

282 Norfolk Redevelopment and Housing Authority v. C and C Real Estate, Inc., 630 S.E.2d 505, 509, 272 Va. 2, 10 (Va. Jun 08, 2006) (NO. 051708) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

283 Municipio Autonomo de Guaynabo representado por su Alcalde, Hector O'Neill Garcia v. Adquisicion de 197.8817 metros cuadrados de terreno, 2010 WL 5167578, *6, 2010TSPR220, 220 (P.R. Dec 02, 2010) (NO. 180 DPR, CC-2009-16, CC-2009-25)

284 Administracion de Terrenos de Puerto Rico v. Rivera Mercado, 2006 WL 982025, *3 (TCA Jan 31, 2006) (NO. KEF2002-0079, KLCE0501241)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Administrative Decisions (U.S.A.)

IRS Non-Docketed Service Advice Review

285 Non Docketed Service Advice Review, 2008 WL 2804980, *2804980+ (IRS NSAR Jul 11, 2008) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

IRS Private Letter Rulings

C 286 PLR 200644019, 2006 WL 3146751 (IRS PLR Nov 03, 2006) " ★★★ **HN: 2,7 (S.Ct.)**

State Administrative Materials (U.S.A.)

287 Ark. Op. Atty. Gen. No. 2005-150, The Honorable Denny Altes (2005) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

288 Kevin J. Rasch, 2006 WL 1280867 (Conn.A.G.), *1+ (2006) ★★

H 289 Neutral Tandem, Inc. v. Level 3 Communications, LLC, 2008 WL 2491651, *13 (Minn.P.U.C. Mar 24, 2008) (NO. 6403/M-07-354, P-5733, P-5733/C-07-296) ★★

290 In the Matter of a Complaint and Request for Expedited Hearing of Neutral Tandem, Inc., Against Level 3 Communications, LLC In the Matter of the Application of Level 3 Communications, LLC, to Terminate Services to Neutral Tandem, Inc., 2008 WL 4876599, *11 (Minn.P.U.C. Mar 24, 2008) ★★

291 La. Atty. Gen. Op. No. 07-0157, Honorable James E. Mayo (2009) ★★★

292 La. Atty. Gen. Op. No. 08-0100, Hon. E. Wade Shows (2008) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

293 La. Atty. Gen. Op. No. 07-0107, Mr. Scott M. Brame (2007) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

294 La. Atty. Gen. Op. No. 07-0147, Hon. Nita R. Hutter (2007) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

295 The Honorable Jarrod R. Johnson, 2008 WL 1995225 (S.D.A.G.), *2+ (2008) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

296 Tenn. Op. Atty. Gen. No. 06-098, The Honorable Henri Brooks (2006) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 297 Tex. Atty. Gen. Op. GA-0517, The Honorable Frank J. Corte Jr. (2007) ★★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

Other Administrative Materials (U.S.A.)

298 P 13-082 LONG TERM CARE PARTNERS, LLC PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT V UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DEFENDANT-APPELLEE. (2010) ★★

299 P 52,089 CAR DEALER'S "CONVEYANCE FEE" IN CONNECTICUT EXAMINED, CCH Consumer Credit Guide 52089 (2011) ★★

300 ACCOUNTING FOR LAWS THAT APPLY DIFFERENTLY TO THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AND ITS PRIVATE COMPETITORS, 2007 WL 4767370 (F.T.C.), *54+ (2007) ★★

301 13 GAO-RB pt. B, s. 1, 1. THE FIFTH AMENDMENT (2008) ★★★ **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

Registers (U.S.A.)

302 Statutory Prohibition on Use of HUD Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 Funds for Eminent Domain-Related

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Activities, 71 Federal Register 40634 (Jul 17, 2006) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

Secondary Sources (U.S.A.)

303 2010 to 2011 A.L.R. United States Supreme Court Review Part I, 2011 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 1 (2011)

H 304 2009 to 2010 A.L.R. United States Supreme Court Review, 48 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 603 (2010) **HN: 1,2,3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

305 2009 to 2010 A.L.R. United States Supreme Court Review Part I, 2010 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 1 (2010)

H 306 2007 to 2008 ALR United States Supreme Court Review, 30 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 637 (2008)

H 307 2006 to 2007 A.L.R. United States Supreme Court Review, 21 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 559 (2007)

C 308 What Constitutes Taking of Property Requiring Compensation Under Takings Clause of Fifth Amendment to United States Constitution--Supreme Court Cases, 10 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 231 (2006)

C 309 Construction and Application of "Public Use" Restriction in Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause--United States Supreme Court Cases, 10 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 407 (2006) **HN: 1,2,3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 310 Method of determining rate of interest allowed on award to owner of property taken by United States in eminent domain proceeding, 56 A.L.R. Fed. 477 (1982)

311 Construction and Application of U.S. Const. Art. I, s 9, cl. 3, Proscribing Federal Bills of Attainder, 62 A.L.R.6th 517 (2011)

312 2010 to 2011 A.L.R. United States Supreme Court Review Part I, 2011 A.L.R.6th 1 (2011)

H 313 2009 to 2010 A.L.R. United States Supreme Court Review, 56 A.L.R.6th 679 (2010) **HN: 1,2,3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

H 314 Elements and Measure of Compensation in Eminent Domain Proceeding for Temporary Taking of Property, 49 A.L.R.6th 205 (2009)

C 315 Validity of Extraterritorial Condemnation by Municipality, 44 A.L.R.6th 259 (2009)

C 316 2007 to 2008 ALR United States Supreme Court Review, 36 A.L.R.6th 681 (2008)

C 317 2006 to 2007 A.L.R. United States Supreme Court Review, 26 A.L.R.6th 659 (2007)

C 318 Application of Kelo v. City of New London, Conn., 125 S. Ct. 2655, 162 L. Ed. 2d 439, 60 Env't. Rep. Cas. (BNA) 1769, 35 Envtl. L. Rep. 20134, 10 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 733 (U.S. 2005), to "Public Use" Restrictions in Federal and State Constitutions Takings Clauses and Eminent Domain Statutes, 21 A.L.R.6th 261 (2007) **HN: 2,3,4,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 319 Construction and application of rule requiring public use for which property is condemned to be "more necessary" or "higher use" than public use to which property is already appropriated--state takings, 49 A.L.R.5th 769 (1997)

H 320 Measure of damages or compensation in eminent domain as affected by premises being restricted to particular educational, religious, charitable, or noncommercial use, 29 A.L.R.5th 36 (1995)

H 321 Validity, construction, and effect of statute or lease provision expressly governing rights and compensation of lessee upon condemnation of leased property, 22 A.L.R.5th 327 (1994)

C 322 Eminent domain: compensability of loss of visibility of owner's property, 7 A.L.R.5th 113 (1992)

H 323 Eminent domain: unity or contiguity of separate properties sufficient to allow damages for diminished value of parcel remaining after taking of other parcel, 59 A.L.R.4th 308 (1988)

C 324 Eminent domain: industrial park or similar development as public use justifying condemnation of

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

private property, 62 A.L.R.4th 1183 (1988)

H 325 Sufficiency of condemnor's negotiations required as preliminary to taking in eminent domain, 21 A.L.R.4th 765 (1983)

C 326 Eminent domain: possibility of overcoming specific obstacles to contemplated use as element in determining existence of necessary public use, 22 A.L.R.4th 840 (1983)

H 327 Eminent domain: compensability of loss of view from owner's property--state cases, 25 A.L.R.4th 671 (1983)

H 328 Eminent domain: measure and elements of lessee's compensation for condemnor's taking or damaging of leasehold, 17 A.L.R.4th 337 (1982)

C 329 Eminent domain: recovery of value of improvements made with knowledge of impending condemnation, 98 A.L.R.3d 504 (1980)

C 330 Eminent domain: Validity of appropriation of property for anticipated future use, 80 A.L.R.3d 1085 (1977)

C 331 What constitutes abandonment of eminent domain proceeding so as to charge condemnor with liability for condemnee's expenses or the like, 68 A.L.R.3d 610 (1976)

C 332 What constitutes "blighted area" within urban renewal and redevelopment statutes, 45 A.L.R.3d 1096 (1972)

C 333 Eminent domain: Validity of "freezing" ordinances or statutes preventing prospective condemnee from improving, or otherwise changing, the condition of his property, 36 A.L.R.3d 751 (1971)

H 334 Substitute condemnation: power to condemn property or interest therein to replace other property taken for public use, 20 A.L.R.3d 862 (1968)

H 335 Right to condemn property in excess of needs for a particular public purpose, 6 A.L.R.3d 297 (1966)

H 336 Injunction against exercise of power of eminent domain, 93 A.L.R.2d 465 (1964)

C 337 Validity, construction, and effect of statutes providing for urban redevelopment by private enterprise, 44 A.L.R.2d 1414 (1955)

C 338 Establishment or extension of sewer as a public use or purpose for which power of eminent domain may be exercised, 169 A.L.R. 576 (1947)

C 339 Eminent domain; combination of public and private uses or purposes, 53 A.L.R. 9 (1928)

C 340 Public benefit or convenience as distinguished from use by the public as ground for the exercise of the power of eminent domain, 54 A.L.R. 7 (1928)

H 341 Exercise of eminent domain for purpose of irrigating land of private owner, 27 A.L.R. 519 (1923)

C 342 Right to condemn property previously condemned or purchased for public use, but not actually so used, 12 A.L.R. 1502 (1921)

343 AHLA Seminar Materials P01250703, A. Public Health Law in Practice: Bioterrorism and Infectious Disease

344 Alabama Law of Damages s 16:1, Requirement of just compensation (2010)

345 Alabama Law of Damages s 16:61, Actions for damages (2010)

346 Anderson's American Law of Zoning s 17:18, Post-Kelo Eminent Domain Reforms; generally (2010) **HN: 3,6,7 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

347 Anderson's American Law of Zoning s 17:4, Supreme Court Jurisprudence (2010) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

348 Anderson's American Law of Zoning s 17:5, The public use requirement; generally (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

349 Anderson's American Law of Zoning s 17:7, Economic Development as a Public Purpose (2010) **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

350 Anderson's American Law of Zoning s 17:8, Pretextual Public Purposes and Private Benefits (2010) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

351 Anderson's American Law of Zoning s 1:15, Eminent domain (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

352 11 Arizona Practice A.R.S. s 12-1111, s 12-1111. Purposes For Which Eminent Domain May Be Exercised (2011) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

353 11 Arizona Practice Const Art 2 s 17, s 17. Eminent Domain; Just Compensation For Private Property Taken; Public Use As Judicial Question (2011) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

354 Arkansas Law Of Damages s 18:1, The power of eminent domain (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

355 Baldwin's Ohio Prac. Merrick-Rippner Probate Law s 105:9, Blight, urban renewal and economic development (2010)

356 BNA Tax Management State Portfolios No. 1450 s 05, 1450.05. STATE INITIATIVES AND POLICY DIRECTIONS

357 BNA Tax Management State Portfolios No. 1460 s 05, 1460.05. STATE INITIATIVES AND POLICY DIRECTIONS

358 BNA Tax Management State Portfolios No. 1470 s 05, 1470.05. STATE INITIATIVES AND POLICY DIRECTIONS

359 Business and Commercial Litigation in Federal Courts s 90:10, Zoning disputes-Taking claims (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

360 California Real Estate 2d Digest Eminent Domain s 10, In general (2011)

361 California Real Estate 2d Digest Eminent Domain s 102, Sufficiency (2011)

362 California Real Estate 2d Digest Eminent Domain s 127, In general (2011)

363 California Real Estate 2d Digest Eminent Domain s 3, Nature of power (2011)

364 California Real Estate 2d Digest Eminent Domain s 7, What constitutes public use or purpose (2011)

365 California Real Estate 2d Digest Eminent Domain s 73, In general (2011)

366 California Real Estate 2d Digest Eminent Domain s 9, Particular uses and purposes (2011)

367 Carmody Wait 2d New York Practice with Forms s 108:12, Generally (2011) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

368 Carmody Wait 2d New York Practice with Forms s 108:13, Where private interests benefited (2011) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

369 Carmody Wait 2d New York Practice with Forms s 108:16, Economic development and construction (2011) **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

370 Carmody Wait 2d New York Practice with Forms s 108:7, Determination of necessity for exercise of power (2011) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

371 Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Litigation: The Law of Section 1983 s 3:68, Substantive due pro-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

cess and taking law (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

372 3 Connecticut Practice Series FORM 404.1, Condemnation proceedings, other than highway (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

373 9B Connecticut Practice Series s 54:1, Constitutional basis for confiscation claims (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

374 Construction and Development Financing, Third Ed. s 1:74.10, Supreme Court expands public use (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

375 29 Construction Contracts Law Report 240, Kelo Backlash Evident In Recently Proposed Federal Legislation (2005)

376 29 Construction Contracts Law Report 368, Congress Pushes Legislation In Response To Kelo (2005)

377 30 Construction Contracts Law Report 351, 110th Congress To Bring Change In Political Climate; Voters Support Transportation Funding And Limiting Kelo Decision (2006)

378 Cyclopedia of Federal Procedure s 83:48, Standard of review (2010) **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

379 28 Employment Practices Update 3, Property Interests (2005)

380 Environmental Obligations in Bankruptcy s 7:70, The constitutionality of lien laws-Taking without just compensation (2011) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

381 Environmental Regulation of Land Use s 14:12, Recent developments in taking jurisprudence-Kelo and the scope of "public use" (2010)

382 Environmental Regulation of Land Use s 14:6, The traditional taking analysis (2010)

383 Environmental Regulation of Land Use s 6:50, The future of farmland preservation (2010)

384 Federal Land Use Law & Litigation s 3:28, Lingle, San Remo and Kelo: The 2005 Takings Trilogy-Kelo: Public Use Requirement of the Fifth Amendment (2010) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

385 Federal Jury Practice and Instructions CH 154 INTRO, Introduction (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

386 Federal Procedural Forms s 13:1, Power of eminent domain; methods of exercising condemnation power (2010)

387 Federal Procedural Forms s 13:136, Complaint or petition for inverse condemnation-Enactment of ordinance favorable to third party prevents development of property by owner [28 U.S.C.A. ss1331, 1367, 1391; 2201] (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

388 Federal Procedural Forms s 13:66, Payment of estimated compensation-Who is entitled to receive compensation (2010)

389 Federal Procedural Forms s 13:83, Trial by court-Particular issues to be decided by court (2010)

390 Federal Procedure, Lawyers Edition s 14:2, Purposes of condemnation action (2011)

391 Federal Procedure, Lawyers Edition s 14:44, Necessity and amount of taking (2011)

392 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 2913, In general (2011) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

393 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 2914, What constitutes public use (2011) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

394 Fletcher Cyclopedia Law of Private Corporations s 2914.100, What constitutes public use-Effect of limited public benefit or incidental private gain (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

395 2/15/2006 Florida Bar News, The 2, CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS (2006)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

396 Gelfand, State and Local Government Debt Financing s 1:18, Public purpose doctrine (2010) **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

397 Gelfand, State and Local Government Debt Financing s 1:19, Public purpose doctrine-Trend to expand definition (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

398 Georgia Eminent Domain s 3-1, In general (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

399 27 Indiana Practice Series IC 32-24-4.5-1, Applicability of chapter (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

400 17 Iowa Practice Series s 14:1, Constitutional overview of the eminent domain power (2011) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

401 17 Iowa Practice Series s 14:2, Statutory overview of condemnations (2011)

402 17 Iowa Practice Series s 14:4, Statutory definition of "public use," "public purpose," or "public improvement" (2011)

403 17 Iowa Practice Series s 14:5, Limitations on condemnation of agricultural land (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

404 Land Use Prac. & Forms: Handling Land Use Case APP P, Appendix P. Brief Amicus Curiae Of John Norquist, President, Congress For New Urbanism, In Support Of Petitioners (2010)

405 Land Use Prac. & Forms: Handling Land Use Case s 21:2, Burden of Proof and Standing (2010) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

406 Land Use Prac. & Forms: Handling Land Use Case s 21:3, Federal Courts (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

407 Land Use Prac. & Forms: Handling Land Use Case s 21:4, State Courts (2010) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

408 Land Use Prac. & Forms: Handling Land Use Case s 21:5, Discussion (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

409 Law of Condominium Operations s 12:2.10, Constitutional issues; State and federal regulation of association (2010)

410 Law of Independent Power s 6:131, Land use-Vestings and takings (2010)

411 Law of Water Rights and Resources s 5:24, Access to water (2010)

412 Local Government Law s 16:53.20, Regulatory takings-Takings cases on the merits: A three-part analytical framework (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

413 Local Government Law s 16:56, Urban redevelopment of "blighted" areas (2010)

414 Local Government Law s 21:23, Public use-Public use, generally (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

415 Local Government Law s 21:28, Public use-Reversion to prior ownership (2010)

416 Local Government Law s 21:29, Public use-Judicial review (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

417 Louisiana Real Estate Transactions s 20:37, Expropriation (2010)

418 10 Mass. Prac. Series s 30:1, Eminent domain-In general (2010)

419 18B Mass. Prac. Series s 28.2, Authority to exercise power (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

420 Matthews Municipal Ordinances s 1A:11, Federal preemption of local laws-Constitutional provisions (2010)

421 McQuillin The Law of Municipal Corporations s 19:34, Protection of private property (2011) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

422 McQuillin The Law of Municipal Corporations s 32:45, Basis of public use doctrine (2011) **HN:**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1,2,3 (S.Ct.)

423 McQuillin The Law of Municipal Corporations s 32:46, Definitions and distinctions (2011) **HN: 2,3 (S.Ct.)**

424 McQuillin The Law of Municipal Corporations s 32:47, Legislative determination of public character of use (2011) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

425 McQuillin The Law of Municipal Corporations s 32:48, Incidental benefits to individuals (2011) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

426 McQuillin The Law of Municipal Corporations s 32:49, Unlawful purposes (2011)

427 McQuillin The Law of Municipal Corporations s 32:50, Who may raise objection (2011)

428 Miller and Starr California Real Estate s 30A:1, Introduction (2011)

429 Miller and Starr California Real Estate s 30A:2, Scope of California's eminent domain statute (2011)

430 Miller and Starr California Real Estate s 30A:4, The right to take (2011)

431 Miller and Starr California Real Estate s 30A:6, Rights included in grant of eminent domain authority; types of property interests (2011)

432 Miller and Starr California Real Estate s 30B:2, Sources and validity of Redevelopment Law (2011)

433 Miller and Starr California Real Estate s 30B:20, Challenges to public use or purpose of agency's exercise of eminent domain power (2011)

434 16 NO. 1 Miller & Starr, California Real Estate Newsalert 1, A Takings Trifecta: The Supreme Court's Lingle, San Remo & Kelo Decisions (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

435 16 NO. 1 Miller & Starr, California Real Estate Newsalert 15, Eminent Domain (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

436 16 NO. 1 Miller & Starr, California Real Estate Newsalert 8, Community Redevelopment (2005)

437 17 NO. 4 Miller & Starr, California Real Estate Newsalert 1, REDEVELOPMENT REDEFINED: STATE LEGISLATIVE RESPONSES TO THE KELO DECISION (2007) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

438 17 NO. 4 Miller & Starr, California Real Estate Newsalert 2, STATUTORY UPDATE: (2007)

439 18 NO. 3 Miller & Starr, California Real Estate Newsalert 14, Eminent Domain (2008)

440 4 Minnesota Practice Series CAT 52 NOTE 1, Note 1 (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

441 25 Minnesota Practice Series s 10:6, The public use requirement (2010) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

442 18 MO Practice Series s 26:8, Constitutional issues in redevelopment incentives and public use (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

443 18 MO Practice Series s 26:9, Eminent domain and redevelopment incentives (2010) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

444 35 MO Practice Series s 35:1, Overview (2011) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

445 35 MO Practice Series s 35:9, Defenses (2011)

446 17A MO Practice Series s 86.01-1, Authority to condemn (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

447 17A MO Practice Series s 86.03-1, Persons entitled to condemn property (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

448 18A MO Practice Series s 64:1, The five "P's" (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

449 1 Nebraska Practice 13.01, NJI2d Civ. 13.01. Eminent Domain-Property Taken-Issues, Burden of Proof, and Condemnee's Compensation (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

450 35 N.J. Prac. Series s 21:5, Eminent domain and redevelopment (2010) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

451 36 N.J. Prac. Series s 11.5, Off-tract improvement on private property (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

452 36 N.J. Prac. Series s 2.11, Implementation of the master plan-Eminent domain (2010)

453 36 N.J. Prac. Series s 24.1, Redevoplment plans-In general (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

454 13C N.J. Prac. Series s 46.35, Regulatory takings (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

455 New York Law and Practice of Real Property s 31:10, Illustrations of "public use" (2010)

456 New York Law and Practice of Real Property s 31:9, Requirement of public use (2010)

457 New York Pattern Jury Instructions--Civil 6:15, Landlord and Tenant--Defenses and Counter-claims-Eminent Domain (2011) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

458 New York Practice, Landlord & Tenant Practice in New York s 10:158, Impact of condemnation by "eminent domain"-"Eminent domain," defined (2010) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

459 New York Zoning Law and Practice, Fourth Edition s 11:28, Exclusion of religious uses (2010)

460 New York Zoning Law and Practice, Fourth Edition s 14:02, Local land use regulations and agri-culture (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

461 New York Zoning Law and Practice, Fourth Edition s 1:06, Eminent domain (2010) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

462 New York Zoning Law and Practice, Fourth Edition s 5A:3, Relationship between federal and state constitutional provisions (2010)

463 New York Zoning Law and Practice, Fourth Edition s 5A:6, Public use (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

464 2008 Norton Annual Survey of Bankruptcy Law PT I s 5, Is There a Legal Basis for Cross-Collateralization? (2008)

465 2009 Norton Annual Survey of Bankruptcy Law PT I s 5, Don't Throw Away Your Deepening Insolvency Materials Just Yet... Damages Under Thabault v. Chait, and Harmonizing Brown Schools with Radnor Holdings and Post-CitX Case Law (2009)

466 Ohio Municipal Law s 18:3, Purposes for which private property may be taken (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

467 Ohio Municipal Law s 26:21, Constitutional issues in urban renewal-Public use (2010) **HN: 3,6 (S.Ct.)**

468 Ohio Municipal Law s 26:22, Use of renewal area for commercial or industrial development (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

469 Ohio Planning and Zoning Law s 2:6, Eminent domain (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

470 Ohio Real Estate Law and Practice s 54:1.50, Public purpose-Background (2010)

471 Ohio Real Estate Law and Practice s 54:1.51, Public purpose-Moratorium (2010)

472 Ordinance Law Annotations Buildings s 146, Generally (2010)

473 Ordinance Law Annotations Eminent Domain s 1, Origin of power (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

474 Ordinance Law Annotations Eminent Domain s 8, Generally (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

475 Ordinance Law Annotations Eminent Domain s 9, Private uses (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

476 Ordinance Law Annotations Redevelopment and Public Housing s 1, Authority and limitations generally (2010)

477 Patry on Copyright s 2:30, The history of English-language general-use dictionaries (2010)

478 Pindar's Ga. Real Estate Law & Proc. with Forms s 2-9, Definition of public purpose (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

479 Public Natural Resources Law s 1:7, State-owned public lands (2011) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

480 Public Natural Resources Law s 3:20, Condemnation purposes (2011)

481 Public Natural Resources Law s 4:13, The "background principles" exception to the Lucas categorical rule (2011)

482 Rathkopf's The Law of Zoning and Planning s 6:12, Taking for private use (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

483 Rathkopf's The Law of Zoning and Planning s 6:66, Planning (2010)

484 Rathkopf's The Law of Zoning and Planning s 6:67, Precondemnation conduct (2010)

485 Real Estate Law Digest, Fourth Edition s 18:3, Necessity for valid public purpose (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

486 Real Estate Law Digest, Fourth Edition s 6:66, Acquisition of property (2010)

487 Religious Organizations and the Law s 15:11, Eminent domain decisions (2011)

... Reynolds Hornbook on Local Government Law App., Appendix: Researching Local Government Law on Westlaw® (Text not available on WESTLAW)

... Reynolds Hornbook on Local Government Law § 19.126, § 126. Municipal Use of Eminent Domain-“Public Use” or “Public Purpose” (Text not available on WESTLAW)

... Reynolds Hornbook on Local Government Law § 20.133, § 133. Constitutionality of Urban Renewal (Text not available on WESTLAW)

491 Standard Pennsylvania Practice s 124:14, Generally (2011) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

492 Standard Pennsylvania Practice s 124:15, Determination of what constitutes public use (2011) **HN: 4,6 (S.Ct.)**

493 Standard Pennsylvania Practice s 124:16, Extent of taking as related to public purpose (2011) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

494 Standard Pennsylvania Practice s 124:18, Particular uses (2011) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

495 State and Local Government Land Use Liability s 12:12, The "public use" component of the takings clause (2010) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

496 State and Local Government Land Use Liability s 13:3, Substantive due-process challenges to purpose or rationality of ordinances (2010)

497 Subdivision Law & Growth Management s 1:14, Constitutional power-Planning (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

498 Subdivision Law & Growth Management s 3:26, Equal protection clause (2010)

499 Subdivision Law & Growth Management s 6:35, Urban redevelopment (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

500 Successful Partnering Between Inside & Outside Csl s 74:37, Leases, licenses, and use and occupancy agreements-Condemnation, casualty, and insurance (2010)

501 Sutherland Statutes and Statutory Construction s 77:8, Eminent domain (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

502 Tenn. Prac., Civil Procedure Forms s 71:1, Condemnation of property-Rule 71 (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

503 Tenn. Prac., Rules of Civil Procedure R 71, Rule 71. CONDEMNATION OF PROPERTY (2010) **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

504 Tenn. Prac., Rules of Civil Procedure s 71:2, AC 71:2. The constitutional public use requirement (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

505 Texas Jurisprudence Pleading & Practice Forms 2d Ed s 106:5, Eminent domain authority-Private corporations, public utilities, and housing authorities (2010) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

506 14 Tex. Prac. Series s 67.1, Power of eminent domain (2011) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

507 22 Tex. Prac. Series s 6.09, Eminent domain (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

508 35 Tex. Prac. Series s 9.30, Eminent domain/condemnation (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

509 46 Tex. Prac. Series s 29.5, Elements of an inverse condemnation action (2010)

510 5A Tex. Prac. Series s 39.1, Introduction to eminent domain in Texas lands (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

511 Tiffany Real Property s 1252, The power to appropriate (2010)

512 Toxic Torts Litigation Guide s 22:26, Eminent domain and inverse condemnation (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

513 Treatise on Constitutional Law s 15.1(a), Introduction (2010) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

514 Treatise on Constitutional Law s 15.13, The "Public Use" Limitation (2010) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

515 West's Federal Administrative Practice s 5278, Constitutional issues (2010)

516 20 West's Pennsylvania Practice s 1312:13, Issues on appeal where permission granted-Law, order addressing unsettled issue of (2010)

517 8 Witkin, California Summary 10th Constitutional Law s 1122, In General.

C 518 Wright & Miller: Federal Prac. & Proc. s 1216, Statement of the Claim-Significance of "Claim for Relief" (2011) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

519 Zoning and Planning Deskbook, Second Edition s 7:18.50, Denial of due process-Defective proceedings below-Irrational application of zoning classification-Eminent domain and "public use" (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

520 1 Am. Jur. Proof of Facts 2d 401, Blighted Area (2010) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

521 71 Am. Jur. Proof of Facts 3d 97, Eminent Domain: Proof of Lack of Reasonable Necessity for Taking of Property (2011) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

522 8 Am. Jur. Trials 57, Condemnation of Rural Property For Highway Purposes (2010)

523 11 Am. Jur. Trials 189, Condemnation of Urban Property (2010) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 524 Am. Jur. 2d Constitutional Law s 395, Appropriation of private property (2010) **HN: 1,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 525 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 31, Condemnor's discretion (2010)

C 526 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 42, Generally; state constitutional requirements and limitations (2010) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 527 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 43, Taking for private uses (2010)

C 528 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 473, Answer, preliminary objections, or traverse (2010)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 529 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 49, Incidental public use or benefit where dominant purpose is private (2010)

C 530 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 50, Incidental public use or benefit where dominant purpose is private-Assistance of private enterprise (2010)

C 531 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 52, Generally (2010)

C 532 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 56, Drainage (2010)

C 533 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 730, Generally (2010)

C 534 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 739, Generally; statutory remedies (2010)

C 535 Am. Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 777, Taking for private purpose (2010)

C 536 Am. Jur. 2d Injunctions s 244, Burden of proof (2010)

537 Cal. Civ. Prac. Real Property Litigation s 14:104.40, Community redevelopment (2010)

538 Cal. Civ. Prac. Real Property Litigation s 15:12, Requirement of public necessity (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

539 CJS Constitutional Law s 1415, Eminent domain (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

540 CJS Constitutional Law s 1861, Generally (2011) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 541 CJS Constitutional Law s 744, Limitations and restrictions; police power (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 542 CJS Eminent Domain s 27, Necessity that use be public (2011) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 543 CJS Eminent Domain s 29, What is public use (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 544 CJS Eminent Domain s 346, Presumptions and burden of proof-Challenge of taking by condemnee (2011)

C 545 CJS Eminent Domain s 348, Sufficiency of evidence (2011)

546 CJS Eminent Domain s 556, Statutory provisions and remedies (2011)

C 547 CJS Eminent Domain s 58, Legislative exercise of power (2011) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

548 Ga. Jur. Property s 19:54, Purposes for which eminent domain may be exercised, generally (2011) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

549 Illinois Civil Practice Forms s 106:1, Governing law (2010) **HN: 3,6 (S.Ct.)**

550 Illinois Civil Practice Forms s 106:10, By city for economic development (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

551 Ind. Law Encycl. Eminent Domain s 9, Effect of Kelo and Eminent Domain Act provisions (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

552 Mich. Civ. Jur. Eminent Domain s 23, Constitutional issues (2011) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

553 Mich. Civ. Jur. Municipal Corporations s 245, Power to condemn property for a public use (2011)

554 Mich. Civ. Jur. Municipal Corporations s 246, Power to condemn property for a public use-Construction of power (2011)

555 Mich. Civ. Jur._Zoning s 3, Balancing public and private interests (2011) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

556 NY Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 22, Public use as legislative or judicial question (2011)

557 NY Jur. 2d Eminent Domain s 25, Use by public as test (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

558 OH Jur. 3d Eminent Domain s 33, State declaration of public use as binding on federal courts

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

(2011)

559 OH Jur. 3d Eminent Domain s 39, Primary public use or purpose; incidental private use or benefit (2011)

560 OH Jur. 3d Eminent Domain s 40, Generally (2011)

561 OH Jur. 3d Eminent Domain s 81, Determination of necessity for, location and extent of, appropriation (2011)

562 OH Jur. 3d Public Housing & Urban Renewal s 50, Generally (2011)

563 Summ PA Jur. 2d Property s 11:21, Public purpose or use (2010) **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

564 Summ PA Jur. 2d Property s 11:33, Need for taking property-Future need (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

565 TX Jur. 3d Eminent Domain s 91, Generally (2011) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

566 TX Jur. 3d Eminent Domain s 94, Generally (2011)

567 TX Jur. 3d Eminent Domain s 95, Dependent on character of use (2011)

568 TX Jur. 3d Eminent Domain s 96, Statutory limitations for private parties or economic development (2011)

569 TX Jur. 3d Urban Renewal s 1, Generally (2011)

570 SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SMART GROWTH AND URBAN POLICY 2006 ANNUAL REPORT, 2006 ABA Env't, Energy, & Resources L.: Year in Rev. 170, 173 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

571 CONSTITUTIONAL LAW 2005 Annual Report, 2005 ABA Env't, Energy, & Resources L.: Year in Rev. 340, 344 (2005) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

572 OREGON LAYS DOWN LAW ON LAND USE Supreme Court Upholds Referendum Requiring Compensation for Property Restrictions, 5 NO. 9 A.B.A. J. E-Report 5, 5+ (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

573 JUSTICE STEVENS' LEGACY IN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW, 41 NO. 6 ABA Trends 6, 6 (2010) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

574 TRENDS IN CONSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW, 37 NO. 4 ABA Trends 8, 9+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

575 IN BRIEF, 37 NO. 2 ABA Trends 6, 6 (2005) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

576 SUPREME COURT NEWS, 31-FALL Admin. & Reg. L. News 16, 17+ (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 577 HIDING NONDELEGATION IN MOUSEHOLES, 62 Admin. L. Rev. 19, 68 (2010)

C 578 A COSTLY SIGNALING THEORY OF "HARD LOOK" JUDICIAL REVIEW, 58 Admin. L. Rev. 753, 813+ (2006)

579 THE "DISCONNECT" IN "CONNECTIVITY" LEGAL ISSUES CONCERNING CONDITIONS OF DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL REQUIRING PRIVATE ACCESS WAYS BETWEEN NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES, 52-APR Advocate (Idaho) 31, 33+ (2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

580 THE MEDIA, ATTORNEYS AND THE LAWMAKING PROCESS, 48-DEC Advocate (Idaho) 14, 14+ (2005)

581 OBAMA, THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT, AND THE DRUG WAR, 44 Akron L. Rev. 303, 331 (2011)

582 CLARENCE THOMAS (2011)

C 583 THE CONSTITUTIONAL JURISPRUDENCE OF SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR: A REFUSAL TO "FORECLOSE THE UNANTICIPATED", 39 Akron L. Rev. 373, 415 (2006)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

584 DO JUDGES SYSTEMATICALLY FAVOR THE INTERESTS OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION?, 59 Ala. L. Rev. 453, 505 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

585 REVISITING KELO AND EMINENT DOMAIN'S "SUMMER OF SCRUTINY", 59 Ala. L. Rev. 561, 610+ (2008) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

586 UNBUNDLING PROPERTY IN WATER, 59 Ala. L. Rev. 679, 745 (2008)

587 HOW TO CREATE-OR DESTROY-WEALTH IN REAL PROPERTY, 58 Ala. L. Rev. 741, 763 (2007)

588 IN PURSUIT OF ACTUAL JUSTICE, 59 Ala. L. Rev. 1, 49+ (2007)

589 WHO WILL REDEVELOP REDEVELOPMENT?: POWER AND PRAGMATISM IN CALIFORNIA REDEVELOPMENT LAW, 12 Alb. L. Envtl. Outlook J. 93, 137+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

590 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND EMINENT DOMAIN AFTER KELO: PROPERTY RIGHTS AND "PUBLIC USE" UNDER STATE CONSTITUTIONS, 11 Alb. L. Envtl. Outlook J. 41, 88+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

591 WHY THE GOOGLE BOOK SEARCH SETTLEMENT SHOULD BE APPROVED: A RESPONSE TO ANTITRUST CONCERNS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR REGULATION, 21 Alb. L.J. Sci. & Tech. 231, 278 (2011) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

592 LINE IN THE SAND: PROGRESSIVE LAWYERING, "MASTER COMMUNITIES," AND A BATTLE FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN NEW YORK CITY, 73 Alb. L. Rev. 715, 763 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

593 REGIONALISM REVISITED: THE EFFORT TO STREAMLINE GOVERNANCE IN BUFFALO AND ERIE COUNTY, NEW YORK, 71 Alb. L. Rev. 117, 163+ (2008)

594 PUBLIC USE & PUBLIC BENEFIT: THE BATTLE FOR UPSTATE NEW YORK, 71 Alb. L. Rev. 673, 695+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

595 OUT OF THE BOTTLE: THE GENIE OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY, 70 Alb. L. Rev. 1045, 1053 (2007) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

596 TAKING PRIVATE PROPERTY TO BUILD AN URBAN SPORTS ARENA: A VALID EXERCISE OF EMINENT DOMAIN POWERS?, 69 Alb. L. Rev. 1135, 1167+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

597 AT LAST, SOME CLARITY: THE POTENTIAL LONG-TERM IMPACT OF LINGLE V. CHEVRON AND THE SEPARATION OF TAKINGS AND SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS, 69 Alb. L. Rev. 343, 356 (2006)

598 SONIA ON SETTLING: THE NEW JUSTICE EMPHASIZES AGREEMENT, 27 Alternatives to High Cost Litig. 138, 140+ (2009) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

599 TAKINGS AND TITLE 11: GOVERNMENTAL POWER AND THE BANKRUPTCY ESTATE, 29-MAY Am. Bankr. Inst. J. 12, 91 (2010)

600 THE DIRTY DOZEN: HOW TWELVE SUPREME COURT CASES RADICALLY EXPANDED GOVERNMENT AND ERODED FREEDOM ROBERT A. LEVY AND WILLIAM MELLOR (THE CATO INSTITUTE, 2009), 29-MAY Am. Bankr. Inst. J. 54, 54 (2010)

601 COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS AND CHAPTER 9 BANKRUPTCY, 81 Am. Bankr. L.J. 295, 340 (2007)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

602 TAKING CONTROL The Eminent Domain Controversy Finds a Battlefront in the Development of a Cincinnati Suburb, 91-DEC A.B.A. J. 45, 46+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

603 CASES & CONTROVERSIES Some Decisions Are All the Rage-Literally, 91-OCT A.B.A. J. 38, 41+ (2005)

C 604 A "COMMONEST" MANIFESTO: PROPERTY AND THE GENERAL WELFARE, 46 Am. Bus. L.J. 103, 137+ (2009)

605 HOW THE ANTI-GAMING BACKLASH IS REDEFINING TRIBAL GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONS, 34 Am. Indian L. Rev. 171, 201 (2010)

C 606 THE AMERICAN INDIAN PROBATE REFORM ACT OF 2004: THE DEATH OF FRACTIONATION OR INDIVIDUAL NATIVE AMERICAN PROPERTY INTERESTS AND TRIBAL CUSTOMS?, 30 Am. Indian L. Rev. 401, 422 (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

607 THE PROTECTION OF FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 58 Am. J. Comp. L. 437, 453+ (2010) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 608 THE BOUNDARIES OF PROPERTY RIGHTS: LA NOTION DE BIENS, 54 Am. J. Comp. L. 145, 165 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 609 KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT: ARE PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS REALLY IN DANGER?, 29 Am. J. Trial Advoc. 443, 466+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

610 A BARGAINING MODEL OF HOLDOUTS AND TAKINGS, 9 Am. L. & Econ. Rev. 160, 174 (2007)

611 MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS: BALANCING RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, 101 Am. Soc'y Int'l L. Proc. 3, 60+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

612 A LOOK AT THE COMPULSORY LICENSE IN INVESTMENT ARBITRATION: THE CASE OF INDIRECT EXPROPRIATION, 25 Am. U. Int'l L. Rev. 357, 422 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 613 REGULATING MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS: TOWARDS PRINCIPLES OF CROSS-BORDER LEGAL FRAMEWORKS IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD BALANCING RIGHTS WITH RESPONSIBILITIES, 23 Am. U. Int'l L. Rev. 451, 558+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 614 RESOLVING THE INTERGENERATIONAL CONFLICTS OF REAL PROPERTY LAW: PRESERVING FREE MARKETS AND PERSONAL AUTONOMY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS, 56 Am. U. L. Rev. 1525, 1582+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 615 PRIVATIZING EMINENT DOMAIN: THE DELEGATION OF A VERY PUBLIC POWER TO PRIVATE, NON-PROFIT AND CHARITABLE CORPORATIONS, 56 Am. U. L. Rev. 455, 514+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 616 LEGAL STANDING FOR ANIMALS AND ADVOCATES, 13 Animal L. 61, 86+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 617 SHOULD KELO BE CONDEMNED? Arizona's Experience with the Public Use Requirement, 43-NOV Ariz. Att'y 30, 30+ (2006)

C 618 KELO'S EVER-PRESENT THREAT A Call to Action for Legislative Relief, 43-NOV Ariz. Att'y 31, 31+ (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 619 THE SOCIAL OBLIGATION OF PROPERTY OWNERSHIP: A COMPARISON OF GERMAN AND U.S. LAW, 24 Ariz. J. Int'l & Comp. L. 389, 449+ (2007)

C 620 LAND USE REGULATION IN ARIZONA AFTER THE PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS PRO-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

TECTION ACT, 51 Ariz. L. Rev. 211, 235+ (2009)

621 BIG ROADS, BIG RIGHTS: VARIETIES OF PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE AND THEIR IMPACT ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES, 50 Ariz. L. Rev. 409, 443 (2008)

622 RECONSIDERING POLETOWN: IN THE WAKE OF KELO, STATES SHOULD MOVE TO RESTORE PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS, 48 Ariz. L. Rev. 369, 395+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

623 LESSONS FROM OREGON: ARIZONA'S APPROACH TO LAND USE REGULATION, 41 Ariz. St. L.J. 505, 530+ (2009) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

624 JUDICIAL AUTONOMY IN A POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT, 38 Ariz. St. L.J. 1, 14 (2006)

625 ARIZONA'S "PUBLIC USE" DEBATE: STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS ON THE POWER TO TAKE PRIVATE PROPERTY, 38 Ariz. St. L.J. 1169, 1195+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

626 DIALOGIC JUDICIAL REVIEW, 61 Ark. L. Rev. 205, 216 (2008)

627 THE REGULATION OF SUPERSTORES: THE LEGALITY OF ZONING ORDINANCES EMERGING FROM THE SKIRMISHES BETWEEN WAL-MART AND THE UNITED FOOD AND COMMERCIAL WORKERS UNION, 58 Ark. L. Rev. 833, 882+ (2006) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

628 POST-KELO DETERMINATION OF PUBLIC USE AND EMINENT DOMAIN IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT UNDER ARKANSAS LAW, 59 Ark. L. Rev. 43, 92+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

629 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS, 58 Ark. L. Rev. 753, 756 (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

630 THE DIRTY DOZEN, 2009-JUN Army Law. 50, 51+ (2009)

631 A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: LEGAL AND CULTURAL ASPECTS OF LAND CONDEMNATION IN THE PRACTICE OF EMINENT DOMAIN IN JAPAN AND AMERICA, 8 Asian-Pac. L. & Pol'y J. 456, 474+ (2007) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

632 A DETAILED LOOK AT CALIFORNIA RETAIL LEASES AND HOW TO CHANGE THEM TO MEET YOUR NEEDS, 2009 WL 3334636 (ASPLBL), *173 (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

633 6 Ave Maria L. Rev. 155, ORIGINALISM AND PRECEDENT: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES IN THE APPLICATION OF STARE DECISIS (2007)

634 6 Ave Maria L. Rev. 307, PATENTS, TROLLS, AND PERSONAL PROPERTY: WILL EBAY AUCTION AWAY A PATENT HOLDER'S RIGHT TO EXCLUDE? (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

635 5 Ave Maria L. Rev. 299, BLIGHT ELIMINATION TAKINGS AS EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE: THE GREAT LAKES STATES IN KELO'S PUBLIC USE PARADIGMS (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

636 5 Ave Maria L. Rev. 587, KATRINA'S HOUSE: THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE FORCED REMOVAL OF CITIZENS FROM THEIR HOMES IN THE WAKE OF NATURAL DISASTERS (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

637 MINING UNEXPLORED RICHES: LITIGATING STATE CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS State constitutional claims have since the 1970s afforded counsel an alternative means to seek protection for rights not found or not as well protected und, 63-APR Bench & B. Minn. 27, 27+ (2006)

638 LIMITS OF URBAN REDEVELOPMENT? Kelo, Walser, and Condemnation in Minnesota, 62-AUG Bench & B. Minn. 14, 14+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

639 CROSS BURNINGS AND THE HARM-VALUATION ANALYTIC: A TALE OF TWO CASES, 9 Berkeley J. Afr.-Am. L. & Pol'y 3, 31+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

640 AGAINST CYBERPROPERTY, 22 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 1485, 1520 (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

641 A THEORY OF DE MINIMIS AND A PROPOSAL FOR ITS APPLICATION IN COPYRIGHT, 21 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 945, 995 (2006)

642 MY LAND IS YOUR LAND: RE-EXAMINING MASSACHUSETTS EMINENT DOMAIN LAW IN LIGHT OF KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 50-JUN B. B.J. 18, 21 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

643 "LOVE DON'T LIVE HERE ANYMORE": ECONOMIC INCENTIVES FOR A MORE EQUITABLE MODEL OF URBAN REDEVELOPMENT, 35 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 1, 8+ (2008) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

644 ADULT SUPERVISION REQUIRED: THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS'S RECKLESS ADVENTURES WITH AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND THE ANTI-SNOB ZONING ACT, 35 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 217, 258 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

645 PUBLIC USES AND NON-USES: SINISTER SCHEMES, IMPROPER MOTIVES, AND BAD FAITH IN EMINENT DOMAIN LAW, 35 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 45, 47+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

646 ACT LOCALLY, AFFECT GLOBALLY: HOW CHANGING SOCIAL NORMS TO INFLUENCE THE PRIVATE SECTOR SHOWS A PATH TO USING LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO CONTROL ENVIRONMENTAL HARMS, 35 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 455, 458+ (2008)

647 EMINENT DOMAIN AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: A NEW STANDARD OF REVIEW IN DISCRIMINATION CASES, 34 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 273, 302+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

648 GOVERNMENTS AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL TAKINGS: WHEN DO RIGHT-TO-FARM LAWS GO TOO FAR?, 33 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 87, 147 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

649 CRYSTALS IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN, 50 B.C. L. Rev. 139, 195+ (2009) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

650 MEASURE 37'S FEDERAL LAW EXCEPTION: A CRITICAL PROTECTION FOR OREGON'S FEDERALLY APPROVED LAND USE LAWS, 48 B.C. L. Rev. 1301, 1342+ (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

651 TAKING STATE PROPERTY RIGHTS OUT OF FEDERAL LABOR LAW, 47 B.C. L. Rev. 891, 948 (2006)

652 PEASANT LAND TENURE SECURITY IN CHINA'S TRANSITIONAL ECONOMY, 26 B.U. Int'l L.J. 97, 141+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

653 THE DEATH OF NOLLAN AND DOLAN? CHALLENGING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF MONETARY EXACTIONS IN THE WAKE OF LINGLE V. CHEVRON, 87 B.U. L. Rev. 725, 757 (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

654 SEEING THE EMPEROR'S CLOTHES: RECOGNIZING THE REALITY OF CONSTITUTIONAL DECISION MAKING, 86 B.U. L. Rev. 1069, 1081+ (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

655 "A SHINING CITY ON A HILL": AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM AND THE SUPREME COURT'S PRACTICE OF RELYING ON FOREIGN LAW, 86 B.U. L. Rev. 1335, 1416 (2006)

656 AESTHETIC REGULATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF FIRST AMENDMENT JURISPRUDENCE, 19 B.U. Pub. Int. L.J. 225, 260+ (2010) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

657 THE SUPREME COMMON LAW COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, 18 B.U. Pub. Int. L.J. 119, 170+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

658 USING SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS AS A TOOL FOR SMART GROWTH: LOUISVILLE'S NEW METRO GOVERNMENT AS A POTENTIAL EXAMPLE, 45 Brandeis L.J. 1, 55+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

659 THE FATE OF DOMESTIC EXPORTERS UNDER THE BYRD AMENDMENT: A CASE STUDY FOR RESUSCITATING LAST-IN-TIME TREATY INTERPRETATION, 3 B.Y.U. Int'l L. & Mgmt. Rev. 171, 212 (2007)

660 RLUIPA AND EMINENT DOMAIN: PROBING THE BOUNDARIES OF RELIGIOUS LAND USE PROTECTION, 2008 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 1213, 1242+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

661 CONSTRAINED BY THE LIBERAL TRADITION: WHY THE SUPREME COURT HAS NOT FOUND POSITIVE RIGHTS IN THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION, 2007 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 1721, 1765+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

662 THE PERSONAL IS POLITICAL-AND ECONOMIC: RETHINKING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, 2007 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 387, 450+ (2007)

663 PROPERTY TESTS, DUE PROCESS TESTS AND REGULATORY TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE, 2007 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 899, 958+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,6 (S.Ct.)**

664 GRAVE MATTERS: THE ANCIENT RIGHTS OF THE GRAVEYARD, 2006 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 1469, 1515+ (2006)

665 ARCHITECTURE AS ART? NOT IN MY NEOCOLONIAL NEIGHBORHOOD: A CASE FOR PROVIDING FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION TO EXPRESSIVE RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE, 2005 B.Y.U. L. Rev. 1625, 1668+ (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

666 A TALE OF THREE TAKINGS: TAKING ANALYSIS IN LAND USE REGULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, AUSTRALIA, AND CANADA, 32 Brook. J. Int'l L. 343, 403 (2007)

667 YOU'VE GOT TO BE KIDNEYING ME! The Fatal Problem of Severing Rights and Remedies From The Body of Organ Donation Law, 74 Brook. L. Rev. 543, 580+ (2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

668 6 Buff. Intell. Prop. L.J. 133, RESETTING THE DOOMSDAY CLOCK: IS IT CONSTITUTIONAL FOR LACHES TO BAR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS WITHIN THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS? (2009)

669 6 Buff. Intell. Prop. L.J. 1, PERMANENT INJUNCTIONS IN PATENT CASES (2008)

670 GETTING BACK THE PUBLIC'S MONEY: THE ANTI-FAVORITISM NORM IN AMERICAN PROPERTY LAW, 58 Buff. L. Rev. 619, 676+ (2010) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

671 TO IMPROVE THE STATE AND CONDITION OF MAN: THE POWER TO POLICE AND THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN GOVERNANCE The Police Power: Patriarchy and the the Foundations of American Government. By Markus Dirk Dubber. Columbia Universit, 53 Buff. L. Rev. 1215, 1271+ (2005) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

672 OVERCOMINING DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING, CREDIT, AND URBAN POLICY University at Buffalo Law School Baldy Center on Law and Social Policy, 25 Buff. Pub. Int. L.J. 77, 166+ (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

673 GOING PRIVATE AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE MARKET AND THE LAW, 62 Bus. Law. 775, 912 (2007)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 674 REGULATORY TAKINGS: A CHRONICLE OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A CONSTITUTIONAL CONCEPT, 23 BYU J. Pub. L. 221, 258 (2009)

C 675 THAT LAND IS YOUR LAND, THIS LAND IS MY LAND. . .UNTIL THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT CAN TURN IT FOR A PROFIT: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 20 BYU J. Pub. L. 139, 165+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 676 JUST COMPENSATION AND THE SELLER'S PARADOX, 20 BYU J. Pub. L. 79, 102+ (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

677 THE DUAL LIVES OF RIGHTS: THE RHETORIC AND PRACTICE OF RIGHTS IN AMERICA, 98 Cal. L. Rev. 277, 326+ (2010) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 678 CONSTITUTIONAL CONSTRAINTS, 97 Cal. L. Rev. 975, 1037 (2009)

C 679 INTEGRATIVE LAWYERING: NAVIGATING THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF URBAN REDEVELOPMENT, 95 Cal. L. Rev. 1999, 2072+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 680 TAMIFLU, THE TAKINGS CLAUSE, AND COMPULSORY LICENSES: AN EXPLORATION OF THE GOVERNMENT'S OPTIONS FOR ACCESSING MEDICAL PATENTS, 95 Cal. L. Rev. 535, 559+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 681 TORTURE, NECESSITY AND EXISTENTIAL POLITICS, 95 Cal. L. Rev. 235, 276+ (2007)

C 682 THE CONSTITUTION AS IDEA: DESCRIBING-DEFINING-DECIDING IN KELO, 43 Cal. W. L. Rev. 363, 387+ (2007) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 683 PROPERTY LESSONS IN AUGUST WILSON'S THE PIANO LESSON AND THE WAKE OF HURRICANE KATRINA, 43 Cal. W. L. Rev. 97, 129 (2006)

684 TEXTUALIST CANONS: CABINING RULES OR PREDILECTIVE TOOLS, 33 Campbell L. Rev. 115, 149+ (2010) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 685 KELO AND THE GAMES PEOPLE PLAY: A GAME-THEORETIC ANALYSIS OF KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 29 Campbell L. Rev. 83, 107+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 686 "DON'T KNOW WHAT A SLIDE RULE IS FOR:" THE NEED FOR A PRECISE DEFINITION OF PUBLIC PURPOSE IN NORTH CAROLINA IN THE WAKE OF KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON (FN2), 28 Campbell L. Rev. 291, 318+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

687 Strong Medicine: Patents, Market, and Policy Challenges for Managing Neglected Diseases and Affordable Prescription Drugs, 7 Canadian Journal of Law & Technology 57+ (2009)

688 MORE THAN JUST A PLOT OF LAND: OHIO'S REJECTION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS, 38 Cap. U. L. Rev. 79, 108+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 689 THE WAR ON DRUGS: HOW KSR v. TELEFLEX AND MERCK v. INTEGRA CONTINUE THE EROSION OF PHARMACEUTICAL PATENT PROTECTION, 36 Cap. U. L. Rev. 1029, 1063 (2008)

C 690 GOVERNMENTAL INDIRECT PATENT INFRINGEMENT: THE NEED TO HOLD UNCLE SAM ACCOUNTABLE UNDER 28 U.S.C. S 1498, 36 Cap. U. L. Rev. 1065, 1129 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 691 EMINENT DOMAIN AFTER KELO, 36 Cap. U. L. Rev. 55, 55+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 692 SIGN AMORTIZATION LAWS: INSIGHT INTO PRECEDENT, PROPERTY, AND PUBLIC POLICY, 35 Cap. U. L. Rev. 891, 892+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

693 THEIR LOVE IS HERE TO STAY: WHY THE SUPREME COURT CANNOT TURN BACK

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

THE HANDS OF TIME, 17 Cardozo J.L. & Gender 1, 31 (2010)

694 ASSESSING THE SCOPE OF WILLIAMSON COUNTY: WHY IT SHOULD BE APPLIED TO PRIVATE PURPOSE CLAIMS, 30 Cardozo L. Rev. 1809, 1842+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

695 THE ROLE OF JUDGES IN A GOVERNMENT OF, BY, AND FOR THE PEOPLE: NOTES FOR THE FIFTY-EIGHTH CARDOZO LECTURE, 30 Cardozo L. Rev. 1, 244+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

696 UNDOING REPEAL OF THE RULE AGAINST PERPETUITIES: FEDERAL AND STATE TOOLS FOR BREAKING DYNASTY TRUSTS, 27 Cardozo L. Rev. 2537, 2549 (2006)

697 GOD IS NOT THE LUNCH-LADY: ACCOMMODATION OF RELIGIOUS DIETARY PRACTICES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 2010 Cardozo L. Rev. de novo 430, 458 (2010)

698 JUSTICE KENNEDY'S SHORT-LIVED LIBERTARIAN REVOLUTION: A BRIEF HISTORY OF SUPREME COURT LIBERTARIAN IDEOLOGY, 7 Cardozo Pub. L. Pol'y & Ethics J. 1, 44+ (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

699 THE REGULATION OF COMMON INTEREST DEVELOPMENTS AS IT RELATES TO POLITICAL EXPRESSION: THE ARGUMENT FOR LIBERTY AND ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY, 59 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 491, 534+ (2009)

700 INTRODUCTION: CORPORATIONS AND THEIR COMMUNITIES, 58 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 1017, 1029 (2008)

701 TAX INCENTIVES FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: PERSONAL (AND PESSIMISTIC) REFLECTIONS, 58 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 1145, 1155 (2008) **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

702 THE POLITICS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS, 58 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 1185, 1198+ (2008)

703 REGIONAL ECONOMIES AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL IMPERATIVE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 58 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 1199, 1232+ (2008) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

704 THE COMMON LAW AND THE ENVIRONMENT, 58 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 583, 620 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

705 BEWARE OF GREENS IN PRAISE OF THE COMMON LAW, 58 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 813, 862 (2008)

706 THE LOW ROAD TO CY PRES REFORM: PRINCIPLED PRACTICE TO REMOVE DEAD HAND CONTROL OF CHARITABLE ASSETS, 58 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 97, 157+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

707 DOES AVOIDING CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS PROMOTE JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE?, 56 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 1031, 1041 (2006)

708 ECONOMIC SALVATION IN A RESTIVE AGE: THE DEMAND FOR SECULAR SALVATION HAS NOT ABATED, 56 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 569, 586 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

709 THE PROGRESSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL GOSPELS VERSUS CLASSICAL LIBERALISM, 56 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 621, 641 (2006)

710 JUSTIFIED MONOPOLIES: REGULATING PHARMACEUTICALS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS, 56 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 103, 134 (2005) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

711 FOREIGN NATIONALS AND PRINCIPLES OF EXTRATERRITORIALITY: WHY ATAMIRZAYEVA v. UNITED STATES WAS DECIDED INCORRECTLY, 59 Cath. U. L.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Rev. 559, 586+ (2010) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

712 PATENT INFRINGEMENT AS NUISANCE, 59 Cath. U. L. Rev. 61, 123 (2009)

713 STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS IN RAILS-TO-TRAILS ACT COMPENSATION CLAIMS: THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT BENDS THE RULES OF TAKINGS LAW, 56 Cath. U. L. Rev. 1307, 1342 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

714 IS THIS THE START OF A SILENT SPRING? KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON'S EFFECT ON ENVIRONMENTAL REFORMS, 56 Cath. U. L. Rev. 1107, 1107+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

715 ESTABLISHING A LEASEHOLD THROUGH EMINENT DOMAIN: A SLIPPERY SLOPE MADE MORE TREACHEROUS BY KELO, 56 Cath. U. L. Rev. 503, 506+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

716 LOOKING AHEAD TO THE 2005-2006 TERM, 2005 Cato Sup. Ct. Rev. 321, 321 (2005) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

717 "POOR RELATION" ONCE MORE: THE SUPREME COURT AND THE VANISHING RIGHTS OF PROPERTY OWNERS, 2005 Cato Sup. Ct. Rev. 39, 39+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

718 PRIVATE PROPERTY, PUBLIC BENEFIT Economic Redevelopment and the Power of Eminent Domain, 19-NOV CBA Rec. 50, 50+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

719 A SCHOLAR'S JOURNEY ON THE DARK SIDE, 11 Chap. L. Rev. 1, 83+ (2007)

720 BE CAREFUL WHAT YOU WISH FOR: COPYRIGHT'S CAMPAIGN FOR PROPERTY RIGHTS AND AN EMINENT CONSEQUENCE OF INTELLECTUAL MONOPOLY, 10 Chap. L. Rev. 789, 821+ (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

721 MINE AND THINE DISTINCT: WHAT KELO SAYS ABOUT OUR PATH, 10 Chap. L. Rev. 1, 48+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

722 SUPREME GUIDANCE FOR WET GROWTH: LESSONS FROM THE HIGH COURT ON THE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, 9 Chap. L. Rev. 233, 264+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

723 THE RESTITUTIONARY APPROACH TO JUST COMPENSATION, 9 Chap. L. Rev. 463, 492+ (2006) **HN: 1,4 (S.Ct.)**

724 THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, ANNOTATED, 9 Chap. L. Rev. 147, 155 (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

725 SECOND THOUGHTS ON DAMAGES FOR WRONGFUL CONVICTIONS, 85 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 127, 161 (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

726 IS THE ILLINOIS EQUITY IN EMINENT DOMAIN ACT TRULY EQUITABLE?, 83 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 995, 1020+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

727 KELO COMPENSATION: THE FUTURE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS, 82 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 1029, 1061+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

728 THIRTEEN WAYS OF LOOKING AT DRED SCOTT, 82 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 49, 95 (2007)

729 THE USES OF HISTORY IN THE SUPREME COURT'S TAKINGS CLAUSE JURISPRUDENCE, 81 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 1233, 1275+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

730 THE WHOLESALE DECOMMISSIONING OF VACANT URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS: SMART DECLINE, PUBLIC-PURPOSE TAKINGS, AND THE LEGALITY OF SHRINKING CITIES, 58 Clev. St. L. Rev. 387, 461+ (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

731 KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON: A REDUCTION OF PROPERTY RIGHTS BUT A TOOL TO COMBAT URBAN SPRAWL, 55 Clev. St. L. Rev. 103, 104+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

732 LEGAL CHANGE, 55 Clev. St. L. Rev. 135, 145+ (2007)

733 MONISM, NOMINALISM, AND PUBLIC-PRIVATE IN THE WORK OF MARGARET JANE RADIN, 54 Clev. St. L. Rev. 219, 247 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

734 KELO CONFINED-COLORADO SAFEGUARDS AGAINST CONDEMNATION FOR PUBLIC-PRIVATE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS, 37-MAR Colo. Law. 39, 39+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

735 EMINENT DOMAIN LAW IN COLORADO-PART I: THE RIGHT TO TAKE PRIVATE PROPERTY, 35-SEP Colo. Law. 65, 69+ (2006) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

736 A HIGH-VOLTAGE CONFLICT ON BLACKACRE: REORIENTING UTILITY EASEMENT RIGHTS FOR ELECTRIC RELIABILITY, 36 Colum. J. Envtl. L. 1, 57 (2011)

737 TROUT OF BOUNDS: THE EFFECTS OF THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS' MISGUIDED FIFTH AMENDMENT TAKINGS ANALYSIS IN CASITAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT V. UNITED STATES, 36 Colum. J. Envtl. L. 59, 123 (2011) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

738 A "SWITCH IN TIME" FOR THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY? LOCHNER DISCOURSE AND THE RECALIBRATION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RIGHTS IN EUROPE, 14 Colum. J. Eur. L. 467, 508 (2008)

739 IN DEFENSE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 2/15/2007 Colum. L. Rev. Sidebar 1, 1+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

740 LIMITED LEGAL SERVICES: IS IT WORTH IT?, 39 Colum. J.L. & Soc. Probs. 331, 374 (2006)

741 ENFORCING INTERNATIONAL NORMS IN THE UNITED STATES AFTER ROPER V. SIMMONS: THE CASE OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS SENTENCED TO LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE Dorsey & Whitney Student Writing Prize in Comparative and International Law Best, 45 Colum. J. Transnat'l L. 262, 311 (2006)

742 A THEORY OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY AND THE SINGLE SUBJECT RULE, 110 Colum. L. Rev. 687, 730+ (2010)

743 EMINENT DOMAIN, INC., 107 Colum. L. Rev. 1704, 1748+ (2007) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

744 LOCAL PROPERTY LAW: ADJUSTING THE SCALE OF PROPERTY PROTECTION, 107 Colum. L. Rev. 883, 948+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

745 THE USELESSNESS OF PUBLIC USE, 106 Colum. L. Rev. 1412, 1449+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

746 WILLIAM HUBBS REHNQUIST, 106 Colum. L. Rev. 494, 497 (2006)

747 JUST COMPENSATION STANDARDS AND EMINENT DOMAIN INJUSTICES: AN UNDEREXAMINED CONNECTION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR REFORM, 6 Conn. Pub. Int. L.J. 269, 297+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

748 "PUBLIC USE" REQUIREMENT IN EMINENT DOMAIN CASES BASED ON SLUM CLEARANCE, ELIMINATION OF URBAN BLIGHT, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 5 Conn. Pub. Int. L.J. 197, 231+ (2006) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

749 RISKS INVOLVED WITH BROWNFIELD TRANSACTIONS AND HOW SELLERS CAN

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

MANAGE THAT RISK THROUGH REMEDIATION AND CONTRACTUAL MECHANISMS, 18 DCBABR 26, 30 (2006)

750 NORTHERN'S EXPOSURE From Berman v. Parker to Kelo v. New London, an Illustration of the U.S. Supreme Court's Unwavering Private Application of the Public Use Clause of the Fifth Amendment, 18 DCBABR 26, 26+ (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

751 EMINENT DOMAIN AFTER KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON: COMPENSATING FOR THE SUPREME COURT'S REFUSAL TO ENFORCE THE FIFTH AMENDMENT, 2 Duke J. Const. L. & Pub. Pol'y Sidebar 11, 11+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 752 WHY ORIGINALISM WON'T DIE-COMMON MISTAKES IN COMPETING THEORIES OF JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION, 2 Duke J. Const. L. & Pub. Pol'y 159, 181+ (2007) **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

753 DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN CHINA: PATTERNS, CAUSES AND PROGNOSIS, 4 E. Asia L. Rev. 1, 61+ (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 754 BREAKING AND ENTERING MY OWN COMPUTER: THE CONTEST OF COPYRIGHT METAPHORS, 13 Comm. L. & Pol'y 231, 274+ (2008) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

755 AN AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES, 4 Envt'l & Energy L. & Pol'y J. 170, 187 (2009)

756 NEW AND EMERGING CONSTITUTIONAL THEORIES AND THE FUTURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, 40 Envtl. L. Rep. News & Analysis 10989, 10990+ (2010)

757 2005 CONNECTICUT REAL PROPERTY LAW DEVELOPMENTS, 80 Conn. B.J. 39, 80+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 758 2005 CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REVIEW, 79 Conn. B.J. 93, 128+ (2005) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

759 PRESERVING JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE: JUDICIAL ELECTIONS AS THE ANTIDOTE TO JUDICIAL ACTIVISM, 6 First Amend. L. Rev. 180, 191 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

760 THE KEYS TO THE KINGDOM: INTERPRETIVE POWER AND SOCIETAL INFLUENCE DURING TWO AGES, 7 Fla. Coastal L. Rev. 697, 744+ (2006)

761 TRESPASS BY POLLUTION: REMEDY BY MANDATORY INJUNCTION, 21 Fordham Envtl L. Rev. 157, 191 (2010)

C 762 SCOTUS + SCONJ + TDRS = NEW JERSEY HIGHLANDS ACT LITIGATION OUTCOMES: WILL IT ALL ADD UP TO A FAIR OUTCOME FOR PROPERTY OWNERS?, 18 Fordham Envtl L. Rev. 399, 432 (2007)

C 763 A LEGAL CHAMELEON: AN EXAMINATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF GOOD FAITH IN CHINESE AND AMERICAN CONTRACT LAW, 25 Conn. J. Int'l L. 305, 329 (2010)

764 TAKINGS LAW: THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, 24 Conn. J. Int'l L. 435, 469+ (2009)

765 PROPERTY'S END: WHY COMPETITION POLICY SHOULD LIMIT THE RIGHT OF PUBLICITY, 43 Conn. L. Rev. 753, 818 (2011) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

766 JEFF BENEDICT'S LITTLE PINK HOUSE: THE BACK STORY OF THE KELO CASE, 42 Conn. L. Rev. 925, 956+ (2010)

C 767 CLERK AND JUSTICE: THE TIES THAT BIND JOHN PAUL STEVENS AND WILEY B.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

RUTLEDGE, 41 Conn. L. Rev. 211, 264+ (2008) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 768 "UPON FURTHER REVIEW": WHY A SPORTS STADIUM CAN JUSTIFY AN EMINENT DOMAIN TAKING, 40 Conn. L. Rev. 1623, 1660+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 769 LIBERALISM AND REPUBLICANISM IN FEDERAL INDIAN LAW, 38 Conn. L. Rev. 813, 831 (2006)

C 770 A BEND IN THE ROAD: EASEMENT RELOCATION AND PLIABILITY IN THE NEW RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF PROPERTY: SERVITUDES, 38 Conn. L. Rev. 1, 77 (2005)

771 CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE: USING AN ANCIENT DOCTRINE TO ADAPT TO RISING SEA LEVELS IN SAN FRANCISCO BAY, 3 Golden Gate U. Envtl. L.J. 243, 281+ (2010)

C 772 FIGHTING UNCERTAINTY: MUNICIPAL PARTNERSHIPS WITH REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES CAN MITIGATE UNCERTAINTY TO ENCOURAGE BROWNFIELD REDEVELOPMENT, 1 Golden Gate U. Envtl. L.J. 267, 316+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

773 OBAMA'S CONSTITUTION: THE PASSIVE VIRTUES WRIT LARGE, 26 Const. Comment. 183, 194 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

774 THE OBAMA PRESIDENCY AND THE ROBERTS COURT: SOME HINTS FROM POLITICAL SCIENCE POLITICAL FOUNDATIONS OF JUDICIAL SUPREM-ACY: THE PRESIDENCY, THE SUPREME COURT, AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN U.S. HISTORY. By Keith E. Wh, 25 Const. Comment. 343, 351 (2008)

C 775 JUDGING FACTS LIKE LAW, 25 Const. Comment. 69, 130 (2008)

C 776 UMPIRES AT BAT: ON INTEGRATION AND LEGITIMATION, 24 Const. Comment. 701, 732 (2007)

C 777 FUNDAMENTALLY WRONG ABOUT FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, 23 Const. Comment. 227, 239 (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 778 FAREWELL TO SOCIAL NOSTALGIA BEYOND CAMELOT: RETHINKING POLITICS AND LAW FOR THE MODERN STATE. By Edward L. Rubin. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005. Pp. 471. $45.00., 23 Const. Comment. 423, 433 (2006)

C 779 ORIGINALISM, STARE DECISIS AND THE PROMOTION OF JUDICIAL RESTRAINT, 22 Const. Comment. 271, 288 (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

780 TAKINGS FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN NEW YORK: A CONSTITUTIONAL SLAM DUNK?, 20 Cornell J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 191, 218+ (2010)

781 THE POLITICS OF PROPERTY AND NEED, 20 Cornell J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 363, 376+ (2010) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

C 782 ABSENTEE LANDLORDS, RENT CONTROL AND HEALTHY GENTRIFICATION: A POLICY PROPOSAL TO DECONCENTRATE THE POOR IN URBAN AMERICA, 17 Cornell J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 1, 74+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 783 CORRECTING FOR KELO: SOCIAL CAPITAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS AND THE REBALANCING OF POWER BETWEEN "DESPERATE" CITIES, CORPORATE INTERESTS, AND THE AVERAGE JOE, 16 Cornell J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 187, 229+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 784 DOES NEW LONDON BURN AGAIN? : EMINENT DOMAIN, LIBERTY AND POPULISM IN THE WAKE OF KELO, 15 Cornell J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 483, 505+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 785 IDENTIFYING INTENSE PREFERENCES, 94 Cornell L. Rev. 1391, 1458+ (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 786 DEMOCRATIC ESTATES: PROPERTY LAW IN A FREE AND DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY, 94 Cornell L. Rev. 1009, 1062 (2009)

C 787 THE SOCIAL-OBLIGATION NORM IN AMERICAN PROPERTY LAW, 94 Cornell L. Rev. 745, 819+ (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 788 MIND THE GAP: THE INDIRECT RELATION BETWEEN ENDS AND MEANS IN AMERICAN PROPERTY LAW, 94 Cornell L. Rev. 959, 989 (2009)

C 789 THE "PUBLIC USE" REQUIREMENT IN EMINENT DOMAIN LAW: A RATIONALE BASED ON SECRET PURCHASES AND PRIVATE INFLUENCE, 92 Cornell L. Rev. 1, 65+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 790 LEVIATHAN: THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC AND THE CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM, 90 Cornell L. Rev. 1639, 1651 (2005)

C 791 TAKING "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" SERIOUSLY: DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE AND THE TAKINGS CLAUSE, 40 Creighton L. Rev. 569, 594 (2007)

C 792 WILL THE REAL CONSTITUTIONAL ORIGINALIST PLEASE STAND UP?, 40 Creighton L. Rev. 595, 650+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 793 SUBDUING THE CEASELESS STORM: BREAKING THE BUILD-DESTROY-REBUILD CYCLE FOLLOWING MAJOR CATASTROPHES THROUGH TAXATION AND RESPONSIBILITY, 2 Alb. Gov't L. Rev. 328, 353+ (2009)

794 DEFINING COMMUNITY IN A SOCIETY BASED ON RIGHTS, 2 Alb. Gov't L. Rev. 354, 365+ (2009)

C 795 THE CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS ON CONGRESS'S POWER OVER LOCAL LAND USE: WHY THE RELIGIOUS LAND USE AND INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL, 2 Alb. Gov't L. Rev. 366, 436+ (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 796 RLUIPA: LINKING RELIGION, LAND USE, OWNERSHIP AND THE COMMON GOOD, 2 Alb. Gov't L. Rev. 485, 536+ (2009) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 797 CONSTITUTIONAL LAW-PUBLIC USE CLAUSE-USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT HELD CONSTITUTIONAL, 36 Cumb. L. Rev. 407, 407+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 798 PROPERTY RISKS IN INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS, 15-SUM Currents: Int'l Trade L.J. 23, 23+ (2006) **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

799 THE LIMITATIONS OF MAJORITARIAN LAND ASSEMBLY, 122 Harv. L. Rev. F. 7, 16+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 800 TOWN OF TELLURIDE v. SAN MIGUEL VALLEY CORP.: EXTRATERRITORIALITY AND LOCAL AUTONOMY, 86 Denv. U. L. Rev. 1311, 1328 (2009)

C 801 CONSTITUTIONAL HOME RULE AND JUDICIAL SCRUTINY, 86 Denv. U. L. Rev. 1337, 1360+ (2009)

C 802 TELLURIDE'S TALE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, HOME RULE, AND RETROACTIVITY, 86 Denv. U. L. Rev. 1433, 1457 (2009) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

803 MINORITY INTERESTS, MAJORITY POLITICS: A COMMENT ON RICHARD COLLINS'

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

"TELLURIDE'S TALE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, HOME RULE, AND RETROACTIVITY", 86 Denv. U. L. Rev. 1459, 1460+ (2009) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 804 ENACTING LIBERTARIAN PROPERTY: OREGON'S MEASURE 37 AND ITS IMPLICATIONS, 85 Denv. U. L. Rev. 279, 368+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 805 EMINENT DOMAIN, PROPERTY RIGHTS, AND THE SOLUTION OF REPRESENTATION REINFORCEMENT, 83 Denv. U. L. Rev. 1, 55+ (2005) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 806 INTERRING THE RHETORIC OF JUDICIAL ACTIVISM, 59 DePaul L. Rev. 555, 599+ (2010)

C 807 FEDERALISM R.I.P.? DID THE ROBERTS HEARINGS JUNK THE REHNQUIST COURT'S FEDERALISM REVOLUTION?, 56 DePaul L. Rev. 1, 54 (2006)

808 IOWA'S AGRIBUSINESS IN A TIF, 14 Drake J. Agric. L. 485, 489+ (2009) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 809 THE LEGISLATIVE AFTERSHOCKS OF KELO: STATE LEGISLATIVE RESPONSE TO THE NEW USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 12 Drake J. Agric. L. 325, 325+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 810 NUISANCES FROM ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATIONS: RECONCILING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND NEIGHBORING PROPERTY RIGHTS, 11 Drake J. Agric. L. 5, 23+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

811 REVIEW OF SELECTED RECENT DEVELOPMENTSIN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW, 10 Drake J. Agric. L. 255, 286 (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

812 TAKINGS AND TRESPASS: TRESPASS LIABILITY FOR PRECONDEMNATION ENTRIES, 56 Drake L. Rev. 341, 380+ (2008) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 813 SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ROLE OF SOCIAL CHANGE ON THE COURTS, 54 Drake L. Rev. 895, 902+ (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 814 IN THE NAME OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: REVIVING "PUBLIC USE" AS A LIMITATION ON THE EMINENT DOMAIN POWER IN THE WAKE OF KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 54 Drake L. Rev. 171, 231+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 815 COME HELL OR HIGH WATER: REEXAMINING THE TAKINGS CLAUSE IN A CLIMATE CHANGED FUTURE, 18 Duke Envtl. L. & Pol'y F. 371, 397+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 816 YOU SAY TAKINGS, AND I SAY TAKINGS: THE HISTORY AND POTENTIAL OF REGULATORY TAKINGS CHALLENGES TO THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT, 16 Duke Envtl. L. & Pol'y F. 293, 343 (2006)

C 817 TAKINGS FOR GRANTED: THE CONVERGENCE AND NON-COVERGENCE OF PROPERTY LAW IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND THE UNITED STATES, 19 Duke J. Comp. & Int'l L. 133, 159+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

818 SEARCH QUERY PRIVACY: THE PROBLEM OF ANONYMIZATION, 2 Hastings Sci. & Tech. L.J. 137, 182 (2010)

819 HOW THE DISSENT BECOMES THE MAJORITY: USING FEDERALISM TO TRANSFORM COALITIONS IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, 59 Duke L.J. 183, 238 (2009)

C 820 LIVING ORIGINALISM, 59 Duke L.J. 239, 307 (2009)

C 821 FROM NEW LONDON TO NORWOOD: A YEAR IN THE LIFE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 57 Duke L.J. 1449, 1483+ (2008)

C 822 ADVISORY COUNTERPARTS TO CONSTITUTIONAL COURTS, 56 Duke L.J. 953, 1045+

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

(2007)

C 823 IT'S NOT ABOUT THE FOX: THE UNTOLD HISTORY OF PIERSON V. POST, 55 Duke L.J. 1089, 1143 (2006)

C 824 A NEW TAKE ON PUBLIC USE: WERE KELO AND LINGLE NONJUSTICIABLE?, 55 Duke L.J. 835, 863+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 825 TAKINGS AND STATUTORY ENTITLEMENTS: DOES THE TOBACCO BUYOUT TAKE QUOTA RIGHTS WITHOUT JUST COMPENSATION?, 55 Duke L.J. 865, 892 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 826 AN INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY: THE ROLE OF CHIEF JUSTICE CAPPY, 47 Duq. L. Rev. 547, 554+ (2009) **HN: 4,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 827 WHEN A TOWNSHIP EXERCISES THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN, THE COURT MUST SEEK THE TRUE PURPOSE BEHIND THE TAKING AND VOID THE CONDEMNATION WHERE IT EXCEEDS STATUTORY AUTHORITY: MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP v. LANDS OF STONE, 47 Duq. L. Rev. 655, 661+ (2009) **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 828 THE ABSTRUSE SCIENCE: KELO, LOCHNER, AND REPRESENTATION REINFORCEMENT IN THE PUBLIC USE DEBATE, 46 Duq. L. Rev. 375, 375+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 829 PUBLIC USE OR PUBLIC PURPOSE?: THE EVER-CHANGING ROLE OF THE COURTS AND THE LEGISLATURE IN INTERPRETING THE PUBLIC USE CLAUSE IN DECIDING WHETHER A STATE CAN TAKE PRIVATE PROPERTY IN EMINENT DOMAIN PROCEEDINGS FOR THE PU, 44 Duq. L. Rev. 709, 728+ (2006)

830 THE FIRST AMENDMENT AS A SHIELD TO EMINENT DOMAIN - AN OPPORTUNITY FOR RESPONSIBILITY IN PENNSYLVANIA, 44 Duq. L. Rev. 487, 517+ (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 831 THE WATER MORATORIUM: TAKINGS, MARKETS, AND PUBLIC CHOICE IMPLICATIONS OF WATER DISTRICTS, 35 Ecology L.Q. 223, 262+ (2008)

C 832 LIVING IN THE PAST: THE KELO COURT AND PUBLIC-PRIVATE ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT, 34 Ecology L.Q. 1, 3+ (2007) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 833 SMART GROWTH MEETS THE NEIGHBORS, 34 Ecology L.Q. 1349, 1370+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 834 TAKINGS LAW TODAY: A PRIMER FOR THE PERPLEXED, 34 Ecology L.Q. 307, 371 (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 835 THE FALSE DICHOTOMY BETWEEN PHYSICAL AND REGULATORY TAKINGS ANALYSIS: A CRITIQUE OF TAHOE-SIERRA'S DISTINCTION BETWEEN PHYSICAL AND REGULATORY TAKINGS, 34 Ecology L.Q. 381, 441 (2007)

C 836 PLANNING AS PUBLIC USE?, 34 Ecology L.Q. 443, 443+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 837 A WINDOW INTO THE REGULATED COMMONS: THE TAKINGS CLAUSE, INVESTMENT SECURITY, AND SUSTAINABILITY, 34 Ecology L.Q. 619, 654+ (2007) **HN: 2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 838 THE PROPERTY RIGHTS MOVEMENT'S EMBRACE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY: TRUE LOVE OR DOOMED RELATIONSHIP?, 34 Ecology L.Q. 713, 754+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

839 FOREWORD, 33 Ecology L.Q. 511, 516 (2006)

840 KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON: THE MORE THINGS STAY THE SAME, THE MORE THEY CHANGE, 33 Ecology L.Q. 545, 546+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

841 LOCALISM'S ECOLOGY: PROTECTING AND RESTORING HABITAT IN THE SUBURBAN NATION, 33 Ecology L.Q. 945, 1014+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

842 THE ETHICS PANEL ETHICS 2.0-THE ETHICAL CHALLENGES AND PITFALLS WEB 2.0 PRESENTS TO BANKRUPTCY ATTORNEYS, 26 Emory Bankr. Dev. J. 245, 266 (2010)

843 "AN ERA OF HUMAN ZONING" : BANISHING SEX OFFENDERS FROM COMMUNITIES THROUGH RESIDENCE AND WORK RESTRICTIONS, 57 Emory L.J. 1347, 1392 (2008)

844 THE SAGE APPROACH TO IMMEDIATE ENTRY BY PRIVATE ENTITIES EXERCISING FEDERAL EMINENT DOMAIN AUTHORITY UNDER THE NATURAL GAS ACT AND THE FEDERAL POWER ACT, 27 Energy L.J. 499, 544 (2006)

845 PUBLIC OUTCRY: KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON-A PROPOSED SOLUTION, 39 Envtl. L. 431, 450+ (2009) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

846 PROPERTY PIECES IN COMPENSATION STATUTES: LAW'S EULOGY FOROREGON'S MEASURE 37, 38 Envtl. L. 1111, 1165 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

847 BIOREGIONAL CONSERVATION MAY MEAN TAKING HABITAT, 37 Envtl. L. 249, 300+ (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

848 A TRIBUTE TO DEAN JAMES HUFFMAN, 37 Envtl. L. IX, xi+ (2007)

849 YEAR ZERO: THE AFTERMATH OF MEASURE 37, 36 Envtl. L. 131, 163+ (2006)

850 KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON ORDINANCE 15053: IS "THE MOST RESTRICTIVE LAND-USE LAW IN THE NATION" CONSTITUTIONAL?, 36 Envtl. L. 257, 287+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

851 THE REMNANTS OF EXACTION TAKINGS, 33-SPG Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 189, 229 (2010)

852 SAND OR CONCRETE AT THE BEACH? PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS ON ERODING OCEANFRONT LAND, 31-SPG Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 217, 249+ (2008) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

853 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AS PUBLIC USE: WHY JUSTICE RYAN'S POLETOWN DISSENT PROVIDES A BETTER WAY TO DECIDE KELO AND FUTURE PUBLIC USE CASES, 15 Fed. Circuit B.J. 201, 202+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

854 Younger Abstention - Pending State Proceeding, 20 Fed. Litigator 5, 5 (2005)

855 LIMITATIONS ON ESTABLISHING UNSAFE STRUCTURES LIENS AND SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS: HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION, SPECIAL BENEFIT TO LAND, AND PUBLIC PURPOSE AND FACILITY DOCTRINE, 85-FEB Fla. B.J. 42, 45+ (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

856 TAX INCREMENT FINANCING IN FLORIDA: A TOOL FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVITALIZATION, RENEWAL, AND REDEVELOPMENT, 81-AUG Fla. B.J. 66, 67+ (2007) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

857 ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT OF SMALL-CITY DOWNTOWNS: OPTIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE PRACTITIONER Part 2, 81-FEB Fla. B.J. 40, 42+ (2007) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

858 ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT OF SMALL-CITY DOWNTOWNS: OPTIONS AND CON-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

SIDERATIONS FOR THE PRACTITIONER Part 1, 81-JAN Fla. B.J. 39, 42+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

859 HOW TO OBTAIN AN ORDER OF TAKING, 80-OCT Fla. B.J. 66, 66+ (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 860 WHY JUSTICE THOMAS SHOULD SPEAK AT ORAL ARGUMENT, 61 Fla. L. Rev. 611, 638+ (2009) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 861 THE PERSPECTIVE OF A JUNIOR CIRCUIT JUDGE ON JUDICIAL MODESTY, 60 Fla. L. Rev. 1007, 1026 (2008)

C 862 CONSTITUTIONAL ADVOCACY EXPLAINS CONSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES, 60 Fla. L. Rev. 857, 894 (2008)

C 863 FLORIDA'S EMINENT DOMAIN OVERHAUL: CREATING MORE PROBLEMS THAN IT SOLVED, 60 Fla. L. Rev. 471, 505+ (2008) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 864 TO BEAR A CROSS: THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND EMINENT DOMAIN INTERSECT AT THE MT. SOLEDAD VETERANS MEMORIAL, 59 Fla. L. Rev. 829, 872+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 865 COUNTER-MAJORITARIAN POWER AND JUDGES' POLITICAL SPEECH, 58 Fla. L. Rev. 53, 118 (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 866 "NOT THE LAW'S BUSINESS:" THE POLITICS OF TOLERANCE AND THE ENFORCEMENT OF MORALITY, 57 Fla. L. Rev. 1097, 1133+ (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

867 FORCED SALE RISK: CLASS, RACE, AND THE "DOUBLE DISCOUNT", 37 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 589, 658 (2010)

C 868 THE IDENTIFIABILITY BIAS IN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW, 35 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 433, 504+ (2008)

C 869 ESTABLISHING A MORAL DUTY TO OBEY THE LAW THROUGH A JURISPRUDENCE OF LAW AND ECONOMICS, 34 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 491, 539 (2007)

C 870 DRINKING FROM A DEEP WELL: THE PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE AND WESTERN WATER LAW, 34 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 1, 39+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 871 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR THE NONTRADITIONAL CHURCH: HOW DO WE GRANT TAX EXEMPTIONS TO PLACES OF WORSHIP AND NOT AMUSEMENT PARKS?, 33 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 1149, 1175+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 872 CONTRACTING AWAY RIGHTS: A COMMENT ON DANIEL FARBER'S "ANOTHER VIEW OF THE QUAGMIRE", 33 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 953, 982+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

873 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS, 33 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 527, 537+ (2005)

874 RECONCILING ORIGINALISM AND THE HISTORY OF THE PUBLIC USE CLAUSE, 79 Fordham L. Rev. 265, 319+ (2010)

C 875 PROPERTY IN CRISIS, 78 Fordham L. Rev. 1607, 1660 (2010)

C 876 WHAT OWNERS WANT AND GOVERNMENTS DO: EVIDENCE FROM THE OREGON EXPERIMENT, 78 Fordham L. Rev. 1281, 1330+ (2009)

C 877 FERRETING OUT FAVORITISM: BRINGING PRETEXT CLAIMS AFTER KELO, 77 Fordham L. Rev. 3095, 3162+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 878 THE ROLE OF THE LAWYER IN THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY, 77 Fordham L. Rev. 1611, 1634 (2009)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 879 PROTECTING STATUS: THE MORTGAGE CRISIS, EMINENT DOMAIN, AND THE ETHIC OF HOMEOWNERSHIP, 77 Fordham L. Rev. 949, 998+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 880 WHITE CARTELS, THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1866, AND THE HISTORY OF JONES V. ALFRED H. MAYER CO., 77 Fordham L. Rev. 999, 1050+ (2008)

C 881 GIVINGS AND THE NEXT COPYRIGHT DEFERMENT, 77 Fordham L. Rev. 809, 850 (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 882 CONDEMNATION FRIENDLY OR LAND USE WISE? A BROAD INTERPRETATION OF THE PUBLIC USE REQUIREMENT WORKS WELL FOR NEW YORK CITY, 76 Fordham L. Rev. 1121, 1175+ (2007) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 883 PUBLIC USE OR PRIVATE BENEFIT? THE POST-KELO INTERSECTION OF RELIGIOUS LAND USE AND THE PUBLIC USE DOCTRINE, 75 Fordham L. Rev. 1105, 1142+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 884 DOES IT REALLY MATTER? CONSERVATIVE COURTS IN A CONSERVATIVE ERA, 75 Fordham L. Rev. 675, 708+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 885 PROPERTY METAPHORS AND KELO V. NEW LONDON: TWO VIEWS OF THE CASTLE, 74 Fordham L. Rev. 2971, 2976 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 886 LEARNING ON THE JOB, 74 Fordham L. Rev. 1561, 1567+ (2006)

C 887 JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT IN TWO DIMENSIONS: CHARTING AREA AND INTENSITY IN THE DECISIONS OF JUSTICE STEVENS, 74 Fordham L. Rev. 2051, 2079+ (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 888 FIGHTING FEDERALISM WITH FEDERALISM: IF IT'S NOT JUST A BATTLE BETWEEN FEDERALISTS AND NATIONALISTS, WHAT IS IT?, 74 Fordham L. Rev. 2081, 2121 (2006)

889 A HERCULEAN LEAP FOR THE HARD CASE OF POST-ACQUISITION CLAIMS: INTERPRETING FAIR HOUSING ACT SECTION 3604(B) AFTER MODESTO, 37 Fordham Urb. L.J. 1083, 1147 (2010)

890 NEW YORK'S FIGHT OVER BLIGHT: THE ROLE OF ECONOMIC UNDERUTILIZATION IN KAUR, 37 Fordham Urb. L.J. 1149, 1195+ (2010)

C 891 CAN URBAN UNIVERSITY EXPANSION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CO-EXIST?: A CASE STUDY IN PROGRESS ON COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, 37 Fordham Urb. L.J. 637, 697 (2010)

C 892 WINDING TOWARD THE HEART OF THE TAKINGS MUDDLE: KELO, LINGLE, AND PUBLIC DISCOURSE ABOUT PRIVATE PROPERTY, 34 Fordham Urb. L.J. 613, 655+ (2007) **HN: 2,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 893 URBAN REVITALIZATION IN THE POST-KELO ERA, 34 Fordham Urb. L.J. 657, 687+ (2007) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 894 THE HOUSES THAT EMINENT DOMAIN AND HOUSING TAX CREDITS BUILT: IMAGINING A BETTER NEW ORLEANS, 34 Fordham Urb. L.J. 689, 720+ (2007) **HN: 2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 895 BROWNFIELDS AT 20: A CRITICAL REEVALUATION, 34 Fordham Urb. L.J. 721, 756+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 896 HOW MUCH IS THAT DOGGY IN THE WINDOW? THE INEVITABLY UNSATISFYING DUTY TO MONETIZE, 33 Fordham Urb. L.J. 1045, 1069 (2006)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

897 SUBPRIME SOLUTIONS TO THE HOUSING CRISIS: CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS WITH THE HELPING FAMILIES SAVE THEIR HOMES ACT OF 2009, 17 Geo. Mason L. Rev. 1149, 1194+ (2010)

C 898 MAKING LANDOWNERS WHOLE WITHOUT PUTTING HOLES IN ZONING: PERSONAL WAIVERS AS THE SOLUTION TO THE PARTIAL REGULATORY TAKINGS COMPENSATION ISSUE, 15 Geo. Mason L. Rev. 513, 547+ (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 899 WRITING ON THE WALL: THE IMPENDING DEMISE OF MODERN SIGN REGULATION UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS, 18 Geo. Mason U. Civ. Rts. L.J. 1, 50 (2007)

900 DERAILING PENN CENTRAL: A POST-LINGLE, COST-BASIS APPROACH TO REGULATORY TAKINGS, 78 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 870, 907+ (2010)

C 901 SPLITTING THE ATOM OF PROPERTY: RIGHTS EXPERIMENTALISM AS OBLIGATION TO FUTURE GENERATIONS, 77 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 1411, 1477+ (2009)

C 902 NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE REHNQUIST COURT, 74 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 1144, 1170+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 903 THE INDIVIDUAL RIGHT TO FEDERALISM IN THE REHNQUIST COURT, 74 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 888, 905+ (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 904 FEDERALISM, INSTRUMENTALISM, AND THE LEGACY OF THE REHNQUIST COURT, 74 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 906, 955+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 905 PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUCCESS IN PROTECTED AREAS: THE PUBLIC INTEREST AND LOCAL COMMUNITY RIGHTS TO PRIOR INFORMED CONSENT (PIC), 19 Geo. Int'l Envtl. L. Rev. 475, 500+ (2007)

C 906 MORE THAN MERELY INCIDENTAL: THIRD-PARTY BENEFICIARY RIGHTS IN URBAN REDEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS, 17 Geo. J. on Poverty L. & Pol'y 287, 295+ (2010)

907 MASTERS OF THEIR OWN EMINENT DOMAIN: THE CASE FOR A RELIANCE INTEREST ASSOCIATED WITH ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS, 99 Geo. L.J. 651, 652+ (2011)

C 908 WHY THE SUPREME COURT CARES ABOUT ELITES, NOT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, 98 Geo. L.J. 1515, 1581 (2010)

C 909 ORIGINALISM AND THE GOOD CONSTITUTION, 98 Geo. L.J. 1693, 1768 (2010)

910 WHEN IS A SEARCH NOT A SEARCH? WHEN IT'S A QUARTER: THE THIRD AMENDMENT, ORIGINALISM, AND NSA WIRETAPPING, 97 Geo. L.J. 555, 587+ (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 911 THE PROPERTY PUZZLE, 96 Geo. L.J. 1987, 1988+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 912 TAKING THE TEMPLE: EMINENT DOMAIN AND THE LIMITS OF RLUIPA, 96 Geo. L.J. 2057, 2058+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 913 DISCRIMINATORY CONDEMNATIONS AND THE FAIR HOUSING ACT, 96 Geo. L.J. 1027, 1027+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 914 THE REHNQUIST COURT AND THE DEATH PENALTY, 94 Geo. L.J. 1367, 1383+ (2006)

C 915 THE LIBERAL LEGACY OF BUSH v. GORE, 94 Geo. L.J. 1427, 1462+ (2006)

C 916 ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL SUBSIDY IN KELO: RESTRICTING THE AVAILABILITY

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

OF TAX-EXEMPT FINANCING FOR REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, 94 Geo. L.J. 1635, 1636+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 917 KYOTO COMES TO GEORGIA: HOW INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES FOSTER SUSTAINABLE COMMERCE IN SMALL TOWN AMERICA, 36 Ga. J. Int'l & Comp. L. 559, 613 (2008)

C 918 THE FUTURE OF FOOTNOTE FOUR, 41 Ga. L. Rev. 797, 841+ (2007) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 919 GENERAL PROVISIONS AND CONDEMNATION PROCEDURE: PROVIDE A COMPREHENSIVE REVISION OF PROVISIONS REGARDING THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 23 Ga. St. U. L. Rev. 157, 158+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

920 FOREWORD: WHY A CONFERENCE ON REDEVELOPMENT, AND WHY NOW, 22 Ga. St. U. L. Rev. 747, 750 (2006)

C 921 WHY KELO IS NOT GOOD NEWS FOR LOCAL PLANNERS AND DEVELOPERS, 22 Ga. St. U. L. Rev. 803, 856+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 922 BEYOND KELO: THINKING ABOUT URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN THE 21ST CENTURY, 22 Ga. St. U. L. Rev. 895, 933+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 923 NATURE OF RIGHT OF EMINENT DOMAIN: CHANGE CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE NATURE OF THE RIGHT OF EMINENT DOMAIN; PROVIDE FOR THE LIMITATION OF PUBLIC PURPOSES FOR WHICH EMINENT DOMAIN MAY BE EXERCISED; PROVIDE FOR STA, 22 Ga. St. U. L. Rev. 131, 137+ (2005) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

924 THE WASHINGTON SUPREME COURT AND THE STATE CONSTITUTION: A 2010 ASSESSMENT, 46 Gonz. L. Rev. 1, 56 (2011)

C 925 FROM PUBLIC USE TO PUBLIC PURPOSE: THE SUPREME COURT STRETCHES THE TAKINGS CLAUSE IN KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 41 Gonz. L. Rev. 81, 101+ (2006)

926 COPING WITH KELO, 26 NO. 6 GPSolo 22, 22+ (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

927 KELO: A SETBACK FOR PROPERTY OWNERS, 23 NO. 6 GPSolo 22, 22+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 928 SEIZED BY NATURE: SUGGESTIONS ON HOW TO BETTER PROTECT ANIMALS AND PROPERTY RIGHTS UNDER THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT, 12 Great Plains Nat. Resources J. 149, 170+ (2008) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

929 KELO RAZES THE BAR OF PUBLIC USE IN NEW LONDON, 11 Great Plains Nat. Resources J. 89, 100+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 930 THE PUBLIC USE, PUBLIC TRUST & PUBLIC BENEFIT Could Both Cooley & Kelo Be Wrong?, 9 Green Bag 2d 125, 131 (2006)

C 931 THE END OF AN ERA October Term 2004, 8 Green Bag 2d 345, 354+ (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 932 KELO: AN AMERICAN ORIGINAL Of Grubby Particulars & Grand Principles, 8 Green Bag 2d 355, 361 (2005)

C 933 NO MORE GOVERNMENT THEFT OF PROPERTY! A CALL TO RETURN TO A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF REVIEW AFTER THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DECISION IN KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 27 Hamline J. Pub. L. & Pol'y 115, 162+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 934 IRRATIONAL BASIS: THE SUPREME COURT, INNER CITIES, AND THE NEW "MANI-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

FEST DESTINY", 23 Harv. BlackLetter L.J. 55, 55+ (2007) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 935 BACKLASH'S TRAVELS, 42 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev. 435, 449 (2007)

C 936 MARITAL STATUS AS PROPERTY: TOWARD A NEW JURISPRUDENCE FOR GAY RIGHTS, 41 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev. 509, 526+ (2006) **HN: 2,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 937 KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 30 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 261, 279+ (2006)

C 938 THE OWNERSHIP SOCIETY AND TAKINGS OF PROPERTY: CASTLES, INVESTMENTS, AND JUST OBLIGATIONS, 30 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 309, 315+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 939 LINGLE'S LEGACY: UNTANGLING SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS FROM TAKINGS DOCTRINE, 30 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 371, 371+ (2006)

C 940 THE RIGHT TO HOUSING RECOVERY AFTER NATURAL DISASTERS, 22 Harv. Hum. Rts. J. 169, 204 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

941 DOES THE STATE CREATE THE MARKET-AND SHOULD IT PURSUE EFFICIENCY?, 33 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 779, 806 (2010)

942 PUNISHMENT AND STUDENT SPEECH: STRAINING THE REACH OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT, 33 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 885, 906 (2010)

C 943 THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS IN THE STATES: AMBIGUITY, FALSE MODESTY, AND (MAYBE) ANOTHER WIN FOR ORIGINALISM, 33 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 185, 192+ (2010)

C 944 REVIVING NECESSITY IN EMINENT DOMAIN, 33 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 239, 281+ (2010)

C 945 A FAINT-HEARTED LIBERTARIAN AT BEST: THE SWEET MYSTERY OF JUSTICE ANTHONY KENNEDY THE TIE GOES TO FREEDOM: JUSTICE ANTHONY M. KENNEDY ON LIBERTY. HELEN J. KNOWLES. ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD, 2009, 33 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 333, 360+ (2010)

C 946 POLITICAL RESPONSES TO SUPREME COURT DECISIONS, 32 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 113, 119+ (2009) **HN: 4,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 947 LAW AND ECONOMICS: REALISM OR DEMOCRACY?, 32 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 127, 145 (2009)

C 948 VOTING WITH YOUR FEET IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, 32 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 29, 44 (2009)

949 LESSONS FROM THE RISE OF LEGAL CONSERVATISM, 32 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 415, 430 (2009)

C 950 NORM CHANGE OR JUDICIAL DECREE? THE COURTS, THE PUBLIC, AND WELFARE REFORM, 32 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 45, 64 (2009)

C 951 JUDICIAL REVIEW OF LOCAL LAND USE DECISIONS: LESSONS FROM RLUIPA, 31 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 717, 760+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 952 EMINENT DOMAIN AFTER KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON: AN ARGUMENT FOR BANNING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS, 29 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 491, 493+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 953 RESTRAINING EMINENT DOMAIN THROUGH JUST COMPENSATION: KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 125 S. CT. 2655 (2005), 29 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 759, 768+ (2006)

C 954 THE HUMAN NATURE OF FREEDOM AND IDENTITY-WE HOLD MORE THAN RAN-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

DOM THOUGHTS, 29 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 33, 52+ (2005)

C 955 EXCLUSION AND EXCLUSIVE USE IN PATENT LAW, 22 Harv. J.L. & Tech. 321, 379 (2009)

C 956 THE FUTURE OF PATENT ENFORCEMENT AFTER EBAY v. MERCEXCHANGE, 20 Harv. J.L. & Tech. 235, 252 (2006)

C 957 JUDICIAL TAKINGS, 124 Harv. L. Rev. 299, 309+ (2010)

C 958 MOBILE CAPITAL, LOCAL ECONOMIC REGULATION, AND THE DEMOCRATIC CITY, 123 Harv. L. Rev. 482, 540+ (2009)

C 959 LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW - PREEMPTION - SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK HOLDS THAT NEW YORK CITY HYBRID TAXI REGULATIONS ARE LIKELY PREEMPTED BY THE EPCA. - METROPOLITAN TAXICAB BOARD OF TRADE V. CITY OF NEW YORK, NO. 08 CIV., 122 Harv. L. Rev. 2275, 2282+ (2009)

C 960 SECOND AMENDMENT MINIMALISM: HELLER AS GRISWOLD, 122 Harv. L. Rev. 246, 274 (2008)

C 961 LAND ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS, 121 Harv. L. Rev. 1465, 1527+ (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 962 RELIGIOUS LAND USE IN THE FEDERAL COURTS UNDER RLUIPA, 120 Harv. L. Rev. 2178, 2199 (2007)

C 963 STATE LAW AS "OTHER LAW": OUR FIFTY SOVEREIGNS IN THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL CANON, 120 Harv. L. Rev. 1670, 1690+ (2007)

C 964 LEGAL ORIGINS, POLITICS, AND MODERN STOCK MARKETS, 120 Harv. L. Rev. 460, 527 (2006)

C 965 EMINENT DOMAIN - PUBLIC USE - OHIO SUPREME COURT HOLDS THAT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CANNOT BY ITSELF SATISFY THE PUBLIC USE LIMITATION OF THE OHIO CONSTITUTION. - CITY OF NORWOOD V. HORNEY, 853 N.E.2D 1115 (OHIO 2006)., 120 Harv. L. Rev. 643, 650+ (2006)

C 966 2. TAX SALES OF REAL PROPERTY - NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD, 120 Harv. L. Rev. 233, 243 (2006)

C 967 1. APPLICATION TO INCARCERATED PERSONS - INMATE ACCESS TO PRINT MEDIA, 120 Harv. L. Rev. 263, 273 (2006)

C 968 SHORT TITLE:A TRIBUTE TO JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR On the occasion of her retirement from the Supreme Court of the United States, the editors of the O'Conner, 119 Harv. L. Rev. 1257, 1273+ (2006)

C 969 THE POLITICAL CONSTITUTION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, 119 Harv. L. Rev. 780, 851 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 970 1. PUBLIC USE-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 119 Harv. L. Rev. 287, 297+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 971 FOREWORD: A POLITICAL COURT, 119 Harv. L. Rev. 31, 102+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 972 THE STATISTICS, 119 Harv. L. Rev. 415, 424 (2005)

973 ON PARENTS INVOLVED AND THE PROBLEMATIC PRAISE OF JUSTICE CLARENCE THOMAS, 37 Hastings Const. L.Q. 225, 242 (2010)

C 974 LEGAL CLAIMS AS PRIVATE PROPERTY: IMPLICATIONS FOR EMINENT DOMAIN, 36

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Hastings Const. L.Q. 373, 423+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

975 TAKING THE COURTS: A BRIEF HISTORY OF TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATE, FEDERAL, AND THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURTS, 35 Hastings Const. L.Q. 897, 909+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

976 TO WHAT EXTENT CAN CONGRESS CHANGE THE PATENT RIGHT WITHOUT EFFECTING A TAKING?, 34 Hastings Const. L.Q. 447, 476+ (2007) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

977 SUPREME COURT VOTING BEHAVIOR 2004 TERM, 32 Hastings Const. L.Q. 909, 986+ (2005) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

978 INFORMAL RULES, TRANSACTION COSTS, AND THE FAILURE OF THE "TAKINGS" LAW IN CHINA, 29 Hastings Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 1, 27 (2005)

979 ENGQUIST AND THE EROSION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE: AN ATTEMPT TO STOP THE CREEP OF IRRATIONAL DICTA, 61 Hastings L.J. 969, 996 (2010)

980 THE WATER NECTAR, AND THE ROCKS PURE GOLD: FINDING A LEGAL STRUCTURE TO FACILITATE NECESSARY CHANGE IN CALIFORNIA'S JEWEL, THE DELTA, 60 Hastings L.J. 647, 671 (2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

981 REGULATING LAND USE IN A CONSTITUTIONAL SHADOW: THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXTS OF EXACTIONS, 58 Hastings L.J. 729, 775+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

982 KEYNOTE ADDRESS, 57 Hastings L.J. 1243, 1260+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

983 HALE'S LEGACY: WHY PRIVATE PROPERTY IS NOT A SYNONYM FOR LIBERTY, 57 Hastings L.J. 1009, 1029 (2006)

984 THE MEASURE OF A JUSTICE: JUSTICE SCALIA AND THE FALTERING OF THE PROPERTY RIGHTS MOVEMENT WITHIN THE SUPREME COURT, 57 Hastings L.J. 759, 825 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

985 FIGHTING FOR A WAY OF LIFE: PUBLIC LANDS AND THE RANCHERS WHO OWN THEM - AN ANALYSIS OF COLVIN CATTLE CO., V. UNITED STATES, 468 F.3D 803 (2006), 14 Hastings W.-N.W. J. Envtl. L. & Pol'y 1613, 1629+ (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

986 2006 WATER LAW SYMPOSIUM: KEYNOTE ADDRESS, 12 Hastings W.-N.W. J. Envtl. L. & Pol'y 125, 139+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

987 CASES AND PLACES IN HAWAII, 10-JUL Haw. B.J. 110, 113 (2006)

988 Court Rejects Use of Eminent Domain to Acquire Property for Columbia University Expansion, 38 NO. CD-1 HDRCURDEV 36, 36+ (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

989 Second Circuit Upholds Taking of Property for Redevelopment, Despite Benefit to Private Party, 36 NO. CD-4 HDRCURDEV 33, 33+ (2008) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

990 Supreme Court Upholds Use of Eminent Domain to Acquire Private Property for Economic Development, 33 NO. CD-14 HDRCURDEV 2, 2+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

991 CONSTITUTIONAL VIABILITY OF THE EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT'S INTEREST ARBITRATION PROVISION, 26 Hofstra Lab. & Emp. L.J. 33, 62 (2008)

992 UNITED STATES REGULATION OF STEM CELL RESEARCH: RECASTING GOVERNMENT'S ROLE AND QUESTIONS TO BE RESOLVED, 37 Hofstra L. Rev. 383, 445+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

993 TO ATTAIN "THE JUST REWARDS OF SO MUCH STRUGGLE": LOCAL-RESIDENT

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

EQUITY PARTICIPATION IN URBAN REVITALIZATION, 35 Hofstra L. Rev. 37, 114+ (2006)

C 994 READING BACK, READING BLACK, 35 Hofstra L. Rev. 9, 22 (2006)

C 995 KELO AND THE LOCAL POLITICAL PROCESS, 34 Hofstra L. Rev. 13, 22+ (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 996 OLYMPIC IDEAL DEMOLISHED: HOW FORCED EVICTIONS IN CHINA RELATED TO THE 2008 OLYMPIC GAMES ARE VIOLATING INTERNATIONAL LAW, 29 Hous. J. Int'l L. 155, 189+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 997 UNVEILING COMPETING PATENT PERSPECTIVES, 46 Hous. L. Rev. 1047, 1114 (2009)

C 998 THE ECHOES OF FORGOTTEN FOOTFALLS: TELECOMMUNICATIONS MERGERS AT THE DAWN OF THE DIGITAL MILLENNIUM, 43 Hous. L. Rev. 1311, 1371+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 999 HOUSE BILL 465: INTERPRETING THE FAIR HOUSING ACT DIRECT THREAT EXCEPTION TO CREATE A DIRECT THREAT FOR IDAHO MUNICIPALITIES, 45 Idaho L. Rev. 621, 650 (2009)

C 1000 EMINENT DOMAIN, REGULATORY TAKINGS, AND LEGISLATIVE RESPONSES IN THE POST-KELO NORTHWEST, 43 Idaho L. Rev. 539, 583+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1001 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY REWRITES EMINENT DOMAIN LAW The Bill, Now on the Governor's Desk, Specifies that Property Can Be Condemned Only for a "Qualified Public Use.", 94 Ill. B.J. 280, 280 (2006)

C 1002 KELO v CITY OF NEW LONDON - HOW SAFE IS YOUR CASTLE?, 94 Ill. B.J. 186, 186+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1003 IN DEFENSE OF KELO: ONE LAWYER'S TAKE ON TAKINGS, 93 Ill. B.J. 524, 524+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1004 RETHINKING JUDICIAL DEFERENCE TO LEGISLATIVE FACT-FINDING, 84 Ind. L.J. 1, 56+ (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1005 MAINTAINING GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY: CALLS FOR A "PUBLIC USE" BEYOND EMINENT DOMAIN, 83 Ind. L.J. 1097, 1119+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1006 THE REALLY NEW PROPERTY: A SKEPTICAL APPRAISAL, 43 Ind. L. Rev. 1229, 1285+ (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1007 YES IN MY BACKYARD: DEVELOPERS, GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITIES WORKING TOGETHER THROUGH DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS AND COMMUNITY BENEFIT AGREEMENTS, 42 Ind. L. Rev. 227, 255 (2009) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1008 REBUILDING THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE CITY: REGULATORY TAKING'S ANTI-SUBORDINATION INSIGHTS FOR EMINENT DOMAIN AND REDEVELOPMENT, 42 Ind. L. Rev. 97, 163+ (2009) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1009 CONFERENCE ON RELATIONS BETWEEN CONGRESS AND THE FEDERAL COURTS, 41 Ind. L. Rev. 305, 382+ (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1010 TAKING BACK EMINENT DOMAIN: USING HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY TO STOP EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE, 39 Ind. L. Rev. 449, 481+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

1011 JUDICIAL REVIEW IN REVIEW: A FOUR-PART DEFENSE OF LEGAL CONSTITUTION-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

ALISM A REVIEW ESSAY ON POLITICAL CONSTITUTIONALISM, BY RICHARD BELLAMY. CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2007, PP. 280, 7 Int'l J. Const. L. 329, 354+ (2009)

1012 PUBLIC GOODS, TAXES, AND TAKINGS, 28 Int'l Rev. L. & Econ. 287, 293 (2008)

1013 PREPAYMENT PREMIUMS: CONTRACTING FOR FUTURE FINANCIAL STABILITY IN THE COMMERCIAL LENDING MARKET, 96 Iowa L. Rev. 1037, 1077 (2011) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1014 WHERE UNITED HAULERS MIGHT TAKE US: THE FUTURE OF THE STATE-SELF-PROMOTION EXCEPTION TO THE DORMANT COMMERCE CLAUSE RULE, 95 Iowa L. Rev. 541, 629 (2010)

C 1015 THE RIGHT AND WRONG WAYS TO SELL A PUBLIC FORUM, 94 Iowa L. Rev. 1419, 1448+ (2009)

C 1016 CLEANING UP CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS: LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL SOLUTIONS TO THE DILEMMA OF ADMITTING CONTAMINATION EVIDENCE, 93 Iowa L. Rev. 1135, 1170+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1017 PROTECTING PRIVATE PROPERTY: AN ANALYSIS OF GEORGIA'S RESPONSE TO KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 2 J. Marshall L.J. 51, 91+ (2009) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1018 THE STATUS OF NOLLAN V. CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION AND DOLAN V. CITY OF TIGARD AFTER LINGLE V. CHEVRON U.S.A., INC., 40 J. Marshall L. Rev. 539, 571+ (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1019 DECONSTRUCTING LINGLE: IMPLICATIONS FOR TAKINGS DOCTRINE, 40 J. Marshall L. Rev. 573, 591 (2007)

C 1020 HOW DO YOU SOLVE A PROBLEM LIKE IN KELO?, 40 J. Marshall L. Rev. 609, 650+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1021 WHY BOTHER CALLING PATENTS PROPERTY? THE GOVERNMENT'S PATH TO LICENSE ANY PATENT AND MAYBE PAY FOR IT, 6 J. Marshall Rev. Intell. Prop. L. 151, 152+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1022 THE LOGICAL CONCLUSION TO REASONABLY CALCULATED NOTICE: ACTUAL NOTICE, 11 Jones L. Rev. 31, 54 (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1023 "AIN'T NO SUNSHINE": EXAMINING INFORMALITY AND STATE OPEN MEETINGS ACTS AS THE ANTI-PUBLIC NORM IN INNER-CITY REDEVELOPMENT DEAL MAKING, 18-FALL J. Affordable Housing & Community Dev. L. 113, 114+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1024 THE HOUSES THAT EMINENT DOMAIN AND HOUSING TAX CREDITS BUILT: IMAGINING A BETTER NEW ORLEANS, 16-SUM J. Affordable Housing & Community Dev. L. 377, 383+ (2007) **HN: 2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1025 LEGISLATIVE RESPONSES TO KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON AND SUBSEQUENT COURT DECISIONS-ONE YEAR LATER, 16-FALL J. Affordable Housing & Community Dev. L. 52, 52+ (2006)

1026 DON'T WASTE A TEACHING MOMENT: KELO, URBAN RENEWAL, AND BLIGHT, 15-FALL J. Affordable Housing & Community Dev. L. 14, 14+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1027 FIVE WAYS APPELLATE COURTS CAN HELP THE NEWS MEDIA, 9 J. App. Prac. & Process 311, 321 (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1028 THE VIEW FROM THE TRENCHES: A REPORT ON THE BREAKOUT SESSIONS AT THE 2005 NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON APPELLATE JUSTICE, 8 J. App. Prac. & Process 141, 205 (2006)

1029 FEDERAL PATENT TAKINGS, 2 J. Bus. Entrepreneurship & L. 1, 29+ (2008) **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

1030 TOO MUCH OF A GOOD THING: HOW MUCH SHOULD HEDGE FUNDS BE REQUIRED TO DISCLOSE?, 2 J. Bus. Entrepreneurship & L. 81, 121+ (2008) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1031 GRIDLOCK ON THE ROAD TO RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT: A DISCUSSION ABOUT THE OPPORTUNITIES & RISKS PRESENTED BY THE MODERNIZATION REQUIREMENTS OF THE ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION NETWORK, 1 J. Bus. Entrepreneurship & L. 137, 179 (2007)

1032 RIGHTS, LIBERTIES, THE COMMON GOOD, AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF AMERICAN LAW IN RECENT DECADES: HAS THE LEGAL PROFESSION FAILED IN ITS ETHICAL OBLIGATION TO IMPROVE THE LEGAL SYSTEM?, 47 J. Cath. Legal Stud. 9, 48 (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1033 SUBSTITUTING COMPLEMENTS, 2 Journal of Competition Law & Economics 333+ (2006)

1034 RESTAURANTS, BARS AND WORKPLACES, LEND ME YOUR AIR: SMOKEFREE LAWS AS PRIVATE PROPERTY EXACTIONS-THE UNDISCOVERED COUNTRY FOR NOLLAN AND DOLAN?, 22 J. Contemp. Health L. & Pol'y 143, 176+ (2005) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1035 OWNERSHIP, LIMITED: RECONCILING TRADITIONAL AND PROGRESSIVE CORPORATE LAW VIA AN ARISTOTELIAN UNDERSTANDING OF OWNERSHIP, 34 J. Corp. L. 247, 292 (2008)

1036 STATE ACTION IMMUNITY, MUNICIPALITIES, AND THE UNIQUE CASE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 33 J. Corp. L. 797, 818 (2008)

1037 AGAINST THE PLAGUE: EXEMPTION OF PHARMACEUTICAL PATENT RIGHTS AS A BIOSECURITY STRATEGY, 2007 U. Ill. J.L. Tech. & Pol'y 287, 343+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1038 REAUTHORIZING THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT IN FAVOR OF WILDLIFE AND WILD LANDS: AN INEVITABLE RESULT OF NARRATIVE CHANGES IN TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY AMERICA?, 24 J. Envtl. L. & Litig. 423, 454 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1039 TRADING SPACES: MEASURE 37, MACPHERSON V. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, AND TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS AS A PATH OUT OF DEADLOCK, 20 J. Envtl. L. & Litig. 273, 328+ (2005) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1040 THROW THE "BUMS" OUT? A DISCUSSION OF THE EFFECTS OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION STATUTES ON LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS THROUGH THE PROCESS OF URBAN GENTRIFICATION IN OLD NEIGHBORHOODS, 11 J. Gender Race & Just. 541, 571+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1041 CHINA'S DING ZI HU, THE UNITED STATES'S KELO, AND SINGAPORE'S EN-BLOC PROCESS: A NEW MODEL FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT EMINENT DOMAIN FROM A GIVINGS PERSPECTIVE, 24 J. Land Use & Envtl. L. 107, 158+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1042 IN SEARCH OF ROBIN HOOD: SUGGESTED LEGISLATIVE RESPONSES TO KELO, 23 J. Land Use & Envtl. L. 305, 332+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

1043 ENDS AND MEANS IN TAKINGS LAW AFTER LINGLE V. CHEVRON, 23 J. Land Use &

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Envtl. L. 333, 394+ (2008) **HN: 1,4 (S.Ct.)**

1044 BROADENING NARROW PERSPECTIVES AND NUISANCE LAW: PROTECTING ECO-SYSTEM SERVICES IN THE ACF BASIN, 22 J. Land Use & Envtl. L. 243, 298+ (2007)

1045 THE STRUCTURE OF THE LAND USE REGULATORY SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES, 22 J. Land Use & Envtl. L. 441, 523+ (2007)

1046 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS, 22 J. Land Use & Envtl. L. 139, 156 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1047 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS, 21 J. Land Use & Envtl. L. 115, 127+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1048 BREAKING FAITH WITH NATURE: THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC LAND POLICY, 27 J. Land Resources & Envtl. L. 195, 253 (2007)

1049 HUNTERS, OIL, NATIVE AMERICANS AND ARCHAEOLOGISTS: CAN CONFLICTING INTERESTS CO-EXIST ON THE "MOST SIGNIFICANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIND IN NORTH AMERICA IN 50 YEARS?", 26 J. Land Resources & Envtl. L. 447, 473+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1050 SURVEYS IN AMERICA'S CLASSROOMS: HOW MUCH DO PARENTS REALLY KNOW?, 37 J.L. & Educ. 143, 192 (2008)

1051 BUREAUCRATIC DECISION COSTS AND ENDOGENOUS AGENCY EXPERTISE, 23 J.L. Econ. & Org. 469, 491 (2007)

1052 PRACTICALLY GROUNDED: CONVERGENCE OF LAND USE LAW PEDAGOGY AND BEST PRACTICES, 60 J. Legal Educ. 519, 548 (2011) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1053 TRANS FAT BANS The Next Regulatory Taking?, 29 J. Legal Med. 99, 115 (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1054 AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF COMPENSATION PAID IN EMINENT DOMAIN SETTLE-MENTS: NEW YORK CITY, 1990-2002, 39 J. Legal Stud. 201, 201+ (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1055 LEGISLATIVELY REVISING KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON: EMINENT DOMAIN, FEDERALISM, AND CONGRESSIONAL POWERS, 32 J. Legis. 165, 219+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1056 QUASI-GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES AND GOVERNMENTAL IMMUNITY FROM SALES AND USE TAXES, 19-FEB J. Multistate Tax'n 28, 32 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1057 INCENTIVES AFTER CUNO-UNCERTAINTIES CONTINUE FOR STATES AND BUSI-NESSES, 16-NOV J. Multistate Tax'n 8, 13 (2006)

1058 LAND AND HOME IN THE AMERICAN MIND, 22 J. Nat. Resources & Envtl. L. 107, 137+ (2009)

1059 THE JURY'S ROLE IN EMINENT DOMAIN COMPENSATION AS EXPLAINED IN MET-ROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA V. CAMPUS CRUSADE FOR CHRIST, INC., 22 J. Nat. Resources & Envtl. L. 219, 228 (2009)

1060 2006 EMINENT DOMAIN BALLOT INITIATIVES: CITIZENS' VOICE OR CRYING WOLF?, 21 J. Nat. Resources & Envtl. L. 99, 119+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1061 TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE AS THREE-TIERED REVIEW, 20 J. Nat. Resources & Envtl. L. 1, 49 (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1062 THE POETRY OF PERSUASION: EARLY LITERARY THEORY AND ITS ADVICE TO LEGAL WRITERS, 6 J. Ass'n Legal Writing Directors 55, 66+ (2009)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1063 PROMOTION OF THE ARTS: AN ARGUMENT FOR LIMITED COPYRIGHT PROTECTION OF ILLEGAL GRAFFITI, 55 J. Copyright Soc'y U.S.A. 257, 282 (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1064 EMINENT DOMAIN-MISSOURI'S RESPONSE TO KELO, 63 J. Mo. B. 178, 178+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1065 PRACTICALITIES AND PECULIARITIES: THE HEIGHTENED DUE PROCESS STANDARD FOR NOTICE UNDER JONES V. FLOWER, 27 J. Nat'l Ass'n Admin. L. Judiciary 209, 253 (2007)

1066 AN INDEPENDENT INVENTION DEFENSE TO PATENT INFRINGEMENT: THE ACADEMY TALKING TO ITSELF: SHOULD ANYONE LISTEN?, 90 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 295, 307 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1067 COMMISSION PROPOSED CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - BY DEFINITION - FOR TRADE SECRETS, A UNIQUELY VALUABLE IP RIGHT, 88 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 919, 957 (2006)

1068 EBAY INC. v. MERCEXCHANGE, L.L.C.: THE RIGHT TO EXCLUDE UNDER U.S. PATENT LAW AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST, 88 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 852, 858 (2006)

1069 TORT LAW IN A LIBERAL STATE, 1 J. Tort L. 3, 41+ (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1070 PROTECTING PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS AFTER THE PUBLIC USE SHIP HAS SAILED, 34 NO. 1 Litigation 25, 25+ (2007) **HN: 2,7 (S.Ct.)**

1071 FROM FREE RIDERS TO FAIRNESS: A COOPERATIVE SYSTEM FOR ORGAN TRANSPLANTATION, 48 Jurimetrics J. 1, 41 (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1072 THE PUBLIC TRUST IN PRIVATE HANDS: SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE POLITICS OF GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT, 96 Ky. L.J. 369, 445 (2008)

1073 THE PSYCHOLOGICAL COST OF EMINENT DOMAIN TAKINGS AND JUST COMPENSATION, 30 Law & Psychol. Rev. 215, 217+ (2006) **HN: 3,6,7 (S.Ct.)**

1074 20 Law & Literature 291, TAKING THE HOME (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1075 LAW'S ALLURE IN AMERICAN POLITICS AND POLICY: WHAT IT IS, WHAT IT IS NOT, AND WHAT IT MIGHT YET BE, 35 Law & Soc. Inquiry 1077, 1079+ (2010)

1076 PLESSY 2.0, 13 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 861, 919 (2009)

1077 OPEN ACCESS, LAW, KNOWLEDGE, COPYRIGHTS, DOMINANCE AND SUBORDINATION, 10 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 869, 884+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1078 RESCUING FEDERALISM AFTER RAICH: THE CASE FOR CLEAR STATEMENT RULES, 9 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 823, 851+ (2005)

1079 "SOCIETY MUST BE (REGULATED)": BIOPOLITICS AND THE COMMERCE CLAUSE IN GONZALES V. RAICH, 9 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 853, 877+ (2005)

1080 WHAT HATH RAICH WROUGHT? FIVE TAKES, 9 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 915, 934 (2005) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1081 NOT BY THE HAIR OF MY CHINNY CHIN CHIN: OHIO'S ATTEMPT TO COMBAT THE BIG BAD WOLF OF BLIGHT, 2 Liberty U. L. Rev. 243, 246+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1082 THE WEIGHT OF KELO The controversy surrounding the Kelo decision may lead to ill-advised changes in California's Community Redevelopment Law, 29-MAR L.A. Law. 36, 37+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1083 THE OVERREACTION TO THE KELO DECISION, 28-JAN L.A. Law. 52, 52+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1084 CONDEMNATION CLAUSES IN REAL ESTATE AGREEMENTS, 28-SEP L.A. Law. 12, 12+ (2005)

1085 FROM THE SUBSTANTIVE TO THE PRACTICAL! The Articles in This Issue Will Keep Your Interest and Be Useful in Your Practice, 55 La. B.J. 395, 395 (2008)

C 1086 EMINENT DOMAIN UNDER THE 2006 LOUISIANA CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS The Legislature's Forward Pass to the Judiciary, 55 La. B.J. 398, 398+ (2008) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1087 LOUISIANA EMINENT DOMAIN After Kelo and Katrina, 53 La. B.J. 363, 363+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1088 TWO YEARS AND COUNTING: LAND USE AND LOUISIANA'S POST-KATRINA RECOVERY, 68 La. L. Rev. 349, 387+ (2008) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1089 SAVING PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT: RESCUING LOUISIANA FROM ITS REACTION TO KELO, 68 La. L. Rev. 631, 679+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1090 THE KELO EFFECT: EMINENT DOMAIN AND PROPERTY RIGHTS IN LOUISIANA, 67 La. L. Rev. 171, 193+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1091 TAX INCREMENT FINANCING: LOUISIANA GOES FISHING FOR NEW BUSINESS, 66 La. L. Rev. 851, 884+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1092 9 Loyola Journal of Public Interest Law 39, BUILDING MORATORIUM, PROPOSED FLOOD ZONING AND EXPROPRIATION AFTER KATRINA (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1093 ADAM SMITH IN THE COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES, 56 Loy. L. Rev. 33, 79 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1094 BEYOND BLACK INK: FROM LANGDELL TO THE OYEZ PROJECT-THE VOICE OF THE PAST, 55 Loy. L. Rev. 277, 330+ (2009)

C 1095 TWO TALES OF ONE CITY: EMINENT DOMAIN POST-KATRINA AND A RESPONSE TO KELO, 53 Loy. L. Rev. 115, 155+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1096 SYMPOSIUM INTRODUCTION, 53 Loy. L. Rev. 719, 725 (2007)

C 1097 LOUISIANA LAND REFORM IN THE STORMS' AFTERMATH, 53 Loy. L. Rev. 727, 761+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1098 HOUSING REDEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES IN THE WAKE OF KATRINA AND ANTI-KELO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS: MAPPING A PATH THROUGH THE LANDSCAPE OF DISASTER, 53 Loy. L. Rev. 763, 838+ (2007)

C 1099 OF REGISTRY: LOUISIANA'S REVISED PUBLIC RECORDS DOCTRINE, 53 Loy. L. Rev. 989, 1035+ (2007)

C 1100 PROPERTY AS A NATURAL RIGHT AND AS A CONVENTIONAL RIGHT IN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 29 Loy. L.A. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 201, 290+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1101 THE PUZZLE OF THE ACTUAL INJURY REQUIREMENT FOR DAMAGES, 42 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 197, 235 (2008)

C 1102 "(UN)EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW": THE INVIDIOUSLY DISPARATE TREATMENT OF AMERICAN PROPERTY OWNERS IN TAKING CASES, 40 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 1065, 1146+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1103 THE FIFTH AMENDMENT'S TAKINGS CLAUSE: PUBLIC USE AND PRIVATE USE; UNFORTUNATELY, THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE, 40 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 809, 852+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1104 RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION, 42 Loy. U. Chi. L.J. 89, 145 (2010)

C 1105 KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON-WRONGLY DECIDED AND A MISSED OPPORTUNITY FOR PRINCIPLED LINE DRAWING WITH RESPECT TO EMINENT DOMAIN TAKINGS, 58 Me. L. Rev. 17, 48+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1106 WAGGING THE DOG? RECONSIDERING ANTITRUST-BASED REGULATION OF IP-LICENSING, 12 Marq. Intell. Prop. L. Rev. 49, 88 (2008)

1107 LIVING PROPERTY: A NEW STATUS FOR ANIMALS WITHIN THE LEGAL SYSTEM, 93 Marq. L. Rev. 1021, 1071+ (2010) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1108 WHAT PLAGIARISM WAS NOT: SOME PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS ON CLASSICAL CHINESE ATTITUDES TOWARD WHAT THE WEST CALLS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, 92 Marq. L. Rev. 199, 220+ (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1109 AN OVERVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE, 90 Marq. L. Rev. 411, 423+ (2007)

C 1110 LOCATION INCENTIVES AND THE NEGATIVE COMMERCE CLAUSE: A FAREWELL TO ARMS?, 89 Marq. L. Rev. 583, 600 (2006)

C 1111 ANTITRUST AND INEFFICIENT JOINT VENTURES: WHY SPORTS LEAGUES SHOULD LOOK MORE LIKE MCDONALD'S AND LESS LIKE THE UNITED NATIONS, 16 Marq. Sports L. Rev. 213, 259 (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1112 EMINENT DOMAIN, 41-DEC Md. B.J. 28, 30+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1113 GREEN CONDEMNATION FOR BUILDING BLOCKS, 41-JUN Md. B.J. 45, 47+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1114 EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM'S FAILURE IN MARYLAND, 39-OCT Md. B.J. 14, 17+ (2006) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1115 A DECISION THEORY APPROACH TO THE BUSINESS JUDGMENT RULE: REFLECTIONS ON DISNEY, GOOD FAITH, AND JUDICIAL UNCERTAINTY, 66 Md. L. Rev. 398, 474 (2007)

C 1116 FEDERALISM AND THE TUG OF WAR WITHIN: SEEKING CHECKS AND BALANCE IN THE INTERJURISDICTIONAL GRAY AREA, 66 Md. L. Rev. 503, 667+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1117 THE NINE: INSIDE THE SECRET WORLD OF THE SUPREME COURT, 39 McGeorge L. Rev. 1131, 1142 (2008)

C 1118 CLEAR AS MUD: CHAPTER 98 AND CALIFORNIA'S COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT LAW, 38 McGeorge L. Rev. 216, 229+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1119 INTRODUCTION: THE IMPACT OF KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON ON EMINENT DOMAIN, 38 McGeorge L. Rev. 369, 371+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1120 JUSTICE THOMAS' KELO DISSENT, OR, "HISTORY AS A GRAB BAG OF PRINCIPLES", 38 McGeorge L. Rev. 373, 404+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1121 THE KELO LEGACY: POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY, NOT LEGISLATION, IS THE CURE, 38 McGeorge L. Rev. 405, 428+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1122 TOWARD A MORE "JUST" COMPENSATION IN EMINENT DOMAIN, 38 McGeorge L. Rev. 429, 459+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

1123 CONSTITUTIONALITY OF RENT CONTROL ORDINANCE DISCUSSED (2008)

1124 EMINENT DOMAIN POWER EXPANDED (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1125 ZONING AND LAND USE LAW, 59 Mercer L. Rev. 493, 543 (2007)

C 1126 EVIDENCE, 58 Mercer L. Rev. 151, 180 (2006)

1127 LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW, 58 Mercer L. Rev. 267, 312+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1128 WHAT'S THE USE? THE COURT TAKES A STANCE ON THE PUBLIC USE DOCTRINE IN KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 57 Mercer L. Rev. 689, 713+ (2006)

1129 ZONING AND LAND USE LAW, 57 Mercer L. Rev. 447, 471+ (2005) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1130 POLETOWN NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL v DETROIT Private Property and Public Use 410 Mich 616 (1981), 88-MAR Mich. B.J. S18, S23+ (2009)

1131 RECENT CHANGES IN EMINENT DOMAIN LAW, 86-NOV Mich. B.J. 22, 23+ (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1132 CONDEMNATION AS A TOOL OF BROWNFIELD REDEVELOPMENT AFTER HATH-COCK, 84-NOV Mich. B.J. 37, 38+ (2005) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1133 RESIDENTIAL PROTECTIONISM AND THE LEGAL MYTHOLOGY OF HOME, 107 Mich. L. Rev. 1093, 1144+ (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1134 SUPREME NEGLECT OF TEXT AND HISTORY, 107 Mich. L. Rev. 1059, 1071+ (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1135 PROPERTY AND RELATIVE STATUS, 107 Mich. L. Rev. 757, 817 (2009)

C 1136 SCRUTINY LAND, 106 Mich. L. Rev. 1479, 1500 (2008)

C 1137 TAKING TEXT TOO SERIOUSLY: MODERN TEXTUALISM, ORIGINAL MEANING, AND THE CASE OF AMAR'S BILL OF RIGHTS, 106 Mich. L. Rev. 487, 543+ (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1138 LOOKING BACKWARD: RICHARD EPSTEIN PONDERS THE "PROGRESSIVE" PERIL, 105 Mich. L. Rev. 1233, 1253+ (2007)

C 1139 THE NEGLECTED POLITICAL ECONOMY OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 105 Mich. L. Rev. 101, 150+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1140 IGNORING PATENTS, 2008 Mich. St. L. Rev 19, 34 (2008)

1141 REVIVING PROTECTION FOR PRIVATE PROPERTY: A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO BLIGHT TAKINGS, 2008 Mich. St. L. Rev 995, 995+ (2008)

C 1142 THE "BACKLASH" SO FAR: WILL AMERICANS GET MEANINGFUL EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM?, 2006 Mich. St. L. Rev 709, 777+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1143 COMPULSORY PATENT LICENSING: IS IT A VIABLE SOLUTION IN THE UNITED STATES?, 13 Mich. Telecomm. & Tech. L. Rev. 509, 539+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1144 DUE PROCESS AND EVICTION FROM PRIVATIZED MILITARY HOUSING-IS THE COM-MANDER KING?, 200 Mil. L. Rev. 108, 153+ (2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1145 PROPERTY RHETORIC AND THE PUBLIC DOMAIN, 94 Minn. L. Rev. 652, 705+ (2010) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1146 THE LIMITS OF BACKLASH: ASSESSING THE POLITICAL RESPONSE TO KELO, 93

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Minn. L. Rev. 2100, 2170+ (2009) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1147 BLIGHT AND ITS DISCONTENTS: AWARDING ATTORNEY'S FEES TO PROPERTY OWNERS IN REDEVELOPMENT ACTIONS, 93 Minn. L. Rev. 741, 778+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1148 TAX INCREMENT FINANCING: PUBLIC USE OR PRIVATE ABUSE?, 90 Minn. L. Rev. 213, 246+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1149 IN DEFENSE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ANXIETY: A RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR FAGUNDES, 94 Minn. L. Rev. Headnotes 85, 87+ (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1150 THE PURPOSE IS TO AVOID PUBLIC USE: THE NEED <<Strike through>>FOR<<End strike through>> IN EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM IN MISSISSIPPI, 29 Miss. C. L. Rev. 631, 661+ (2010) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1151 THE COSTS OF THE FOURTH AMENDMENT: HOME SEARCHES AND TAKINGS LAW, 28 Miss. C. L. Rev. 1, 35+ (2009)

C 1152 REACTIVE AND INCOMPLETELY THEORIZED STATE CONSTITUTIONAL DECISION-MAKING, 77 Miss. L.J. 265, 313 (2007)

1153 REGULATORY TAKINGS: THE SUPREME COURT ELIMINATES THE SUBSTANTIALLY ADVANCES TEST FROM TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE, 14 Mo. Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 339, 347+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1154 THE MISSOURI EMINENT DOMAIN REFORMS OF 2006 "GOOD FAITH NEGOTIATION" REQUIREMENT: CITIES CAN USE ILLEGITIMATE APPRAISALS UNDER KANSAS CITY v. KU, 74 Mo. L. Rev. 1083, 1116+ (2009) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1155 REDEVELOPMENT CONDEMNATIONS: A BLIGHT OR A BLESSING UPON THE LAND?, 74 Mo. L. Rev. 301, 301+ (2009)

C 1156 INTERPRETING EMINENT DOMAIN IN MISSOURI: ELIMINATION OF BLIGHT IS ALL-RIGHT, 74 Mo. L. Rev. 235, 250+ (2009)

1157 HOW TO SOLVE (OR AVOID) THE EXACTIONS PROBLEM, 72 Mo. L. Rev. 973, 992 (2007)

C 1158 JOHN LOCKE AND THE MEANING OF THE TAKINGS CLAUSE, 72 Mo. L. Rev. 525, 579+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1159 EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM IN MISSOURI: A LEGISLATIVE MEMOIR, 71 Mo. L. Rev. 721, 723+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1160 THE HIGHEST FORM OF FLATTERY? APPLICATION OF THE FAIR USE DEFENSE AGAINST COPYRIGHT CLAIMS FOR UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION OF LITIGATION DOCUMENTS, 71 Mo. L. Rev. 391, 446 (2006)

C 1161 WAS THE BIG SKY REALLY FALLING? EXAMINING MONTANA'S RESPONSE TO KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 69 Mont. L. Rev. 79, 111+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1162 NOT JUST KELO ANYMORE I-154 Goes beyond Eminent Domain, It Reduces Ability to Regulate Land Use, 32-SEP Mont. Law. 8, 8+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1163 THE APPELLATE HOTLIST S Section, 4/7/2008 Nat'l L.J. S8, col. 1, S8, col. 1 (2008)

1164 CONDEMNATION POWERS VIEWED NARROWLY, 6/18/2007 Nat'l L.J. 16, col. 1, 16, col. 1 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1165 EMINENT DOMAIN TAKES A BIG HIT TEN STATES LIMIT TAKING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY; DEFINING BLIGHT THE NEXT BIG FIGHT, 11/13/2006 Nat'l L.J. 6, col. 1, 6, col. 1+ (2006)

1166 N.H. LAWMAKERS MOVE TO LIMIT EMINENT DOMAIN, 3/27/2006 Nat'l L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1 (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1167 EMINENT DOMAIN BACK FOR BATTLE ON STATE TURF UNUSUAL ALLIES IN OHIO AS THREE MORE STATES BRACE FOR THE SAME, 1/16/2006 Nat'l L.J. 4, col. 3, 4, col. 3+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1168 CONTROVERSY OVER "KELO', 8/3/2005 Nat'l L.J. 12, col. 1, 12, col. 1 (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1169 STATES RIDE POST-"KELO' WAVE OF LEGISLATION EMINENT DOMAIN CURBS IN 28 STATES, 8/1/2005 Nat'l L.J. 1, col. 1, 1, col. 1+ (2005)

1170 FROM WARRANTED TO VALUABLE BELIEF: LOCAL GOVERNMENT, CLIMATE CHANGE, AND GIVING UP THE PICKUP TO SAVE BANGLADESH, 49 Nat. Resources J. 743, 783+ (2009) **HN: 2,3,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1171 A COMMON TRAGEDY: CONDEMNATION AND THE ANTICOMMONS, 47 Nat. Resources J. 165, 193+ (2007) **HN: 3,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1172 THE DOG THAT DIDN't BARK: ASSESSING DAMAGES FOR VALID REGULATORY TAKINGS, 46 Nat. Resources J. 131, 155+ (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1173 SOMETIMES BLACKACRE IS A WIDGET: RETHINKING COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE CONTRACT REMEDIES, 88 Neb. L. Rev. 635, 691+ (2010)

1174 TRIBAL LAND CORPORATIONS: USING INCORPORATION TO COMBAT FRACTIONATION, 88 Neb. L. Rev. 385, 432 (2009) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1175 TROUBLE IN FORT TRUMBULL: USING EMINENT DOMAIN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 85 Neb. L. Rev. 547, 574+ (2006)

1176 8 Nev. L.J. 787, HEDGE FUNDS AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS: IS THE SEC TELLING SECRETS? (2008)

C 1177 7 Nev. L.J. 348, MAKING SENSE OUT OF NONSENSE: A RESPONSE TO ADVERSE POSSESSION BY GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1178 6 Nev. L.J. 1, JUDICIAL PREDILECTIONS (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1179 6 Nev. L.J. 272, KELO V. NEW LONDON: AN OPPORTUNITY LOST TO REHABILITATE THE TAKINGS CLAUSE (2005) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1180 THE THIRD AMENDMENT IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: MILITARY RECRUITING ON PRIVATE CAMPUSES, 40 New Eng. L. Rev. 113, 163 (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1181 THE CONSERVATIVE CASE FOR PROGRESSIVE TAXATION, 40 New Eng. L. Rev. 69, 111 (2005)

1182 196 New Jersey Law Journal 139, REDEVELOPMENT IN A DOWN MARKET ESTABLISHING REASONABLE LOCAL PRIORITIES (2009)

1183 12/31/2007 New Jersey Law Journal 1, PUNDIT FOR EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM NEW JERSEY'S PUBLIC ADVOCATE IS THE DRAFTSMAN OF THE STATE'S NEW HARD LINE AGAINST ARBITRARY TAKINGS FOR REDEVELOPMENT LAWYER OF THE YEAR: RONALD CHEN (2007)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1184 190 New Jersey Law Journal 1130, EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM? (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1185 190 New Jersey Law Journal 614, A NARROWER DEFINITION OF BLIGHT COURTS WILL BE TAKING A HARDER LOOK AT EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF A BLIGHT DESIGNATION (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1186 190 New Jersey Law Journal 402, THE NEW RULES OF REDEVELOPMENT COURTS MORE SKEPTICAL OF 'AREA IN NEED OF REDEVELOPMENT' DESIGNATIONS (2007) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

1187 189 New Jersey Law Journal 818, LEAD PAINT NOT A 'NUISANCE' COURT REJECTS PUBLIC NUISANCE CLAIM AGAINST LEAD PAINT MANUFACTURERS (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1188 189 New Jersey Law Journal 485, COURT'S REDEFINITION OF 'BLIGHT' HELPS OWNERS WIN EMINENT DOMAIN CASES (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1189 189 New Jersey Law Journal 112, TIGHTENING 'BLIGHT' IN EMINENT DOMAIN (2007) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1190 188 New Jersey Law Journal 1177, CONDEMNORS MUST GET IT RIGHT THE FIRST TIME MUNICIPALITIES SEEKING TO ACQUIRE LAND MUST PAY ATTENTION TO EACH STEP IN THE PROCESS (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1191 188 New Jersey Law Journal 1049, N.J. COURT SETS A TOUGHER TEST OF 'BLIGHT' FOR USING EMINENT DOMAIN (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1192 187 New Jersey Law Journal 1158, IS FAIR MARKET VALUE FAIR? ALTERNATIVE METHOD FOR DETERMINING JUST COMPENSATION IS NEEDED (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1193 2/9/2007 New Jersey Law Journal CONDEMNATION TO SLOW DEVELOPMENT WHEN IT COMES TO CONDEMNATION AUTHORITY, MOTIVE RARELY MATTERS (2007)

1194 187 New Jersey Law Journal 271, AVOIDING REDEVELOPMENT LITIGATION TO AVOID EMINENT DOMAIN CHALLENGES, MUNICIPALITIES MUST CREATE A STRONG FACTUAL RECORD (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1195 186 New Jersey Law Journal 925, 2006 CASES TEST BOUNDS OF AGENCY AUTHORITY RULINGS OFTEN TURNED ON THE AMOUNT OF DISCRETION COURTS ALLOWED PUBLIC AGENCIES (2006)

1196 185 New Jersey Law Journal 814, HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF REVIEW (2006)

1197 185 New Jersey Law Journal 22, KELO AND REDEVELOPMENT REFORM (2006) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1198 184 New Jersey Law Journal 1039, LEGISLATORS PONDER BILLS TO MAKE EMINENT DOMAIN LESS IMMINENT (2006)

1199 184 New Jersey Law Journal 675, SLAYING THE WHITE ELEPHANT NEW JERSEY MUST ADDRESS SHORTCOMING IN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1200 182 New Jersey Law Journal 821, A TAINTED TAKING? OPPONENTS SAY PROCESS WAS POISONED BY CITY LAWYER'S HAVING SAT ON DEVELOPER'S BOARD (2005) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1201 182 New Jersey Law Journal 709, TAKINGS LAW, JERSEY STYLE STATE ATTEMPTS SEIZURE OF ONE OWNER'S LAND FOR BENEFIT OF ANOTHER IMPACTED BY HIGHWAY PROJECT (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1202 181 New Jersey Law Journal 1220, REDEVELOPMENT IN NEW JERSEY BASED ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF STATE LAW, THE PROPOSITION OF PURELY ECONOMIC RE-DEVELOPMENT IS A NULLITY (2005) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1203 181 New Jersey Law Journal 1222, MT. LAUREL'S NEW LEGACY? MIPRO COULD WIDEN THE GULF BETWEEN HOMEOWNERS AND RENTERS - A SITUATION THE MT. LAUREL DECISIONS WERE INTENDED TO REMEDY (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1204 181 New Jersey Law Journal 485, CALL IT THE POST-KELO WAVE EMINENT DOMAIN CURBS ARE INTRODUCED IN 28 STATES (2005) **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

1205 EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE: NOW YOUR LAND CAN BE TAKEN FOR ... NOTHING, 247-AUG N.J. Law. 38, 40+ (2007)

1206 NEW JERSEY'S REDEVELOPMENT PROCESS: ISSUES FOR LEGAL CONSIDERATION, 243-DEC N.J. Law. 44, 48 (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1207 EMINENT DOMAIN IN NEW JERSEY AFTER KELO: WHAT'S NEXT?, 237-DEC N.J. Law. 44, 49+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1208 CITIZEN GUN RIGHTS: INCORPORATING THE SECOND AMENDMENT THROUGH THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES CLAUSE, 39 N.M. L. Rev. 195, 260 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1209 MANNING V. MINING AND MINERALS DIVISION: SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AS A BAR AGAINST CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BROUGHT UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, 37 N.M. L. Rev. 573, 601+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1210 THE CONSTITUTIONAL IMBALANCE, 37 N.M. L. Rev. 1, 38 (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1211 HOME TEAM ADVANTAGE?: THE TAKING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY FOR SPORTS STA-DIUMS, 9 N.Y. City L. Rev. 93, 119+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1212 IN THE MATTER OF UPTOWN HOLDINGS, LLC, ET AL., APPELLANTS, V. CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL., RESPONDENTS. SSD 6, 2/18/2011 N.Y. L.J. 29, col. 5, 29, col. 5 (2011)

1213 DEFENDING EMINENT DOMAIN DURING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 12/23/2010 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1214 2882. IN RE UPTOWN HOLDINGS, LLC PET, V. CITY OF NEW YORK RES, 10/14/2010 N.Y. L.J. 26, col. 3, 26, col. 3+ (2010) **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

1215 BOOST IN DISSENTS, CRIMINAL APPEALS MARKS LIPPMAN'S EARLY TENURE, 8/16/2010 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 3, 1, col. 3 (2010)

1216 BOOST IN DISSENTS, CRIMINAL APPEALS MARKS LIPPMAN'S EARLY TENURE, 8/16/2010 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 3, 1, col. 3 (2010)

1217 EMINENT DOMAIN RULINGS AFFIRM BROAD AUTHORITY FOR GOVERNMENT, 7/28/2010 N.Y. L.J. 5, col. 2, 5, col. 2+ (2010)

1218 2009 SURVEY OF TAX CERTIORARI, PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION, EMINENT DO-MAIN CASES, 4/23/2010 N.Y. L.J. 4, col. 1, 4, col. 1+ (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1219 EMINENT DOMAIN MODERNIZATION AHEAD?, 1/25/2010 N.Y. L.J. 11, col. 1, 11, col. 1+ (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1220 'ATLANTIC YARDS' AND THE FUTURE OF EMINENT DOMAIN LITIGATION, 12/7/2009 N.Y. L.J. 4, col. 1, 4, col. 1+ (2009) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1221 IN RE KAUR V. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION 777-778,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

12/4/2009 N.Y. L.J. 25, col. 3, 25, col. 3+ (2009) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1222 ATLANTIC YARDS PLAN CLEARS HURDLE WITH RULING ON EMINENT DOMAIN, 11/25/2009 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 4, 1, col. 4+ (2009) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1223 MATTER OF GOLDSTEIN V. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION No. 178, 11/25/2009 N.Y. L.J. 25, col. 3, 25, col. 3 (2009)

1224 ATLANTIC YARDS CASE: IS PUBLIC USE TO BE REDEFINED?, 10/27/2009 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1225 PUBLIC USE, ROBERT MOSES, AND THE FIGHT OVER ATLANTIC YARDS, 10/26/2009 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1+ (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1226 JUDGES PONDER CONSTITUTIONALITY OF STATE'S USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN FOR ATLANTIC YARDS PROJECT, 10/15/2009 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 4, 1, col. 4+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1227 THE CITY OF NEW YORK AS FRIEND OF THE COURT, 5/26/2009 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1 (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1228 GOLDSTEIN V. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORP. 07064 Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department, 5/18/2009 N.Y. L.J. 23, col. 5, 23, col. 5+ (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1229 REALTY LAW DIGEST, 4/15/2009 N.Y. L.J. 5, col. 1, 5, col. 1+ (2009) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1230 PANEL VALIDATES BRANDING CHILD KIDNAPPERS AS SEX OFFENDERS, 2/18/2009 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 3, 1, col. 3+ (2009) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1231 CHALLENGED "TAKING' WAS PROPER; CERTIFIED QUESTION UNNECESSARY TO ANSWER, 2/18/2009 N.Y. L.J. 28, col. 2, 28, col. 2 (2009)

1232 MATTERS INVOLVING LAWYER DECEPTION, FELONY SENTENCES ON TAP FOR JANUARY COURT OF APPEALS, 1/5/2009 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 3, 1, col. 3 (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1233 NASSAU COUNTY SUPREME COURT NYPA's Acquisition of Property for Power Plant Exceeded Eminent Domain Power, Set Aside, 9/19/2008 N.Y. L.J. 27, col. 3, 27, col. 3 (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1234 SOUTHERN DISTRICT Owner of Property Village Seized by Eminent Domain Is Entitled to Nominal Damages of $2, 8/18/2008 N.Y. L.J. 20, col. 3, 20, col. 3 (2008)

1235 DECISION OF THE DAY Appellate Division GRA V LLC petitioners-appellants v. Srinivasan, respondents-respondents Decided July 29, 2008 Before Andrias, J.P.; Friedman, Buckley, McGuire, Moskowitz, JJ. Docket No. 2951, 8/5/2008 N.Y. L.J. 26, col. 1, 26, col. 1+ (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1236 DECISION OF THE DAY Appellate Division People, plaintiff-respondent v. Richard A. Grasso, defendants-appellants Decided July 1, 2008 Before Mazzarelli, J.P., Saxe, Buckley, McGuire, JJ. Docket No. 82, 7/8/2008 N.Y. L.J. 26, col. 1, 26, col. 1 (2008)

1237 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT Practitioners Need Broader Expertise Real Estate Law Is Undergoing Profound Changes, 6/18/2008 N.Y. L.J. 5, col. 2, 5, col. 2+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1238 REALTY LAW DIGEST, 5/21/2008 N.Y. L.J. 5, col. 1, 5, col. 1+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

1239 CONDEMNATION AND TAX CERTIORARI Where Is Temporary Commission on Eminent Domain?, 3/14/2008 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1+ (2008)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1240 REALTY LAW DIGEST, 2/20/2008 N.Y. L.J. 5, col. 1, 5, col. 1+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1241 U.S. COURT OF APPEALS Before: Jacobs, Ch.J., Katzmann and Livingston, C.JJ. Eminent Domain Ruling Clears Way for Atlantic Yards; Fifth Amendment's Public Use Clause Not Violated, 2/7/2008 N.Y. L.J. 33, col. 1, 33, col. 1+ (2008) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

1242 EMINENT DOMAIN DECISION CLEARS WAY FOR ATLANTIC YARDS, 2/4/2008 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 4, 1, col. 4+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1243 JUDGES, CHILDREN, GLOBALIZATION ON STATE BAR AGENDA, 1/29/2008 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 4, 1, col. 4 (2008) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1244 REALTY LAW DIGEST, 12/12/2007 N.Y. L.J. 5, col. 1, 5, col. 1 (2007) **HN: 3,6 (S.Ct.)**

1245 DECISION OF THE DAY Appellate Division Matter of Aspen Creek Estates Ltd., petitioner v. Town of Brookhaven, respondents Decided Dec. 4, 2007 Before Crane, J.P.; Krausman, Fisher, Lifson, JJ. Docket No. 2006-03815, 12/11/2007 N.Y. L.J. 26, col. 1, 26, col. 1+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1246 PANEL UPHOLDS CONDEMNATION OF FARMLAND, 12/6/2007 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 3, 1, col. 3+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1247 ERIE COUNTY SUPREME COURT Church Denied Special Permit to Build in Area Zoned Industrial Park; Village's Decision Upheld, 9/25/2007 N.Y. L.J. 29, col. 3, 29, col. 3+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1248 REALTY LAW DIGEST News, 9/12/2007 N.Y. L.J. 5, col. 1, 5, col. 1+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1249 CONDEMNATION AND TAX CERTIORARI Oh, No! 'Brody' Again! The Promise of 'Matter of 49 WB', 8/22/2007 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1+ (2007)

1250 DECISION OF THE DAY Appellate Division Matter of 49 WB LLC, petitioner v. Village of Haverstraw, respondents Decided June 19, 2007 Before Miller, J.P.; Spolzino, Fisher, Dillon, JJ. Docket No. 2006-00605, 6/27/2007 N.Y. L.J. 18, col. 1, 18, col. 1+ (2007) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

1251 CONDEMNATION AND TAX CERTIORARI News Winds of Change Across Eminent Domain Landscape?, 6/27/2007 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1252 EASTERN DISTRICT Atlantic Yards Development Project Meets Fifth Amendment's Public Use Standard, 6/12/2007 N.Y. L.J. 27, col. 3, 27, col. 3+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1253 JUDGE FINDS ATLANTIC YARDS MEETS PUBLIC USE STANDARD, 6/7/2007 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 4, 1, col. 4+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1254 EASTERN DISTRICT 'Burford' Cited in Magistrate's Recommendation To Dismiss Suit Against Atlantic Yards Project, 3/1/2007 N.Y. L.J. 26, col. 3, 26, col. 3+ (2007)

1255 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT 'Didden v. Port Chester' Placing Eminent Domain Debate in Proper Perspective, 2/21/2007 N.Y. L.J. 5, col. 2, 5, col. 2+ (2007) **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

1256 NEWS IN BRIEF, 2/8/2007 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 1, 1, col. 1+ (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1257 COMPLEX POLICY CHOICES IN MANAGING GROWTH Affordable housing has become a potent political issue., 1/16/2007 N.Y. L.J. S8, col. 1, S8, col. 1+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1258 CONDEMNATION AND TAX CERTIORARI Will 2007 Change Eminent Domain Proceeding Law?, 12/29/2006 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1+ (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1259 ARE TRADING ORDERS UNCONSTITUTIONAL? Fifth Amendment takings argument faces

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

hurdles., 10/30/2006 N.Y. L.J. S3, col. 1, S3, col. 1+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1260 GROUPS ACTING TO BLOCK ATLANTIC YARDS PROJECT CITE EMINENT DOMAIN, 10/27/2006 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 3, 1, col. 3+ (2006) **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

1261 FORDHAM UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, 10/2006 N.Y. L.J. S32, col. 1, S32, col. 1 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1262 U.S. COURT OF APPEALS Before Cardamone, Calabresi, and Hall, Circuit Judges. City Wage Freeze in Buffalo Survives Challenge Under Constitution's Contracts, Takings Clauses, 9/28/2006 N.Y. L.J. 33, col. 1, 33, col. 1 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1263 CONDEMNATION AND TAX CERTIORARI What Hath 'Kelo' Wrought?, 6/28/2006 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1+ (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1264 DECISION OF THE DAY Appellate Division In re C/S 12th Avenue LLC, petitioner v. The City of New York, respondent Decided May 25, 2006 Before Andrias, J.P.; Saxe, Friedman, Williams, and Malone, Jr., JJ. Docket No. 7926, 6/1/2006 N.Y. L.J. 22, col. 1, 22, col. 1 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1265 STATE BAR BACKS STUDY TO MODERATE POST-"KELO' BACKLASH, 4/7/2006 N.Y. L.J. 1, col. 3, 1, col. 3+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1266 U.S. COURT OF APPEALS Second Circuit Condemnor Must Give as Much Notice 'as Practicable' To Inform Owner of Threat to Property Interest, 12/9/2005 N.Y. L.J. 21, col. 3, 21, col. 3+ (2005) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1267 CONDEMNATION AND TAX CERTIORARI News Brodksy Bill Attacks the Real Problem With Condemnation Powers Restricting Eminent Domain The Eminent Domain Procedure Law Abuses of Eminent Domain The Real Problem An Omission, 10/26/2005 N.Y. L.J. 3, col. 1, 3, col. 1+ (2005)

1268 ENVIRONMENTAL LAW Fallout From 'Kelo' Ruling Spurs Legislative Proposals to Limit Takings, 10/19/2005 N.Y. L.J. 5, col. 2, 5, col. 2+ (2005) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1269 SOUTHERN DISTRICT Unpaid Maintenance Deprived Plaintiff of Property Interest in Patent; Its Expiry Not an Unlawful Taking, 9/29/2005 N.Y. L.J. 21, col. 1, 21, col. 1 (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1270 TAX CERTIORARI & CONDEMNATION IN THE 9TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT, 78-JUN N.Y. St. B.J. 22, 23+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1271 THIS LAND IS YOUR LAND? Eminent Domain's Public Use Limitation, 77-OCT N.Y. St. B.J. 10, 11+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1272 THE UNBEARABLE COST OF SKIPPING THE CHECK: PROPERTY RIGHTS, TAKINGS COMPENSATION & ECOLOGICAL PROTECTION IN THE WESTERN WATER LAW CONTEXT, 17 N.Y.U. Envtl. L.J. 1063, 1134 (2009)

C 1273 A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR NAFTA, 16 N.Y.U. Envtl. L.J. 380, 482 (2008)

C 1274 FROM DEMSETZ TO DENG: SPECULATIONS ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF CHINESE GROWTH FOR LAW AND DEVELOPMENT THEORY, 41 N.Y.U. J. Int'l L. & Pol. 551, 602 (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1275 LIABILITY BEGINS AT HOME: AN ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATION SCHEME FOR NAFTA EXPROPRIATIONS, 40 N.Y.U. J. Int'l L. & Pol. 219, 257+ (2007) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1276 PRIVATE LAW AND STATE-MAKING IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION, 39 N.Y.U. J. Int'l L. & Pol. 1, 74 (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1277 THE RURAL LAND QUESTION IN CHINA: ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON A SEVENTEEN-PROVINCE SURVEY, 38 N.Y.U. J. Int'l L. & Pol. 761, 839+ (2006)

C 1278 PREVENTING REAL TAKINGS FOR IMAGINARY PURPOSES: A POST-KELO PUBLIC USE PROPOSAL, 84 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1656, 1690+ (2009) **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1279 JUDICIAL REVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE PURPOSE, 83 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1784, 1882+ (2008)

1280 WHAT COMMONWEALTH V. ALGER CANNOT TELL US ABOUT REGULATORY TAKINGS, 82 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1746, 1779+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1281 REJECTING THE RETURN TO BLIGHT IN POST-KELO STATE LEGISLATION, 82 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 177, 208+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1282 BIG DIFFERENCES FOR SMALL GOVERNMENTS: LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND THE TAKINGS CLAUSE, 81 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1624, 1698+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1283 OUR 18TH CENTURY CONSTITUTION IN THE 21ST CENTURY WORLD, 80 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1079, 1107+ (2005) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1284 DAIMLERCHRYSLER V. CUNO - PLAINTIFFS LACK STANDING TO CHALLENGE STATE FRANCHISE TAX CREDIT IN FEDERAL COURT, ACCORDING TO THE SUPREME COURT, 29 N.C. Cent. L.J. 66, 76 (2006)

C 1285 ODIOUS DEBT: THE TERMS OF THE DEBATE, 32 N.C. J. Int'l L. & Com. Reg. 605, 667+ (2007)

1286 BLINSON V. STATE AND THE CONTINUED EROSION OF THE PUBLIC PURPOSE DOCTRINE IN NORTH CAROLINA, 87 N.C. L. Rev. 644, 667+ (2009)

C 1287 INTEGRATING CONSERVATION USES INTO TAKINGS LAW: WHY COURTS SHOULD VIEW CONSERVATION AS A POSSIBLE HIGHEST AND BEST USE, 86 N.C. L. Rev. 274, 303 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1288 FORCING URBAN REDEVELOPMENT TO PROCEED "BUILDING BY BUILDING" : NORTH CAROLINA'S FLAWED POLICY RESPONSE TO KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON (FNa1), 85 N.C. L. Rev. 1784, 1798+ (2007)

C 1289 TRIBAL BONDS: STATUTORY SHACKLES AND REGULATORY RESTRAINTS ON TRIBAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 85 N.C. L. Rev. 1009, 1085+ (2007) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1290 DO NORTH CAROLINA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS NEED HOME RULE?, 84 N.C. L. Rev. 1983, 2029+ (2006)

C 1291 PUBLIC LAW LIMITATIONS ON PRIVATIZATION OF GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONS, 84 N.C. L. Rev. 397, 469+ (2006) **HN: 2,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1292 OVERCOMING THE ACHILLES HEEL OF COPYRIGHT LAW, 5 Nw. J. Tech. & Intell. Prop. 265, 152+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1293 THE RIGHT TO EXCLUDE IN THE SHADOW OF THE CATHEDRAL: A RESPONSE TO PARCHOMOVSKY AND STEIN, 104 Nw. U. L. Rev. Colloquy 262, 278+ (2010) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1294 PROPERTY AND SPEECH IN SUMMUM, 104 Nw. U. L. Rev. Colloquy 83, 91+ (2009) **HN:**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1,2 (S.Ct.)

C 1295 THE LECTURE NOTES OF ST. GEORGE TUCKER: A FRAMING ERA VIEW OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS, 103 Nw. U. L. Rev. Colloquy 272, 285 (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1296 WHY THE BLIGHT DISTINCTION IN POST-KELO REFORM DOES MATTER, 102 Nw. U. L. Rev. Colloquy 30, 30+ (2007) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1297 IS POST-KELO EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM BAD FOR THE POOR?, 101 Nw. U. L. Rev. Colloquy 195, 207 (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1298 IDEOLOGICAL DRIFT AMONG SUPREME COURT JUSTICES: WHO, WHEN, AND HOW IMPORTANT?, 101 Nw. U. L. Rev. Colloquy 127, 131 (2007)

C 1299 THE LAW AND EXPRESSIVE MEANING OF CONDEMNING THE POOR AFTER KELO, 101 Nw. U. L. Rev. Colloquy 5, 5+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1300 WHEN THE SUPREME COURT IS NOT SUPREME, 104 Nw. U. L. Rev. 979, 1065 (2010)

1301 THE RIGHT TO EXCLUDE IN THE SHADOW OF THE CATHEDRAL: A RESPONSE TO PARCHOMOVSKY AND STEIN, 104 Nw. U. L. Rev. 391, 409 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1302 THE LECTURE NOTES OF ST. GEORGE TUCKER: A FRAMING ERA VIEW OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS, 103 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1527, 1540 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1303 HOMEOWNERSHIP 2.0, 102 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1047, 1118+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1304 IDEOLOGICAL DRIFT AMONG SUPREME COURT JUSTICES: WHO, WHEN, AND HOW IMPORTANT?, 101 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1483, 1541+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1305 IS POST-KELO EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM BAD FOR THE POOR?, 101 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1931, 1943 (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1306 LOCAL REDISTRIBUTION, LIVING WAGE ORDINANCES, AND JUDICIAL INTERVENTION, 101 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1057, 1122 (2007)

C 1307 THE LAW AND EXPRESSIVE MEANING OF CONDEMNING THE POOR AFTER KELO, 101 Nw. U. L. Rev. 365, 382+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1308 FOUR LAND USE VIGNETTES FROM UNZONED(?) HOUSTON, 24 Notre Dame J.L. Ethics & Pub. Pol'y 159, 185+ (2010) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1309 JUSTICE AND THE JUST COMPENSATION CLAUSE: A NEW APPROACH TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS, 24 Notre Dame J.L. Ethics & Pub. Pol'y 219, 253+ (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1310 THE FOURTH BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT: EVALUATING THE MEDIA'S ROLE IN OVERSEEING THE INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY, 22 Notre Dame J.L. Ethics & Pub. Pol'y 507, 532+ (2008) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1311 CONDEMNING RELIGION: RLUIPA AND THE POLITICS OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 85 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1, 54+ (2009) **HN: 3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1312 THE EMPEROR'S NEW CLOTHES: EXPOSING THE FAILURES OF REGULATING LAND USE THROUGH THE BALLOT BOX, 84 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1453, 1528+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1313 STARE DECISIS AND THE CONSTITUTION: FOUR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, 83 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1173, 1226 (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1314 DEBT AND DEMOCRACY: TOWARDS A CONSTITUTIONAL THEORY OF BANK-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

RUPTCY, 83 Notre Dame L. Rev. 605, 696 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1315 THE CITY AS AN ECOLOGICAL SPACE: SOCIAL CAPITAL AND URBAN LAND USE, 82 Notre Dame L. Rev. 527, 582+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1316 MODERN PUBLIC TRUST PRINCIPLES: RECOGNIZING RIGHTS AND INTEGRATING STANDARDS, 82 Notre Dame L. Rev. 699, 754 (2006)

1317 "AS MUCH UPON TRADITION AS UPON PRINCIPLE": A CRITIQUE OF THE PRIVILEGE OF NECESSITY DESTRUCTION UNDER THE FIFTH AMENDMENT, 82 Notre Dame L. Rev. 481, 526 (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1318 SHADOW OF A BULLDOZER?: RLUIPA AND EMINENT DOMAIN AFTER KELO, 81 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1653, 1696+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1319 PROPERTY TAX REASSESSMENT: WHO NEEDS IT?, 81 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1037, 1094 (2006)

1320 EMINENT DOMAIN AND THE SANCTITY OF HOME, 81 Notre Dame L. Rev. 783, 819+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

1321 THE PARABLE OF THE SEEDS: INTERPRETING THE PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION ACT IN FURTHERANCE OF INNOVATION POLICY, 81 Notre Dame L. Rev. 105, 158 (2005)

1322 2006-2007 SURVEY OF FLORIDA LAW AFFECTING BUSINESS OWNERS, 32 Nova L. Rev. 21, 121+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1323 SUBSTANTIALLY ADVANCING PENN CENTRAL: SHARPENING THE REMAINING ARROW IN THE PROPERTY ADVOCATE'S QUIVER FOR THE NEW AGE OF REGULATORY TAKINGS, 30 Nova L. Rev. 445, 471+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1324 RECKLESS CAUTION: THE PERILS OF JUDICIAL MINIMALISM, 5 NYU J. L. & Liberty 347, 393+ (2010) **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

1325 PROPERTY RIGHTS, STATE OF NATURE THEORY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, 4 NYU J. L. & Liberty 1, 35 (2009)

1326 THE ROBERTS COURT AND FEDERALISM, 4 NYU J. L. & Liberty 330, 371 (2009)

1327 PROPERTY AND FREEDOM, 4 NYU J. L. & Liberty 36, 69 (2009)

1328 WHICH ORIGINAL MEANING OF THE CONSTITUTION MATTERS TO JUSTICE THOMAS?, 4 NYU J. L. & Liberty 494, 516+ (2009)

1329 "BUT FOR THE GRACE OF GOD THERE GO I": JUSTICE THOMAS AND THE LITTLE GUY, 4 NYU J. L. & Liberty 626, 647+ (2009) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1330 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY: AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM OR INTERNATIONAL HARMONIZATION?, 3 NYU J. L. & Liberty 448, 490+ (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1331 THE CASE AGAINST ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS, 1 NYU J. L. & Liberty 949, 949+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1332 EMINENT DOMAIN AND SECONDARY RENT-SEEKING, 1 NYU J. L. & Liberty 958, 966+ (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1333 THE ANTI-FEDERALIST TRADITION IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE, 1 NYU J. L. & Liberty 967, 982 (2005)

1334 PREFACE, 33 Ohio N.U. L. Rev. 1065, 1070 (2007)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1335 CITY OF NORWOOD V. HORNEY, CITY OF NORWOOD V. GAMBLE 110 Ohio St. 3d 353, 2006 Ohio 3799, 853 N.E.2d 1115 Decided July 26, 2006, 33 Ohio N.U. L. Rev. 1096, 1107 (2007)

C 1336 DIVERGENT VIEWS ON THE USE OF INTERNATIONAL AND FOREIGN LAW: CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE VERSUS THE COURT, 33 Ohio N.U. L. Rev. 113, 152 (2007)

C 1337 KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 32 Ohio N.U. L. Rev. 381, 393+ (2006)

1338 "WE WERE ALL BORN ON IT. AND SOME OF US WAS KILLED ON IT" : ADOPTING A TRANSFORMATIVE MODEL IN EMINENT DOMAIN MEDIATION, 23 Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol. 687, 714+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1339 FIVE TAKES ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA V. HELLER, 69 Ohio St. L.J. 671, 699 (2008)

C 1340 THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF CONSERVED LAND: EXAMINING WHETHER CONSERVATION EASEMENTS REPRESENT A SUFFICIENT SOURCE OF LAND VALUE TO INFLUENCE THE OUTCOME OF REGULATORY TAKINGS CLAIMS, 69 Ohio St. L.J. 743, 786 (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1341 NATIONALIZING THE BILL OF RIGHTS: REVISITING THE ORIGINAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT IN 1866-67, 68 Ohio St. L.J. 1509, 1626 (2007)

C 1342 JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR'S FRIENDS, 68 Ohio St. L.J. 517, 573 (2007)

C 1343 THE KELO BLOWBACK: HOW THE NEWLY-ENACTED EMINENT DOMAIN STATUTES AND PAST BLIGHT STATUTES ARE A MAGINOT LINE-DEFENSE MECHANISM FOR ALL NON-AFFLUENT AND MINORITY PROPERTY OWNERS, 68 Ohio St. L.J. 609, 639+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1344 MEASURING INTERNAL INFLUENCE ON THE REHNQUIST COURT: AN ANALYSIS OF NON-MAJORITY OPINION JOINING BEHAVIOR, 68 Ohio St. L.J. 679, 732+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1345 THE DEATH OF THE REGULATORY COMPACT: ADJUSTING PRICES AND EXPECTATIONS IN THE LAW OF REGULATED INDUSTRIES, 67 Ohio St. L.J. 1265, 1338+ (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1346 A NOMINATION OF A SUPREME COURT JUSTICE: THE INCORPORATION DOCTRINE REVISITED, 35 Okla. City U. L. Rev. 365, 385+ (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1347 WHY TEACH-AND WHY STUDY-STATE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 34 Okla. City U. L. Rev. 165, 178 (2009)

1348 A JUDICIAL TRADITIONALIST CONFRONTS JUSTICE BRENNAN'S SCHOOL OF JUDICIAL PHILOSOPHY, 33 Okla. City U. L. Rev. 263, 285+ (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1349 BEHAVIORAL BIOLOGY AND CONSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS, 32 Okla. City U. L. Rev. 375, 418+ (2007)

1350 FEDERALISM AND THE CULTURE WARS, 31 Okla. City U. L. Rev. 507, 529 (2006)

C 1351 PLANNING AHEAD: CONSISTENCY WITH A COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN YIELDS CONSISTENT RESULTS FOR MUNICIPALITIES, 60 Okla. L. Rev. 73, 107+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

1352 CIVIL HIGH COURT PRONOUNCEMENTS, 47-NOV Orange County Law. 10, 18 (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1353 FEDERALISM, THE REHNQUIST COURT, AND THE MODERN REPUBLICAN PARTY, 87 Or. L. Rev. 117, 174 (2008)

C 1354 FEDERAL LABOR LAW, INDIAN SOVEREIGNTY, AND THE CANONS OF CONSTRUCTION, 86 Or. L. Rev. 413, 531 (2007)

1355 THE EXHAUSTING QUESTION OF LOCAL REMEDIES: EXPROPRIATION UNDER NAFTA CHAPTER 11, 8 Or. Rev. Int'l L. 31, 131 (2006)

C 1356 ANIMAL FARM JURISPRUDENCE: (FN2) HIDING PERSONAL PREDILECTIONS BEHIND THE "PLAIN LANGUAGE' OF THE TAKINGS CLAUSE, 25 Pace Envtl. L. Rev. 355, 392 (2008)

C 1357 KELO'S WAKE: IN SEARCH OF A PROPORTIONAL BENEFIT, 24 Pace Envtl. L. Rev. 271, 297+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1358 DON'T TAKE MY SUNSHINE AWAY: RIGHT-TO-LIGHT AND SOLAR ENERGY IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY, 28 Pace L. Rev. 535, 560+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1359 THE TAKING OF AMERICA?, 28 Pace L. Rev. 129, 159+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1360 LAND SEIZURES IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA: PROTECTING PROPERTY WHILE ENCOURAGING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 22 Pac. McGeorge Global Bus. & Dev. L.J. 355, 377+ (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1361 REGULAR TAKINGS OR REGULATORY TAKINGS?: LAND EXPROPRIATION IN RURAL CHINA, 20 Pac. Rim L. & Pol'y J. 71, 124+ (2011) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1362 CURBING RENT-SEEKING AND INEFFICIENCY WITH BROAD TAKINGS POWERS AND UNDERCOMPENSATION: THE CASE OF SINGAPORE FROM A GIVINGS PERSPECTIVE, 19 Pac. Rim L. & Pol'y J. 1, 61+ (2010)

C 1363 RURAL LAND STEWARDSHIP: REINVENTING DEVELOPMENT FROM THE GRASSROOTS WITH A LOCALIZED, LONG-TERM, INCENTIVE-BASED PROGRAM, 17 Penn St. Envtl. L. Rev. 225, 253+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1364 THE CLIMAX OF TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE IN THE REHNQUIST COURT ERA: LOOKING BACK FROM KELO, CHEVRON U.S.A. AND SAN REMO HOTEL AT STANDARDS OF REVIEW FOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC REGULATION, 16 Penn St. Envtl. L. Rev. 115, 197+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1365 THE LUCAS DISSENTERS SAW KATRINA COMING: WHY ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION OF COASTAL DEVELOPMENT SHOULD NOT BE CATEGORIZED AS A "TAKING", 15 Penn St. Envtl. L. Rev. 373, 395+ (2007)

C 1366 WHEN DOES A REGULATION "GO TOO FAR?"-THE SUPREME COURT'S ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR DRAWING THE LINE BETWEEN AN EXERCISE OF THE POLICE POWER AND AN EXERCISE OF THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 14 Penn St. Envtl. L. Rev. 397, 434+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1367 THE UNEXPLORED OPTION: JEWISH SETTLEMENTS IN A PALESTINIAN STATE, 25 Penn St. Int'l L. Rev. 75, 205+ (2006)

1368 BLACK LIKE ME: THE FREE SPEECH JURISPRUDENCE OF CLARENCE THOMAS, 114 Penn St. L. Rev. 415, 463+ (2009) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1369 GOD V. WAL-MART; THE BATTLE OVER THE "BETTER USE" OF LAND: HAS THE SU-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

PREME COURT ALLOWED FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AT THE COST OF IN-VALUABLE RELIGIOUS RIGHTS?, 111 Penn St. L. Rev. 239, 261+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1370 CURRENT TRENDS IN PENNSYLVANIA LAND USE, 77 Pa. B.A. Q. 23, 33 (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1371 CRACKING THE FOUNDATION: HIGHLIGHTING AND CRITICIZING THE SHORTCOMINGS OF MANDATORY INCLUSIONARY ZONING PRACTICES, 37 Pepp. L. Rev. 1039, 1112+ (2010) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1372 OVERVIEW OF THE TERM: THE RULE OF LAW & ROBERTS'S REVOLUTION OF RESTRAINT, 34 Pepp. L. Rev. 495, 520 (2007)

C 1373 THE ROBERTS COURT GETS DOWN TO BUSINESS: THE BUSINESS CASES, 34 Pepp. L. Rev. 599, 612 (2007)

1374 EVALUATING THE NEW JUSTICES IN LIGHT OF THE CONFIRMATION ORDEAL, 34 Pepp. L. Rev. 621, 625 (2007)

C 1375 THE PUBLIC USE CLAUSE: CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE OR "HORTATORY FLUFF"?, 33 Pepp. L. Rev. 335, 384+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1376 INTERMITTENT STATE CONSTITUTIONALISM, 34 Pepp. L. Rev. 41, 103 (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1377 THE ABOLITIONIST'S DILEMMA: ESTABLISHING THE STANDARDS FOR THE EVOLVING STANDARDS OF DECENCY, 6 Pierce L. Rev. 441, 467 (2008)

C 1378 CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE MASSACHUSETTS SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT AND THE LEGISLATURE: CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM AND SAME-SEX MARRIAGE, 4 Pierce L. Rev. 279, 316 (2006)

1379 PREPARING FOR THE INITIAL TAKING OR POSSESSION HEARING In addition to the substantive defenses that have been around for years, the procedural defenses are multiplying, and you can use them to great advantage for your cl, 23 NO. 6 Prac. Real Est. Law. 15, 18+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1380 SOME REFLECTIONS ON KELO No one can predict what the final legislative responses will be. But one thing is certain: Pubic resistance is growing, and the pressure is on, 23 NO. 4 Prac. Real Est. Law. 13, 14+ (2007) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1381 KEEPING CURRENT-PROPERTY, 24-AUG Prob. & Prop. 26, 30 (2010)

1382 KEEPING CURRENT-PROPERTY, 24-APR Prob. & Prop. 30, 31+ (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1383 KEEPING CURRENT-PROPERTY, 24-FEB Prob. & Prop. 22, 26+ (2010)

1384 KEEPING CURRENT-PROPERTY, 23-FEB Prob. & Prop. 18, 21+ (2009) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1385 KEEPING CURRENT-PROPERTY, 22-JUN Prob. & Prop. 18, 20+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1386 LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL REACTIONS TO KELO: EMINENT DOMAIN'S CONTINUING ROLE IN REDEVELOPMENT, 22-APR Prob. & Prop. 60, 60+ (2008)

1387 KEEPING CURRENT-PROPERTY, 21-DEC Prob. & Prop. 26, 29+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1388 THE NEW CHINESE PROPERTY LAW A Real Estate Practitioner's Perspective, 21-OCT Prob. & Prop. 14, 19+ (2007)

1389 KEEPING CURRENT-PROPERTY, 21-OCT Prob. & Prop. 30, 33+ (2007)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1390 REMOVING RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS AS BURDENS TO A DISASTER RESPONSE, 20-OCT Prob. & Prop. 45, 48 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1391 REBUILDING A REGION Housing Recovery Efforts in the Wake of Katrina and Rita, 20-OCT Prob. & Prop. 49, 50 (2006)

1392 KEEPING CURRENT PROPERTY, 20-JUN Prob. & Prop. 28, 31+ (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1393 A REQUIEM FOR PUBLIC USE, 20-FEB Prob. & Prop. 11, 11+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1394 A TALE OF PRAGMATISM GONE AWRY, 20-FEB Prob. & Prop. 15, 15+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

1395 SUPREME COURT REFUSES TO HAMSTRING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, 20-FEB Prob. & Prop. 17, 17+ (2006) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1396 SIX MYTHS ABOUT KELO, 20-FEB Prob. & Prop. 19, 19+ (2006) **HN: 1,3,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1397 ANALYSIS OF THE SUPREME COURT'S CONTROVERSIAL DECISION ON THE USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES, 20-FEB Prob. & Prop. 9, 9+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1398 KEEPING CURRENT Property, 19-OCT Prob. & Prop. 25, 28+ (2005) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1399 THE PLURALITY PARADOX: RAPANOS V. U.S. AND THE UNCERTAIN FUTURE OF FEDERAL WETLANDS PROTECTION, 28 Pub. Land & Resources L. Rev. 89, 115 (2007) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1400 PLAIN LANGUAGE TEXTUALISM: SOME PERSONAL PREDILECTIONS ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS, 26 Quinnipiac L. Rev. 337 (2008)

1401 THE WHEELER COURT, 24 QLR 301, 333 (2006)

C 1402 THE LAW OF SPRAWL: A ROAD MAP, 25 Quinnipiac L. Rev. 147 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1403 ZONING AND LAND USE PLANNING, 37 Real Est. L.J. 336, 349+ (2009)

1404 NECESSITY AND EXCESS CONDEMNATION UNDER EMINENT DOMAIN, 38 Real Est. L.J. 304, 304+ (2009) **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

1405 ZONING AND LAND USE PLANNING, 37 Real Est. L.J. 234, 245+ (2008) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1406 FROM THE ENVIRONMENT, 37 Real Est. L.J. 77, 82+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1407 ZONING AND LAND USE PLANNING, 36 Real Est. L.J. 484, 491+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1408 DIGEST OF SELECTED ARTICLES, 37 Real Est. L.J. 223, 232+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1409 FROM THE ENVIRONMENT, 35 Real Est. L.J. 611, 627+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1410 KELO AND THE "WHALING CITY": A SEARCH FOR THE URBAN PUBLIC INTEREST, 35 Real Est. L.J. 223, 247+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1411 DIGEST OF SELECTED ARTICLES, 34 Real Est. L.J. 523, 526+ (2006)

C 1412 CURRENT STATUS OF PROPERTY RIGHTS COMPENSATION STATUTES, 35 Real Est. L.J. 405, 419 (2006)

1413 ZONING AND LAND USE PLANNING, 35 Real Est. L.J. 475, 489+ (2006)

1414 DIGEST OF SELECTED ARTICLES, 35 Real Est. L.J. 500, 500+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1415 THE AFTERMATH OF KELO, 34 Real Est. L.J. 157, 157+ (2005) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1416 FROM THE COURTS, 34 Real Est. L.J. 206, 220+ (2005) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1417 ZONING AND LAND USE PLANNING, 34 Real Est. L.J. 244, 264+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1418 TAX ISSUES, 34 Real Est. L.J. 349, 349+ (2005) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1419 ZONING AND LAND USE PLANNING, 34 Real Est. L.J. 375, 375+ (2005) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1420 DIGEST OF SELECTED ARTICLES, 34 Real Est. L.J. 397, 397+ (2005) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1421 TAKING: NO BLIGHT, NO TAKING, 39-MAR Real Est. L. Rep. 4, 4+ (2010)

1422 TAKINGS: STATES TIGHTEN RULES, 36-AUG Real Est. L. Rep. 4, 4+ (2006) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1423 TAKING: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT NOT PUBLIC USE, 36-JUL Real Est. L. Rep. 3, 3+ (2006) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1424 SUPREME COURT: EXPANDING "PUBLIC USE", 35-AUG Real Est. L. Rep. 1, 1 (2005)

1425 COPING WITH KELO: A POTPOURRI OF LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL RESPONSES, 42 Real Prop. Prob. & Tr. J. 799, 800+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1426 DON'T MESS WITH PROPERTY RIGHTS IN TEXAS: HOW THE STATE CONSTITUTION PROTECTS PROPERTY OWNERS IN THE WAKE OF KELO, 41 Real Prop. Prob. & Tr. J. 227, 227+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1427 WHY THE PUBLIC PLUNDERING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IS STILL A VERY BAD IDEA, 41 Real Prop. Prob. & Tr. J. 25, 62+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1428 FIGHTING DISPARATE TREATMENT: USING THE "CLASS OF ONE" EQUAL PROTECTION DOCTRINE IN EMINENT DOMAIN SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS, 45 Real Prop. Tr. & Est. L.J. 369, 418+ (2010)

1429 KELO'S PLANNING MANDATE: REPLACING CLARITY WITH COMPLICATION, 43 Real Prop. Tr. & Est. L.J. 139, 140+ (2008) **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

1430 AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF AMICI CURIAE IN FEDERAL COURT: A FINE BALANCE OF ACCESS, EFFICIENCY, AND ADVERSARIALISM, 27 Rev. Litig. 669, 711 (2008)

1431 DERECHO CONSTITUCIONAL, 76 Rev. Jur. U.P.R. 583, 615 (2007)

1432 EMINENT DOMAIN AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY ADDRESSES Kelo vs. City of New London, 57-DEC R.I. B.J. 13, 44+ (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1433 VIRTUAL PROPERTY: PROTECTING BITS IN CONTEXT, 13 Rich. J.L. & Tech. 7, 87 (2006)

1434 PROPERTY LAW Rhode Island Economic Development Corp. v. Parking Co., 892 A.2d 87 (R.I. 2006)., 12 Roger Williams U. L. Rev. 645, 654+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1435 A PUBLIC USE FOR THE DIRTY SIDE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: FINDING COMMON GROUND BETWEEN KELO AND HATHCOCK FOR COLLATERAL TAKINGS IN BROWNFIELD REDEVELOPMENT, 12 Roger Williams U. L. Rev. 229, 255+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1436 A THREAT TO THE SECURITY OF PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS: KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON AND A RECOMMENDATION TO THE SUPREME COURT OF RHODE ISLAND, 11 Roger Williams U. L. Rev. 721, 756+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1437 SECONDARY LIABILITY FOR THIRD PARTIES' COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT UPHELD BY THE SUPREME COURT: MGM STUDIOS, INC. V. GROKSTER, LTD., 32 Rutgers Com-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

puter & Tech. L.J. 62, 80 (2005)

1438 KELO v. NEW LONDON AND THE STATE LEGISLATIVE REACTION: EVALUATING THE EFFICACY AND NECESSITY OF RESTRICTING EMINENT DOMAIN FOR ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT AT THE STATE LEVEL, 4 Rutgers J. L. & Pub. Pol'y 730, 730+ (2007) **HN: 2,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

1439 3 Rutgers J. L. & Urb. Pol'y 84, SOLUTIONS TO THE CRISIS IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING: A PROPOSED MODEL FOR NEW YORK CITY (2005) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1440 PROVIDING MEANINGFUL JUDICIAL REVIEW OF MUNICIPAL REDEVELOPMENT DESIGNATIONS: REDEVELOPMENT IN NEW JERSEY BEFORE AND AFTER GALLENTHIN REALTY DEVELOPMENT, INC. v. BOROUGH OF PAULSBORO, 40 Rutgers L.J. 451, 501+ (2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1441 THE DEATH OF "LIFE?" DUE PROCESS DOCTRINE AFTER ABIGAIL ALLIANCE FOR BETTER ACCESS TO DEVELOPMENTAL DRUGS v. VON ESCHENBACH, 40 Rutgers L.J. 503, 533 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1442 STATE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW-ECONOMIC BENEFIT ALONE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A PUBLIC USE FOR EMINENT DOMAIN TAKINGS. CITY OF NORWOOD V. HORNEY, 853 N.E.2D 1115 (OHIO 2006)., 38 Rutgers L.J. 1379, 1394+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1443 GONZALES v. RAICH AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCE CLAUSE JURISPRUDENCE: IS THE NECESSARY AND PROPER CLAUSE THE PERFECT DRUG?, 38 Rutgers L.J. 251, 320 (2006)

1444 EMINENT DOMAIN-THE SEATTLE POPULAR MONORAIL AUTHORITY'S CONDEMNATION OF A PRIVATE PARKING GARAGE FOR THE PURPOSE OF BUILDING A MONORAIL STATION DOES NOT VIOLATE THE EMINENT DOMAIN PROVISION OF THE WASHINGTON CONSTITUTION, 37 Rutgers L.J. 1251, 1266+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

1445 EMINENT DOMAIN-GENERALIZED ECONOMIC BENEFIT IS INSUFFICIENT PUBLIC USE TO JUSTIFY EMINENT DOMAIN UNDER THE MICHIGAN CONSTITUTION. COUNTY OF WAYNE V. HATHCOCK, 684 N.W.2D 765 (MICH. 2004)., 36 Rutgers L.J. 1363, 1379 (2005)

1446 WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO REDEVELOPMENT IN NEW JERSEY WHEN THE ECONOMY RECOVERS?, 36 Rutgers L. Rec. 314, 317+ (2009) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1447 DOES WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT THE LIFE CYCLE OF DEMOCRACY FIT CONSTITUTIONAL LAW?, 61 Rutgers L. Rev. 595, 625 (2009)

1448 PUSHING GROWTH SHARE: CAN INCLUSIONARY ZONING FIX WHAT IS BROKEN WITH NEW JERSEY'S MOUNT LAUREL DOCTRINE, 59 Rutgers L. Rev. 191, 219 (2006)

1449 PARTICIPATORY PLANNING AND PROCEDURAL PROTECTIONS: THE CASE FOR DEEPER PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN URBAN REDEVELOPMENT, 29 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 243, 272+ (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1450 HOME SWEET HOME? THE EFFICACY OF RENTAL RESTRICTIONS TO PROMOTE NEIGHBORHOOD STABILITY, 29 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 41, 83 (2009)

1451 THE MEANING AND NATURE OF PROPERTY: HOMEOWNERSHIP AND SHARED EQUITY IN THE CONTEXT OF POVERTY, 29 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 85, 111 (2009)

1452 CONCEPTIONS OF THE VESSEL: ABU ALI, HABEAS CORPUS, AND THE DARK SIDE

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

OF THE "WAR ON TERRORISM", 26 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 309, 356 (2007)

C 1453 RIGHTS AS A FUNCTIONAL GUIDE FOR SERVICE PROVISION IN HOMELESS ADVOCACY, 26 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 45, 62 (2007)

C 1454 IMMINENT CHANGE: A RECOMMENDED RESPONSE FOR MISSOURI IN THE WAKE OF THE SUPREME COURT'S EMINENT DOMAIN DECISION IN KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 25 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 449, 481+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

1455 12 San Diego Int'l L.J. 5, PRIVATE AND PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION IN MODERN CHINA (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1456 9 San Diego Int'l L.J. 167, NET NEUTRALITY: AN INTERNATIONAL POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1457 A DOWNWIND VIEW OF THE CATHEDRAL: USING RULE FOUR TO ALLOCATE WIND RIGHTS, 46 San Diego L. Rev. 207, 245+ (2009)

C 1458 PROPERTY RIGHTS, PUBLIC USE, AND THE PERFECT STORM: AN ESSAY IN HONOR OF BERNARD H. SIEGAN, 45 San Diego L. Rev. 609, 632+ (2008) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1459 "NO TAKING WITHOUT A TOUCHING?" QUESTIONS FROM AN ARMCHAIR ORIGINALIST, 45 San Diego L. Rev. 761, 776+ (2008) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1460 LAND USE AND AGRICULTURAL EXCEPTIONALISM, 16 SANJALR 219, 237+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1461 SANTA CLARA LAW REVIEW SYMPOSIUM: BIG BUSINESS AND THE ROBERTS COURT, 49 Santa Clara L. Rev. 929, 941 (2009)

C 1462 JUDGING AND SELF-PRESENTATION: TOWARDS A MORE REALISTIC CONCEPTION OF THE HUMAN (JUDICIAL) ANIMAL Reviewing: Lawrence Baum, Judges and Their Audiences: A Perspective on Judicial Behavior, 48 Santa Clara L. Rev. 523, 568 (2008)

C 1463 HOME AS A LEGAL CONCEPT, 46 Santa Clara L. Rev. 255, 306+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1464 KEYNOTE ADDRESS-KELO, LINGLE, AND SAN REMO HOTEL: TAKINGS LAW NOW BELONGS TO THE STATES, 46 Santa Clara L. Rev. 767, 779+ (2006) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1465 OPENING REMARKS, 46 Santa Clara L. Rev. 781, 786+ (2006)

C 1466 THE IMPLICATIONS OF KELO IN LAND USE LAW, 46 Santa Clara L. Rev. 787, 810+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1467 LOCATIONAL JUSTICE: RACE, CLASS, AND THE GRASSROOTS PROTEST OF PROPERTY TAKINGS, 46 Santa Clara L. Rev. 811, 840+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1468 UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES: EMINENT DOMAIN AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING, 46 Santa Clara L. Rev. 841, 865+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1469 THAT '70S SHOW: EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW REVOLUTION, 46 Santa Clara L. Rev. 867, 888+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1470 THE BANK BAILOUT: A LICENSE FOR SOVEREIGN SECURITIES FRAUD, 33 Seattle U. L. Rev. 1, 37+ (2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1471 PROPERTY 101: IS PROPERTY A THING OR A BUNDLE?, 32 Seattle U. L. Rev. 617, 646+ (2009) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1472 CONDEMNED IF THEY DO, CONDEMNED IF THEY DON'T: EMINENT DOMAIN, PUBLIC USE ABANDONMENT, AND THE NEED FOR CONDEMNEE PROTECTIONS, 30

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Seattle U. L. Rev. 503, 510+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1473 KILLING JIM CROW AND THE UNDEAD NONDELEGATION DOCTRINE WITH PRIVATELY ENFORCEABLE FEDERAL REGULATIONS, 29 Seattle U. L. Rev. 917, 962 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1474 2 Seton Hall Circuit Review 621, GONZALEZ v. RAICH AND THE FEDERAL CHILD PORNOGRAPHY STATUTES: BALANCING THE COMMERCE CLAUSE AND STATE SOVEREIGNTY (2006)

1475 KEEPING THE PUBLIC IN THE PUBLIC USE REQUIREMENT: ACQUISITION OF LAND BY EMINENT DOMAIN FOR NEW SPORTS STADIUMS SHOULD REQUIRE MORE THAN HYPOTHETICAL JOBS AND TAX REVENUES TO MEET THE PUBLIC USE REQUIREMENT, 16 Seton Hall J. Sports & Ent. L. 289, 315+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1476 THE QUEST FOR CONGRUENCE: WHY THE RELIGIOUS LAND USE AND INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT SHOULD APPLY TO EMINENT DOMAIN, 39 Seton Hall L. Rev. 1263, 1297+ (2009) **HN: 2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1477 A "BLIGHTED AREA" OF THE LAW: WHY EMINENT DOMAIN LEGISLATION IS STILL NECESSARY IN NEW JERSEY AFTER GALLENTHIN, 39 Seton Hall L. Rev. 225, 264+ (2009)

C 1478 APPLYING A USABLE PAST: THE USE OF HISTORY IN LAW, 38 Seton Hall L. Rev. 479, 553+ (2008)

C 1479 THE LOOMING COLLAPSE OF RESTRICTIONS ON JUDICIAL CAMPAIGN SPEECH, 38 Seton Hall L. Rev. 63, 135 (2008)

C 1480 LIMITING THE SCOPE OF THE RELIGIOUS LAND USE AND INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT: WHY RLUIPA SHOULD NOT BE AMENDED TO REGULATE EMINENT DOMAIN ACTIONS AGAINST RELIGIOUS PROPERTY, 38 Seton Hall L. Rev. 667, 713+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1481 RLUIPA AS A POSSIBLE SHIELD FROM THE GOVERNMENT TAKING OF RELIGIOUS PROPERTY, 38 Seton Hall L. Rev. 823, 857+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1482 KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON: NEW JERSEY'S TAKE ON TAKINGS, 37 Seton Hall L. Rev. 307, 334+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1483 KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON: IS THE RESPONSE TO CURB THE EFFECT OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION GOING TOO FAR?, 37 Seton Hall L. Rev. 527, 560+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1484 INFORMING EXPECTATIONS THROUGH VISUAL CUES: CREATING THE ASSURANCE OF JUSTICE IN REGULATORY TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE, 36 Seton Hall L. Rev. 1309, 1339+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1485 A ONE-SIDED FEDERALISM REVOLUTION: THE UNADDRESSED CONSTITUTIONAL COMPROMISE ON FEDERALISM AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, 36 Seton Hall L. Rev. 851, 893+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1486 YOU CAN TAKE THIS HEALTH INSURANCE AND ... MANDATE IT?, 33 Seton Hall Legis. J. 535, 559+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1487 "SMART GROWTH" BENEFITS ALL NEW JERSEY RESIDENTS-TIGHTER RESTRICTIONS ON EMINENT DOMAIN ARE UNDESIRABLE, 32 Seton Hall Legis. J. 401, 425+

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

(2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1488 WHAT THE LEGISLATURE GIVETH THE JUDICIARY TAKETH AWAY: THE POWER TO TAKE PRIVATE PROPERTY FOR REDEVELOPMENT IN NEW JERSEY AND GALLENTHIN REALTY DEVELOPMENT, INC. V. BOROUGH OF PAULSBORO, 33 Seton Hall Legis. J. 289, 326+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1489 BANISHED! - NEW JERSEY'S MUNICIPALITIES' UNCONSTITUTIONAL TREND OF BANISHING SEX OFFENDERS, 31 Seton Hall Legis. J. 253, 285 (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1490 CIVILIANS IN CYBERWARFARE: CASUALTIES, 13 SMU Sci. & Tech. L. Rev. 249, 282+ (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1491 SWEET LAND OF PROPERTY?: THE HISTORY, SYMBOLS, RHETORIC, AND THEORY BEHIND THE ORDERING OF THE RIGHTS TO LIBERTY AND PROPERTY IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL LEXICON, 60 S.C. L. Rev. 1, 61+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1492 THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENTAL PURPOSE IN CONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL REVIEW, 59 S.C. L. Rev. 1, 60+ (2007)

C 1493 THE FAIR MARKET VALUE METHOD OF PROPERTY VALUATION IN EMINENT DOMAIN: "JUST COMPENSATION" OR JUST BARELY COMPENSATING?, 58 S.C. L. Rev. 489, 508+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1494 KELO IN SOUTH CAROLINA?: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS NOT A PUBLIC USE FOR PURPOSES OF EMINENT DOMAIN IN SOUTH CAROLINA, 57 S.C. L. Rev. 505, 529+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1495 FOOTNOTES, 17-NOV S.C. Law. 50, 50 (2005)

C 1496 KELO V. NEW LONDON: A DIVIDED COURT AFFIRMS THE RATIONAL BASIS STANDARD OF REVIEW IN EVALUATING LOCAL DETERMINATIONS OF "PUBLIC USE', 51 S.D. L. Rev. 193, 232+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1497 "WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH THE DRUNKEN SAILOR?": THE INTERSECTION OF THE TAKINGS CLAUSE AND THE CHARACTER, MERIT, OR IMPROPRIETY OF REGULATORY ACTION, 17 Southeastern Envtl. L.J. 1, 93+ (2008)

1498 OREGON'S EXPERIENCE WITH PROPERTY RIGHTS COMPENSATION STATUTES, 17 Southeastern Envtl. L.J. 137, 168+ (2008)

1499 A VERY CLEAR BLUE LINE: BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS, PUBLIC CHOICE, PUBLIC ART AND SEA LEVEL RISE, 16 Southeastern Envtl. L.J. 83, 112+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1500 MODIFIED PRIVATE PROPERTY: NEW JERSEY'S PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE, PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT AND EXCLUSION, AND SHARED PUBLIC USES OF NATURAL RESOURCES, 15 Southeastern Envtl. L.J. 71, 119 (2006) **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

1501 A BIOLOGICAL BASIS OF RIGHTS, 19 S. Cal. Interdisc. L.J. 195, 235 (2010)

1502 ADAPTING TO ADAPTIVE REUSE: COMMENTS AND CONCERNS ABOUT THE IMPACTS OF A GROWING PHENOMENON, 18 S. Cal. Interdisc. L.J. 703, 727 (2009)

C 1503 TECHNOLOGICAL FAIR USE, 83 S. Cal. L. Rev. 797, 874+ (2010)

C 1504 CLEARING A PATH FOR DIGITAL DEVELOPMENT: TAKING PATENTS IN EMINENT DOMAIN THROUGH THE ADOPTION OF MANDATORY STANDARDS, 82 S. Cal. L. Rev. 97, 134+ (2008)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1505 U.S. COURTS AND THE INTERNATIONAL LAW OF EXPROPRIATION: TOWARD A NEW MODEL FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT, 80 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1, 87 (2006)

C 1506 DUE PROCESS AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES: THE ERROR OF FEDERAL EXCESSIVENESS JURISPRUDENCE, 79 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1085, 1154+ (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1507 A JEFFERSONIAN REPUBLIC BY HAMILTONIAN MEANS: VALUES, CONSTRAINTS, AND FINANCE IN THE DESIGN OF A COMPREHENSIVE AND CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN "OWNERSHIP SOCIETY", 79 S. Cal. L. Rev. 45, 164+ (2005)

C 1508 REDEVELOPMENT TAKINGS AFTER KELO: WHAT'S BLIGHT GOT TO DO WITH IT?, 17 S. Cal. Rev. L. & Soc. Just. 803, 851+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1509 SUSTAINABLE COMMERCE: PUBLIC HEALTH LAW AND ENVIRONMENTAL LAW PROVIDE TOOLS FOR INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENT TO CONSTRUCT GLOBALLY-COMPETITIVE GREEN ECONOMIES, 33 S. Ill. U. L.J. 367, 401+ (2009) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1510 FROM REPARATION TO RESTORATION: MOVING BEYOND RESTORING PROPERTY RIGHTS TO RESTORING POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC VISIBILITY, 60 SMU L. Rev. 1419, 1470 (2007)

1511 ZONING AND LAND USE, 59 SMU L. Rev. 1649, 1659+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1512 PRIVATE PROPERTY, DEVELOPMENT AND FREEDOM: ON TAKING OUR OWN ADVICE, 59 SMU L. Rev. 345, 383+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1513 MOVE UP OR MOVE OUT: GENTRIFICATION AND THE FUTILITY OF THE INTENT DOCTRINE, 4 S. Regional Black L. Students Ass'n L.J. 117, 136 (2010)

C 1514 ONE STEP FORWARD, TWO STEPS BACK: HOW CALIFORNIA'S 2008 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT CHANGED THE STATE'S EMINENT DOMAIN POWER, 39 Sw. L. Rev. 209, 231+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1515 PROCESS-ORIENTED REVIEW AND THE ORIGINAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE PUBLIC USE REQUIREMENT, 38 Sw. L. Rev. 37, 87+ (2008) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1516 INTO THE WILD: THE UNEVEN AND SELF-DEFEATING EFFECTS OF BELL ATLANTIC V. TWOMBLY, 24 St. John's J. Legal Comment. 73, 111 (2009)

1517 JUDGMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTITUTIONAL COURT AS A BASIS FOR A UNIVERSAL METHOD TO RESOLVE CONFLICTS BETWEEN FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, 22 St. John's J. Legal Comment. 595, 641+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1518 ENTER THE DRAGON'S LAIR: THE NEW SOCIALISM AND PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERSHIP IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, 22 St. John's J. Legal Comment. 805, 842+ (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1519 WHAT IS PROPERTY? PROPERTY IS THEFT: THE LACK OF SOCIAL JUSTICE IN U.S. EMINENT DOMAIN LAW, 84 St. John's L. Rev. 63, 116+ (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1520 EMINENT REASSESSMENT OR TAX DOMAIN: ARE LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES SUFFERING FROM DYSLEXIA?, 81 St. John's L. Rev. 949, 974+ (2007) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1521 THE PAST COMING BACK TO HAUNT THEM: THE PROSECUTION AND SENTENCING OF ONCE DEADLY BUT NOW ELDERLY CRIMINALS, 81 St. John's L. Rev. 369, 397 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1522 "WE SHALL NOT BE MOVED": URBAN COMMUNITIES, EMINENT DOMAIN AND THE SOCIOECONOMICS OF JUST COMPENSATION, 80 St. John's L. Rev. 923, 990+ (2006) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1523 ARE YOU STILL MASTER OF YOUR DOMAIN? ABUSES OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS, AND MICHIGAN'S RETURN TO "PUBLIC USE" IN COUNTY OF WAYNE V. HATHCOCK, 79 St. John's L. Rev. 1259, 1285+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1524 PRIVATIZATION AND DEMOCRATIZATION-REFLECTIONS ON THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 50 St. Louis U. L.J. 751, 759+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1525 A COMMENT ON PRIVATIZATION AND DEMOCRATIZATION, 50 St. Louis U. L.J. 783, 798 (2006)

1526 THE "UNABLE TO AGREE" REQUIREMENT AND TEXAS CONDEMNATION LAW: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF HUBENAK V. SAN JACINTO GAS TRANSMISSION CO., 37 St. Mary's L.J. 569, 605+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1527 RESTRICTING KELO: WILL REDEFINING "BLIGHT" IN SENATE BILL 7 BE THE LIGHT AT THE END OF THE TUNNEL?, 37 St. Mary's L.J. 795, 847+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1528 MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF PRACTITIONERS' BRIEFS IN THE LAW SCHOOL CURRICULUM, 22 St. Thomas L. Rev. 417, 432+ (2010)

C 1529 THE IMPLICATIONS OF LINGLE ON INCLUSIONARY ZONING AND OTHER LEGISLATIVE AND MONETARY EXACTIONS, 28 Stan. Envtl. L.J. 397, 438 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1530 THE TRACK RECORD ON TAKINGS LEGISLATION: LESSONS FROM DEMOCRACY'S LABORATORIES, 28 Stan. Envtl. L.J. 439, 524 (2009)

C 1531 THE STUBBORN INCOHERENCE OF REGULATORY TAKINGS, 28 Stan. Envtl. L.J. 525, 576 (2009)

C 1532 REAL PROPERTY AND PEOPLEHOOD, 27 Stan. Envtl. L.J. 313, 395+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1533 THE LUCAS CASE: THE TRIAL COURT STRATEGY AND THE CASE'S EFFECT ON THE PROPERTY RIGHTS MOVEMENT, 27 Stan. Envtl. L.J. 271, 295 (2008)

C 1534 WHO GETS TO INTERPRET THE CONSTITUTION? THE CASE OF MAYORS AND MARRIAGE EQUALITY, 3 Stanford Journal of Civil Rights & Civil Liberties 1 (2007)

C 1535 THE DISINTEGRATION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY? A CLASSICAL LIBERAL RESPONSE TO A PREMATURE OBITUARY, 62 Stan. L. Rev. 455, 521 (2010)

C 1536 SUPER MEDIANS, 61 Stan. L. Rev. 37, 99 (2008)

C 1537 PRIVATIZATION AND THE LAW AND ECONOMICS OF POLITICAL ADVOCACY, 60 Stan. L. Rev. 1197, 1253 (2008)

C 1538 IF PEOPLE WOULD BE OUTRAGED BY THEIR RULINGS, SHOULD JUDGES CARE?, 60 Stan. L. Rev. 155, 212+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1539 EQUALITY IN THE WAR ON TERROR, 59 Stan. L. Rev. 1365, 1394 (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1540 TAKING COMPENSATION PRIVATE, 59 Stan. L. Rev. 871, 906+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1541 ANTITRUST AND THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE, 59 Stan. L. Rev. 77, 130 (2006)

C 1542 MUNICIPALITIES AND THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION, 37 Stetson L. Rev. 435, 457 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1543 FIRM GROUND FOR WETLAND PROTECTION: USING THE TREATY POWER TO STRENGTHEN CONSERVATION EASEMENTS, 36 Stetson L. Rev. 207, 246+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1544 "BLIGHT" AS A MEANS OF JUSTIFYING CONDEMNATION FOR ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT IN FLORIDA, 35 Stetson L. Rev. 443, 460+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1545 SEEING THE LIGHT: IGNORING COLLATERAL ECONOMIC BENEFITS TO THE PUBLIC WHEN ENFORCING SERVITUDES, 12 Suffolk J. Trial & App. Advoc. 139, 158+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1546 INVESTMENT PROTECTION UNDER THE PROPOSED ASEAN-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT, 33 Suffolk Transnat'l L. Rev. 225, 256+ (2010) **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1547 NATURAL LAW ORIGINALISM FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY - A PRINCIPLE OF JUDICIAL RESTRAINT, NOT INVENTION, 40 Suffolk U. L. Rev. 383, 417 (2007)

1548 INTRODUCTION TO SYMPOSIUM ON POST-KELO REFORM, 17 Sup. Ct. Econ. Rev. 1, 1+ (2009) **HN: 2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1549 POST-KELO REFORM: IS THE GLASS HALF FULL OR HALF EMPTY?, 17 Sup. Ct. Econ. Rev. 127, 128+ (2009) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1550 PUBLIC USE IN A POST-KELO WORLD, 17 Sup. Ct. Econ. Rev. 151, 171+ (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1551 PRETEXTUAL TAKINGS: OF PRIVATE DEVELOPERS, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, AND IMPERMISSIBLE FAVORITISM, 17 Sup. Ct. Econ. Rev. 173, 174+ (2009) **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1552 SYMBOL OR SUBSTANCE? AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF STATE RESPONSES TO KELO, 17 Sup. Ct. Econ. Rev. 237, 238+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1553 KELO, DIRECTED GROWTH, AND MUNICIPAL INDUSTRIAL POLICY, 17 Sup. Ct. Econ. Rev. 63, 64+ (2009) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

1554 EXCLUSIONARY EMINENT DOMAIN, 17 Sup. Ct. Econ. Rev. 7, 9+ (2009) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1555 CONTROLLING THE GRASPING HAND: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS AFTER KELO, 15 Sup. Ct. Econ. Rev. 183, 185+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1556 KELO'S LEGACY: EMINENT DOMAIN AND THE FUTURE OF PROPERTY RIGHTS, 2005 Sup. Ct. Rev. 103, 133+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1557 MEDITATIONS ON STRATHCLYDE: CONTROLLING PRIVATE LAND USE RESTRICTIONS AT THE CROSSROADS OF LEGAL SYSTEMS, 36 Syracuse J. Int'l L. & Com. 1, 42 (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1558 THE UNITED STATES PATENT SYSTEM IN THE MEDIA MIRROR, 58 Syracuse L. Rev. 459, 521 (2008)

C 1559 COPYRIGHT AS INTELLECTUAL ((Strikethrough))PROPERTY((end Strikethrough)) PRIVILEGE, 58 Syracuse L. Rev. 523, 546 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1560 LEGAL PROTECTIONS FOR HOME DWELLERS: CAULKING THE CRACKS TO PRESERVE OCCUPANCY, 56 Syracuse L. Rev. 277, 319+ (2006)

C 1561 LOANS, AND TAKINGS, AND BUILDINGS-OH MY!: A NECESSARY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PUBLIC PURPOSE AND PUBLIC USE IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 56 Syracuse L. Rev. 321, 352+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1562 THE CHIEF AND US: CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM REHNQUIST, THE NEWS MEDIA, AND THE NEED FOR DIALOGUE BETWEEN JUDGES AND JOURNALISTS, 56 Syracuse L. Rev. 407, 417 (2006)

C 1563 LOCAL GOVERNMENT, 56 Syracuse L. Rev. 931, 952+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1564 PROTECTING PETER WHEN THE LEGISLATURE ROBS PETER TO PAY PAUL AFTER EMPRESS CASINO v. GIANNOULIAS, 63 Tax Law. 1299, 1300+ (2010)

C 1565 SOLVING THE PERSONAL USE/INVESTMENT DILEMMA FOR LIKE-KIND EXCHANGES: MOORE v. COMMISSIONER, 63 Tax Law. 267, 284 (2009)

1566 LESSENING THE BURDENS OF A CHANGING GOVERNMENT, 20 Tax'n of Exempts 3, 7 (2009)

C 1567 LEGAL ETHICS, JURISPRUDENCE, AND THE CULTURAL STUDY OF THE LAWYER, 81 Temp. L. Rev. 737, 785 (2008)

C 1568 YOU CAN HAVE IT ALL: LESS SPRAWL AND PROPERTY RIGHTS TOO, 80 Temp. L. Rev. 1093, 1134+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1569 MESSING WITH TEXAS? WHY PRESIDENT BUSH'S MEMORANDUM ORDER TRUMPS STATE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, 79 Temp. L. Rev. 1029, 1074+ (2006)

C 1570 WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? STATES REVISE EMINENT DOMAIN LEGISLATION IN RESPONSE TO KELO, 79 Temp. L. Rev. 617, 647+ (2006)

C 1571 INEQUITY IN EQUITY: THE TRAGEDY OF TENANCY IN COMMON FOR HEIRS' PROPERTY OWNERS FACING PARTITION IN EQUITY, 17 Temp. Pol. & Civ. Rts. L. Rev. 1, 81 (2007)

C 1572 KELO - MIDKIFF'S LATEST VICTIM, 16 Temp. Pol. & Civ. Rts. L. Rev. 257, 281+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1573 PROPERTY RIGHTS vs. PUBLIC USE Analyzing Tennessee's response to Kelo eminent domain ruling, 43-FEB Tenn. B.J. 14, 15+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1574 WHAT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S 2004-2005 DECISIONS MEAN TO TENNESSEE LAWYERS, 41-SEP Tenn. B.J. 16, 33+ (2005) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1575 NONUSE AND EASEMENTS: CREATING A PLIABILITY REGIME OF PRIVATE EMINENT DOMAIN, 78 Tenn. L. Rev. 1, 45+ (2010) **HN: 1,2,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1576 "AIN'T NO SUNSHINE" : EXAMINING INFORMALITY AND STATE OPEN MEETINGS ACTS AS THE ANTI-PUBLIC NORM IN INNER-CITY REDEVELOPMENT DEAL MAKING, 74 Tenn. L. Rev. 623, 668+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1577 REAL ESTATE LAW, 70 Tex. B.J. 692, 694 (2007)

C 1578 ENVIRONMENTAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES LAW, 69 Tex. B.J. 32, 33+ (2006) **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1579 WHO TOOK MY IP?-DEFENDING THE AVAILABILITY OF INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR PATENT OWNERS, 16 Tex. Intell. Prop. L.J. 187, 235+ (2008) **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

1580 THE RELATIVE IRRELEVANCE OF THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE, 89 Tex. L. Rev. 583, 651 (2011)

C 1581 THE TAKING/TAXING TAXONOMY, 88 Tex. L. Rev. 1235, 1282+ (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1582 THE RISE OF THE CONSERVATIVE LEGAL MOVEMENT: THE BATTLE FOR CONTROL

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

OF THE LAW. BY STEVEN M. TELES. PRINCETON, N.J.: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2008. 339 PAGES. $35.00., 87 Tex. L. Rev. 447, 462 (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1583 INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS UNDER STATE CONSTITUTIONS WHEN THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT WAS RATIFIED IN 1868: WHAT RIGHTS ARE DEEPLY ROOTED IN AMERICAN HISTORY AND TRADITION?, 87 Tex. L. Rev. 7, 120 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1584 JUDICIAL JURISDICTION STRIPPING MASQUERADING AS RIPENESS: ELIMINATING THE WILLIAMSON COUNTY STATE LITIGATION REQUIREMENT FOR REGULATORY TAKINGS CLAIMS, 85 Tex. L. Rev. 199, 241+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1585 THE COURT AGAINST THE COURTS: HOSTILITY TO LITIGATION AS AN ORGANIZING THEME IN THE REHNQUIST COURT'S JURISPRUDENCE, 84 Tex. L. Rev. 1097, 1202 (2006)

C 1586 FOREWORD, 83 Tex. L. Rev. 1809, 1872 (2005)

C 1587 THE YEAR OF THE GUN: SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND THE SUPREME COURT, 86 Tex. L. Rev. See Also 22, 23+ (2008)

1588 SET THE DEFAULT TO OPEN: PLESSY'S MEANING IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY AND HOW TECHNOLOGY PUTS THE INDIVIDUAL BACK AT THE CENTER OF LIFE, LIBERTY, AND GOVERNMENT, 14 Tex. Rev. L. & Pol. 48, 89 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1589 RLUIPA AND EMINENT DOMAIN: HOW A PLAIN READING OF A FLAWED STATUTE CREATES AN ABSURD RESULT, 13 Tex. Rev. L. & Pol. 311, 364+ (2009)

1590 DID THE RIGHT MAKE AMERICA A LAWSUIT NATION? See You in Court. Thomas Geoghegan. New York: The New Press, 2007. Pp. 246. $24.95., 12 Tex. Rev. L. & Pol. 477, 518 (2008)

C 1591 BRENNAN'S EPIPHANY: THE NECESSITY OF INVOKING STATE CONSTITUTIONS TO PROTECT FREEDOM, 12 Tex. Rev. L. & Pol. 137, 160+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

1592 CAUTION! T. BOONE PICKENS PLANS TO PERMANENTLY ALTER TEXAS'S LANDSCAPE ABOVE AND BELOW GROUND, FROM THE PANHANDLE TO METROPOLIS, 9 Tex. Tech Admin. L.J. 265, 286+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

1593 A CONCLUSION IN SEARCH OF A HISTORY TO SUPPORT IT, 43 Tex. Tech L. Rev. 29, 49 (2010)

C 1594 EMINENT DOMAIN POWER GRANTED TO PRIVATE PIPELINE COMPANIES MEETS WITH GREATER RESISTANCE FROM PROPERTY OWNERS IN URBAN RATHER THAN RURAL AREAS, 16 Tex. Wesleyan L. Rev. 17, 27+ (2009) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1595 NO COMPENSATION FOR SLAVE TRADERS: SOME IMPLICATIONS, 14 Tex. Wesleyan L. Rev. 289, 296 (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1596 TAKE IT OR LEAVE IT: EMINENT DOMAIN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT-STATUTES, ORDINANCES, & POLITICS, OH MY!, 12 Tex. Wesleyan L. Rev. 523, 553+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1597 PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS IN STATE AND LOCAL HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS, 55-DEC Fed. Law. 34, 41+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1598 PROPERTY RIGHTS AND WRONGS: THE COMING FIGHT IN CONGRESS TO END EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE, 54-OCT Fed. Law. 37, 37+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1599 CORNERSTONE OF LIBERTY: PROPERTY RIGHTS IN 21ST CENTURY AMERICA BY TIMOTHY SANDEFUR CATO INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, DC, 2006. 155 PAGES, $19.95, 54-OCT Fed. Law. 52, 52+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1600 AN INTRODUCTION TO FIFTH AMENDMENT TAKINGS, 54-OCT Fed. Law. 6, 6 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1601 DAVID HACKETT SOUTER: TRADITIONAL REPUBLICAN ON THE REHNQUIST COURT BY TINSLEY E. YARBROUGH OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, NEW YORK, NY, 2005. 311 PAGES, $29.95, 53-SEP Fed. Law. 54, 55+ (2006)

C 1602 THE WOLVES AND THE SHEEP OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: A REVIEW ESSAY ON KERMIT ROOSEVELT'S THE MYTH OF JUDICIAL ACTIVISM, 23 J.L. & Pol. 1, 40+ (2007)

C 1603 LAND HUNGRY, 21 J.L. & Pol. 293, 321+ (2005) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1604 ALL THE KING'S HORSES AND ALL THE KING'S MEN: HURDLES TO PUTTING THE FRAGMENTED METROPOLIS BACK TOGETHER AGAIN? STATEWIDE LAND USE PLANNING, PORTLAND METRO AND OREGON'S MEASURE 37, 21 J.L. & Pol. 397, 450+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1605 SEIZURE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY: POWERS AND PROTECTIONS, 35 J.L. Med. & Ethics 77, 78 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1606 THE BAR'S ROLE IN PUBLIC EDUCATION ABOUT THE COURTS, 46 NO. 2 Judges' J. 27, 31+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1607 GOLDSTEIN V. PATAKI: DOWN BUT NOT OUT, FIFTEEN PROPERTY OWNERS STOP THE CLOCK ON BRUCE RATNER'S EMINENT DOMAIN GAME, 16 Sports Law. J. 319, 332+ (2009) **HN: 2,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1608 FOR THE PUBLIC'S USE? EMINENT DOMAIN IN STADIUM CONSTRUCTION, 15 Sports Law. J. 173, 193+ (2008) **HN: 2,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1609 KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON: DESPITE THE OUTCRY, THE DECISION IS FIRMLY SUPPORTED BY PRECEDENT-HOWEVER, EMINENT DOMAIN CRITICS STILL HAVE GAINED GROUND, 38 U. Mem. L. Rev. 187, 187+ (2007) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

1610 THE REVIVAL OF DUE PROCESS RIGHTS IN REDEVELOPMENT TAKINGS: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN DUE PROCESS IN STATE EMINENT DOMAIN CASE LAW, 42 Urb. Law. 581, 581+ (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1611 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CHALLENGING THE RIGHT TO TAKE IN EMINENT DOMAIN, 42 Urb. Law. 693, 693+ (2010)

1612 URBAN AGRICULTURE AND OTHER GREEN USES: REMAKING THE SHRINKING CITY, 42 Urb. Law. 225, 285+ (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1613 URBAN REDEVELOPMENT POLICY, JUDICIAL DEFERENCE TO UNACCOUNTABLE AGENCIES, AND REALITY IN BROOKLYN'S ATLANTIC YARDS PROJECT, 42 Urb. Law. 287, 304+ (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1614 URBAN RENEWAL AND THE STORY OF BERMAN v. PARKER, 42 Urb. Law. 423, 424+ (2010) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1615 2009 ZONING AND PLANNING LAW HANDBOOK PATRICIA E. SALKIN ED., 29TH ED. 2009, 42 Urb. Law. 205, 207+ (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1616 TAX INCREMENT FINANCING AS A TOOL FOR REDEVELOPMENT: ATTRACTING PRIVATE INVESTMENT TO SERVE A PUBLIC PURPOSE-THE EXAMPLE OF MICHIGAN, 41 Urb. Law. 755, 766+ (2009) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1617 REGULATORY TAKINGS AND FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNERS, 41 Urb. Law. 427, 431+ (2009)

1618 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN PUBLIC USE AND PRETEXT IN EMINENT DOMAIN, 41 Urb. Law. 563, 563+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1619 25TH SMITH-BABCOCK-WILLIAMS STUDENT WRITING COMPETITION WINNER Restitution, Eminent Domain, and Economic Development: Moving to a Gains-Based Conception of the Takings Clause, 41 Urb. Law. 183, 183+ (2009)

1620 THE ZONING OF AMERICA: EUCLID v. AMBLER MICHAEL ALLAN WOLF, 40 Urb. Law. 999, 1002 (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1621 THE GENESIS OF RLUIPA AND FEDERALISM: EVALUATING THE CREATION OF A FEDERAL STATUTORY RIGHT AND ITS IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT, 40 Urb. Law. 195, 258+ (2008)

1622 AFFORDING BALTIMORE: PUBLIC-PRIVATE APPROACHES TO WORKFORCE HOUSING, 40 Urb. Law. 331, 364+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1623 THE COVENANT CONUNDRUM IN URBAN WATER CONSERVATION, 40 Urb. Law. 17, 50 (2008)

1624 THE FUTURE OF THE REGULATORY TAKINGS ISSUE IN THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE: DIVERGENCE OR CONVERGENCE?, 40 Urb. Law. 51, 61+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1625 DOES BLIGHT REALLY JUSTIFY CONDEMNATION?, 39 Urb. Law. 833, 833+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1626 WE DON'T HAVE TO FOLLOW ANY STINKIN' PLANNING-SORRY ABOUT THAT, JUSTICE STEVENS, 39 Urb. Law. 529, 529+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1627 HIGH HOPES, HOLLOW HARVEST: STATE REMEDIES FOR PARTIAL REGULATORY TAKINGS, 39 Urb. Law. 619, 632 (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1628 CAN A CONDEMNEE REGAIN ITS PROPERTY IF THE CONDEMNOR ABANDONS THE PUBLIC USE?, 39 Urb. Law. 671, 680 (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1629 SEATTLE'S CENTRAL DISTRICT, 1990-2006: INTEGRATION OR DISPLACEMENT?, 39 Urb. Law. 167, 237 (2007)

1630 AVERAGE RECIPROCITY OF ADVANTAGE: "MAGIC WORDS" OR ECONOMIC REALITY-LESSONS FROM PALAZZOLO, 39 Urb. Law. 319, 370+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1631 CASE NOTES, 39 Urb. Law. 159, 163 (2007)

1632 THE DEVELOPMENT, STATUS, AND VIABILITY OF THE CONSERVATION EASEMENT AS A PRIVATE LAND CONSERVATION TOOL IN THE WESTERN UNITED STATES, 39 Urb. Law. 19, 60+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,5 (S.Ct.)**

1633 MEASURE 37 AND A SPOONFUL OF KELO: A RECIPE FOR PROPERTY RIGHTS ACTIVISTS AT THE BALLOT BOX, 38 Urb. Law. 1065, 1069+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1634 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CONDEMNATION LAW, 38 Urb. Law. 1223, 1251+ (2006) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1635 JUST A FLESH WOUND? THE IMPACT OF LINGLE v. CHEVRON ON REGULATORY TAKINGS LAW, 38 Urb. Law. 437, 450+ (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1636 INDIGESTION FROM EATING CROW : THE IMPACT OF LINGLE v. CHEVRON U.S.A., INC. ON THE FUTURE OF REGULATORY TAKINGS DOCTRINE, 38 Urb. Law. 451, 483+ (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1637 EXACTIONS UPDATE: THE STATE OF DEVELOPMENT EXACTIONS AFTER LINGLE v. CHEVRON U.S.A., INC., 38 Urb. Law. 641, 641+ (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1638 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING LAW, 38 Urb. Law. 685, 699 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1639 HOW TO THINK ABOUT KELO AFTER THE SHOUTING STOPS, 38 Urb. Law. 191, 191+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1640 KELO v. NEW LONDON: BAD LAW, BAD POLICY, AND BAD JUDGMENT, 38 Urb. Law. 201, 201+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

1641 YEAR ZERO: THE AFTERMATH OF MEASURE 37, 38 Urb. Law. 237, 273+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1642 THE SUPREME COURT REPORT 2004-05: THE END OF THE REHNQUIST ERA, 37 Urb. Law. 715, 720+ (2005) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1643 MOUNT LAUREL TOWNSHIP v. MIPRO HOMES, L.L.C., 37 Urb. Law. 983, 984 (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1644 INTERMEDIATE SCRUTINY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS: PROPOSING A NEW TEST BASED ON JUSTICE KENNEDY'S KELO CONCURRENCE, 31 T. Jefferson L. Rev. 431, 459+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1645 HOUSTON GENTRIFICATION: OPTIONS FOR CURRENT RESIDENTS OF THIRD WARD, 35 T. Marshall L. Rev. 239, 255+ (2010) **HN: 3,6 (S.Ct.)**

1646 ADDRESSING HOUSING NEEDS IN THE POST KATRINA GULF COAST, 31 T. Marshall L. Rev. 327, 351 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1647 SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION, SECOND DEPARTMENT, 26 Touro L. Rev. 863, 876+ (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1648 A LOOK BACK AT THE REHNQUIST ERA AND AN OVERVIEW OF THE 2004 SUPREME COURT TERM, 21 Touro L. Rev. 731, 762+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1649 SECTION 1983 CASES IN THE OCTOBER 2004 TERM, 21 Touro L. Rev. 763, 785 (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1650 FEDERALISM CASES IN THE OCTOBER 2004 TERM, 21 Touro L. Rev. 787, 807+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,6 (S.Ct.)**

1651 TAKINGS CASES IN THE OCTOBER 2004 TERM, 21 Touro L. Rev. 809, 827+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1652 THE PROPERTY RIGHTS REVOLUTION THAT FAILED: EMINENT DOMAIN IN THE 2004 SUPREME COURT TERM, 21 Touro L. Rev. 929, 988+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1653 CHANGING WITH THE TIMES: EMINENT DOMAIN PRACTICE IN LIGHT OF TENNESSEE PUBLIC ACT 863, 9 Transactions: Tenn. J. Bus. L. 179, 248+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1654 CASE COMMENTARIES, 8 Transactions: Tenn. J. Bus. L. 199, 225+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1655 A NEW TERM, A NEW JUSTICE, 45-NOV Trial 50, 51 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1656 OHIO HIGH COURT REINS IN EMINENT DOMAIN, 42-OCT Trial 74, 74 (2006)

1657 HALLOWED GROUND: THE GETTYSBURG BATTLEFIELD IN HISTORIC PRESERVATION LAW, 22 Tul. Envtl. L.J. 203, 269 (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1658 NOTICE AND EXPECTATION UNDER BOUNDED UNCERTAINTY: DEFINING EVOLVING PROPERTY RIGHTS BOUNDARIES THROUGH PUBLIC TRUST AND TAKINGS, 21 Tul. Envtl. L.J. 233, 293+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1659 MAY THE MARKET DO WHAT TAKING JURISPRUDENCE DOES NOT: DIVIDE A SINGLE PARCEL INTO DISCRETE SEGMENTS?, 19 Tul. Envtl. L.J. 269, 291 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1660 TIERRA Y LIBERTAD: THE SOCIAL FUNCTION DOCTRINE AND LAND REFORM IN LATIN AMERICA, 19 Tul. Envtl. L.J. 69, 120 (2006)

C 1661 INTRODUCTION TO THE SYMPOSIUM: A PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON PROPERTY LAW, 83 Tul. L. Rev. 601, 607+ (2009) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1662 "TO BE HUMAN": A PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON PROPERTY LAW, 83 Tul. L. Rev. 609, 644 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1663 LEGAL QUESTIONS FOR THE PSYCHOLOGY OF HOME, 83 Tul. L. Rev. 645, 660+ (2009)

C 1664 ARTISTS' MORAL RIGHTS AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF OWNERSHIP, 83 Tul. L. Rev. 661, 678 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1665 NEW ORLEANS, KATRINA AND KELO: AMERICAN CITIES IN THE POST-KELO ERA, 83 Tul. L. Rev. 395, 437+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1666 AFTER KELO, CURBING OPPORTUNISTIC TIF-DRIVEN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: FORGOING INEFFECTUAL BLIGHT TESTS; EMPOWERING PROPERTY OWNERS AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 83 Tul. L. Rev. 45, 110+ (2008) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1667 THE ROBERTS COURT, STARE DECISIS, AND THE FUTURE OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 82 Tul. L. Rev. 1533, 1559 (2008)

C 1668 THE REFLECTIONS AND RESPONSES OF A LEGAL CONTRARIAN, 44 Tulsa L. Rev. 647, 675 (2009)

1669 FEDERALISM AND KELO: A QUESTION FOR RICHARD EPSTEIN, 44 Tulsa L. Rev. 751, 763+ (2009)

1670 A REEXAMINATION OF THE TEMPORAL DIMENSION IN PROPERTY AND TAKINGS, 44 Tulsa L. Rev. 765, 777+ (2009) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1671 A NEW DEAL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES: AN ESSAY IN HONOR OF CASS R. SUNSTEIN, 43 Tulsa L. Rev. 921, 931 (2008)

C 1672 THE BUSH IMPRINT ON THE SUPREME COURT: WHY CONSERVATIVES SHOULD CONTINUE TO YEARN AND LIBERALS SHOULD NOT FEAR, 43 Tulsa L. Rev. 651, 671 (2008)

C 1673 SYMPOSIUM FOREWORD: INDIAN NATIONS AND THE LAW, 41 Tulsa L. Rev. 1, 4 (2005) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1674 BY EMINENT DOMAIN OR SOME OTHER NAME: A TRIBAL PERSPECTIVE ON TAKING LAND, 41 Tulsa L. Rev. 51, 77+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1675 SYMPOSIUM FOREWORD, 41 Tulsa L. Rev. 117, 123+ (2005) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1676 DESTABILIZED DOCTRINE AT THE END OF THE REHNQUIST ERA AND THE BUSINESS RELATED CASES IN ITS FINAL TERM, 41 Tulsa L. Rev. 219, 241+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1677 TAKINGS AND THREES: THE SUPREME COURT'S 2004-2005 TERM, 41 Tulsa L. Rev. 243, 290+ (2005) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

1678 APPLYING COMMUNAL THEORIES TO URBAN PROPERTY: AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL LOOK AT USING THE ELABORATION OF COMMON PROPERTY REGIMES TO REDUCE SOCIAL EXCLUSION FROM HOUSING MARKETS, 10 U.C. Davis Bus. L.J. 33, 64 (2009)

1679 USING LAND IN CHINA How Foreign Companies are Navigating Changing Chinese Property Laws - an interview with Anna Han of Santa Clara University, 7 U.C. Davis Bus. L.J. 7, 7 (2007)

1680 WHAT'S YOURS CAN BE MINE: ARE THERE ANY PRIVATE TAKINGS AFTER KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON?, 24 UCLA J. Envtl. L. & Pol'y 195, 234+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1681 CONDEMNATION OF LOW INCOME RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES UNDER THE TAKINGS CLAUSE, 23 UCLA J. Envtl. L. & Pol'y 131, 169+ (2005) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1682 ACQUIRING LAND USE RIGHTS IN TODAY'S CHINA: A SNAPSHOT FROM ON THE GROUND, 24 UCLA Pac. Basin L.J. 1, 50+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1683 ENSLAVING PAUL BY FREEING PETER: THE DILEMMA OF PROTECTING COUNSEL'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WHILE PROVIDING INDIGENT DEFENDANTS WITH EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, 78 UMKC L. Rev. 291, 317 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1684 THE MANY MEANINGS OF "POLITICS" IN JUDICIAL DECISION MAKING, 77 UMKC L. Rev. 347, 379 (2008)

1685 E.T. TAKE HOME: THE OUT-OF-THIS-WORLD RATIONALE FOR EXTRATERRITORIAL TAKINGS AND IGNORING THEIR INHERENT CONFLICT WITH THE FIFTH AMENDMENT, 75 UMKC L. Rev. 925, 942 (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1686 PROPERTY LAW, 28 U. Ark. Little Rock L. Rev. 761, 766+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1687 EAST SIDE STORY THE REDEVELOPMENT OF EAST BALTIMORE, 15 U. Balt. J. Envtl. L. 97, 128+ (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1688 ETHICAL EMISSIONS TRADING AND THE LAW, 13 U. Balt. J. Envtl. L. 149, 174+ (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1689 REICHS FORD RD. JOINT VENTURE V. STATE RDS. COMM'N OF THE STATE HIGHWAY ADMIN: DURING THE EXERCISE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, DAMAGES INCURRED FROM A CONDEMNOR'S PRE-CONDEMNATION CONDUCT EVENTUALLY RESULTING IN FORMAL CONDEMNATI, 36 U. Balt. L.F. 81, 84 (2005)

1690 FOUR TERMS OF THE KENNEDY COURT: PROJECTING THE FUTURE OF CONSTITUTIONAL DOCTRINE, 39 U. Balt. L. Rev. 1, 62+ (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1691 MORSE, SCHOOL SPEECH, AND ORIGINALISM, 42 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 637, 660 (2009)

1692 THE MEASURE OF JUST COMPENSATION, 41 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 239, 287+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1693 KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON: A PERSPECTIVE ON ECONOMIC FREEDOMS, 40 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 1997, 2037+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1694 MULTIJURISDICTIONALITY AND FEDERALISM: ASSESSING SAN REMO HOTEL'S EFFECT ON REGULATORY TAKINGS, 57 UCLA L. Rev. 1819, 1878+ (2010) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1695 HELLER AND THE TRIUMPH OF ORIGINALIST JUDICIAL ENGAGEMENT: A RESPONSE TO JUDGE HARVIE WILKINSON, 56 UCLA L. Rev. 1127, 1169+ (2009) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1696 NORMATIVE METHODS FOR LAWYERS, 56 UCLA L. Rev. 899, 982+ (2009) **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1697 OWNING THE CENTER OF THE EARTH, 55 UCLA L. Rev. 979, 1040+ (2008) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1698 REACHING BACKWARD WHILE LOOKING FORWARD: THE RETROACTIVE EFFECT OF CALIFORNIA'S DOMESTIC PARTNER RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES ACT, 54 UCLA L. Rev. 185, 234+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1699 BACKDOOR FEDERALIZATION, 53 UCLA L. Rev. 1353, 1433+ (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1700 CALIBRATING THE BALANCE OF FREE EXERCISE, RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENT, AND LAND USE REGULATION: IS RLUIPA AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE TO AN OVERSTATED PROBLEM?, 53 UCLA L. Rev. 485, 522 (2005)

C 1701 ROPER V. SIMMONS AND OUR CONSTITUTION IN INTERNATIONAL EQUIPOISE, 53 UCLA L. Rev. 1, 27+ (2005)

C 1702 SOME REALISM ABOUT PUNISHMENT NATURALISM, 77 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1531, 1608 (2010)

C 1703 DIRECT VOTING BY PROPERTY OWNERS, 77 U. Chi. L. Rev. 275, 275+ (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1704 ENTRENCHING ENVIRONMENTALISM: PRIVATE CONSERVATION EASEMENTS OVER PUBLIC LAND, 77 U. Chi. L. Rev. 341, 366 (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1705 THE MOST POPULAR TOOL: TAX INCREMENT FINANCING AND THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT, 77 U. Chi. L. Rev. 65, 95 (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1706 PRIVATE TAKINGS, 76 U. Chi. L. Rev. 517, 585+ (2009)

C 1707 THE DALE PROBLEM: PROPERTY AND SPEECH UNDER THE REGULATORY STATE, 75 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1541, 1600+ (2008)

C 1708 RECONFIGURING PROPERTY IN THREE DIMENSIONS, 75 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1015, 1070 (2008) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1709 THE RIGHT ONES FOR THE JOB: DIVINING THE CORRECT STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR CURTILAGE DETERMINATIONS IN THE AFTERMATH OF ORNELAS V UNITED STATES, 75 U. Chi. L. Rev. 885, 910+ (2008) **HN: 2,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1710 CONISTON CORP V VILLAGE OF HOFFMAN HILLS: HOW TO MAKE PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS DISAPPEAR, 74 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1689, 1703+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1711 "IT'S NOT EASY BEING GREEN": LOCAL INITIATIVES, PREEMPTION PROBLEMS, AND THE MARKET PARTICIPANT EXCEPTION, 78 U. Cin. L. Rev. 835, 889+ (2010) **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1712 BRINGING CLARITY TO TITLE CLEARING: TAX FORECLOSURE AND DUE PROCESS IN THE INTERNET AGE, 77 U. Cin. L. Rev. 63, 118 (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1713 COULD TOO MUCH OVERSIGHT OF THE JUDICIARY LEAD TO J.A.I.L.? HOW A

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

FAILED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT BALLOT INITIATIVE IN SOUTH DAKOTA ILLUSTRATES THE NEED TO RESTRAIN JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT, 76 U. Cin. L. Rev. 299, 322+ (2007) **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1714 DETERIORATED VS. DETERIORATING: THE VOID-FOR-VAGUENESS DOCTRINE AND BLIGHT TAKINGS NORWOOD V. HORNEY, 75 U. Cin. L. Rev. 1769, 1794+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1715 SCALIA'S INFIDELITY: A CRITIQUE OF "FAINT-HEARTED" ORIGINALISM, 75 U. Cin. L. Rev. 7, 24+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1716 THE VISIBLE HAND IN GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED FINANCIAL SERVICES: WHY STATES SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO OFFER 529 PLANS, 74 U. Cin. L. Rev. 1265, 1301 (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1717 MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING: KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, BABBITT V. SWEET HOME, AND OTHER TALES FROM THE SUPREME COURT, 75 U. Cin. L. Rev. 663, 719+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1718 CONSTITUTIONAL CONTOURS FOR THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MULTISTATE RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS, 81 U. Colo. L. Rev. 771, 832 (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1719 THE FRONTIER OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 79 U. Colo. L. Rev. 651, 700+ (2008) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1720 THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION IN THE NEW CENTURY, 78 U. Colo. L. Rev. 1265, 1335 (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1721 COALBED METHANE: CRAFTING A RIGHT TO SELL FROM AN OBLIGATION TO VENT, 78 U. Colo. L. Rev. 613, 646+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1722 INTERPRETING AND ENACTING STATUTES IN THE CONSTITUTION'S SHADOWS: AN INTRODUCTION, 32 U. Dayton L. Rev. 307, 319+ (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1723 TWO MODELS OF PUBLIC INTEREST REVIEW OF WATER ALLOCATION IN THE WEST, 9 U. Denv. Water L. Rev. 485, 517 (2006)

C 1724 GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE WITH THE USE OF WATER: WHEN DO UNCONSTITUTIONAL "TAKINGS" OCCUR?, 9 U. Denv. Water L. Rev. 1, 71 (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1725 THE KELO REVOLUTION, 86 U. Det. Mercy L. Rev. 65, 129+ (2009)

1726 MICHIGAN'S PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO KELO: ADEQUATE PROTECTION AGAINST EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE OR FALSE HOPE TO PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS?, 84 U. Det. Mercy L. Rev. 187, 210+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1727 THE CONSTITUTION AND FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, 18 U. Fla. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y IX, xiii (2007)

C 1728 FAIR USE RIGHTS IN A WORLD OF THE BROADCAST FLAG AND DIGITAL RIGHTS MANAGEMENT: DO CONSUMERS HAVE A CHANCE?, 18 U. Fla. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 115, 135 (2007)

C 1729 DO WE NEED TO IMPAIR OR STRENGTHEN PROPERTY RIGHTS IN ORDER TO "FULFILL THEIR UNIQUE ROLE"? A RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR DYAL-CHAND, 31 U. Haw.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

L. Rev. 423, 473+ (2009) **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1730 RLUIPA AND THE INDIVIDUALIZED ASSESSMENT: SPECIAL USE PERMITS AND VARIANCES UNDER STRICT CONGRESSIONAL SCRUTINY, 31 U. Haw. L. Rev. 257, 290 (2008) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1731 KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON: OF PLANNING, FEDERALISM, AND A SWITCH IN TIME, 28 U. Haw. L. Rev. 327, 347+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1732 THE OVERREACHING USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN AND THE POLICE POWER AFTER KELO, 28 U. Haw. L. Rev. 349, 364+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1733 KELO: A CASE RIGHTLY DECIDED, 28 U. Haw. L. Rev. 365, 371+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1734 TEXT-MESS: THERE IS NO TEXTUAL BASIS FOR APPLICATION OF THE TAKINGS CLAUSE TO THE STATES, 28 U. Haw. L. Rev. 373, 385+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1735 RE-DEFINING PUBLIC USE: KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 28 U. Haw. L. Rev. 485, 508+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1736 A PUBLIC LECTURE BY JOSEPH L. SAX, ENVIRONMENT AND ITS MORTAL ENEMY: THE RISE AND DECLINE OF THE PROPERTY RIGHTS MOVEMENT, 28 U. Haw. L. Rev. 7, 21+ (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1737 CLIMATE CHANGE, CARBON SEQUESTRATION, AND PROPERTY RIGHTS, 2010 U. Ill. L. Rev. 363, 428+ (2010) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1738 SHADOWS ON THE CATHEDRAL: SOLAR ACCESS LAWS IN A DIFFERENT LIGHT, 2010 U. Ill. L. Rev. 851, 896+ (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1739 SHAREHOLDER OWNERSHIP AND PRIMACY, 2010 U. Ill. L. Rev. 897, 956 (2010)

C 1740 DECODING AND RECODING NATURAL MONOPOLY, DEREGULATION, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, 2008 U. Ill. L. Rev. 1125, 1184 (2008)

C 1741 UNINTELLIGENT DESIGN IN CONTRACT, 2008 U. Ill. L. Rev. 505, 555+ (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1742 DOES SUSTAINABILITY REQUIRE A NEW THEORY OF PROPERTY RIGHTS?, 58 U. Kan. L. Rev. 91, 159+ (2009) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1743 GUNFIGHT AT THE K-12 CORRAL: LEGISLATIVE VS. JUDICIAL POWER IN THE KANSAS SCHOOL FINANCE LITIGATION, 54 U. Kan. L. Rev. 1021, 1114 (2006)

C 1744 EMINENT DOMAIN: A LEGAL AND ECONOMIC CRITIQUE, 7 U. Md. L.J. Race, Religion, Gender & Class 140, 171+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1745 THE ROBIN HOOD ANTITHESIS - ROBBING FROM THE POOR TO GIVE TO THE RICH: HOW EMINENT DOMAIN IS USED TO TAKE PROPERTY IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT, 6 U. Md. L.J. Race, Religion, Gender & Class 515, 536+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1746 THE LAW AND ECONOMICS OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN HOUSING: THE DIVERSITY IMPULSE, 15 U. Miami Bus. L. Rev. 133, 199 (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1747 BRAZIL'S IP OPPORTUNISM THREATENS U.S. PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS, 38 U. Miami Inter-Am. L. Rev. 1, 139+ (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1748 THE WORLD COURT'S ADVISORY FUNCTION: "NOT LEGALLY WELL-FOUNDED", 14 U. Miami Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 185, 216 (2006)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1749 JUST ANOTHER DAY IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD? THE SHAPING OF A LEGAL (AND SOCIAL) CONSCIOUSNESS IN HARLEM, 64 U. Miami L. Rev. 267, 303+ (2009) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1750 ASSAULT ON THE JUDICIARY: JUDICIAL RESPONSE TO CRITICISM POST-SCHIAVO, 61 U. Miami L. Rev. 931, 959 (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1751 A DIFFERENT MODEL FOR THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY: THE POLITICAL QUESTION DOCTRINE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS, 61 U. Miami L. Rev. 169, 201+ (2006) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1752 PUBLIC USE, PUBLIC CHOICE, AND THE URBAN GROWTH MACHINE: COMPETING POLITICAL ECONOMIES OF TAKINGS LAW, 42 U. Mich. J.L. Reform 265, 322+ (2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1753 FEAR AND LOATHING: COMBATING SPECULATION IN LOCAL COMMUNITIES, 39 U. Mich. J.L. Reform 543, 595+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1754 TAKE US BACK TO THE BALL GAME: THE LAWS AND POLICY OF PROFESSIONAL SPORTS TICKET PRICES, 39 U. Mich. J.L. Reform 37, 72 (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1755 NECESSITY AS A CHECK ON STATE EMINENT DOMAIN POWER, 12 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 99, 141+ (2009) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1756 THE FAILURE OF FEDERALISM: DOES COMPETITIVE FEDERALISM ACTUALLY PROTECT INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS?, 10 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 643, 664+ (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1757 WHEN WORLDS COLLIDE: FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION OF STATE INSTITUTIONAL COMPETENCE, 9 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 1167, 1206+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1758 THE TAKINGS CLAUSE, VERSION 2005: THE LEGAL PROCESS OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROPERTY RIGHTS, 9 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 667, 744+ (2007) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1759 A THEORY OF GOVERNMENTAL DAMAGES LIABILITY: TORTS, CONSTITUTIONAL TORTS, AND TAKINGS, 9 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 797, 870+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1760 ENUMERATION AND OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIES FOR PROTECTING RIGHTS: THE VIEW FROM 1787/1791, 9 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 357, 399 (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1761 2006 TEMPLETON LECTURE: EMINENT DOMAIN POST-KELO Introduction to the 2006 Templeton Lecture Hitting Home-The Supreme Court Earns Public Notice Opining on Public Use, 9 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 501, 543+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1762 LAW AND LIMITS: HOW CATEGORIES CONSTRUCT CONSTITUTIONAL MEANING, 8 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 1005, 1032+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1763 POOR LAW: THE DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT'S CITIZENSHIP DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENT FOR MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY, 8 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 1033, 1070 (2006)

C 1764 DEVELOPING DEVELOPMENT THEORY: LAW AND DEVELOPMENT ORTHODOXIES AND THE NORTHEAST ASIAN EXPERIENCE, 28 U. Pa. J. Int'l Econ. L. 219, 308+ (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1765 REINVENTING DISCOVERY: PATENT LAW'S CHARACTERIZATIONS OF AND INTERVENTIONS UPON SCIENCE, 157 U. Pa. L. Rev. 2175, 2232 (2009) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1766 TOWARDS ENVIRONMENTAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP: RESTORING THE PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE IN NEW YORK, 155 U. Pa. L. Rev. 203, 230+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1767 ASSESSING CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM REHNQUIST, 154 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1331, 1364 (2006)

1768 DEMOCRACY, POLITICAL IGNORANCE, AND CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, 157 U. Pa. L. Rev. PENNumbra 239, 254 (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1769 SOCIAL MOVEMENTS EVERYWHERE, 155 U. Pa. L. Rev. PENNumbra 18, 25 (2007)

1770 FRICTION BY DESIGN: THE NECESSARY CONTEST OF STATE JUDICIAL POWER AND LEGISLATIVE POLICYMAKING, 43 U. Rich. L. Rev. 571, 621+ (2009) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1771 DAIMLERCHRYSLER V. CUNO: AN ESCAPE FROM THE DORMANT COMMERCE CLAUSE QUAGMIRE?, 40 U. Rich. L. Rev. 1229, 1261+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1772 ECONOMIC REGULATION IN THE UNITED STATES: THE CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK, 40 U. Rich. L. Rev. 949, 980+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1773 BARRING INTELLIGENT DESIGN FROM PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A PHILOSOPHICAL AND LEGAL INQUIRY, 4 U. St. Thomas J. L. & Pub. Pol'y 117, 203 (2009) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1774 THE ELDER STATESMAN SERIES INAUGURAL INTERVIEW: A CONVERSATION WITH FORMER UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL EDWIN MEESE, III, 3 U. St. Thomas J. L. & Pub. Pol'y 1, 14 (2009)

1775 ADVANCING THE CULTURE OF LIFE THROUGH FAITHFUL CITIZENSHIP, 2 U. St. Thomas J. L. & Pub. Pol'y 20, 52 (2008)

1776 PROTECTING THE PUBLIC INTEREST AND INVESTMENT IN CONSERVATION: A RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR KORNGOLD'S CRITIQUE OF CONSERVATION EASEMENTS, 2008 Utah L. Rev. 1561, 1594 (2008)

1777 A THREE-DIMENSIONAL APPROACH TO THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE DISTINCTION, 2008 Utah L. Rev. 635, 664+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1778 KELO, PARENTS AND THE SPATIALIZATION OF COLOR (BLINDNESS) IN THE BERMAN-BROWN METROPOLITAN HETEROTOPIA, 2008 Utah L. Rev. 947, 1018+ (2008) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1779 SOLVING THE CONTENTIOUS ISSUES OF PRIVATE CONSERVATION EASEMENTS: PROMOTING FLEXIBILITY FOR THE FUTURE AND ENGAGING THE PUBLIC LAND USE PROCESS, 2007 Utah L. Rev. 1039, 1084 (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1780 B. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AMENDMENTS, 2005 Utah L. Rev. 1452, 1458+ (2005) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1781 INVOLUNTARY DISCHARGE: IS AN ASSISTED LIVING RESIDENT REALLY A TENANT BY ANOTHER NAME?, 45 Val. U. L. Rev. 201, 251+ (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1782 PLURAL VISION: INTERNATIONAL LAW SEEN THROUGH THE VARIED LENSES OF DOMESTIC IMPLEMENTATION, 44 Val. U. L. Rev. 759, 778 (2010)

1783 THE "PUBLIC USE" OF PRIVATE SPORTS STADIUMS: KELO HITS A HOMERUN FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPERS, 9 Vand. J. Ent. & Tech. L. 145, 170+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1784 RECAPTURING PUBLIC POWER: IS INVESTMENT ARBITRATION'S ENGAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST CONTRIBUTING TO THE DEMOCRATIC DEFICIT?, 41 Vand. J. Transnat'l L. 775, 832 (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1785 HARMONIZATION THROUGH CONDEMNATION: IS NEW LONDON THE KEY TO WORLD PATENT HARMONY?, 40 Vand. J. Transnat'l L. 445, 502+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1786 THE LIBERAL TRADITION OF THE SUPREME COURT CLERKSHIP: ITS RISE, FALL, AND REINCARNATION?, 62 Vand. L. Rev. 1749, 1814 (2009)

1787 RUFUS W. PECKHAM AND ECONOMIC LIBERTY, 62 Vand. L. Rev. 591, 638 (2009)

1788 NON-JUDICIAL PRECEDENT, 61 Vand. L. Rev. 713, 784+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1789 OVERCOMING ANOTHER TRAGEDY IN NEW ORLEANS: REBUILDING IN THE WAKE OF KELO AND ACT NO. 851, 60 Vand. L. Rev. 1599, 1631+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1790 WHY LINGLE IS HALF RIGHT, 11 Vt. J. Envtl L. 421, 435 (2010)

1791 TAKINGS AND THE PROBLEM OF VALUE: GRAPPLING WITH TRUTH IN LAND-RESTRICTION CASES, 11 Vt. J. Envtl L. 465, 477+ (2010)

1792 IS REGULATION OF WATER A CONSTITUTIONAL TAKING?, 11 Vt. J. Envtl L. 579, 624 (2010)

1793 ADAPTING WATER LAW TO PUBLIC NECESSITY: REFRAMING CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AS EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND PREPAREDNESS, 11 Vt. J. Envtl L. 709, 756 (2010)

1794 EXTRATERRITORIAL CONDEMNATION FOR OPEN SPACE AND PARKS: A LOOK AT TOWN OF TELLURIDE V. SAN MIGUEL VALLEY CORP.'S EFFECT ON COLORADO AND THE MOUNTAIN WEST, 11 Vt. J. Envtl L. 779, 804+ (2010) **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

1795 THE "GIFT" THAT KEEPS ON GIVING: GLOBAL WARMING MEETS THE COMMON LAW, 10 Vt. J. Envtl L. 109, 179+ (2008)

1796 INTRODUCTION, 7 Vt. J. Envtl L. 1, 1 (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1797 THE TRIUMPH OF JUSTICE STEVENS AND THE PRINCIPLE OF GENERALITY, 7 Vt. J. Envtl L. 22, 22+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

1798 PUBLIC-PRIVATE REDEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS AND THE SUPREME COURT: KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 7 Vt. J. Envtl L. 41, 41+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

1799 KELO AND THE "WHALING CITY": THE FAILURE OF THE SUPREME COURT'S OPPORTUNITY TO ARTICULATE A PUBLIC PURPOSE OF SUSTAINABILITY, 7 Vt. J. Envtl L. 5, 5+ (2006) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1800 LINGLE AND KELO: THE ACCIDENTAL TOURIST IN CANADA AND NAFTA-LAND, 7 Vt. J. Envtl L. 62, 62+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1801 JUDICIAL TAKINGS AND SCALIA'S SHIFTING SANDS, 35 Vt. L. Rev. 423, 435 (2010)

1802 STOP THE BEACH RENOURISHMENT: WHY THE JUDICIARY IS DIFFERENT, 35 Vt. L. Rev. 475, 493 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1803 A CLIMATE OF EXTREMES: TRANSBOUNDARY CONFLICT RESOLUTION, 32 Vt. L. Rev. 477, 523+ (2008)

1804 REFRAMING EMINENT DOMAIN: UNSUPPORTED ADVOCACY, AMBIGUOUS ECONOMICS, AND THE CASE FOR A NEW PUBLIC USE TEST, 32 Vt. L. Rev. 129, 169+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1805 A WARNING TO STATES-ACCEPTING THIS INVITATION MAY BE HAZARDOUS TO YOUR HEALTH (SAFETY, AND PUBLIC WELFARE): AN ANALYSIS OF POST-KELO LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY, 31 Vt. L. Rev. 663, 706+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1806 FROM A "DARKLING PLAIN" TO WHAT?: THE REGULATORY TAKINGS ISSUE IN U.S.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

LAW AND POLICY, 30 Vt. L. Rev. 969, 987+ (2006) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1807 A STEP BACKWARD IS NOT NECESSARILY A STEP IN THE WRONG DIRECTION, 30 Vt. L. Rev. 43, 70+ (2005) **HN: 4,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1808 THE GEOGRAPHY OF JUSTICE WORMHOLES: DILEMMAS FROM PROPERTY AND CRIMINAL LAW, 53 Vill. L. Rev. 117, 169 (2008)

C 1809 THE EROSION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS AFTER RALEIGH AVENUE BEACH ASSOCIATION V. ATLANTIS BEACH CLUB, 51 Vill. L. Rev. 459, 498+ (2006) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1810 FROM AN ACT OF GOD TO THE FAILURE OF MAN: HURRICANE KATRINA AND THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY OF NEW ORLEANS, 51 Vill. L. Rev. 581, 592+ (2006)

C 1811 IS IT TIME TO REVISIT THE DOCTRINE OF "STATE ACTION" IN THE CONTEXT OF INTERCOLLEGIATE AND INTERSCHOLASTIC SPORTS?, 14 Vill. Sports & Ent. L.J. 191, 232 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1812 EMINENT DOMAIN WOLVES IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING: PRIVATE BENEFIT MASQUERADING AS CLASSIC PUBLIC USE, 28 Va. Envtl. L.J. 1, 43+ (2010)

C 1813 A CLIMATE OF CHANGE: SHIFTING ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS AND PROPERTY LAW NORMS THROUGH THE LENS OF LEED BUILDING STANDARDS, 28 Va. Envtl. L.J. 299, 341 (2010)

C 1814 LEFT AND RIGHT IN THE MIDDLE EAST: NOTES ON THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF RACE, 47 Va. J. Int'l L. 201, 258+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1815 OF PROCESS AND PRODUCT: KREMEN V. COHEN AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF RECOGNIZING PROPERTY RIGHTS IN DOMAIN NAMES, 14 Va. J.L. & Tech. 1, 1+ (2009) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1816 DECENTRALIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT, 96 Va. L. Rev. 1837, 1909 (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1817 THE HIDDEN FUNCTION OF TAKINGS COMPENSATION, 96 Va. L. Rev. 1673, 1725 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

C 1818 SAN ANTONIO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT V. RODRIGUEZ AND ITS AFTERMATH, 94 Va. L. Rev. 1963, 1986 (2008)

C 1819 CITIES, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND THE FREE TRADE CONSTITUTION, 94 Va. L. Rev. 1091, 1164+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1820 ORIGINALISM, POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY, AND REVERSE STARE DECISIS, 93 Va. L. Rev. 1437, 1481+ (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1821 INTERGOVERNMENTAL LIABILITY RULES, 92 Va. L. Rev. 929, 989 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1822 PROPERTY AS ENTRANCE, 91 Va. L. Rev. 1889, 1972+ (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1823 THE CONSTITUTION IN TWO DIMENSIONS: A TRANSACTION COST ANALYSIS OF CONSTITUTIONAL REMEDIES, 91 Va. L. Rev. 1135, 1198 (2005)

C 1824 AN EVALUATION OF EMINENT DOMAIN AND A NATIONAL CARBON CAPTURE AND GEOLOGIC SEQUESTRATION PROGRAM: REDEFINING THE SPACE BELOW, 45 Wake Forest L. Rev. 261, 290+ (2010) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

C 1825 OUR PLURALIST HOUSING ETHICS AND THE STRUGGLE FOR AFFORDABILITY, 42

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Wake Forest L. Rev. 511, 593+ (2007)

1826 WEIGHING AND REWEIGHING EMINENT DOMAIN'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHIES POST-KELO, 41 Wake Forest L. Rev. 237, 301+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1827 WATER SCARCITY: THE NEED TO APPLY A REGULATORY TAKINGS ANALYSIS TO PARTIAL RESTRICTIONS ON WATER USE (CASITAS MUN. WATER DIST. V. UNITED STATES, 543 F.3D 1276 (FED. CIR. 2008)), 48 Washburn L.J. 729, 754 (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1828 TAKING BACK THE FIFTH: WHY KANSAS' APPROACH TO INVERSE CONDEMNATION VIOLATES THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND LEADS TO UNNECESSARY CONFUSION (ESTATE OF KIRKPATRICK V. OLATHE, 178 P.3D 667 (KAN. CT. APP. 2008)), 48 Washburn L.J. 241, 266 (2008)

1829 AVOIDING JUDICIAL IN-ACTIVISM: THE USE OF LEGISLATIVE HISTORY TO DETERMINE LEGISLATIVE INTENT IN STATUTORY INTERPRETATION, 46 Washburn L.J. 189, 222 (2006)

1830 WAKE OF THE FLOOD: EXAMINING THE DISSIPATION OF PROPERTY RIGHTS THROUGH A MODEL OF POST-KATRINA NEW ORLEANS, 13 Wash. & Lee J. Civil Rts. & Soc. Just. 389, 433+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1831 IMMINENTLY EMINENT: A GAME THEORETIC ANALYSIS OF TAKINGS SINCE KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 64 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 1619, 1661+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1832 "SOCIOLOGICAL LEGITIMACY" IN SUPREME COURT OPINIONS, 64 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 1011, 1070+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1833 THE COLLISION OF THE TAKINGS AND STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY DOCTRINES, 63 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 493, 602 (2006)

1834 THE BULLS AND BEARS OF LAW TEACHING, 63 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 25, 77+ (2006)

1835 JUSTICE KENNEDY AND THE ENVIRONMENT: PROPERTY, STATES' RIGHTS, AND A PERSISTENT SEARCH FOR NEXUS, 82 Wash. L. Rev. 667, 730+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1836 BEYOND RATIONAL RELATIONS: THE CONSTITUTIONAL INFIRMITIES OF ANTI-GAY PARTNERSHIP LAWS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE, 81 Wash. L. Rev. 417, 445 (2006)

1837 7 Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev. 215, LOCAL PUBLIC ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND JUDICIAL INTERVENTION IN A EURO-AMERICAN AND GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE (2008) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1838 6 Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev. 121, WHEN THE RIGHT TO COMPENSATION FOR "REGULATORY TAKINGS" GOES TO THE EXTREME: THE CASE OF ISRAEL (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1839 5 Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev. 469, INTRODUCTION: REGULATORY TAKINGS VIEWED THROUGH CROSS-NATIONAL COMPARATIVE LENSES (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1840 THE CHINESE TAKINGS LAW FROM A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE, 26 Wash. U. J.L. & Pol'y 301, 351+ (2008) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1841 A PROPERTY RIGHTS VIEW: COMMENTARY ON PROPERTY AND SPEECH BY ROBERT A. SEDLER, 21 Wash. U. J.L. & Pol'y 155, 172+ (2006) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1842 PROPERTY FRAMES, 87 Wash. U. L. Rev. 449, 503+ (2010) **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

C 1843 THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO HEALTH: WHEN PATIENT RIGHTS THREATEN THE COMMONS, 86 Wash. U. L. Rev. 1335, 1396 (2009)

C 1844 THE GREEN COSTS OF KELO: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAKINGS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, 84 Wash. U. L. Rev. 623, 666+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1845 TAKING(S) IN THE BIG PICTURE: THE IMPACT OF PROP. 4'S EMINENT DOMAIN RESTRICTIONS ON URBAN REDEVELOPMENT IN MICHIGAN, 53 Wayne L. Rev. 899, 900+ (2007)

1846 CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 52 Wayne L. Rev. 435, 490 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1847 HOW PUBLIC IS YOUR BENEFIT? MICHIGAN REVERSES COURSE ON THE USAGE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, 52 Wayne L. Rev. 243, 253+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 1848 EMINENT DOMAIN AND THE "PUBLIC USE": MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT LEGISLATES AN UNPRECEDENTED OVERRULING OF POLETOWN IN COUNTY OF WAYNE v. HATHCOCK, 51 Wayne L. Rev. 1331, 1359+ (2005) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1849 CONFRONTING THE APPALACHIAN BREAKDOWN: HISTORIC PRESERVATION LAW IN APPALACHIA AND THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES, 110 W. Va. L. Rev. 1303, 1372 (2008)

C 1850 THE POLICE POWER AND "PUBLIC USE": BALANCING THE PUBLIC INTEREST AGAINST PRIVATE RIGHTS THROUGH PRINCIPLED CONSTITUTIONAL DISTINCTIONS, 110 W. Va. L. Rev. 711, 712+ (2008) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1851 THE DOWNLOW ON KELO: HOW AN EXPANSIVE INTERPRETATION OF THE PUBLIC USE CLAUSE HAS OPENED THE FLOODGATES FOR EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE, 109 W. Va. L. Rev. 493, 525+ (2007) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1852 A TAKING WITHOUT JUST COMPENSATION? THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF AMORTIZATION PROVISIONS FOR NONCONFORMING USES, 109 W. Va. L. Rev. 225, 256+ (2006)

1853 NEW YORK STATE TAX CERTIORARI, EMINENT DOMAIN AND REAL PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTIONS LAW 2007-2008, 36 Westchester B.J. 18, 19+ (2009)

1854 THE TAX CERTIORARI AND CONDEMNATION LAW IN THE 9áTHã JUDICIAL DISTRICT, 33 Westchester B.J. 21, 22+ (2006)

1855 FOREWORD: ENTREPRENEURSHIP, RACE, AND THE CURRENT ENVIRONMENT FOR COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 30 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 1, 17 (2007) **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1856 PUTTING THE "PUBLIC" BACK INTO PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 30 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 39, 60+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 1857 FOREWORD: LAW, BUSINESS, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT-CURRENT ISSUES AND AGE-OLD BATTLES, 29 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 1, 10 (2006)

C 1858 EMINENT DOMAIN: IN THE AFTERMATH OF KELO V. NEW LONDON, A RESURRECTION IN NORWOOD: ONE PUBLIC INTEREST ATTORNEY'S VIEW, 29 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 121, 140+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,5 (S.Ct.)**

C 1859 WHERE TO GO AFTER KELO? BACK TO THE FUTURE!, 29 W. New Eng. L. Rev. 75, 108+ (2006) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1860 THE ROBERTS COURT AND THE FUTURE OF SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS: THE DEMISE OF "SPLIT-THE-DIFFERENCE" JURISPRUDENCE?, 28 Whittier L. Rev. 861, 904+ (2007)

1861 THE PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC USE: WHY RATIONAL BASIS REVIEW OF A PRIVATE PROPERTY CONDEMNATION IS A VIOLATION OF A FUNDAMENTAL CIVIL RIGHT, 28 Whittier L. Rev. 511, 535+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

1862 EBAY INC. V. MERCEXCHANGE, L.L.C.: THE RIGHT TO EXCLUDE UNDER UNITED STATES PATENT LAW AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST, 27 Whittier L. Rev. 985, 995 (2006)

1863 COASE AND KELO: OMINOUS PARALLELS AND REPLY TO LOTT ON ROTHBARD ON COASE, 27 Whittier L. Rev. 997, 1022+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1864 CALIFORNIA REDEVELOPMENT LAW: ASKING FOR CHANGE FOR ALL THE WRONG REASONS, 28 Whittier L. Rev. 751, 769+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1865 GOING OUT WITH A WHIMPER: A TERM OF TINKERING AND FINE TUNING, THE SUPREME COURT'S 2004-2005 TERM, 27 Whittier L. Rev. 77, 215+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1866 19 Widener L.J. 749, TAX INCREMENT FINANCING IN PENNSYLVANIA: THE EFFECT OF MAZUR v. TRINITY AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT ON DETERMINATIONS OF BLIGHT (2010) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1867 20 Widener L.J. 193, CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE COMMONWEALTH COURT TO CONDEMNATION LAW SINCE 1970 (2010) **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

1868 18 Widener L.J. 715, THE EXERCISE OF EMINENT DOMAIN BY SECOND-CLASS TOWNSHIPS IN PENNSYLVANIA: A SURVEY OF MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP v. LANDS OF STONE (2009) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1869 18 Widener L.J. 205, THE PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT: AN OVERVIEW OF PENNSYLVANIA'S RESPONSE TO KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON (2008) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1870 WHEN KELO MET TWOMBLY-IQBAL: IMPLICATIONS FOR PRETEXT CHALLENGES TO EMINENT DOMAIN, 46 Willamette L. Rev. 201, 254+ (2009) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1871 THE (PRACTICAL) MEANING OF PROPERTY, 46 Willamette L. Rev. 297, 355+ (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1872 THE BATTLE OVER PROPERTY RIGHTS IN OREGON: MEASURES 37 AND 49 AND THE NEED FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND USE PLANNING, 45 Willamette L. Rev. 313, 358 (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1873 COMPETING JUDICIAL PHILOSOPHIES AND DIFFERING OUTCOMES: THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ALLOWS AND DISALLOWS THE POSTING OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS ON PUBLIC PROPERTY IN VAN ORDEN V. PERRY AND MCCREARY COUNTY V. ACLU, 42 Willamette L. Rev. 99, 122 (2006)

1874 OF FAT PEOPLE AND FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS: THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE NEW YORK CITY TRANS-FAT BAN, 18 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 857, 882+ (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1875 JUSTIFYING MOTIVE ANALYSIS IN JUDICIAL REVIEW, 17 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 191, 261 (2008)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1876 "A POOR RELATION?" REFLECTIONS ON A PANEL DISCUSSION COMPARING PROPERTY RIGHTS TO OTHER RIGHTS ENUMERATED IN THE BILL OF RIGHTS, 16 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 849, 863 (2008)

1877 KELO'S MORAL FAILURE, 15 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 377, 387+ (2006) **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

1878 NUANCE AND COMPLEXITY IN REGULATORY TAKINGS LAW, 15 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 389, 406 (2006)

1879 TAKING STOCK OF TAKINGS: AN AUTHOR'S RETROSPECTIVE, 15 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 407, 420 (2006)

1880 IMPACT OF RICHARD A. EPSTEIN, 15 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 421, 428+ (2006)

1881 THE MARKET FOR LEGAL EDUCATION & FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION: WHY THE "SOLOMON AMENDMENT" IS CONSTITUTIONAL AND LAW SCHOOLS ARE NOT EXPRESSIVE ASSOCIATIONS, 14 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 415, 474 (2005)

1882 QUIETING THE CLANG: HATHCOCK AS A MODEL OF THE STATE-BASED PROTECTION OF PROPERTY WHICH KELO DEMANDS, 14 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 351, 386+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1883 "THE LOSS IN MY BONES": PROTECTING AFRICAN AMERICAN HEIRS' PROPERTY WITH THE PUBLIC USE DOCTRINE, 14 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 387, 414+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

1884 WEIGHING THE NEED TO ESTABLISH REGULATORY TAKINGS DOCTRINE TO JUSTIFY TAKINGS STANDARDS OF REVIEW AND PRINCIPLES, 34 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 315, 375+ (2010)

1885 SHOULD OWNERS AND DEVELOPERS OF LOW-PERFORMANCE BUILDINGS PAY IMPACT OR MITIGATION FEES TO FINANCE GREEN BUILDING INCENTIVE PROGRAMS AND OTHER SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES?, 34 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 55, 120+ (2009) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1886 RESTORING RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN DISASTER RELIEF, 31 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 893, 925+ (2007)

1887 AN END-RUN AROUND THE TAKINGS CLAUSE? THE LAW AND ECONOMICS OF BIVENS ACTIONS FOR PROPERTY RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, 50 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1739, 1786+ (2009) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1888 THE MORALITY OF PROPERTY, 48 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1849, 1895+ (2007) **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1889 THE DEMISE OF FEDERAL TAKINGS LITIGATION, 48 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 251, 301 (2006)

1890 HAUNTED BY HISTORY: COLONIAL LAND TRUSTS POSE NATIONAL THREAT, 48 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 303, 344 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1891 CASE NOTE: PROPERTY-HOLE-IN-ONE FOR LAND-USE CONTROL: ENDORSING THE DOMINANCE OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS-MENDOTA GOLF, LLP V. CITY OF MENDOTA HEIGHTS, 33 Wm. Mitchell L. Rev. 627, 652 (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1892 JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE AND NONPARTISAN ELECTIONS, 2009 Wis. L. Rev. 21, 65 (2009)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1893 RESOLVING THE FORECLOSURE CRISIS: MODIFICATION OF MORTGAGES IN BANKRUPTCY, 2009 Wis. L. Rev. 565, 655 (2009)

1894 A MATCH MADE IN HEAVEN OR A PAIR OF STAR-CROSSED LOVERS? ASSESSING DORMANT-FOREIGN-COMMERCE-CLAUSE LIMITATIONS ON THE WISCONSIN-CHINA RELATIONSHIP, 2009 Wis. L. Rev. 733, 762+ (2009)

1895 TOWARD A DISTRIBUTIVE COMMONS IN PATENT LAW, 2009 Wis. L. Rev. 917, 1016 (2009)

1896 A MORE PALATABLE SOLUTION? COMPARING THE VIABILITY OF SMART GROWTH STATUTES TO OTHER LEGISLATIVE METHODS OF CONTROLLING THE OBESITY EPIDEMIC, 2007 Wis. L. Rev. 1091, 1120 (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1897 WHEN SECOND COMES FIRST: CORRECTING PATENT'S POOR SECONDARY INCENTIVES THROUGH AN OPTIONAL PATENT PURCHASE SYSTEM, 2007 Wis. L. Rev. 585, 648 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1898 PUTTING THE CONTRACT INTO CONTRACTIONS: REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS AND THE FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLIC, 2005 Wis. L. Rev. 1535, 1610+ (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1899 WISCONSIN'S RESPONSE TO CONDEMNATION FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 80-SEP Wis. Law. 14, 15+ (2007) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

1900 THE MORE THINGS CHANGE, THE MORE THINGS STAY THE SAME: A PRACTITIONER'S GUIDE TO RECENT CHANGES TO WYOMING'S EMINENT DOMAIN ACT, 8 Wyo. L. Rev. 1, 23+ (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1901 PROPERTY LAW-NOT SO FAST: THE SUPREME COURT'S OVERLY BROAD PUBLIC USE RULING CONDEMNS PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS WITH SURPRISING RESULTS. KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON, 125 S. CT. 2655 (2005)., 6 Wyo. L. Rev. 255, 285+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1902 KELO v. CITY OF NEW LONDON "Economic Development" as a "Public Use" under the Fifth Amendment, 28-OCT Wyo. Law. 14, 14+ (2005) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

1903 BITS AND PIECES OF PROPERTY, 36 Yale J. Int'l L. 115, 166 (2011)

1904 LOCATING THE INTERNATIONAL INTEREST IN INTRANATIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY DISPUTES, 35 Yale J. Int'l L. 347, 404 (2010)

1905 INTRODUCTION: PROPERTY AND LANGUAGE, OR, THE GHOST OF THE FIFTH PANEL, 18 Yale J.L. & Human. 1, 28 (2006)

1906 VISIONS OF GUADALUPE: TRACES OF THE GHOST PANEL, 18 Yale J.L. & Human. 161, 170 (2006)

1907 13 Yale J. L. & Tech. 1, 28 U.S.C. S 1498(A) AND THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL TAKING OF PATENTS (2011) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1908 THE REINVENTION OF OWNERSHIP: THE EMBRACE OF RESIDENTIAL ZONING AND THE MODERN POPULIST READING OF PROPERTY, 28 Yale J. on Reg. 91, 149+ (2011) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1909 PRIVATE BUSINESS AS PUBLIC GOOD: HOTEL DEVELOPMENT AND KELO, 24 Yale L. & Pol'y Rev. 363, 397+ (2006) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1910 EMINENT DOMAIN DUE PROCESS, 119 Yale L.J. 1280, 1326+ (2010) **HN: 2,7 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1911 THE FEDERALISM CHALLENGES OF IMPACT LITIGATION BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTORS, 118 Yale L.J. 1557, 1570 (2009)

C 1912 THE PRICE OF PUBLIC ACTION: CONSTITUTIONAL DOCTRINE AND THE JUDICIAL MANIPULATION OF LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENT COSTS, 118 Yale L.J. 2, 62+ (2008) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

C 1913 SEARCHING FOR BALANCE IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE 2006 TAKINGS INITIATIVES, 116 Yale L.J. 1518, 1566 (2007)

1914 THE NEW JUDICIAL TAKINGS CONSTRUCT, 120 Yale L.J. Online 247, 266+ (2011)

C 1915 NEW ACTIONS OR NEW ARGUMENTS OVER REGULATORY TAKINGS?, 117 Yale L.J. Pocket Part 66, 70+ (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

C 1916 ENDING COURT PROTECTION OF VOTERS FROM THE INITIATIVE PROCESS, 116 Yale L.J. Pocket Part 117, 117+ (2006)

1917 The Constitutionality of Design Standards in Planned Community Regulations (2010)

1918 The Eleventh Commandment: Thou Shalt Not Burden Religious Land Use Applicants (2010) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1919 Direct Democracy Rising: An Overview of Citizen Votes on Critical Land Decisions (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1920 A Year in Review: Selected Summaries of Land-Use Law Review Articles from 2006 (2007)

1921 LAND ASSEMBLY BY ASSEMBLING PEOPLE (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1922 Position Prediction ThRough Past Performance: A Quarter Century of UniteD States Supreme Court Landowner Rights Jurisprudence (2007) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1923 Where's Waldo? Finding Federal Wetlands After the Rapanos Decision (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1924 "Improving the Process So We Can GeT to the Substance" (2006) **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

1925 THE 2005 ZiPLeRs: THE ELEVENTH ANNUAL ZONING AND PLANNING LAW REPORT LAND USE DECISION AWARDS (2006)

1926 A Hat Trick in the U.S. Supreme Court for Government: Lingle, San Remo, and Kelo (2005) **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

1927 042910 American Bankruptcy Institute 1077, Real Estate Distressed Real Estate: Market Trends and Disposition Strategies in a Difficult Market (2010)

1928 041207 American Bankruptcy Institute 973, Real Estate Committee Interests Impervious to Bankruptcy (2007) **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

1929 ANTIQUATED AND RECENT SUBDIVISIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESTRAINTS, CS001 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1 (2010)

1930 ANTIQUATED AND RECENT SUBDIVISIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESTRAINTS: CAN WE LET THE CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST?, SS001 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 839 (2010)

1931 TAKINGS CASES - DIRECT AND INVERSE, SS001 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 97 (2010)

1932 TRESPASS BY POLLUTION: REMEDY BY MANDATORY INJUNCTION, SR045 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1181 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1933 BRIEFS SUBMITTED IN COUER ALASKA, INC. V. SOUTHEAST ALASKA CONSERVATION COUNCIL, ET AL., SR026 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 175 (2009)

1934 RECENT BRIEFS ON CLEAN WATER ISSUES, SP041 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 27 (2009)

1935 LAND ASSEMBLY BY ASSEMBLING PEOPLE, SP006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 351+ (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1936 2007-2008 UPDATE ON JUDICIAL REACTIONS TO KELO, SP006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 63+ (2009) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1937 RECENT TRENDS IN EXERCISING EMINENT DOMAIN POWERS IN A POST- KELO WORLD, SP006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 85+ (2009)

1938 EXPLORING SETTLEMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN EMINENT DOMAIN CASES, SP007 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 193 (2009)

1939 A SHORT HISTORY OF REGULATORY TAKINGS - WHERE WE HAVE BEEN AND WHAT ARE THE HOT ISSUES OF TODAY?, SP007 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 387+ (2009)

1940 THE ROAD TO VALUATION: A STREAMLINED DESCRIPTION OF AN EMINENT DOMAIN PROCEEDING, SP007 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 53+ (2009) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1941 THE THREE APPROACHES TO MEASURE FAIR MARKET VALUE: WHAT DOES JED CLAMPETT KNOW ABOUT PICASSO ANYWAY? CASE STUDY JACKSONVILLE PORT AUTHORITY V. KEYSTONE COAL COMPANY, SP007 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 85 (2009) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1942 COMPREHENSIVE PLANS: THE LAW OF THE LAND OR IDEALISTIC LEGISLATION?, SP011 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1175+ (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1943 CASE LAW DEVELOPMENTS POST- KELO, SP011 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 961+ (2008)

1944 2007-2008 UPDATE ON JUDICIAL REACTIONS TO KELO, SP011 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 983+ (2008)

1945 ARIZONA'S PROPOSITION 207, SN015 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 517 (2008)

1946 CONDEMNATION ISSUES RELEVANT TO BILLBOARDS AND SIGNS, SN041 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 231 (2008)

1947 CAPITALIZING ON ANTI-EMINENT DOMAIN SENTIMENT: WHERE DOES ZEALOUS ADVOCACY CROSS THE LINE INTO UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR, REVERSAL OF THE CASE, AND MALPRACTICE CLAIMS?, SN041 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 295 (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1948 SELLING VALUE AT TRIAL, SN041 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 311 (2008)

1949 EMINENT DOMAIN FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT: 2005-2007 -STATE COURTS DISFAVOR EMINENT DOMAIN FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT, SN041 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 389 (2008)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1950 HOW TO CREATE-OR DESTROY-WEALTH IN REAL PROPERTY, SN041 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 43 (2008)

1951 TAKEN IN MID-DEVELOPMENT: CASE LAW AND CASE STUDIES ON OBTAINING JUST COMPENSATION FOR LAND USE ENTITLEMENTS AND/OR DEVELOPERS' PROFIT FOR VACANT LAND TAKINGS, SN041 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 485 (2008)

1952 CROSSING THE THIN LINE BETWEEN PUBLIC USE AND PUBLIC ABUSE: HERCULEAN EFFORTS TO USE THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN TO THWART PROPOSED LAND USES, SN041 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 625 (2008)

1953 HOW TO SOLVE (OR AVOID) THE EXACTIONS PROBLEM, SN041 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 69 (2008)

1954 WE DON'T HAVE TO FOLLOW ANY STINKIN' PLANNING - SORRY ABOUT THAT, JUSTICE STEVENS, SN041 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 7+ (2008)

1955 CAPITALIZING ON ANTI-EMINENT DOMAIN SENTIMENT: WHERE DOES ZEALOUS ADVOCACY CROSS THE LINE INTO UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR, REVERSAL OF THE CASE, AND MALPRACTICE CLAIMS?, SN042 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 67 (2008) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1956 WHERE'S WALDO? FINDING FEDERAL WETLANDS AFTER THE RAPANOS DECISION, SN005 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1075+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1957 UP THE CREEK WITHOUT A PADDLE: THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DECIDES LITTLE IN DECIDING RAPANOS AND CARABELL, SN005 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1093 (2007)

1958 SELECTED RECENT COURT DECISIONS, SN005 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 11 (2007)

1959 ONCE A DIRT LAWYER, ALWAYS A DIRT LAWYER: THE ROOTS OF A STATE SUPREME COURT JUDGE'S VIEW OF LAND USE CASES, SN005 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1429 (2007)

1960 AVERAGE RECIPROCITY OF ADVANTAGE: "MAGIC WORDS" OR ECONOMIC REALITY - LESSONS FROM PALAZZOLO, SN005 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 333 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1961 POST - KELO STATE CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE REFORMS, SN005 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 531+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1962 THE "BACKLASH" SO FAR: WILL AMERICANS GET MEANINGFUL EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM?, SN005 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 611+ (2007) **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

1963 THE MIAMI BEACH ART DECO DISTRICT: AN EVOLVING CASE STUDY OF PRESERVATION AND ITS DISCONTENTS, SM056 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 563 (2007)

1964 SUPREME COURT TAKINGS CASES AT A GLANCE (NTHP PRESERVATION LAW REPORTER EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS, 2007), SM056 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 771 (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1965 SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THE KELO DECISION FOR MEMBERS OF THE HISTORIC

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

PRESERVATION COMMUNITY..., SM056 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 775 (2007)

1966 STATE LEGISLATION ADDRESSING EMINENT DOMAIN AND REGULATORY TAKINGS (NTHP, APRIL 2007), SM056 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 791 (2007)

1967 THE ROBERTS COURT AND PROPERTY RIGHTS: A LOOK INTO THE CRYSTAL BALL, SM040 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 111+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1968 A SHORT HISTORY OF REGULATORY TAKINGS - WHERE WE HAVE BEEN AND WHAT ARE THE HOT ISSUES OF TODAY, SM040 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 13+ (2007)

1969 UNEQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW - ARE PROPERTY OWNERS MISTREATED IN TAKINGS CASES?, SM040 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 151+ (2007)

1970 USE OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACTS TO RECOVER DAMAGES IN LAND USE CASES, SM040 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 207 (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1971 A DOZEN RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND HOW THEY AFFECT YOUR CLIENT, SM040 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 51 (2007)

1972 THE KELO BACKLASH IN THE COURTS AND LEGISLATURES: GOOD FOR LANDOWNERS, BAD FOR GOVERNMENT?, SM040 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 517 (2007)

1973 THE "BACKLASH" SO FAR: WILL AMERICANS GET MEANINGFUL EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM?, SM040 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 587+ (2007)

1974 PROPOSITION 90: AN ANALYSIS, SM040 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 669+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1975 THE STATUS OF NOLLAN V. CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION AND DOLAN V. CITY OF TIGARD AFTER LINGLE V. CHEVRON U.S.A., INC., SM040 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 733+ (2007)

1976 PLANNING? WE DON'T HAVE TO FOLLOW ANY STINKIN' PLANNING, SM006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 15+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1977 IS THE RIGHT TO PRIVATE PROPERTY A FUNDAMENTAL OR AN ECONOMIC RIGHT?, SM006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 33+ (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1978 THE "SCOPE" OF THE PROJECT INFLUENCE RULE, SM006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 377 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1979 THE CONDEMNATION LANDSCAPE ACROSS THE COUNTRY POST-KELO, SM006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 433+ (2007) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

1980 WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE PROJECT FAILS?, SM006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 697+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

1981 HOW DO THE CONDEMNOR'S TAKING DOCUMENTS LIMIT THE POST-TAKING USE OF THE PROPERTY BY THE CONDEMNOR?, SM006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 721 (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

1982 IS THERE REALLY SUCH A THING AS TRULY PRIVATE PROPERTY? DOES THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN CREATING VALUE IN PROPERTY DIMINISH ITS DUTY TO PAY

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

JUST COMPENSATION?, SM006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 773 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1983 A COMPILATION AND DIGEST OF RECENT LAW REVIEW ARTICLES ON JUST COMPENSATION, SM006 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 787 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1984 IS THERE REALLY SUCH A THING AS TRULY PRIVATE PROPERTY? DOES THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN CREATING VALUE IN PROPERTY DIMINISH ITS DUTY TO PAY JUST COMPENSATION?, SM102 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 317 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1985 A COMPILATION AND DIGEST OF RECENT LAW REVIEW ARTICLES ON JUST COMPENSATION, SM102 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 331 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

1986 PREPARING FOR THE INITIAL HEARING REGARDING ORDER OF TAKING OR POSSESSION, SM102 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 89+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1987 NAVIGABLE WATERS DEFINED: FALLOUT FROM THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS IN CARABELL AND RAPANOS, SM020 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 195 (2006)

1988 BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE - NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOMEBUILDERS IN SUPPORT OF THE PETITIONERS - RAPANOS V. UNITED STATES AND CARABELL V. UNITED STATES ARMY CORP OF ENGINEERS, SM004 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 127 (2006)

1989 CHOICE OF FORUM: A BIT OF RIPENESS HISTORY, SM004 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1381 (2006)

1990 UPDATE ON KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON AND THE USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT, SM004 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1633+ (2006)

1991 KELO ANNIVERSARY: SUBSEQUENT TREATMENT BY LOWER COURTS, SM004 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1657+ (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1992 PLANNING? WE DON'T HAVE TO FOLLOW ANY STINKIN' PLANNING, SM004 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1669+ (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

1993 KELO V. NEW LONDON: BAD LAW, BAD POLICY, AND BAD JUDGMENT, SM004 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1679+ (2006) **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

1994 SWIFT LEGISLATIVE (OVER)REACTION TO EMINENT DOMAIN: BE CAREFUL WHAT YOU WISH FOR, SM004 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 865 (2006)

1995 KELO V. NEW LONDON: BAD LAW, BAD POLICY AND BAD JUDGMENT, SL049 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1+ (2006) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

1996 KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON: WHAT IT MEANS AND THE NEED FOR REAL EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM (INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE WHITE PAPER ON KELO DECISION), SL049 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 145+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

1997 INVERSELY YOURS: SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES IN INVERSE CONDEMNATION, SL049 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 623 (2006)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

1998 REGULATORY TAKINGS UPDATE, SL049 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 661 (2006)

1999 THE "BACKLASH" SO FAR: WILL CITIZENS GET MEANINGFUL EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM?, SL049 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 703+ (2006) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2000 INVERSELY YOURS: SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES IN INVERSE CONDEMNATION, SL050 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1 (2006)

2001 MARKETING YOUR EMINENT DOMAIN PRACTICE, SL050 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 351 (2006)

2002 THE MIAMI BEACH ART DECO DISTRICT: A CASE STUDY OF PRESERVATION AND ITS DISCONTENTS, SL014 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 401 (2005)

2003 SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THE KELO DECISION FOR MEMBERS OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMUNITY..., SL014 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 629 (2005)

2004 A SHORT HISTORY OF REGULATORY TAKINGS, SL012 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1 (2005)

2005 THE TRUE STORY OF POLETOWN, SL012 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 127 (2005)

2006 LINGLE V. CHEVRON AND ITS EFFECT ON REGULATORY TAKINGS, SL012 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 167+ (2005) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2007 DOES RENT CONTROL FAIL TO SUBSTANTIALLY ADVANCE LEGITIMATE STATE INTERESTS, SL012 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 205 (2005)

2008 SELECTED RECENT COURT DECISIONS, SL005 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 1 (2005)

2009 "KELO V. HATHCOCK", SL005 American Law Institute-American Bar Association 187 (2005)

2010 7/2/2009 BNA Banking Daily D15, APPOINTMENTS & NOMINATIONS: SOTOMAYOR'S RECORD YIELDS FEW CLUES ON FUTURE RULINGS IN FINANCIAL DISPUTES (2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2011 214 BNA Daily Environment Report A-6, 2006, CALIFORNIA: EMINENT DOMAIN MEASURE'S TAKINGS PROVISION WOULD HARM ENVIRONMENT, OPPONENTS SAY (2006)

2012 214 BNA Daily Environment Report A-9, 2005, BROWNFIELDS: HOUSE VOTE LIMITS USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, EXEMPTS BROWNFIELDS TO SPUR REDEVELOPMENT (2005)

2013 125 BNA Daily Report for Executives A-24, 2010, Supreme Court: Senate GOP Whip Kyl Says Filibuster Of Kagan Nomination "Highly Improbable' (2010)

2014 126 BNA Daily Report for Executives C-1, 2009, U.S. Supreme Court: Sotomayor's Record Yields Few Clues On Future Rulings in Financial Disputes (2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2015 225 BNA Daily Report for Executives J-1, 2006, State Taxes Limits on Use of Eminent Domain Pass in Nine States,While TABOR Fizzles in Maine, Nebraska, and Oregon (2006)

2016 186 BNA Daily Report for Executives A-21, 2006, Eminent Domain:House Poised to Back Measure to Ease Filing of Takings Claims in Federal Court (2006)

2017 185 BNA Daily Report for Executives H-3, 2006, EMINENT DOMAIN LEGISLATION, REGU-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

LATORY TAKINGS MEASURES LIMIT CONDEMNATION OF PROPERTY FOR TAX REVENUE PURPOSES (2006)

2018 185 BNA Daily Report for Executives J-1, 2006, Tax Policy Eminent Domain Legislation, Regulatory Takings MeasuresLimit Condemnation of Property for Tax Revenue Purposes (2006)

2019 221 BNA Daily Report for Executives A-17, 2005, COPYRIGHTS: COMMERCE COMMITTEE CHAIR BARTON LINES UP WITH BOUCHER ON DIGITAL FAIR USE LEGISLATION (2005) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2020 221 BNA Daily Report for Executives A-17, 2005, Copyrights:Commerce Committee Chair Barton Lines Up With Boucher on Digital Fair Use Legislation (2005)

2021 214 BNA Daily Report for Executives A-35, 2005, Hazardous Waste:House Votes to Limit Use of Eminent Domain, Exempts Brownfields to Spur Redevelopment (2005)

2022 214 BNA Daily Report for Executives A-35, 2005, HAZARDOUS WASTE: HOUSE VOTES TO LIMIT USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, EXEMPTS BROWNFIELDS TO SPUR REDEVELOPMENT (2005)

2023 225 BNA Daily Tax Report H-2, 2006, LIMITS ON USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN PASS IN NINE STATES, WHILE TABOR FIZZLES IN MAINE, NEBRASKA, AND OREGON (2006)

2024 225 BNA Daily Tax Report J-1, 2006, State Taxes: Limits on Use of Eminent Domain Pass in Nine States, While TABOR Fizzles in Maine, Nebraska, and Oregon (2006)

2025 185 BNA Daily Tax Report H-3, 2006, EMINENT DOMAIN LEGISLATION, REGULATORY TAKINGS MEASURES LIMIT CONDEMNATION OF PROPERTY FOR TAX REVENUE PURPOSES (2006)

2026 185 BNA Daily Tax Report J-1, 2006, Tax Policy: Eminent Domain Legislation, Regulatory Takings Measures Limit Condemnation of Property for Tax Revenue Purposes (2006)

2027 11/17/2005 BNA E-Commerce Law Daily D10, COPYRIGHTS: COMMERCE COMMITTEE CHAIR BARTON LINES UP WITH BOUCHER ON DIGITAL FAIR USE LEGISLATION (2005) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2028 11/7/2005 BNA National Environment Daily D13, BROWNFIELDS: HOUSE VOTE LIMITS USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, EXEMPTS BROWNFIELDS TO SPUR REDEVELOPMENT (2005)

2029 11/17/2005 BNA Patent, Trademark & Copyright Law Daily D8 (2005) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2030 71 BNA Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 87, LEGISLATION/COPYRIGHTS: COMMERCE COMMITTEE CHAIR BARTON LINES UP WITH BOUCHER ON DIGITAL FAIR USE LEGISLATION (2005) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2031 11/6/2006 BNA State Environment Daily D8, CALIFORNIA: EMINENT DOMAIN MEASURE'S TAKINGS PROVISION WOULD HARM ENVIRONMENT, OPPONENTS SAY (2006)

2032 PLR 200644019, 25 BNA Tax Management Weekly Report 1721 (2006)

2033 11/7/2005 BNA Toxics Law Daily D12, BROWNFIELDS: HOUSE VOTE LIMITS USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN, EXEMPTS BROWNFIELDS TO SPUR REDEVELOPMENT (2005)

2034 10 BNA United States Law Week Supreme Court Today 202, 2010, EMINENT DOMAIN: (2010)

2035 9 BNA United States Law Week Supreme Court Today 98, 2009 (2009) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2036 8 BNA United States Law Week Supreme Court Today 77, 2008, EMINENT DOMAIN: 07-1247 Goldstein v. Pataki (2008)

2037 7 BNA United States Law Week Supreme Court Today 40, 2007, EMINENT DOMAIN: 06-1025 Lacy v. Board of Supervisors of Halifax County, Va. (2007)

2038 7 BNA United States Law Week Supreme Court Today 10, 2007, EMINENT DOMAIN: 06-652 Didden v. Village of Port Chester, N.Y. (2007) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2039 6 BNA United States Law Week Supreme Court Today 225, 2006, EMINENT DOMAIN: 06-652 Didden v. Village of Port Chester, N.Y. (2006)

2040 DUELING EMINENT DOMAIN INITIATIVES PROMISED FOR JUNE BALLOT, 21 California Environmental Insider 8+ (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2041 IN THE SPOTLIGHT Fallout from Kelo, 18 Commercial Leasing Law & Strategy 1+ (2006)

2042 EDPP Florida Bar Continuing Legal Education Materials 1-1, INTRODUCTION (2008) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2043 EDPP Florida Bar Continuing Legal Education Materials 16-1, DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN FLORIDA AND FEDERAL PRACTICE (2008) **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

2044 EDPP Florida Bar Continuing Legal Education Materials 2-1, AUTHORITY TO EXERCISE POWER (2008) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2045 EDPP Florida Bar Continuing Legal Education Materials 3-1, THE PUBLIC PURPOSE DOCTRINE (2008)

2046 ENVI Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 19-1, LAND USE PLANNING (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2047 CROCI Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 1-1, HISTORICAL AND GENERAL NOTES (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2048 CROCII Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 28-1, EMINENT DOMAIN (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2049 ENVII Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 29-1, THE POLICE POWER AND REGULATORY TAKINGS (2010) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2050 RETITLE Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 13-1, Eminent Domain (2010) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2051 DIAF Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 9-1, DAMAGES TO REAL PROPERTY (2009) **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

2052 RSCH Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 7-1, MUNICIPAL LAW (2009)

2053 MLI Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 11-1, TAXATION OF REAL ESTATE, TAX COLLECTION AND DEMOLITION OF UNSAFE AND ABANDONED BUILDINGS (2008)

2054 MLI Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 15-1, MUNICIPAL REAL ESTATE ISSUES (2008) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2055 CIVJII Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 10-1, EMINENT DOMAIN CASES (2008) **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2056 ENVIII Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 29-1, THE POLICE POWER AND REGULATORY TAKINGS (2008) **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2057 LRRED Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 19-1, EMINENT DOMAIN (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2058 ZONEI Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 2-1, ZONING POWER AND ITS LIMITATIONS (2007) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2059 ENVII Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Materials 19, LAND USE PLANNING (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2060 "ATLANTIC YARDS' CONDEMNATION UPHELD, 22 New York Real Estate Law Reporter 1 (2008)

2061 ALL SOUND, NO FURY? THE IMPACTS OF STATE-BASED KELO LAWS, 63 Planning & Environmental Law No. 2 p. 3+ (2011)

2062 JUSTICE JOHN PAUL STEVENS-HIS TAKE ON TAKINGS, 62 Planning & Environmental Law No. 10 p. 3+ (2010) **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2063 IS AN ANSWER BLOWIN' IN THE WIND?, 62 Planning & Environmental Law No. 9 p. 7+ (2010)

2064 ENOUGH IS ENOUGH: AMORTIZATION AND THE END OF UNIFORMITY, 62 Planning & Environmental Law No. 4 p. 3 (2010)

2065 EMINENT DOMAIN New York, 62 Planning & Environmental Law 53 (2010)

2066 A LINE IN THE SAND: ORAL ARGUMENTS, 62 Planning & Environmental Law No. 2 p. 17 (2010)

2067 NARRATIVE AS LAWMAKING: THE ANTI-KELO STORY, 62 Planning & Environmental Law No. 1 p. 3+ (2010)

2068 AN ALTERNATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON UNITED STATES-EUROPEAN PROPERTY RIGHTS AND LAND USE PLANNING: DIFFERENCES WITHOUT ANY SUBSTANCE, 61 Planning & Environmental Law No. 3 p. 3+ (2009)

2069 REFLECTIONS ON PRIVATE PROPERTY, PLANNING, AND STATE POWER, 61 Planning & Environmental Law No. 1 p. 3 (2009) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2070 EMINENT DOMAIN New York, 60 Planning & Environmental Law 59 (2008) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2071 AIRSPACE NEAR AIRPORT RUNWAYS: PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS VERSUS RIGHTS OF THE TRAVELING PUBLIC, 59 Planning & Environmental Law No. 9 p. 3+ (2007) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2072 ARIZONA HAS THE DISTINCTION OF BEING THE ONLY STATE TO PASS A REGULATORY TAKINGS BALLOT INITIATIVE IN NOVEMBER 2006, 59 Planning & Environmental Law No. 1 p. 3+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2073 ARIZONA HAS THE DISTINCTION OF BEING THE ONLY STATE TO PASS A REGULATORY TAKINGS BALLOT INITIATIVE IN NOVEMBER 2006, 59 Planning & Environmental Law No. 1 p. 3+ (2007) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2074 EMINENT DOMAIN: JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE RESPONSES TO KELO, 58 Planning & Environmental Law No. 11 p. 3+ (2006)

2075 UP THE CREEK WITHOUT A PADDLE: THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DECIDES LITTLE IN DECIDING RAPANOS AND CARABELL, 58 Planning & Environmental Law No. 8 p. 3 (2006)

2076 EMINENT DOMAIN, 58 Planning & Environmental Law 268 (2006)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2077 EMINENT DOMAIN, 58 Planning & Environmental Law 220 (2006) **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2078 EMINENT DOMAIN FOR PRIVATE GAIN? THE KELO V. CITY OF NEW LONDON DECISION AND AFTERMATH, 57 Planning & Environmental Law No. 9 p. 3+ (2005) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2079 THE SEC SHARPENS ITS TALONS: INCREASED ENFORCEMENT OF NO-FAULT CLAWBACK ACTIONS UNDER SECTION 304 OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002, 1832 Practising Law Institute Corporate Law and Practice Course Handbook Series 943 (2010) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2080 EMINENT DOMAIN - BEFORE AND AFTER KELO, 209 Practising Law Institute Litig. & Admin. Prac.: Crim. Law & Urban Problems 317+ (2007)

2081 BASIC PRINCIPLES OF JUST COMPENSATION, 209 Practising Law Institute Litig. & Admin. Prac.: Crim. Law & Urban Problems 327 (2007) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2082 THE CALM BEFORE THE STORM, 731 Practising Law Institute Litigation and Administrative Practice: Litigation 25+ (2005) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2083 SUPREME COURT UPDATE, 731 Practising Law Institute Litigation and Administrative Practice: Litigation 35 (2005) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2084 SUPREME COURT REVIEW - OCTOBER 2004 TERM - SECTION 1983 LITIGATION, 731 Practising Law Institute Litigation and Administrative Practice: Litigation 43+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,6 (S.Ct.)**

2085 THE END OF AN ERA: SUPREME COURT OCTOBER TERM 2004, 731 Practising Law Institute Litigation and Administrative Practice: Litigation 7+ (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2086 SECTION 1983 LITIGATION, 736 Practising Law Institute Litigation and Administrative Practice: Litigation 133+ (2005) **HN: 2,3,6 (S.Ct.)**

2087 THE END OF AN ERA: SUPREME COURT OCTOBER TERM 2004, 736 Practising Law Institute Litigation and Administrative Practice: Litigation 17+ (2005) **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2088 THE CALM BEFORE THE STORM, 736 Practising Law Institute Litigation and Administrative Practice: Litigation 33+ (2005) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2089 SUPREME COURT REVIEW OUTLINE, 736 Practising Law Institute Litigation and Administrative Practice: Litigation 9 (2005) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2090 AN OVERVIEW OF THE ENTITLEMENT PROCESS: A BURGEONING THICKET OF COMPLEXITY IN THE STORM OF DECLINING MARKETS (2010), 582 Practising Law Institute Real Estate Law and Practice 765 (2010)

2091 AN OVERVIEW OF THE ENTITLEMENT PROCESS: A BURGEONING THICKET OF COMPLEXITY IN THE STORM OF DECLINING MARKETS, 571 Practising Law Institute Real Estate Law and Practice 741 (2009)

2092 LAND USE, 558 Practising Law Institute Real Estate Law and Practice 1023 (2008)

2093 CONDEMNATION LITIGATION - THE SWORD AND THE SHIELD, 2008 NO. 1 Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation Institute PAPER NO. 15+ (2008)

2094 PUBLIC PURPOSE OR PRIVATE PROFIT: CONDEMNATION FOR NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AFTER KELO V. NEW LONDON, 53 Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation Institute 5-1 (2007)+ (2007)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2095 A CHEVRON/SWALLOWS UPDATE, PLUS A CALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT, 899 Practising Law Institute Tax Law and Estate Planning: Tax Law and Practice 1145+ (2009) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2096 A CHEVRON/SWALLOWS UPDATE, PLUS A CALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT, 853 Practising Law Institute Tax Law and Estate Planning: Tax Law and Practice 923+ (2008) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2097 A CHEVRON/SWALLOWS UPDATE, PLUS A CALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT, 794 Practising Law Institute Tax Law and Estate Planning: Tax Law and Practice 573+ (2007) **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2098 2004-05 Preview of the United States Supreme Court Cases 471, Property Lost: The Takings Clause in the 2004 Term (2005) **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2099 LIMITS ON USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN PASS IN NINE STATES, WHILE TABOR FIZZLES IN MAINE, NEBRASKA, AND OREGON, 2006 TM Weekly State Reports 5+ (2006)

2100 EMINENT DOMAIN LEGISLATION, REGULATORY TAKINGS MEASURES LIMIT CONDEMNATION OF PROPERTY FOR TAX REVENUE PURPOSES, 2006 TM Weekly State Reports 5+ (2006)

2101 TABOR, EMINENT DOMAIN, REGULATORY TAKINGS EMERGE AS LEADING BALLOT QUESTIONS FOR NOVEMBER'S ELECTION, 2006 TM Weekly State Reports 5+ (2006)

2102 Public Purpose in Condemning Land for Private University's New Urban Campus, 12-17-2010 United States Supreme Court Actions 6 (2010) **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2103 Taking Land Pursuant to Legislatively-Declared Public Policy, 10-19-2009 United States Supreme Court Actions 23 (2009)

2104 Urban Redevelopment Project as Taking, 07-3-2008 United States Supreme Court Actions 17 (2008)

2105 Review of Cases Decided This Term, 07-21-2005 United States Supreme Court Actions 11 (2005) **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

C 2106 SECTION 1981 AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS: THE NINTH CIRCUIT REVISITS RACE-CONSCIOUS ADMISSIONS POLICIES, 210 Ed. Law Rep. 23, 40 (2006) **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

C 2107 RELIGION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS: AN AMERICAN AND SOUTH AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE, 204 Ed. Law Rep. 445, 453+ (2006) **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

Court Documents

Appellate Court Documents (U.S.A.)

Appellate Petitions, Motions and Filings

2108 Fideicomiso De La Tierra Del Cano Martin Pena v. Fortuno, 2011 WL 527367, *527367+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 15, 2011) **Reply Brief** (NO. 10-576) ★★★★

2109 Pena v. Fortuno, 2011 WL 333939, *333939+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 31, 2011) **Brief in Opposition** (NO. 10-576) ★★★★

2110 Golan v. Holder, 2011 WL 178700, *178700+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

18, 2011) **Brief for the Respondents in Opposition** (NO. 10-545) ★★

2111 City of New York v. The Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations, 2010 WL 5126513, *5126513+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 13, 2010) **Brief Amici Curiae of International Municipal Lawyers Association, National League of Cities, and U.S. Conference of Mayors in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 10-627) ★★

2112 Tuck-It-Away, Inc. v. New York State Urban Development Corporation, 2010 WL 4803794, *4803794+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 22, 2010) **Reply to Brief in Opposition** (NO. 10-402) ★★★★

2113 Tuck-It-Away, Inc. v. New York State Urban Development Corp., 2010 WL 4641635, *4641635+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 12, 2010) **Brief in Opposition** (NO. 10-402) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2114 Raynor v. Myers, 2010 WL 4641645, *4641645+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 09, 2010) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 10-645) ★★

2115 Pena v. Fortuno, 2010 WL 4314349, *4314349+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 01, 2010) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 10-576) " ★★★★

2116 Tuck-It-Away, Inc. v. New York State Urban Development Corp., 2010 WL 4255035, *4255035+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 25, 2010) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New York State Senator Bill Perkins in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 10-402) " ★★★★

2117 Onyeabor v. Centennial Pointe Homeowners' Ass'n, 2010 WL 4380143, *4380143 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 25, 2010) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 10-599) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2118 Tuck-It-Away, Inc. v. New York State Urban Development Corp., 2010 WL 4232633, *4232633+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 22, 2010) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 10-402) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,6 (S.Ct.)**

2119 Golan v. Holder, 2010 WL 4232641, *4232641+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 20, 2010) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 10-545) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2120 Board of County Com'rs of Boulder County v. Rocky Mountain Christian Church, 2010 WL 4132233, *4132233+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 15, 2010) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 10-521) " ★★

2121 Maunalua Bay Beach Ohana 28 v. State of Hawaii, 2010 WL 4035362, *4035362+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 12, 2010) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation and the Cato Institute in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 10-331) ★★

2122 Tuck-It-Away, Inc. v. New York State Urban Development Corp., 2010 WL 3722066, *3722066+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 21, 2010) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 10-402) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

2123 City of Milwaukee Post No. 2874 Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States v. Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee, 2010 WL 2256198, *2256198+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 02, 2010) **Reply in Support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 09-1204) ★★

2124 Fitzgerald v. Thompson, 2010 WL 2145274, *2145274+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 25, 2010) **Brief of an Amicus Curiae in Support of the Position of the Petitioners**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Before the Court's Consideration of a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari (NO. 09-930) ★★

2125 Brown v. Pedreira, 2010 WL 1932614, *1932614+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 10, 2010) **Brief for Respondents in Opposition** (NO. 09-1121) ★★

2126 City of Milwaukee Post No. 2874 Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. v. Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee, 2010 WL 1848204, *1848204+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 05, 2010) **Brief of Amici Curiae National Association of Home Builders and Wisconsin Builders Association in Support of Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 09-1204) ★★★

2127 City of Milwaukee Post No. 2874 Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States v. Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee, 2010 WL 1848205, *1848205+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 05, 2010) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Institute for Justice in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 09-1204) ★★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2128 City of Milwaukee Post No. 2874 Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States v. Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee, 2010 WL 1316251, *1316251+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 02, 2010) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 09-1204) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2129 Fitzgerald v. Thompson, 2010 WL 391274, *391274+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 01, 2010) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 09-930) " ★★★

2130 Textron Inc. and Subsidiaries v. United States of America, 2010 WL 320376, *320376+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 27, 2010) **Brief of New England Legal Foundation as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 09-750) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2131 Speights v. City of Oceanside, 2009 WL 4624183, *4624183+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 03, 2009) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 09-659) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2132 480.00 Acres of Land v. United States of America, 2009 WL 4099543, *4099543+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 23, 2009) **Brief of the Cato Institute as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 09-505) " ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2133 Hoy v. Mentor Tp., 2009 WL 6105947, *6105947 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 30, 2009) **Petition for Rehearing** (NO. 09-121) ★★

2134 Macerich Management Co. v. United Broth. of Carpenters and Joiners of America Local, 2009 WL 3090414, *3090414+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 25, 2009) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 09-235) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2135 Wallace v. State of Montana, 2009 WL 2842071, *2842071+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 31, 2009) **Brief in Opposition to Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-1395) " ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2136 Kimco of Evansville, Inc. v. State of Indiana, 2009 WL 2509225, *2509225+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 06, 2009) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 09-197) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2137 In re Aspen Creek Estates, Ltd. v. Town of Brookhaven, 2009 WL 1759034, *1759034+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 17, 2009) **Brief in Opposition** (NO. 08-1444) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2138 In re Aspen Creek Estates, Ltd. v. Town of Brookhaven, 2009 WL 1430032, *1430032+

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

(Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 18, 2009) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-1444) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2139 Swisher Intern., Inc. v. Vilsack, 2009 WL 1223288, *1223288+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 01, 2009) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-1361) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2140 IMS Health, Inc. v. Ayotte, 2009 WL 1155410, *1155410 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 24, 2009) **Brief of Amici Curiae New England Legal Foundation Associated Industries of Massachusetts Associated Industries of Vermont Maine Merchants Association and American Legislative Exchange Council in ...** (NO. 08-1202) ★

2141 Stop the Beach Renourishment, Inc. v. Florida Dept. of Environmental Protection, 2009 WL 1030518, *1030518+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 15, 2009) **Motion for Leave to File and Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-1151) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2142 Brown v. City of Chester Redevelopment Authority, 2009 WL 788661, *788661+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 23, 2009) **Brief in Opposition** (NO. 08-1069) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2143 House of Realty, Inc. v. City of Midwest City, 2009 WL 720928, *720928+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 16, 2009) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-1164) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2144 Empress Casino Joliet Corp. v. Giannoulis, 2009 WL 526999, *526999+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 27, 2009) **Motion for Leave to File Brief Amicus Curiae and Brief Amicus Curiae of Illinois Allance for Growth, Americans for Tax Reform in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 08-945) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2145 Empress Casino Joliet Corp. v. Giannoulias, 2009 WL 527002, *527002+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 27, 2009) **Brief for the Cato Institute as Amicus Curiae Supporting Petitioners** (NO. 08-945) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

2146 Empress Casino Joliet Corp. v. Giannoulias, 2009 WL 564640, *564640+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 27, 2009) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 08-945) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2147 Empress Casino Joliet Corp. v. Giannoulias, 2009 WL 564641, *564641+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 27, 2009) **Brief of Amici Curiae National Taxpayers Union, American Association of Small Property Owners, Center for Individual Freedom, Citizen Outreach, Citizens for Limited Taxation, Evergreen Freedom ...** (NO. 08-945) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2148 Empress Casino Joliet Corp. v. Giannoulias, 2009 WL 564642, *564642+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 27, 2009) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Mountain States Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 08-945) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2149 Brown v. City of Chester Redevelopment Authority, 2009 WL 453268, *453268 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 17, 2009) **Petition for Whit of Certiorari** (NO. 08-1069) " ★★

2150 AmeriSource Corp. v. United States of America, 2009 WL 390029, *390029+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 13, 2009) **Brief for the United States in Opposition** (NO.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

08-497) ★★

2151 MCA Associates L.P. v. Township of Montville, 2009 WL 344625, *344625+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 09, 2009) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-1016) ★★

2152 Empress Casino Joliet Corp. v. Giannoulias, 2009 WL 208133, *208133+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 21, 2009) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-945) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

2153 Coumo v. The Clearing House Ass'n L.L.C., 2008 WL 4843621, *4843621+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 06, 2008) **Brief of National Association of Realtors(R) as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 08-453) ★★

2154 Agripost, LLC v. Miami-Dade County, Florida, 2008 WL 4757424, *4757424+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 27, 2008) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-567) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2155 Amerisource Corp. v. The United States of America, 2008 WL 5748518, *5748518+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Oct 15, 2008) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-497) " ★★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2156 Ate Kays Co. v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 2008 WL 4533653, *4533653+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 30, 2008) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-465) " ★★★

2157 Braun v. Ann Arbor Charter Tp., 2008 WL 4360900, *4360900 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 24, 2008) **Motion for Leave to File Amici Curiae and Brief of the National Association of Home Builders and Franklin P. Kottschade in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 08-250) ★

2158 NiSource Inc. v. Estate of Garrison G. Tawney, 2008 WL 4360894, *4360894+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 22, 2008) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Mountain States Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 08-219) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2159 NiSource Inc. v. Tawney, 2008 WL 4360898, *4360898+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 22, 2008) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Mountain States Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 08-229) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2160 Exxon Mobil Corp. v. F.E.R.C., 2008 WL 3875290, *3875290+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 18, 2008) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-212) " ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2161 Grice v. Vermont Elec. Power Co. Inc., 2008 WL 3833288, *3833288+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 13, 2008) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-200) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2162 Goldstein v. Pataki, 2008 WL 2323309, *2323309+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 03, 2008) **Petitioners' Reply Brief** (NO. 07-1247) " ★★★★

2163 Glenmont Hills Associates v. Montgomery County, Maryland, 2008 WL 2305788, *2305788 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 02, 2008) **Motion for Leave to File Amicus Curiae Brief and Brief of the National Association of Home Builders Supporting Petitioners** (NO. 07-1373) ★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2164 Clark County, Nevada v. Vacation Village, Inc., 2008 WL 2199954, *2199954+ (Appellate Peti-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

tion, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 23, 2008) **Brief for the United States as Amicus Curiae** (NO. 07-373) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2165 Goldstein v. Pataki, 2008 WL 2149854, *2149854+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 16, 2008) **Brief in Opposition for the ESDC and Municipal Respondents** (NO. 07-1247) " ★★★★

2166 Goldstein v. Pataki, 2008 WL 1969295, *1969295+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 02, 2008) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Institute for Justice in Support of Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-1247) " ★★★★

2167 Angino v. Middle Paxton Tp., 2008 WL 1882995, *1882995+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 24, 2008) **Brief in Opposition** (NO. 07-1252) ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2168 City and County of Honolulu v. Matsuda, 2008 WL 1765765, *1765765+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 14, 2008) **Petition For Writ Of Certiorari** (NO. 07-1305) " ★★★

2169 Sanders v. Brown, 2008 WL 960677, *960677+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 02, 2008) **Brief for the Respondent Manufacturers in Opposition** (NO. 07-995) ★★

2170 Goldstein v. Pataki, 2008 WL 899311, *899311+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 31, 2008) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-1247) " ★★★★

2171 Cienega Gardens v. United States, 2008 WL 877882, *877882 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 27, 2008) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New England Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 07-1100) ★

2172 Angino v. Middle Paxton Township, 2008 WL 905196, *905196+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 29, 2008) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-1252) ★★★

2173 Cienega Gardens v. United States of America, 2008 WL 515859, *515859+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 22, 2008) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-1100) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2174 Peters v. Village of Clifton, 2008 WL 378896, *378896+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 08, 2008) **Reply to Opposition to Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-635) ★★

2175 Evans v. United States of America,, 2008 WL 275503, *275503+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 28, 2008) **Brief Amicus Curiae Of Pacific Legal Foundation In Support Of Petitioners** (NO. 07-871) ★★

2176 Overview Books, LLC v. U.S., 2008 WL 205142, *205142+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 22, 2008) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-966) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2177 Evans v. United States, 2007 WL 4631311, *4631311+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 28, 2007) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-871) ★★★ **HN: 1,7 (S.Ct.)**

2178 Kelly v. State of Illinois, 2007 WL 4365705, *4365705+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 10, 2007) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-787) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2179 Loriz v. Connaughton, 2007 WL 4300864, *4300864+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 30, 2007) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 07-759) " ★★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2180 Mongeau v. City of Marlborough, 2007 WL 4207121, *4207121+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 21, 2007) **Brief of Amici Curiae New England Legal Foundation and National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, Massachusetts Chapter, in Sup-**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

port of Petitioner (NO. 07-533) ★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2181 Clark County v. Vacation Village, Inc., 2007 WL 4142596, *4142596+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 19, 2007) **Brief for Respondents in Opposition** (NO. 07-373) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2182 McNamara v. City of Rittman, 2007 WL 2010872, *2010872 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 11, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Association of Home Builders in Support of the Petitioners** (NO. 06-1481) ★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2183 MiPro Homes, L.L.C. v. Mount Laurel Tp., 2007 WL 1794223, *1794223+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 19, 2007) **Reply Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 06-1345) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2184 B. Willis, C.P.A., Inc. v. Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, 2007 WL 1812493, *1812493+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 14, 2007) **Petitioner's Reply Brief** (NO. 06-1467) " ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2185 MiPro Homes, L.L.C. v. Mount Laurel Tp., 2007 WL 1655122, *1655122+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 08, 2007) **Motion for Leave to File Brief Amicus Curiae and Brief Amicus Curiae of the American Farm Bureau Federation in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 06-1345) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

2186 MiPro Homes, L.L.C. v. Mount Laurel Tp., 2007 WL 1655121, *1655121+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 06, 2007) **Brief in Opposition** (NO. 06-1345) " ★★★ **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2187 MiPro Homes, L.L.C. v. Mount Laurel Township, 2007 WL 1647555, *1647555+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 05, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Association of Home Builders in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 06-1345) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

2188 Gerke Excavating, Inc. v. United States of America, 2007 WL 1594330, *1594330 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 04, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Association of Home Builders in Support of the Petitioner** (NO. 06-1331) ★

2189 B. Willis, C.P.A., Inc. v. Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, 2007 WL 1319355, *1319355+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 04, 2007) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-1467) " ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2190 MiPro Homes, L.L.C. v. Mount Laurel Tp., 2007 WL 1354279, *1354279+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 04, 2007) **Motion for Leave to File Amicus Curiae Brief and Brief of Avalonbay Communities, Inc. as Amicus Curiae in Support of the Petitioner** (NO. 06-1345) ★★★★ **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2191 Kaufmann's Carousel, Inc. v. City of Syracuse Indus. Development Agency, 2007 WL 1100127, *1100127+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 11, 2007) **Reply for Petitioners** (NO. 06-1159) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2192 MiPro Homes, L.L.C. v. Mount Laurel Tp., 2007 WL 1059570, *1059570+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 06, 2007) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-1345) " ★★ ★★ **HN: 2,3,4 (S.Ct.)**

2193 Border Business Park v. The City of San Diego, 2007 WL 1050201, *1050201+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 03, 2007) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-1337) " ★ ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2194 Hercules Inc. v. United States of America, 2007 WL 989151, *989151+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 30, 2007) **Reply to Brief in Opposition** (NO. 06-865) ★★

2195 Kaufman's Carousel, Inc. v. City of Syracuse Indus. Development Agency, 2007 WL 951003, *951003+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 29, 2007) **Brief in Opposition of Respondent Carousel Center Company, L.P.** (NO. 06-1159) ★★★

2196 Kaufmann's Carousel, Inc. v. City of Syracuse Indus. Development Agency, 2007 WL 965444, *965444+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 28, 2007) **Brief in Opposition of Respondent City of Syracuse Industrial Development Agency** (NO. 06-1159) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2197 United States of America v. Hook, 2007 WL 836939, *836939+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 13, 2007) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-1270) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2198 Lacy v. Board of Sup'rs of Halifax County, Virginia, 2007 WL 626654, *626654+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 26, 2007) **Brief in Opposition to Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-1025) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

2199 Kaufmann's Carousel, Inc. v. City of Syracuse Indus. Development Agency, 2007 WL 580715, *580715+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 20, 2007) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-1159) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2200 Giovanella v. Town of Ashland Conservation Comm'n, 2007 WL 541669, *541669+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 15, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curi%8A New England Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 06-972) ★

2201 Detroit Intern. Bridge Co. v. United States of America, 2007 WL 432472, *432472+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Feb 07, 2007) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation, National Taxpayers Union, And New England Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 06-639) ★★★★ **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

2202 Villadsen v. Mason County Road Com'n, 2007 WL 215526, *215526+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 24, 2007) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-1027) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2203 Lacy v. Board of Sup'rs of Halifax County, Virginia, 2007 WL 215524, *215524+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 23, 2007) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-1025) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

2204 Didden v. Village of Port Chester, 2006 WL 3825276, *3825276+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 26, 2006) **Supplemental Brief for Respondents** (NO. 06-652) ★★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2205 Didden v. The Village of Port Chester, 2006 WL 3779009, *3779009+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 21, 2006) **Reply Brief of Petitioners** (NO. 06-652) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2206 Hercules Inc. v. United States of America, 2006 WL 3775972, *3775972+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 14, 2006) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-865) " ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2207 Didden v. Village of Port Chester, New York, 2006 WL 3667543, *3667543+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 11, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 06-652) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2208 Didden v. Village of Port Chester, 2006 WL 3667545, *3667545+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 11, 2006) **Brief in Opposition** (NO. 06-652) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

2209 Tal v. Hogan, 2006 WL 3674265, *3674265+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 11, 2006) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-823) ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2210 Didden v. The Village of Port Chester, 2006 WL 3610985, *3610985+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 08, 2006) **Motion for Leave to File Amici Curiae Brief and Brief of Law Professors D. Benjamin Barros, Eric R. Claeys, Viet D. Dinh, Steven J. Eagle, James W. Ely, Jr., Richard A. Epstein, Adam Mossoff, and ...** (NO. 06-652) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2211 Didden v. The Village of Port Chester, 2006 WL 3806379, *3806379+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Dec 08, 2006) **Brief of Law Professors D. Benjamin Barros, Eric R. Claeys, Viet D. Dinh, Steven J. Eagle, James W. Ely, Jr., Richard A. Epstein, Adam Mossoff, and Ilya Somin as Amici Curiae in Support of ...** (NO. 06-652) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2212 Loriz v. Connaughton, 2006 WL 3381602, *3381602+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 15, 2006) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari and Appendix** (NO. 06-711) " ★★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2213 Didden v. The Village of Port Chester, 2006 WL 3265594, *3265594+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 07, 2006) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-652) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2214 Drebick v. City of Olympia, 2006 WL 2701733, *2701733+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 13, 2006) **Brief of Amici Curi%8A New England Legal Foundation, Atlantic Legal Foundation, and Greater Boston Real Estate Board in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 06-223) ★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2215 Davis v. Brown, 2006 WL 2546432, *2546432+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 30, 2006) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 06-302) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2216 Torromeo v. Town of Fremont, New Hampshire, 2006 WL 2459582, *2459582+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 23, 2006) **Brief of Amicus Curiae the Honorable Steve Chabot, Chair, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives** (NO. 06-112) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2217 Hammer v. City of Eugene, Oregon, 2006 WL 2471820, *2471820+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 23, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 05-1643) ★★

2218 Stolt-Nielsen S.A. v. U.S., 2006 WL 2546437, *2546437+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 21, 2006) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New England Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 06-97) ★

2219 State of Washington v. Washington Educ. Ass'n, 2006 WL 2354946, *2354946+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 10, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 05-1657) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2220 Talley v. The Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia, 2006 WL 1516931, *1516931+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 25, 2006) **Petition for Rehearing on Behalf of Logie W. Talley, Petitioner** (NO. 05-1104) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2221 Members of the Peanut Quota Holders Ass'n, Inc. v. United States of America, 2006 WL 1440784, *1440784+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 23, 2006) **Brief for the United States in Opposition** (NO. 05-1225) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

2222 M2 Software, Inc. v. Madacy Entertainment, 2006 WL 1339084, *1339084+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. May 12, 2006) **Petition for Rehearing** (NO. 05-967) " ★★★

2223 Rosso v. Puerto Rico Government Bank for Land Use Admin., 2006 WL 1316565, *1316565+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 27, 2006) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 05-1444) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2224 Norman v. U.S., 2006 WL 1002523, *1002523+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Apr 17, 2006) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Association of Home Builders in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 05-1050) ★★

2225 Members of the Peanut Quota Holders Ass'n, Inc. v. United States of America, 2006 WL 755782, *755782+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Mar 23, 2006) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari With Appendix** (NO. 05-1225) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2226 Cashman v. City of Cotati, 2006 WL 247283, *247283+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 30, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 05-676) ★★

2227 Seven Up Pete Venture v. The State of Montana, 2006 WL 62027, *62027+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jan 09, 2006) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Mountain States Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 05-588) " ★★

2228 Holmes v. Slack, 2005 WL 3076068, *3076068+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Nov 07, 2005) **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 05-621) ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2229 Hanna v. Massachusetts Turnpike Authority, 2005 WL 2214769, *2214769+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Sep 02, 2005) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 05-322) ★★★ **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

2230 Draughon v. Utah Dept. of Financial Institutions, 2005 WL 2875038, *2875038+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 23, 2005) **Brief in Support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 05-548) ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2231 Bochese v. Town of Ponce Inlet, Florida, 2005 WL 1942453, *1942453+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Aug 10, 2005) **Brief in Opposition to Petition for a Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 05-062) ★★

2232 DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno, 2005 WL 1707557, *1707557+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 20, 2005) **Brief of Amici Curiae Louisville Area Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, Commerce Lexington, Inc., Scott County United, Inc., ...** (NO. 04-1704, 04-1724) " ★★

2233 Adams v. U.S., 2005 WL 1703138, *1703138+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 19, 2005) **Reply to Brief in Opposition** (NO. 04-1226) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2234 Adams v. United States of America, 2005 WL 1582856, *1582856+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jul 06, 2005) **Brief for the Respondents in Opposition** (NO. 04-1225, 04-1226) " ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2235 Intermountain Sports, Inc. v. Utah Dept. of Transp., 2005 WL 1566516, *1566516 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (U.S. Jun 30, 2005) **Reply Brief in Support of Petition for a Writ of**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Certiorari (NO. 04-1551) ★★

2236 Mario ROMERO, Amanda Villegas De Romero Waldo Romero Villegas, Claudia Marc Romero Villegas, Victor Mario Romero Villegas, Lorena Rome Villegas, Petitioners, v. Alberto GONZALES, Attorney General of the United States, Respondent., 2007 WL 6012956, *6012956+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (2nd Cir. Nov 27, 2007) **Petitioners' Reply Brief** (NO. 07-1401-AG) ★★

2237 Mario ROMERO, et al., Petitioner, v. Peter D. KEISLER, Acting U.S. Attorney General, Respondent., 2007 WL 6012955, *6012955+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (2nd Cir. Nov 13, 2007) **Brief for Respondents** (NO. 07-1401-AG) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2238 Bart DIDDEN, Domenick Bologna, Cabernet 119 Realty Corp., Opus 113 Corp., Pauillac 115 Realty Corp., 117 North Main Street, Plaintiffs-Appellants, Fred Decesare, Plaintiff, v. THE VILLAGE OF PORT CHESTER, the Board of Trustees for the Village of Port Chester, Peter J. Ciccone, Individually and in his official capacity as Village Trustee for the Village of Port Chester, Daniel Colangelo Jr., Individually and in his official capacity as Village Trustee for the Village, 2006 WL 4290525, *4290525+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (2nd Cir. Apr 19, 2006) **Petition for Rehearing En Banc** (NO. 04-3485-CV) " ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2239 Robert B. LEBLANC; Joan S. LeBlanc; Husband & Wife Jointly & Severally, Petitioners, v. UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, Respondent., 2008 WL 5076699, *5076699+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (6th Cir. Apr 04, 2008) **The LeBlancs' Brief with Addendum & Proof of Service** (NO. 08-3049) ★★

2240 OVERVIEW BOOKS, LLC, and Lev Tsitrin, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. United States, Defendant-Appellee., 2007 WL 3265761, *3265761+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Fed.Cir. Sep 26, 2007) **Petition for Rehearing en banc for Plaintiffs-Appellants Overview Books, LLC and Lev Tsitrin** (NO. 2006-5138) ★★★

2241 STORAGE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION (d/b/a StorageTek), Plaintiff-Appellee, v. CUSTOM HARDWARE ENGINEERING & CONSULTING, INC., et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2005 WL 4838020, *4838020 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Fed.Cir. Oct 26, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curie of New England Legal Foundation in Support Plaintiff-Appellee's Petition for Rehearing or Rehearing En Banc** (NO. 04-1462) ★★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2242 STORAGE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION (d/b/a StorageTek), Plaintiff-Appellee, v. CUSTOM HARDWARE ENGINEERING & CONSULTING, INC., et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2005 WL 4863755, *4863755 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Fed.Cir. Oct 21, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curi%8A of New England Legal Foundation in Support Plaintiff-Appellee's Petition for Rehearing or Rehearing En Banc** (NO. 04-1462) ★★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2243 PEANUT QUOTA HOLDERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Augustus Garrett, Jerome Paulk, Faye Paulk, and D. U. Pullum, On half of Themselves And All Others Similarly Situated, Plaintiff - Appellants. v. UNITED STATES, Defendant - Appellee., 2005 WL 4814448, *4814448+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Fed.Cir. Oct 05, 2005) **Petition for Rehearing En Banc** (NO. 04-5099) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2244 Ex parte MARBLE CITY PLAZA, INC., Petitioner. In re State of Alabama, v. Marble City Plaza, Inc., 2006 WL 6310520, *6310520+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ala. Jul 05, 2006) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 1051417) ★★

2245 PIMA COUNTY, a body politic and corporate, and PIMA County Board of Supervisors,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Plaintiffs/Counterdefendants/Appellants, v. CLEAR CHANNEL OUTDOOR, INC., Formerly Known As Eller Media, Defendant/Counterclaimant/Appellee., 2006 WL 5409717, *5409717+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ariz. Apr 04, 2006) **Response to Petition for Review** (NO. C-2002-2918, CA-CV2005-0025, CV-06-0045-PR) ★★

2246 PIMA COUNTY, a body politic and corporate, and PIMA County Board of Supervisors, Plaintiffs/Counterdefendants/Appellants, v. CLEAR CHANNEL OUTDOOR, INC., formerly known as Eller Media, Defendant/Counterclaimant/Appellee., 2006 WL 5409715, *5409715 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ariz. Feb 27, 2006) **Petition for Review** (NO. 2CA-CV2005-0025, C-2002-2918, CV-06-0045-PR) ★★

2247 M&A GABAEE, a California Limited Partnership, and Arman Gabay, Defendants/Appellants, v. THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a public agency, City of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation, Plaintiff/Respondent., 2009 WL 3483356, *3483356+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Aug 18, 2009) **Petition for Review** (NO. S175588) ★★

2248 Irene S. CHRISTOPHER, as Trustee of the Christopher Family Trust dated December 22, 1987, Petitioner, v. SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Respondent. City of Inglewood and Walden House, Inc., Real Parties in Interest., 2009 WL 809830, *809830+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Jan 26, 2009) **Answer to Petition for Review of Real Party in Interest and Plaintiff City of Inglewood** (NO. S169498) ★★

2249 Irene S. CHRISTOPHER, as Trustee of the Christopher Family Trust Dated December 22, 1987, Petitioner and Defendant, v. SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Respondent and Plaintiff. CITY OF INGLEWOOD AND WALDEN HOUSE, INC., Real Parties In Interest., 2008 WL 6109608, *6109608 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Dec 30, 2008) **Petition for Review of a Decision of The Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division 8** (NO. S169498) ★★

2250 CONTEMPO MARIN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. MANUFACTURED HOME COMMUNITIES, INC., et al., Defendants and Appellants., 2008 WL 5152013, *5152013+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Oct 30, 2008) **Petition for Review** (NO. S167907) ★★

2251 Cheryl C. MURPHY, et al., Petitioner/Plaintiff, v. Roger BURCH, et al., Appellant/Defendants., 2008 WL 794304, *794304+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Jan 18, 2008) **Answer to Petition for Review** (NO. S159489) ★★

2252 Cheryl C. MURPHY, et al., Petitioner/Plaintiff, v. Roger BURCH, et al., Respondent/Defendants., 2007 WL 4914959, *4914959+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Dec 31, 2007) **Petition for Review In Supreme Court** (NO. S159489) ★★

2253 CITY OF RIVERSIDE, Plaintiff and appellant, v. Ken STANSBURY, et al., Defendants and respondents., 2007 WL 4615810, *4615810+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Nov 21, 2007) **Petition for Review** (NO. S158477) ★★

2254 Wayne A. HANSON, etc. et al., Petitioners and Defendants, v. SAN LUIS OBISPO SUPERIOR COURT, Respondent; City of San Luis Obispo, Real Party in Interest and Plaintiff., 2007 WL 2313944, *2313944+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Jul 02, 2007) **Petition for Review** (NO. S153983) ★★★★

2255 Robert B. BLUE, Betty L. Blue, Individually and dba Kitro Company, and as Trustees for the

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Blue Family Trust, John Walsh, Plaintiffs and Petitioners, v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES; City Council of the City of Los Angeles; the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles; etc., et al., Defendants and Respondents., 2006 WL 5164845, *5164845+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. May 09, 2006) **Answer to Petition for Review** (NO. S142906) ★★

2256 CONAWAY PRESERVATION GROUP, LLC, Petitioner and Defendant, v. YOLO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, Respondent, Board of Supervisors of the County of Yolo, Real Party in Interest and Plaintiff., 2006 WL 1759514, *1759514+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Mar 20, 2006) **Reply in Support of Petition for Review** (NO. S141456) ★★

2257 CONAWAY PRESERVATION GROUP, LLC, Petitioner and Defendant, v. YOLO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, Respondent, Board of Supervisors of the County of Yolo, Real Party in Interest and Plaintiff., 2006 WL 938375, *938375+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Feb 28, 2006) **Petition for Review** (NO. S141456) ★★★★

2258 THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, a public corporation, Plaintiff, Respondent and Petitioner, v. CAMPUS CRUSADE FOR CHRIST, INC., a California Nonprofit Religious Corporation; and Del Rosa Mutual Water Company, a California corporation, Defendants, Appellants and Respondents., 2006 WL 1267700, *1267700+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Feb 15, 2006) **Petition for Review of A Decision By the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two** (NO. S141148) ★★

2259 CITY OF CITRUS HEIGHTS, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. Opal E. MORGAN et al., Defendants and Appellants., 2005 WL 3127567, *3127567+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Sep 07, 2005) **Petition for Review** (NO. S137143) ★★★

2260 NORTH BEVERLY PARK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. Jeannette A. BISNO, et al, Defendants and Appellants., 2005 WL 2810610, *2810610+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal. Aug 01, 2005) **Petition for Review After a Decision by the Court of Appeal Second Appellate District, Division Four 2nd Civil No. B 175173** (NO. S135585) ★★

2261 INLAND VALLEY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY, A Joint Powers Authority established under the laws of the State of California, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. Vibhakerbhai B. PATEL and Vimalaben V. Patel, Trustees of the V & V Patel Family Trust dated October 1, 1993, et al., Defendants and Appellants., 2005 WL 3240029, *3240029 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Aug 04, 2005) **Appellants' Petition for Rehearing** (NO. E034937) " ★★

2262 1843, LLC, Mach 1 Salon, et al., Petitioners, v. CITY OF HOLLYWOOD COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, et al., Respondents., 2006 WL 5939291, *5939291+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Fla. 2006) **Petitioner's Brief On Jurisdiction** (NO. 4D06-4016) ★★

2263 EMPRESS CASINO JOLIET CORPORATION, an Illinois corporation, Des Plaines Development Limited Partnership, an Illinois limited partnership d/b/a Harrah's Casino Cruises Joliet, Hollywood Casino-Aurora, Inc., an Illinois corporation, and Elgin Riverboat Resort-Riverboat Casino, an Illinois general partnership d/b/a Grand Victoria Casino, Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Alexi GIANNOULIAS, solely in his official capacity as Treasurer of the State of, 2008 WL 5693614, *5693614 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ill. Jun 26, 2008) **Plaintiffs-Appellees' Petition for Rehearing** (NO. 104586, 104587, 104590) ★★

2264 Katherine R. NAPLETON, as Trustee Under the Katherine R. Napleton Revocable Self-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Declaration of Trust Dated October 1, 1992, Plaintiff-Petitioner, v. THE VILLAGE OF HINSDALE, Defendant-Respondent., 2007 WL 6083205, *6083205 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ill. Aug 14, 2007) **Petition for Leave to Appeal** (NO. 105096) ★★

2265 1350 LAKE SHORE ASSOCIATES, an Illinois limited partnership, Plaintiff-Appellant-Petitioner, v. Denise M. CASALINO, Commissioner, Department of Planning and Development of the City of Chicago, and the City of Chicago, a Municipal Corporation, Defendants-Appellees-Respondents, Edward T. Joyce, Carl Hunter, John Stassen, John C. Mullen, Clark W. Fetridge, Respicio F. Vasquez and Bernard J. Miller, Intervenors-Appellees-Respondents., 2006 WL 4526774, *4526774+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ill. Feb 15, 2006) **Intervenors' Response in Opposition to 1350 Lake Shore Associates' Petition for Leave to Appeal** (NO. 102093) ★★

2266 A. PERIN DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, LLC, v. TY-PAR REALTY, INC., 2008 WL 5167696, *5167696 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (N.C. Nov 21, 2008) **Petition for Discretionary Review Under G.S. 7A-31 (Filed 21 November 2008)** (NO. 520P08) ★★

2267 Frances L. AUSTIN Family Limited Partnership and Piedmont Land Conservancy, v. CITY OF HIGH POINT., 2006 WL 2189805, *2189805 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (N.C. Jul 05, 2006) **Petition for Discretionary Review Under G.S. 7A-31 (Filed 6 July 2006)** (NO. 352P06) ★★

2268 Craig L. WHITAKER, Appellant, v. M.T. AUTOMOTIVE, INC., d/b/a Montrose Toyota, Appellee., 2008 WL 977313, *977313 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Feb 11, 2008) **Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction of Appellant Craig L. Whitaker** (NO. 08-0330) ★★

2269 PALCO INVESTMENT CO. INC., et al, Appellants, v. THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, Appellee., 2006 WL 4803459, *4803459 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Feb 09, 2006) **Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction of Appellants Palco Investment Co. Inc., Dixie Distributing Company and Harry Denune** (NO. 2006-0283) ★★

2270 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Matthew F. BURTON, et al., Appellants., 2006 WL 4545159, *4545159+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Jan 06, 2006) **Memorandum in Opposition to Jurisdiction of Appellee City of Norwood, Ohio** (NO. 2005-2314) ★★

2271 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Matthew F. BURTON; Sanae Ichikawa Burton; ABN Amro Mortgage Group, Inc.; Fortune: Bank; Dusty Rhodes; Hamilton County Auditor; Robert A. Goering; Hamilton County Treasurer; State of Ohio; United States of America, Appellants., 2005 WL 5479561, *5479561+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Dec 09, 2005) **Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction of Appellants Matthew F. Burton and Sanae Ichikawa Burton** (NO. 2005-2314) ★★

2272 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P HORNEY, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 5431434, *5431434+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Jul 29, 2005) **Memorandum in Opposition to Jurisdiction of Appellee City of Norwood, Ohio** (NO. 05-1210) ★★★

2273 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Carl E. GAMBLE, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 5431441, *5431441+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Jul 29, 2005) **Memorandum in Opposition to Jurisdiction of Appellee City of Norwood, Ohio** (NO. 05-1211) ★★★

2274 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY; Carol S. Gooch; Chase Manhattan Mortgage Company; Dusty Rhodes, Hamilton County Auditor; and Robert A. Goering, Hamilton

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

County Treasurer, Appellants., 2005 WL 5431431, *5431431+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Jul 05, 2005) **Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction of Appellants Joseph P. Horney and Carol S. Gooch** (NO. 05-1210) ★★

2275 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY; Carol S. Gooch; Chase Manhattan mortgage Company; Dusty Rhodes, Hamilton County Auditor; and Robert A. Goering, Hamilton County Treasurer, Appellants., 2005 WL 5431436, *5431436+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Jul 05, 2005) **Memorandum of Amicus Curiae Buckeye Institute for Public Policy Solutions in Support of Jurisdiction** (NO. 05-1210) ★★★

2276 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY; Carol S. Gooch, Chase Manhattan Mortgage Company; Dusty Rhodes, Hamilton County Auditor, and Robert A. Goering, Hamilton County Treasurer, Appellants., 2005 WL 5431437, *5431437+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Jul 05, 2005) **Jurisdictional Memorandum Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Appellants** (NO. 05-1210) ★★

2277 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Carl E. GAMBLE, Jr.; Joy E. Gamble; STATE OF OHIO, C/O Ohio Attorney General's Office; Dusty Rhodes, Hamilton County Auditor; Robert A. Goering, Hamilton County Treasurer, Appellants., 2005 WL 5431438, *5431438+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Jul 05, 2005) **Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction of Appellants Carl E. Gamble and Joy E. Gamble** (NO. 05-1211) ★★★

2278 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Carl E. GAMBLE, Jr.; Joy E. Gamble; State of Ohio, C/O Ohio Attorney General's Office; Dusty Rhodes, Hamilton County Auditor; Robert A. Goering, Hamilton County Treasurer, Appellants., 2005 WL 5431443, *5431443+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Jul 05, 2005) **Memorandum of Amicus Curiae Buckeye Institute for Public Policy Solutions in Support of Jurisdiction** (NO. 05-1211) ★★★

2279 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Carl E GAMBLE, Jr, Joy E Gamble, State of Ohio, C/O Ohio Attorney General's Office, Dusty Rhodes, Hamilton County Auditor; and Robert A. Goering, Hamilton County Treasurer, Appellants., 2005 WL 5431444, *5431444+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Ohio Jul 05, 2005) **Jurisdictional Memorandum Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation Support of Appellants** (NO. 05-1211) ★★

2280 TOO TACKY PARTNERSHIP, Appellant, v. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH and Environmental Control and Mayo Read, Jr., Respondents, of whom Too Tacky Partnership is, Petitioner., 2010 WL 1619152, *1619152+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (S.C. Mar 22, 2010) **Petitioner's Reply to Respondents' Joint Return to Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Certiorari** ★★

2281 In re: DALLAS COUNTY HOSPITAL DISTRICT d/b/a Parkland Health & Hospital System, Relator., 2010 WL 2797963, *2797963 (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Jun 23, 2010) **Relator's Reply Brief in Support of Petition for Writ of Mandamus** (NO. 10-0386) ★★

2282 CITY OF AUSTIN, Petitioner, v. Harry M. WHITTINGTON, et al., Respondents., 2010 WL 2797961, *2797961+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Jun 21, 2010) **Reply by City of Austin to Response to Petition for Review** (NO. 10-0316) ★★

2283 TH INVESTMENTS, INC., Petitioner, v. KIRBY INLAND MARINE, L.P. and Port of Houston Authority of Harris County, Texas, Respondents., 2008 WL 910076, *910076+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Feb 24, 2008) **Brief Amicus Curiae of pacific Legal Foundation In Support of Petitioner** (NO. 07-0111) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2284 GUITAR HOLDING CO., L.P., Petitioner, v. HUDSPETH COUNTY UNDERGROUND WATER Conservation District No. 1, et al., Respondents., 2008 WL 494957, *494957+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Jan 29, 2008) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Mesa Water, LP, on the Merits** (NO. 06-0904) ★★

2285 In re 3M COMPANY., 2007 WL 1170213, *1170213+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Apr 03, 2007) **Petition for Writ of Mandamus of 3M Company** (NO. 2007-0260) ★★

2286 GUITAR HOLDING CO., L.P., Petitioner, v. HUDSPETH COUNTY UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT No. 1, et al., Respondents., 2006 WL 3900485, *3900485+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Dec 22, 2006) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Mesa Water, Inc. In Support of Granting Petition for Review** (NO. 06-0904) ★★

2287 PR INVESTMENTS and Specialty Retailers, Inc., Petitioners, v. State of Texas, Respondent., 2006 WL 2991529, *2991529+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Sep 20, 2006) **Petitioner PRI's Brief on the Merits** (NO. 04-0431) ★★

2288 PR INVESTMENTS and Specialty Retailers, Inc., Petitioners, v. State of Texas, Respondent., 2006 WL 2991528, *2991528+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Sep 19, 2006) **Brief on the Merits of Specialty Retailers, Inc.** (NO. 04-0431) ★★

2289 THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, Petitioner, v. EL DORADO AMUSEMENT COMPANY, INC., Respondent., 2006 WL 2127698, *2127698+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Jun 12, 2006) **Petition for Review** (NO. 06-0481) ★★

2290 Frank George NEWSOM, Petitioner, v. MALCOMSON ROAD UTILITY DISTRICT, Respondent., 2006 WL 985224, *985224+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Mar 31, 2006) **Brief in Reply of Frank George Newsom** (NO. 05-0626) ★★★★

2291 PR INVESTMENTS and Specialty Retailers, Inc., Petitioners, v. State of Texas, Respondent., 2006 WL 451695, *451695+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Jan 30, 2006) **Petition for Review of Specialty Retailers. Inc.** (NO. 04-0431) ★★

2292 PR INVESTMENTS and Specialty Retailers, Inc., Petitioners, v. State of Texas, Respondent., 2006 WL 451696, *451696+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Jan 27, 2006) **Pri's Petition for Review** (NO. 04-0431) ★★

2293 CITY OF AUSTIN, Petitioner, v. Harry M. WHITTINGTON, et al., Respondents., 2005 WL 3487598, *3487598+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Nov 23, 2005) **Petition for Review** (NO. 05-0912) ★★★

2294 Evan LOEWENSTEIN, Petitioner, v. The State of Texas, Respondent., 2005 WL 3294971, *3294971+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Oct 31, 2005) **First Amended Petition for Review** (NO. 05-0828) ★★

2295 Frank George NEWSOM, Petitioner, v. MALCOMSON ROAD UTILITY DISTRICT, Respondent., 2005 WL 2332829, *2332829+ (Appellate Petition, Motion and Filing) (Tex. Aug 08, 2005) **Petition for Review of Frank George Newsom** (NO. 05-0626) ★★★

Appellate Briefs

2296 American Electric Power Company, Inc. v. State of Connecticut, 2011 WL 396511, *396511 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 07, 2011) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Association of Home Builders in Support of the Petitioner** (NO. 10-174) ★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2297 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University v. Roche Molecular Systems, Inc., 2011 WL 380825, *380825+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 01, 2011) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Intellectual Property Owners Association in Support of Respondents** (NO. 09-1159) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2298 United States of America v. Tohono O'Odham Nation, 2010 WL 3501192, *3501192 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 03, 2010) **Brief of the National Association of Home Builders as Amicus Curiae in Support of the Respondent** (NO. 09-846) ★

2299 AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion, 2010 WL 3232489, *3232489 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 09, 2010) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New England Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 09-893) ★

2300 McDonald v. City of Chicago, Illinois, 2010 WL 59029, *59029+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 06, 2010) **Brief for the States of Illinois, Maryland, and New Jersey as Amici Curiae in Support of Respondents** (NO. 08-1521) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2301 McDonald v. City of Chicago, Illinois, 2009 WL 4099514, *4099514+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 23, 2009) **Brief for Amici Curiae Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, and the National Black Police ...** (NO. 08-1521) " ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2302 McDonald v. City of Chicago, Illinois, 2009 WL 4099516, *4099516+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 23, 2009) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Eagle Forum Education & Legal Defense in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 08-1521) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2303 Stop the Beach Renourishment, Inc. v. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, 2009 WL 3495336, *3495336+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Oct 27, 2009) **Reply Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 08-1151) " ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2304 Stop the Beach Renourishment, Inc. v. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, 2009 WL 2574816, *2574816+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 20, 2009) **Brief of Amici Curiae National Association of Home Builders and Florida Home Builders Association Supporting Petitioners** (NO. 08-1151) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2305 Stop the Beach Renourishment, Inc. v. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, 2009 WL 3635887, *3635887 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 20, 2009) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New England Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 08-1151) ★

2306 Stop the Beach Renourishment, Inc. v. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, 2009 WL 2588282, *2588282+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 19, 2009) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Cato Institute, NFIB Legal Center, and Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 08-1151) ★★

2307 Salazar v. Buono, 2009 WL 1629703, *1629703+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jun 08, 2009) **Brief of Amicus Curiae of Foundation for Moral Law, in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 08-472) " ★★

2308 Cuomo v. The Clearing House Association, 2009 WL 556385, *556385+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 04, 2009) **Brief of National Association of Realtors(R) as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 08-453) ★★

2309 Travelers Indemnity Company v. Bailey, 2009 WL 526205, *526205+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 26, 2009) **Brief in Support of Respondents for Amici Curiae Jagdeep S. Bhandari, Susan Block-Lieb, Erwin Chemerinsky, Ingrid Hillinger, George W. Kuney, Charles W.**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Mooney, Jr., Theresa J. Pulley Radwan, Keith ... (NO. 08-295, 08-307) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2310 Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Company Inc., 2009 WL 298466, *298466+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 04, 2009) **Brief of the States of Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, and Utah as Amici Curiae in Support of Respondents** (NO. 08-22) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2311 Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Company, Inc., 2009 WL 298467, *298467+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 04, 2009) **Brief of Ten Current and Former Chief Justices and Justices as Amici Curiae in Support of Respondents** (NO. 08-22) ★★

2312 The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company v. United States of America, 2008 WL 5417430, *5417430+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 24, 2008) **Brief for Amicus Curiae General Electric Company in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 07-1601, 07-1607) " ★★

2313 Coeur Alaska, Inc. v. Southeast Alaska Conservation Council, 2008 WL 4370057, *4370057 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 24, 2008) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Association of Home Builders Supporting Petitioners** (NO. 07-984, 07-990) ★

2314 Entergy Corporation v. Environmental Protection Agency, 2008 WL 2817678, *2817678 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 18, 2008) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Association of Home Builders Supporting Petitioners** (NO. 07-588, 07-589, 07-597) ★

2315 District of Columbia v. Heller, 2008 WL 157186, *157186+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 11, 2008) **Brief of Law Professors Erwin Chemerinsky and Adam Winkler, as Amici Curiae in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 07-290) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2316 Boumediene v. Bush, 2007 WL 2441580, *2441580+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 24, 2007) **Brief of Professors of Constitutional Law and Federal Jurisdiction as Amici Curiae in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 06-1195, 06-1196) " ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2317 John R. Sand & Gravel Company v. United States of America, 2007 WL 2236606, *2236606+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 03, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Association of Home Builders in Support of the Petitioner** (NO. 06-1164) ★★

2318 Hall Street Associates, L.L.C. v. Mattel, Inc., 2007 WL 2344617, *2344617 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 27, 2007) **Brief of Amici Curiae New England Legal Foundation and National Federation of Independent Business Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioner on the Merits** (NO. 06-989) ★

2319 Federal Election Commission v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc., 2007 WL 894816, *894816+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Mar 23, 2007) **Brief of National Association of Realtors(R) as Amicus Curiae in Support of Appellee** (NO. 06-969, 06-970) ★★

2320 Wilkie v. Robbins, 2007 WL 550927, *550927+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 20, 2007) **Brief of Brooks Realty and Burgett Geothermal Greenhouses, Inc. as Amici Curiae in Support of Respondent** (NO. 06-219) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2321 Wilkie v. Robbins, 2007 WL 550928, *550928+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 20, 2007) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Mountain States Legal Foundation in Support of Respondent** (NO. 06-219) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2322 Tellabs, Incorporated v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd., 2007 WL 445337, *445337+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Feb 09, 2007) **Brief for New England Legal Foundation as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 06-484) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2323 Davenport v. Washington Education Association, 2006 WL 3294734, *3294734+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 09, 2006) **Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 05-1589) ★★

2324 State of Washington v. Washington Education Association, 2006 WL 3294735, *3294735+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 08, 2006) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Mountain States Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 05-1657) ★★

2325 Watters v. Wachovia Bank, N.A., 2006 WL 3265611, *3265611 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 03, 2006) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New England Legal Foundation in Support of Respondents on the Merits** (NO. 05-1342) ★

2326 Philip Morris USA v. Williams, 2006 WL 2153775, *2153775+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 27, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioner** (NO. 05-1256) ★★

2327 G. K. Ltd. Travel v. City of Lake Oswego, Oregon, 2006 WL 2054350, *2054350+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 17, 2006) **Brief for International Sign Association as Amici Curiae in Support of the Petitioners** (NO. 05-1603) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2328 eBay, Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C., 2006 WL 236068, *236068+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 24, 2006) **Brief of Law Professors as Amicus Curiae in Support of Respondent** (NO. 05-130) ★ ★

2329 DaimlerChrysler Corporation v. Cuno, 2006 WL 189947, *189947+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 23, 2006) **Brief of Amici Curiae Fiscal Policy Institute, Connecticut Voices for Children and Good Jobs First in Support of Respondents** (NO. 04-1704, 04-1724) ★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2330 Rapanos v. United States of America, 2006 WL 139202, *139202+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 13, 2006) **Brief of American Planning Association as Amicus Curiae in Support of Respondents** (NO. 04-1034, 04-1384) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2331 Jackson v. Perry, 2006 WL 62062, *62062+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jan 10, 2006) **Brief for Appellants** (NO. 05-276) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2332 DaimlerChrysler Corporation v. Cuno, 2005 WL 3295631, *3295631+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 05, 2005) **Brief for Petitioner DaimlerChrysler Corporation** (NO. 04-1704) " ★★

2333 DaimlerChrysler Corporation v. Cuno, 2005 WL 3322933, *3322933+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 05, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Nissan North America, Inc. in Support of Petitioners** (NO. 04-1704, 04-1724) ★★

2334 Wilkins v. Cuno, 2005 WL 3348849, *3348849+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 05, 2005) **Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 04-1724) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2335 Rapanos v. United States, 2005 WL 3294920, *3294920 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 02, 2005) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Association of Home Builders in Support of the Petitioners** (NO. 04-1034, 04-1384) ★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2336 Rapanos v. United States, 2005 WL 3308796, *3308796+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 02, 2005) **Brief of Amici Curiae Charles R. Johnson, Atlantic Legal Foundation, Defenders of Property Rights, and New England Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioners on the Merits** (NO. 04-1034, 04-1384) ★★

2337 Rapanos v. United States, 2005 WL 3309661, *3309661 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Dec 02, 2005) **Brief of Amicus Curiae The Claremont Institute Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence In Support of Petitioners** (NO. 04-1034, 04-1384) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2338 S.D. Warren Company v. Maine Department of Environmental Protection, 2005 WL 3197629, *3197629+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Nov 25, 2005) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New England Legal Foundation in Support of Petitioner on the Merits** (NO. 04-1527) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2339 United States of America v. State of Georgia, 2005 WL 2347176, *2347176+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Sep 22, 2005) **Brief for Respondents** (NO. 04-1203, 04-1236) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2340 Jackson v. Perry, 2005 WL 2104582, *2104582+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Aug 31, 2005) **Jurisdictional Statement** (NO. 05-276) " ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2341 Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic and Institutional Right, 2005 WL 1707461, *1707461+ (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Jul 18, 2005) **Amici Curiae Brief on the Merits of U.S. Congressman Richard Pombo, New Jersey and Pennsylvania Law Students Elizabeth P. Rizzo, David Wasserman, and Daniel L. Stants, and Mountain States Legal ...** (NO. 04-1152) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2342 FIDEICOMISO DE LA TIERRA DEL CANO MARTIN PENA, Plaintiff, Appellant, v. Luis G. FORTUNO in his official capacity as Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Antonio M. Sagardia-De Jesus, in his official capacity as Secretary of Justice of Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Municipality of San Juan; Jorge Santini in his official capacity as the Mayor of Municipality of San Juan; Autoridad De Energia Electrica; and Autoridad De Carreteras; Administracion, 2009 WL 6809419, *6809419+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Sep 04, 2009) **Reply Brief of Appellant/Petitioner Fideicomiso De La Tierra Del Ca%25no Martin Pe%25na** (NO. 09-1911) ★ ★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2343 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. James TAMBONE and Robert Hussey, Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 7167037, *7167037 (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Sep 04, 2009) **Supplemental Brief of Amici Curiae New England Legal Foundation and Associated Industries of Massachusetts in Support of Appellees James Tambone and Robert Hussey** (NO. 07-1384) ★

2344 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. James TAMBONE and Robert Hussey, Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 7273034, *7273034 (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Sep 04, 2009) **Supplemental Brief of Amici Curiae New England Legal Foundation and Associated Industries of Massachusetts in Support of Appellees James Tambone and Robert Hussey** (NO. 07-1384) ★

2345 FIDEICOMISO DE LA TIERRA DEL CANO MARTIN PENA, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. Luis G. FORTUNO, in his official capacity as Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Antonio M. Sagardia-De-Jesus, in his official capacity as Secretary of Justice of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Municipality of San Juan; Jorge Santini, in his official capacity as the Mayor of the Municipality of San Juan; Autoridad De Energia Electrica De Puerto Rico (Aee); Autoridad De, 2009 WL 6809417, *6809417+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Aug 31, 2009) **Defendants - Appellees' Brief** (NO. 09-1911) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

2346 FIDEICOMISO DE LA TIERRA DEL CANO MARTIN PENA, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. Luis G. FORTUNO, in his official capacity as Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Antonio M. Sagardia - De Jesus, in his official capacity as Secretary of Justice of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Municipality of San Juan; Jorge Santini, in his official capacity as the Mayor of the Municipality of San Juan; Autoridad De Energia Electrica; and Autoridad De Carreteras; Administracion, 2009 WL 6809418, *6809418+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Aug 31, 2009) **Brief for Ap-**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

pellees Puerto Rico Land Administration Puerto Rico Highway and Transportation Authority Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority (NO. 09-1911) ★★

2347 FIDEICOMISO DE LA TIERRA DEL CANO MARTIN PENA, Plaintiff, Appellant, v. Luis G. FORTUNO in his official capacity as Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Antonio M. Sagardia-De Jesus, in his official capacity as Secretary of Justice of Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Municipality of San Juan; Jorge Santini in his official capacity as the Mayor of Municipality of San Juan; Autoridad de Energia Electrica; and Autoridad de Carreteras; Administracion, 2009 WL 6809416, *6809416+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Jul 08, 2009) **Brief of Appellant/Petitioner for Mandamus Fideicomiso de la Tierra Del Ca%25no Martin Pe%25na** (NO. 09-1911) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2348 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. James TAMBONE, and Robert Hussey, Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 7273028, *7273028 (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Apr 24, 2009) **Brief of Amici Curiae New England Legal Foundation and Associated Industries of Massachusetts in Support of Appellees' Petitions for Rehearing En Banc** (NO. 07-1384) ★

2349 FRANKLIN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. Brenda M. HARVEY, in Her Official Capacity as the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Defendant/Appellee., 2009 WL 6809250, *6809250+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Mar 11, 2009) **Brief of Defendant/Appellee Brenda M. Harvey** (NO. 08-2550) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2350 PHARMACEUTICAL CARE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff- Appellant, v. G. Steven ROWE, in His Official Capacity as Attorney General of the State of Maine, Defendant-Appellee., 2005 WL 6250776, *6250776+ (Appellate Brief) (1st Cir. Jul 14, 2005) **Reply Brief of Plaintiff - Appellant Pharmaceutical Care Management Association** (NO. 05-1606) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2351 James D. HARMON, Jr., Jeanne Harmon, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Marvin MARKUS, Individually and in his official capacity as Member and Chair of the New York City Rent Guidelines Board, City of New York, Deborah Van Amerongen, Individually and in her official capacity as Commissioner, Division of Housing & Community Renewal, State of New York, Defendants-Appellees., 2011 WL 494370, *494370+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Feb 03, 2011) **Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. 10-1126-CV) ★★★★

2352 James D. HARMON, Jr., Jeanne Harmon, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Marvin MARKUS, Individually and in his official capacity as Member and Chair of the New York City Rent Guidelines Board, City of New York, Deborah Van Amerongen, Individually and in her official capacity as Commissioner, Division of Housing & Community Renewal, State of New York, Defendants-Appellees., 2011 WL 199375, *199375+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jan 13, 2011) **Reply Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. 10-1126-CV) ★★★

2353 James D. HARMON, Jr., Jeanne Harmon, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Marvin MARKUS, individually and in his official capacity as Member and Chair of the New York City Rent Guidelines Board, City of New York, Deborah Van Amerongen, Individually and in her official capacity as Commissioner, Division of Housing & Community Renewal, State of New York, Defendants-Appellees., 2010 WL 5265036, *5265036+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Dec 16, 2010) **Brief for Appellee Deborah Van Amerongen** (NO. 10-1126-CV) ★★★

2354 OLD ST. GEORGE'S, LLC, ATK Consulting Inc. and Thomas DeChiaro, Plaintiffs-Appellants,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

v. Nicholas BIANCO, individually, Louis Campisi, individually, Linda Cooper, individually, Bruce Barber, individually, John Tegeder, individually, William D. Gregory, individually, Town of Yorktown, George Oros, individually and County of Westchester, Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 7044815, *7044815+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Oct 26, 2009) **Brief for Defendants-Appellees George Oros and County of Westchester** (NO. 09-2017-CV) ★★

2355 Kenyon B. FITZGERALD Jr., Peter Scoville Wells, Sidney Siller, Disabled American Veterans Department of New York, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Wade F.B. THOMPSON, Elihu Rose, Arie L. Kopelman, Stephen Lash, Edward Klein, Rebecca Robertson, Kirsten Reoch, Charles Gargano, William Sherman, Carol Berens, John Doe, Mary Roe, Seventh Regiment Armory Conservancy, Inc., Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 6771588, *6771588+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jul 21, 2009) **Reply Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants Kenyon B. Fitzgerald Jr., Peter Scoville Wells, Sidney Siller and Disabled American Veterans Department of New York** (NO. 09-0354-CV) ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2356 Kenyon B. FITZGERALD Jr., Peter Scoville Wells, Sidney Siller, Disabled American Veterans Department of New York, Inc., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Wade F.B. THOMPSON, Elihu Rose, Arie L. Kopelman, Stephen Lash, Edward Klein, Rebecca Robertson, Kirsten Reoch, Charles Gargano, William Sherman, Carol Berens, John Doe, Mary Roe, Seventh Regiment Armory Conservancy, Inc., Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 6771587, *6771587+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jul 10, 2009) **Brief for State Defendants-Appellees** (NO. 09-0354-CV) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2357 Kenyon B. FITZGERALD Jr., Peter Scoville Wells, Sidney Siller, Disabled American Veterans Department of New York, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Wade F.B. THOMPSON, Elihu Rose, Arie L. Kopelman, Stephen Lash, Edward Klein, Rebecca Robertson, Kirsten Reoch, Charles Gargano, William Sherman, Carol Berens, John Doe, Mary Roe, Seventh Regiment Armory Conservancy, Inc., Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 6771589, *6771589+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jul 07, 2009) **Brief for Defendants-Appellees Wade F.B. Thompson, Elihu Rose, Arie L. Kopelman, Stephen Lash, Edward Klein, Rebecca Robertson, Kirsten Reoch, and Seventh Regiment Armory Conservancy, Inc.** (NO. 09-0354-CV) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2358 Kenyon B. FITZGERALD Jr., Peter Scoville Wells, Sidney Siller, Disabled American Veterans Department of New York, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Wade F.B. THOMPSON, Elihu Rose, Arie L. Kopelman, Stephen Lash, Edward Klein, Rebecca Robertson, Kirsten Reoch, Charles Gargano, William Sherman, Carol Berens, John Doe, Mary Roe, Seventh Regiment Armory Conservancy, Inc., Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 6771586, *6771586+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Apr 16, 2009) **Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants Kenyon B. Fitzgerald Jr., Peter Scoville Wells, Sidney Siller and Disabled American Veterans Department of New York** (NO. 09-0354-CV) " ★★ ★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2359 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Jerry Campbell, as the putative administrator of the estate of Oliver St. Clair Stewart and in his individual capacity, Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill, Inc., doing business as Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez, Huda Mufleh-Odeh, Jan Akhtar, David Sheets, Joseph Pastore, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., Aaron Piller and, 2007 WL 6158384, *6158384+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Sep 20, 2007) **Reply Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. 07-2537-CV) " ★★★★

2360 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Jerry Campbell, as the putative administrator of the estate of Oliver St.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Clair Steward and in his individual capacity, Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill, Inc., d/b/a Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez, Huda Mufleh-Odeh, Jan Akhtar, David Sheets, Joseph Pastore, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., Aaron Puller and Rockwell Property, 2007 WL 6158381, *6158381+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Aug 31, 2007) **Brief for Forest City Ratner Appellees** (NO. 07-2537-CV) " ★★★★

2361 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Jerry Campbell, as the putative administrator of the estate of Oliver St. Clair Stewart and in his individual capacity, the Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill, Inc., d/b/a Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Huda Mufleh-Odeh, Jan Akhtar, David Sheets, Joseph Pastore, Peter Williams, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., Henry Weinstein, 535 Carleton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton, 2007 WL 6158383, *6158383+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Aug 31, 2007) **Municipal Appellees' Brief** (NO. 07-2537, CV) " ★★★★

2362 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Jerry Campbell, as the Putative Administrator of the Estate of Oliver St. Clair Stewart and in his Individual Capacity, Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill, Inc., doing business as Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez, Huda Mufleh-Odeh, Jan Akhtar, David Sheets, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., Aaron Piller and Rockwell Property, 2007 WL 6158385, *6158385+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Aug 31, 2007) **Brief for the ES-DC Defendants-Appellees** (NO. 07-2537-CV) " ★★★★

2363 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Jerry Campbell, as the putative administrator of the estate of Oliver St. Clair Stewart and in his individual capacity, Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill, Inc., doing business as Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez, Huda Mufleh-Odeh, Jan Akhtar, David Sheets, Joseph Pastore, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., Aaron Piller and, 2007 WL 6158382, *6158382+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jul 31, 2007) **Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. 07-2537-CV) " ★★★★

2364 NEXTG NETWORKS OF NY, INC., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. CITY OF NEW YORK, City of New York Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications and Paul J. Cosgrave, in His Official Capacity, Defendants-Appellees., 2007 WL 5444620, *5444620+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jun 12, 2007) **Reply Brief for Plaintiff-Appellant** (NO. 06-5696-CV) ★★

2365 NEXTG NETWORKS OF NY, INC., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. CITY OF NEW YORK, City of New York Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications and Paul J.cosgrave, in His Official Capacity, Defendant-Appellees., 2007 WL 5444621, *5444621 (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. May 29, 2007) **Brief for Defendants-Appellees** (NO. 06-5696-CV) ★★

2366 CITY OF NEW YORK, Plaintiff-Appellee, Rudolph W. GUILIANI, Mayor of the City of New York, Peter F. Vallone, Speaker of the New York City Council, New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. BERETTA U.S.A CORP., Browning Arms Co., Colt's MFG. Co. Inc., Forjas Tauraus, S.A., Glock Inc., Phoenix Arms, Sigarms, Inc., Smith & Wesson Corp., Sturm, Ruger and Co., Inc., Taurus International Manufacturing, Inc., SIG Arms Sauer, 2006 WL 5487818, *5487818+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Sep 06, 2006) **Brief for Intervenor United States of America** (NO. 05-6673-CV(CON), 05-6711-CV(XAP), 05-6942-CV(L), 05-6964-CV(XAP)) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2367 Timothy D. WALKER, Plaintiffs-Appellants, Joseph Fischetti, Edward Grenier, Mark Johnston, John F. Moffo, Nathaniel Shulde, James W. Burns, Mark Gostyla, Russell Paltauf, Fernando Ramirex, Dale Salmon, Alexander Cruz, Ivan Hernandez, David Krasnowski, Richard T. Paltauf, Robert Stokes, Gerald Zarella, Consolidated-Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. CITY OF WATERBURY, Defendant-Cross-Claimant-Appellee, WATERBURY FINANCIAL PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE BOARD,, 2006 WL 5582283, *5582283+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Sep 06, 2006) **Brief of City of Waterbury Defendant-Cross-Claimant-Appellee** (NO. 06-2011) ★★

2368 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee, v. Aref ELFGEEH and Bad Elfgeeh, Defendants-Appellants., 2006 WL 5839007, *5839007 (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jul 20, 2006) **Brief on Behalf of Defendant-Appellant Aref Elfgeeh** (NO. 06-0638-CR(L), 06-07744-CR(CON)) ★★

2369 FAITH TEMPLE CHURCH, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. TOWN OF BRIGHTON, Sandra L. Frankel, in her official capacity as Brighton Town Supervisor, Thomas Low, in his official capacity as Brighton Commissioner of Public Works, Ramsey Boehner, in his official capacity as Brighton Town Planner, and James R. Vogel, Raymond Tierney III, Vigdor Feldman and Sherry Kraus, in their official capacity as Brighton Town Board Members, Defendants-Appellees., 2006 WL 4846934, *4846934+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Jul 06, 2006) **Brief on Behalf of Defendants-Appellees** (NO. 06-0354-CV) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2370 FAITH TEMPLE CHURCH, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. TOWN OF BRIGHTON, Sandra L. Frankel, in her official capacity as Brighton Town Supervisor, Thomas Low, in his official capacity as Brighton Commissioner of Public Works, Ramsey Boehner, in his official capacity as Brighton Town Planner, and James R. Vogel, Raymond Tierney III, Jill Vigdor Feldman and Sherry Kraus, in their official capacity as Brighton Town Board Members, Defendants-Appellees., 2006 WL 4846939, *4846939+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. May 23, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty in Support of Plaintiff-Appellant and Reversal** (NO. 06-0354-CV) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2371 FAITH TEMPLE CHURCH, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. TOWN OF BRIGHTON, Sandra L. Frankel, in her official capacity as Brighton Town Supervisor, Thomas Low, in his official capacity as Brighton Commissioner of Public Works, Ramsey Boehner, in his official capacity as Brighton Town Planner, and James R. Vogel, Raymond Tierney III, Jill Vigdor Feldman and Sherry Kraus, in their official capacity as Brighton Town Board Members, Defendants-Appellees., 2006 WL 4846940, *4846940+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. May 16, 2006) **Brief on Behalf of Plaintiff-Appellant with Addendum** (NO. 06-0354-CV) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2372 Buffalo Teachers FEDERATION, Buffalo Educational Support Team-NEA/NY, Transportation Aides of Buffalo, NEA/NY, Substitutes United/Buffalo-NEA-NY, Buffalo Council of Supervisors and Administrators, AFSCME Local 264, Professional, Clerical and Technical Employees' Association and Local 409 International Union of Operating Engineers, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Richard TOBE, Thomas E. Baker, Alair Townsend, H. Carl McCall, John J. Faso, Joel A. Giambra, Anthony, 2005 WL 5622149, *5622149+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Dec 27, 2005) **Brief for Defendants-Appellees** (NO. 05-4744) ★★

2373 TIORONDA, L.L.C., Plaintiff-Appellee, v. State of New York, George E. Pataki, in his official capacity as Governor of the State of New York, Thomas J. Madison, Jr., in his official capacity as the Acting Commissioner of the Department of Transportation of the State of New York, Defendants-Appellants., 2005 WL 5061642, *5061642+ (Appellate Brief) (2nd Cir. Oct 21, 2005) **Brief for Appellants** (NO. 05-3646) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2374 R & J HOLDING COMPANY, RJ Florig Industrial Company, Inc., Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, Donald W. Pulver, Greater Conshohocken Improvement Corp., TBFA Partners, L.P., Defendants/Appellees., 2010 WL 5852218, *5852218+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Nov 30, 2010) **Reply Brief for Appellants R & J Holding Company and RJ Florig Industrial Company, Inc.** (NO. 10-1047) ★ ★

2375 Jane DOE and John Doe, individually and as parents and next friend of Jamie Doe, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. INDIAN RIVER SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al., Defendants- Appellees., 2010 WL 4062359, *4062359+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Sep 09, 2010) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Foundation for Moral Law, on Behalf of Appellees** (NO. 10-1819) " ★★

2376 R & J HOLDING COMPANY, RJ Florig Industrial Company, Inc., Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, Donald W. Pulver, Greater Conshohocken Improvement Corp., TBFA Partners, L.P., Defendants/Appellees., 2010 WL 4060233, *4060233+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Aug 31, 2010) **Reply Brief for Appellants R & J Holding Company and Rj Florig Industrial Company, Inc.** (NO. 10-1047) ★ ★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2377 R&J HOLDING COMPANY, RJ Florig Industrial Company, Inc., Appellants, v. THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, Donald W. Pulver, Greater Conshohocken Improvement Corp., and TBFA Partners, L.P., Appellees., 2010 WL 4060229, *4060229+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jul 28, 2010) **Brief of Appellees, Donald W. Pulver and Greater Conshohocken Improvement Corporation** (NO. 10-1047) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2378 R & J HOLDING COMPANY and RJ Florig Industrial Company, Inc., Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, Donald W. Pulver, Greater Conshohocken Improvement Corporation and TBFA Partners, L.P., Defendants/Appellees., 2010 WL 4060232, *4060232+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jul 28, 2010) **Brief for Defendant-Appellee the Redevelopment Authority of the County of Montgomery** (NO. 10-1047) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2379 Thomas R. WHITTAKER; Christy L. Whittaker; and Edna J. Hamilton, as Executrix of the Estate of David C. Hamilton, Appellants, v. COUNTY OF LAWRENCE; Township of Neshannock; Lawrence County Economic Development Corporation; Redevelopment Authority of Lawrence County; Steve J. Craig; Daniel J. Vogler; Frank Telesz; James Gagliano, Jr.; Dennis F. Alduk; Joseph Caminiti; Ryan Kegel; Jon Natale; Gale E. Measel, Jr.; Robert Del Signore, Sr.; and Linda Nitch, Appellees., 2010 WL 3048304, *3048304+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jul 12, 2010) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. 10-1138) ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2380 Thomas R. WHITTAKER; Christy L. Whittaker; Edna J. Hamilton, as Executrix of the Estate of David C. Hamilton, Appellants, v. COUNTY OF LAWRENCE; Township of Neshannock; Lawrence County Economic Development Corporation; Redevelopment Authority of Lawrence County; Steve J. Craig; Daniel J. Vogler; Franz Telesz; James Gagliano, Jr.; Dennis F. Alduk; Joseph Caminiti; Ryan Kegel; Jon Natale; Gale E. Measel, Jr.; Robert Del Signore, Sr.; Linda Nitch, Appellees., 2010 WL 3048302, *3048302+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jun 25, 2010) **Joint Brief of All Appellees** (NO. 10-1138) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2381 Thomas R. WHITTAKER; Christy L. Whittaker; and Edna J. Hamilton, as Executrix of the Es-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

tate of David C. Hamilton, Appellants, v. COUNTY OF LAWRENCE; Township of Neshannock; Lawrence County Economic Development Corporation; Redevelopment Authority of Lawrence County; Steve J. Craig; Daniel J. Vogler; Frank Telesz; James Gagliano, Jr.; Dennis F. Alduk; Joseph Caminiti; Ryan Kegel; Jon Natale; Gale E. Measel, Jr.; Robert Del Signore, Sr.; and Linda Nitch, Appellees., 2010 WL 3048303, *3048303+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. May 24, 2010) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 10-1138) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2382 RLR INVESTMENTS, LLC, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. TOWN OF KEARNY, Alberto G. Santos, Mayor, Council of the Town of Kearny, Planning Board of the Town of Kearny, Kearny-Harrison, LLC, Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 6870696, *6870696+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Dec 16, 2009) **Brief of Appellant RLR Investments LLC and Volume I of Appendix (Pages 1a - 20a)** (NO. 09-3100) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2383 Gayle REEDY, Beth Burns, Katherine Sorg, Elena R. Flynn Maurice and Kathy Cornelis, Barbara N. Furman, Richard James, Sandra Mccausland, Elola Sokoloff, Marcia Shapiro and Raymond L. Villano, Plaintiff-Appellants, v. BOROUGH OF COLLINGSWOOD, Defendant-Appellee., 2006 WL 5411252, *5411252+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Feb 08, 2006) **Brief and Appendix (Volume 1 of II) of Appellants** (NO. 05-3490) ★★

2384 GALLENTHIN REALTY DEVELOPMENT, INC.; George A. Gallenthin, III, Ltc, Husband; Cynthia L. Gallenthin, Wife, Appellants, v. BP PRODUCTS OF NORTH AMERICA, INC. d/b/a Bp Oil Company; Essex Chemical Corporation; Dow Chemical Company; Commerce Bank/ harrsiburg National Association d/b/a Commerce Bank, N/a; Triad Advisory Services, Inc. d/b/a Triad Associates, Inc.; Urs Corporation; Parker Mccay & Criscuolo, P.A.; Gloucester County Improvement Authority; Borough of, 2005 WL 6083810, *6083810+ (Appellate Brief) (3rd Cir. Jul 15, 2005) **Joint Brief of Appellees Commerce Bank, BP Products of North America, Essex Chemical Corp., Dow Chemical Co.; Urs Corp., and Borough of Paulsboro** (NO. 05-1822) ★ ★

2385 Janet JOYNER and Constance Lynn Blackmon, Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. FORSYTH COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA, Defendant-Appellant., 2010 WL 2661815, *2661815+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. May 26, 2010) **Amicus Brief of the Foundation for Moral Law, Supporting Reversal** (NO. 10-1232) " ★★

2386 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee, v. Cory CHAFIN, Appellant., 2009 WL 1867928, *1867928+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Jun 29, 2009) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 09-4098) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2387 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee, v. William Samuel CHESTER, Jr., Appellant., 2009 WL 890132, *890132+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Apr 02, 2009) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 09-4084) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2388 PARK RITCHIE, LLC, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND, et al., Defendants - Appellees., 2008 WL 3460066, *3460066+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Jul 24, 2008) **Brief of Appellees** (NO. 08-1224) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2389 Robert D. ADAMS, Jr.; Aileen S. Adams, Plaintiffs - Appellants, v. VILLAGE OF WESLEY CHAPEL, North Carolina Municipal Corporation; Albert W. Black, Individually, Defendants - Appellees., 2007 WL 1132821, *1132821+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Apr 05, 2007) **Amicus Curiae Brief of the North Carolina Property Rights Coalition and the John Locke Foundation in Support of Appellants and in Support of Reversal of District Court** (NO. 06-2115) ★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

★

2390 ALI SALEH KAHLAH AL-MARRI and Mark A. Berman, as next friend, Petitioners-Appellants, v. S.L. WRIGHT, U.S.N. COMMANDER, Naval Consolidated Brig., Respondent-Appellee., 2006 WL 4003614, *4003614+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Dec 21, 2006) **Brief of Amici Curiae Professors of Constitutional Law and Federal Jurisdiction Advocating Denial of Motion to Dismiss (Reversal)** (NO. 06-7427) " ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2391 Marguerite Evans WILLNER, and Michael A. Willner, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. John T. FREY, in his official capacity as Clerk of the Fairfax County Circuit Court Defendant-Appellee., 2006 WL 1911703, *1911703+ (Appellate Brief) (4th Cir. Jun 27, 2006) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 06-1432) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2392 James LINDQUIST and Sandra Lindquist, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. THE CITY OF PASADENA, TEXAS, Defendant-Appellee., 2009 WL 6391038, *6391038+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Dec 30, 2009) **Proposed¨ Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Plaintiffs-Appellants and Reversal** (NO. 09-20683) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2393 Fletcher FLY, Appellant, v. YALOBUSHA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, Appellee. La Wrence Litten, Plaintiff, v. Grenada County, Mississippi, et al, Defendant., 2009 WL 6328343, *6328343+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Nov 13, 2009) **Reply Brief of Appellants Fletcher Fly and Lawrence Litten** (NO. 09-60463, 09-60502) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2394 Fletcher FLY, Appellant, v. YALOBUSHA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, Appellee. Lawrence Litten, Plaintiff, v. Grenada County, Mississippi, et al, Defendant., 2009 WL 6670119, *6670119 (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Nov 12, 2009) **Reply Brief of Appellants Fletcher Fly and Lawrence Litten** (NO. 09-60463, 09-60502) ★★

2395 Fletcher FLY, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. YALOBUSHA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, Defendant-Appellee., 2009 WL 6328342, *6328342+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Oct 19, 2009) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 09-60502) " ★★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2396 Fletcher FLY, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. YALOBUSHA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, Defendant-Appellee., 2008 WL 7987540, *7987540+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Oct 15, 2008) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 09-60463, 09-60502) " ★★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2397 Yolanda ANDERSON, Gilda Burbank, Allen Harris, Donna Johnigan, Odessia Lewis, Emelda May, Sylvia Moten, Hilda Johnson, Cynthia Bell, Judith Watson, Gloria Williams, Mary Ann Wright, Catrice Doucet, and Linda DeGruy, in their own right and as representatives of all similarly situated displaced New Orleans, Louisiana public housing residents, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Alphonso JACKSON, Secretary of the United States Department of Housing and Urban, 2008 WL 6082645, *6082645+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Feb 28, 2008) **Appellants' Brief in Support of Appeal of Denial of Preliminary Injunction Under 28 U.S.C. 1292(a)** (NO. 07-31138) " ★★

2398 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff condemnor- appellee, v. 4.27 ACRES OF LAND JACK HEMMENWAY and Brad Hemmenway, Landowner claimants- appellants., 2007 WL 5356942, *5356942+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Sep 24, 2007) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 07-40563) ★★

2399 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff condemnor-Appellee, v. 1.44 Acres of Land William Bradley BURRELL, Defendant landowner - appellant., 2007 WL 5129143, *5129143+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Sep 18, 2007) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 07-40, 562) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2400 ALDEN, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. NEW ORLEANS RED. AUTH., Defendant-Appellee., 2007 WL 5110747, *5110747+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Jun 13, 2007) **Brief of Appellant Wesley Alden** (NO. 07-30240) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2401 John DOE, Individually and as next friend of his minor children James Doe and Jack Doe, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. TANGIPAHOA PARISH SCHOOL BOARD, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2007 WL 2735331, *2735331+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Mar 21, 2007) **En Banc Amicus Curiae Brief of Foundation for Moral Law, on Behalf of Defendants-Appellants, in Support of Reversal** (NO. 05-30294) " ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2402 Shamille PETERS; Barbara Peacock; Kayode Howell, Plaintiffs - Appellants, v. Bob ODOM; Van Cox; Walter Imahara; Randy Harris; Harold Tani; Roger Mayes; Stephen Hoover; Matthew Keppinger; Paul Coreil; Emily Stich; Rob Barry, III; Donald Kelly; Thomas Spedale; Richard Heroman, Defendants - appellees., 2005 WL 6111808, *6111808+ (Appellate Brief) (5th Cir. Jul 01, 2005) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 05-30450) " ★★

2403 Joyce KUBICKI and Joyce Kubicki, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. APPROXIMATELY 3.38 ACRES OF LAND and Approximately 3.38 Acres of Land, Located Near County of Oakland, State of Michigan, Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 4610579, *4610579 (Appellate Brief) (6th Cir. Nov 25, 2009) **Kubicki's Brief** (NO. 09-2378) ★★

2404 Bradley W. CROSBY, et al., Plaintiffs- Appellants, v. PICKAWAY COUNTY GENERAL HEALTH DISTRICT; Pickaway County; Glenn Reeser; John Stevenson; Ula Jean Metzler, Defendants - Appellees., 2007 WL 4266646, *4266646+ (Appellate Brief) (6th Cir. Jul 11, 2007) **Final Brief of the Appellees** (NO. 06-3869) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2405 RIVER CITY CAPITAL, L.P., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, Clermont County, Ohio, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2006 WL 3846229, *3846229+ (Appellate Brief) (6th Cir. Aug 01, 2006) **Final Brief of Plaintiff-Appellant River City Capital, L.P.** (NO. 05-4331) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2406 RIVER CITY CAPITAL, L.P., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, Clermont County, Ohio, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2006 WL 3846231, *3846231+ (Appellate Brief) (6th Cir. Aug 01, 2006) **Final Reply Brief of Plaintiff-Appellant River City Capital, L.P.** (NO. 05-4331) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2407 LIVING WATER CHURCH OF GOD, d/b/a Okemos Christian Center, a Michigan Ecclesiastical Non-Profit Corporation, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. MERIDIAN CHARTER TOWNSHIP, Susan McGillicuddy, Mary Helmbrecht, Bruce D. Hunting, Julie Brixie, Steve Stier, Andrew J. Such, Anne W. Woiwode, in their official Capacities as members of the Meridian Township Board, Defendants-Appellants., 2006 WL 3014325, *3014325+ (Appellate Brief) (6th Cir. Apr 21, 2006) **Reply Brief on Appeal Certificate of Compliance Certificate of Service** (NO. 05-2309) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2408 Barack OBAMA, et al., Defendants - Appellants, v. FREEDOM FROM RELIGION FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED, et al., Plaintiffs - Appellees., 2010 WL 5584800, *5584800+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. Jul 08, 2010) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Foundation for Moral Law, on Behalf of Defendants-Appellants, in Support of Reversal** (NO. 10-1973) ★★

2409 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Steven M. SKOIEN, Defendant-Appellant., 2010 WL 2665132, *2665132+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. May 03, 2010) **Brief for Amici Curiae Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence, National Black Police Association, Hispanic**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

American Police Command Officers Association, National Latino Peace Officers Association, and ... (NO. 08-3770) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2410 CITY OF JOLIET, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, Defendant-Appellant, NEW WEST AND NEW BLUFF, Illinois Limited Partnerships, Defendants-Appellants, EVERGREEN TERRACE TENANTS, Intervening Defendant-Appellant., 2008 WL 5786335, *5786335+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. Sep 23, 2008) **Brief for the Federal Appellant** (NO. 08-3032, 08-3033) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2411 CITY OF JOLIET, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, Defendant-Appellant, New West and New Bluff, Illinois Limited Partnerships, Defendants-Appellants, Evergreen Terrace Tenants, Intervening Defendant-Appellant., 2008 WL 5583608, *5583608+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. Sep 22, 2008) **Brief for the Federal Appellant** (NO. 08-3032, 08-3033) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2412 RIVER OF LIFE KINGDOM MINISTRIES, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. VILLAGE OF HAZEL CREST, ILLINOIS, Defendant-Appellee., 2008 WL 5786341, *5786341+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. Sep 22, 2008) **Brief and Appendix of Defendant-Appellee Village of Hazel Crest, Illinois** (NO. 08-2819) ★★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2413 Anthony HINRICHS, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Brian BOSMA, in his official capacity as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly, Defendant-Appellant., 2006 WL 4820681, *4820681+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. May 15, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Foundation for Moral Law, on Behalf of Defendant-Appellant, in Support of Reversal** (NO. 05-4604, 05-4781) " ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2414 ST. JOHN'S UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, an Illinois not-for-profit corporation; Helen Runge; Shirley Steele, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. CITY OF CHICAGO, an Illinois Municipal Corporation; Federal Aviation Administration; Marion Blakey, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Defendants-Appellees., 2005 WL 3749818, *3749818+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. Dec 28, 2005) **Brief of Defendant-Appellee City of Chicago** (NO. 05-4418, 05-4450, 05-4451) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2415 TOLEDO, Peoria & Western Railway Corporation, Petitioner, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and the Surface Transportation Board, Respondents, Keokuk Junction Railway Company, Intervenor- Respondent., 2005 WL 3736446, *3736446+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. Nov 07, 2005) **Reply Brief of Petitioner - Toledo, Peoria & Western Railway Corporation** (NO. 05-1920) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2416 Eugene WINKLER, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Donald H. RUMSFELD, Defendant-Appellant., 2005 WL 3738637, *3738637+ (Appellate Brief) (7th Cir. Nov 07, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Foundation for Moral Law, Inc., on Behalf of Defendant-Appellant, in Support of Reversal** (NO. 05-3451) " ★★

2417 IOWA ASSURANCE CORPORATION, Ron's Automotive, L.C., Ronald L. Inman, III, Vinton Philip Watson, and Judith Watson, Appellants, v. CITY OF INDIANOLA, IOWA, Randy Gathers, Bob Kreamer, Shirley Clark, Pete Berry, Steve Richardson, and Mark Vickroy, in their Official Capacities, Appellees., 2011 WL 511425, *511425+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. Feb 03, 2011) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 10-3815) ★★

2418 NEIGHBORHOOD ENTERPRISES, INC., Sanctuary in the Ordinary, and Jim Roos, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. CITY OF ST. LOUIS and St. Louis Board of Adjustment, Defendants/Appellees.,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2010 WL 2501094, *2501094+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. Jun 10, 2010) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 10-1937) " ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2419 NEIGHBORHOOD ENTERPRISES, INC., Sanctuary in the Ordinary, and Jim Roos, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. CITY OF ST. LOUIS and St. Louis Board of Adjustment, Defendants/Appellees., 2010 WL 5808701, *5808701+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. Mar 29, 2010) **Appellants' Brief (Corrected)** (NO. 10-1937) ★★

2420 Michael DAHLEN, et al, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. Shelter HOUSE, et al, Defendants/Appellees., 2009 WL 1699599, *1699599+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. Jun 05, 2009) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 09-1909) ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2421 Michael DAHLEN, et al, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. SHELTER HOUSE, et al, Defendants/Appellees., 2009 WL 1849549, *1849549+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. Jun 05, 2009) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 09-1909) ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2422 Michael DAHLEN, et al, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. SHELTER HOUSE, et al, Defendants/Appellees., 2009 WL 1572890, *1572890+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. May 26, 2009) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 09-1909) ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2423 Michael DAHLEN, et al, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. SHELTER HOUSE, et al, Defendants/Appellees., 2009 WL 1849550, *1849550+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. May 26, 2009) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 09-1909) ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2424 MARTIN MARIETTA MATERIALS, INC., Plaintiff-Appellee/Cross-Appellant, HUNT MARTIN MATERIALS, LLC, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. CITY OF GREENWOOD, Missouri, Defendant-Appellant/Cross-Appellee., 2009 WL 1044119, *1044119+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. Apr 01, 2009) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 08-3983, 09-1029) ★★

2425 Andrew SASSER, Appellant, v. Larry NORRIS, Director, Arkansas Department of Correction, Appellee., 2008 WL 660805, *660805 (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. Feb 27, 2008) **Brief for Appellee** (NO. 07-2385) ★★

2426 AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. PRISON FELLOWSHIP MINISTRIES, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2006 WL 6259222, *6259222+ (Appellate Brief) (8th Cir. Sep 25, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Foundation for Moral Law on Behalf of Defendants-Appellants, in Support of Reversal** (NO. 06-2741) " ★★

2427 Kristin M. PERRY, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Arnold SCHWARZENEGGER, et al., Defendants, Proposition 8 Official Proponents Dennis Hollingsworth, et al., Defendants-Intervenors-Appellants., 2010 WL 4622576, *4622576+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Oct 25, 2010) **Brief of Amici Curiae ACLU Foundation of Northern California, Gay and Lesbian Advocates and Defenders, Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc., and National Center for Lesbian Rights** (NO. 10-16696) ★★

2428 Tracy COLLINS, Keith B. Humphrey, Joseph R. Diaz, Judith McDaniel, Beverly Seckinger, Stephen Russell, Deanna Pfleger, Corey Seemiller, Carrie Sperling and Leslie Kemp, Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Janice K. BREWER, in her official capacity as Governor of the State of Arizona; David Raber, in his official capacity as Interim Director of the Arizona Department of Administration and Personnel Board; Kathy Peckardt, in her official capacity as Director of Human, 2010 WL 5813343, *5813343+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Oct 12, 2010) **Plaintiffs-Appellees' Response Brief** (NO. 10-16797) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2429 COLONY COVE PROPERTIES, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. CITY OF CARSON, a municipal corporation; City of Carson Mobilehome Park Rental Review Board, a public administrative body, Defendants-Appellees., 2010 WL 5779701, *5779701+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Aug 23, 2010) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 09-57039) ★★

2430 COLONY COVE PROPERTIES, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. CITY OF CARSON, a municipal corporation; City of Carson Mobilehome Park Rental Review Board, a public administrative body, Defendants-Appellees., 2010 WL 5779700, *5779700+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jul 21, 2010) **Appellees' Answering Brief** (NO. 09-57039) ★★★

2431 COLONY COVE PROPERTIES, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. CITY OF CARSON, a municipal corporation; City of Carson Mobil Ehome Park Rental Review Board, a public administrative body, Defendants-Appellees., 2010 WL 5779699, *5779699+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jun 21, 2010) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 09-57039) ★★★

2432 PEST COMMITTEE, Tony Badillo, Jack Lipsman, AL Maurice, Kenny Blackman, We the People Nevada and Citizens in Charge, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Ross MILLER, in his official capacity as Secretary of State for the State of Nevada, Defendant-Appellee., 2010 WL 5078898, *5078898+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 24, 2010) **Reply Brief of Appellants** (NO. 09-17002) ★★

2433 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership; and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs-Appellees Cross-Appellants, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, Defendant-Appellant Cross-Appellee, Contempo Marin Homeowners Association, Defendant-Intervenor - Appellant Cross-Appellee., 2010 WL 5080096, *5080096+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 09, 2010) **Brief of Amici Curiae League of California Cities and California State Association of Counties in Support of Appellants City of San Rafael and Contempo Marin Homeowners Association** (NO. 09-16447, 09-16451, 09-16612, 09-16613) ★★★★

2434 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership; and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs-Appellees Cross Appellants, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, Defendant - Appellant Cross-Appellee, Contempo Marin Homeowners Association, Defendant-Intervenor - Appellant Cross-Appellee., 2010 WL 5780569, *5780569+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 09, 2010) **Motion for Leave to File Brief of Amici Curiae League of California Cities and California State Association of Counties in Support of Appellants City of San Rafael and Contempo Marin Homeowners ...** (NO. 09-16447, 09-16451, 09-16612, 09-16613) ★★★★

2435 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership; and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs-Appellees Cross Appellants, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, Defendant - Appellant Cross-Appellee, Contempo Marin Homeowners Association, Defendant-Intervenor - Appellant Cross-Appellee., 2010 WL 5780571, *5780571+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 09, 2010) **Motion for Leave to File Brief of Amici Curiae League of California Cities and California State Association of Counties in Support of Appellants City of San Rafael and Contempo Marin Homeowners ...** (NO. 09-16447, 09-16451, 09-16612, 09-16613) ★★★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2436 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership; and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs-Appellees Cross Appellants, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, Defendant-Appellant Cross-Appellee, Contempo Marin Homeowners Association, Defendant-Intervenor Appellant Cross-Appellee., 2010 WL 5780573, *5780573+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 09, 2010) **Motion for Leave to File Brief of Amici Curiae League of California Cities and California State Association of Counties in Support of Appellants City of San Rafael and Contempo Marin Homeowners ...** (NO. 09-16447, 09-16451, 09-16612, 09-16613) ★ ★★★

2437 PEST COMMITTEE, Tony Badillo, Jack Lipsman, Al Maurice, Kenny Blackman, We the People Nevada and Citizens in Charge, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Ross MILLER, in his official capacity as Secretary of State for the State of Nevada, Defendant-Appellee., 2009 WL 7217890, *7217890+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Dec 28, 2009) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 09-17002) ★★

2438 Ernestine Ching YOUNG, individually, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU, Defendant-Appellee. Kathleen M. Barr, Trustee under that certain unrecorded Kathleen M. Barr Trust dated September 7, 2006, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. City and County of Honolulu, Defendant-Appellee., 2009 WL 6652283, *6652283+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Dec 24, 2009) **Defendant-Appellee's Answering Brief Statement of Related Cases Certificate of Compliance Certificate of Service** (NO. 09-16034, 09-16495) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2439 MILTON H. GREENE ARCHIVES, INC., et. al., Plaintiffs -- Appellees, v. MARILYN MONROE, LLC, et. al., Defendants -- Appellants., 2009 WL 7366749, *7366749 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Dec 09, 2009) **Third Brief on Cross Appeal and Reply of Defendant / Appellant CMG Worldwide, Inc.** (NO. 08-56471, 08-56472, 08-56552) ★★

2440 MILTON H. GREENE ARCHIVES, INC., et. al., Plaintiffs - Appellees, v. MARILYN MONROE, LLC, et. al., Defendants - Appellants., 2009 WL 7418305, *7418305 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Dec 09, 2009) **Third Brief on Cross Appeal and Reply of Defendant / Appellant CMG Worldwide, Inc.** (NO. 08-56471, 08-56472, 08-56552) ★★

2441 Karl SNOWDON, Suzanne Snowdon, Maverick Snowdon, and Paige Snowdon, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. PREFERRED RV RESORT OWNERS ASSOCIATION, a Nevada Corporation, d/b/a Preferred RV Resort; James S. Horton individually and as manager of the Preferred RV Resort; Thomas Kreft, individually and as an employee of Preferred RV Resort; Candice Durbin, individually and as President of the Board of Directors of Preferred RV Resort; William T. Schaffer, individually and as Treasurer of, 2009 WL 6706900, *6706900+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Nov 12, 2009) **Motion to File Corrected Brief** (NO. 09-15877) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2442 Sari H. HANNER, Appellant/Petitioner, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; U.S. Department of the Army and Madigan Army Medical Center, Appellee/Respondent., 2009 WL 4248759, *4248759 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Sep 02, 2009) **Appellant/Petitioner's Opening Brief** (NO. 09-35686) " ★★

2443 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership; and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs-Appellees Cross-Appellants, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, Defendant - Appellant Cross-Appellee, Contempo Marin Homeowners Association, Defendant-intervenor - Appellant Cross Appellee., 2009 WL 7218573, *7218573+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 02, 2009) **Appellants City of San Rafael's and Contempo Marin Homeowners Association's Opening Brief** (NO. 09-16447, 09-16451, 09-16612, 09-16613) ★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

★★★

2444 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership; and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs-Appellees Cross-Appellants, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, Defendant - Appellant Cross-Appellee, Contempo Marin Homeowners Association, Defendant-intervenor - Appellant Cross Appellee., 2009 WL 7418284, *7418284+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 02, 2009) **Appellants City of San Rafael's and Contempo Marin Homeowners Association's Opening Brief** (NO. 09-16447, 09-16451, 09-16612, 09-16613) ★ ★★★

2445 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership; and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs-Appellees Cross-Appellants, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, Defendant - Appellant Cross-Appellee, Contempo Marin Homeowners Association, Defendant-intervenor - Appellant Cross Appellee., 2009 WL 7418285, *7418285+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 02, 2009) **Appellants City of San Rafael's and Contempo Marin Homeowners Association's Opening Brief** (NO. 09-16447, 09-16451, 09-16612, 09-16613) ★ ★★★

2446 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership; and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs-Appellees Cross-Appellants, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, Defendant - Appellant Cross-Appellee, Contempo Marin Homeowners Association, Defendant-intervenor - Appellant Cross Appellee., 2009 WL 7418286, *7418286+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 02, 2009) **Appellants City of San Rafael's and Contempo Marin Homeowners Association's Opening Brief** (NO. 09-16447, 09-16451, 09-16612, 09-16613) ★ ★★★

2447 SURF AND SAND, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, Petitioners-Appellants, v. CITY OF CAPITOLA, Respondent-Appellee., 2008 WL 5070067, *5070067+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Oct 24, 2008) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 08-16481) " ★★★

2448 LOS ANGELES POLICE PROTECTIVE, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES, et al., Defendants/Respondents., 2008 WL 5053994, *5053994 (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Oct 16, 2008) **Answering Brief on the Merits** (NO. 08-56399) ★★

2449 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Antonio ROMERO-OCHOA, Defendant-Appellant., 2008 WL 6042398, *6042398+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jul 15, 2008) **Opening Brief of Appellant** (NO. 08-30251) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2450 LOS ALTOS EL GRANADA INVESTORS, LP, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. CITY OF CAPITOLA, City of Capitola Mobilehome Rent Review Board, Defendant-Appellee., 2008 WL 2340068, *2340068+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Apr 21, 2008) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 07-16888) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2451 Joseph M. RIMAC, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Randy DUNCAN, Randy Crawford, Fort Dick Fire Protection District, and County of Del Norte, Defendants-Appellees., 2008 WL 656593, *656593+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jan 31, 2008) **Answering Brief of Defendant-Appellee County of Del Norte** (NO. 07-15962) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2452 Lilian S. ILETO; Joshua Stepakoff; Mindy Gale Finkelstein; Benjamin Kadish; and Nathan Lawrence Powers, Plaintiffs - Appellants, v. RSR MANAGEMENT CORPORATION; RSR Group Nevada, Inc.; and Glock, Inc., a Georgia corporation, Defendants - Appellees. Lilian S. Ileto; Joshua Stepakoff; Mindy Gale Finkelstein; Benjamin Kadish; and Nathan Lawrence

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Powers, Plaintiffs - Appellants / Appellees, v. China North Industries Corp., aka Norinco, Defendant - Appellant /, 2007 WL 4266471, *4266471+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Sep 25, 2007) **Opening Brief for Plaintiffs / Appellants-Appellees** (NO. 06-56872, 07-15403, 07-15404) ★★

2453 BESARO MOBILE HOME PARK, LLC, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. THE CITY OF FREMONT, Defendant and Appellee., 2007 WL 2063562, *2063562+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. May 14, 2007) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 06-17201) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2454 TAPPS BREWING INC., a Washington corporation, and Daniel and Andrea McClung, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. CITY OF SUMNER, Washington, Defendant/Respondent., 2007 WL 1899115, *1899115+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. May 11, 2007) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Building Industry Association of Washington and Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Appellants Tapps Brewing, Inc., and Daniel and Andrea McClung** (NO. 07-35231) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2455 Joseph M. RIMAC, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Randy DUNCAN, Randy Crawford, Fort Dick Fire Protection District, and County of Del Norte, Defendants-Appellees., 2007 WL 4991087, *4991087+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. 2007) **Answering Brief of Defendant - Appellee Randy Duncan** (NO. 07-15962) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2456 Sally A. MATSUDA,Trustee of the Sally A. Matsuda Self-Trusteed Trust dated October 15, 1993, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU, a municipal corporation of the State of Hawai'i Defendant-Appellee., 2006 WL 2984469, *2984469+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jun 27, 2006) **Appellee's Answering Brief** (NO. 06-15337) " ★★★ **HN: 4,7 (S.Ct.)**

2457 ROECHILD-2 and Jan Roe, Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. John CAREY Adrienne Carey, Brenden Carey, the Knights of Columbus, et al., Defendant-Intervenor-Appellants, Rio Linda Union School District, Defendant-Appellant, The United States of America, Defendant-Intervenor-Appellant., 2006 WL 6322862, *6322862+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jun 12, 2006) **Amicus Brief** (NO. 2005-17257) " ★★

2458 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. 14.02 ACRES OF LAND MORE OR LESS IN THE COUNTY OF FRESNO, Edna E. Stone, et al., Defendants, Maxine H. Sawyer; Andrew Klemm; Harriet H. Leonard; Mark W. Sawyer; Charles A. Sawyer; Ramon Echeveste; Defendants-Appellants., 2006 WL 2378663, *2378663+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. May 05, 2006) **Opening Brief of Appellants** (NO. 05-17347) " ★★★

2459 ACTION APARTMENT ASSOCIATION, INC., a California corporation; Mathew Millen., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. SANTA MONICA RENT CONTROL BOARD, a municipal entity; Mary Ann Yurkonis, Defendants - Appellees., 2006 WL 2981998, *2981998+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Mar 06, 2006) **Appellants' Reply** (NO. 05-56533) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2460 ACTION APARTMENT ASSOCIATION, INC. and Mathew Millen, Plaintiffs and Appellants, v. SANTA MONICA RENT CONTROL BOARD and Mary Ann Yurkonis, Defendants and Appellees., 2006 WL 2981997, *2981997+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Feb 24, 2006) **Appellees' Brief** (NO. 05-56533) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2461 ACTION APARTMENT ASSOCIATION, INC., a California corporation; Mathew Millen, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. SANTA MONICA RENT CONTROL BOARD, a municipal entity; Mary Ann Yurkonis, Defendants - Appellees., 2006 WL 2361991, *2361991+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Jan 17, 2006) **Appellants' Opening Brief** (NO. 05-56533) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2462 Robert D HAYS, by and through his Guardian ad Litem Terri Thorson, Plaintiff-Appellant. v. David HALLBERG and John Does 1-10, all in their official and individual capacities, and the City of Portland, Defendants-Appellees., 2005 WL 4586396, *4586396+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Oct 24, 2005) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 05-35728) ★★★ **HN: 2,4 (S.Ct.)**

2463 Gary BYLER, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. MARICOPA COUNTY, Maricopa County Planning & Zoning Department, and State of Arizona, Defendants-Appellees., 2005 WL 4121428, *4121428+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Oct 11, 2005) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 05-16663) ★★

2464 John ARMSTRONG, et al., Plaintiffs-Appelles, v. Gray DAVIS, Governor of the State of California, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2000 WL 33980084, *33980084+ (Appellate Brief) (9th Cir. Oct 27, 2000) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. 00-15132) ★★

2465 ROCKY MOUNTAIN CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Plaintiff-Appellee, United States of America, Intervenor Plaintiff-Appellee, v. BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF BOULDER COUNTY, Defendant-Appellant., 2009 WL 2955218, *2955218+ (Appellate Brief) (10th Cir. Aug 31, 2009) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 09-1188) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2466 AMERICAN ATHEISTS, INC., a Texas, non-profit corporation; R. Andrews; S. Clark; and M. Rivers, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Colonel Scott. T. DUNCAN, Supt., Utah Highway Patrol, et al., Defendants-Appellees, Utah Highway Patrol Association, Defendant/Intervenor/Appellee., 2008 WL 4972689, *4972689+ (Appellate Brief) (10th Cir. Oct 24, 2008) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Foundation for Moral Law, on Behalf of Defendants-Appellees, in Support of Affirmance** (NO. 08-4061) " ★★

2467 James W. GREEN, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. HASKELL COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2007 WL 1379323, *1379323+ (Appellate Brief) (10th Cir. Apr 05, 2007) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Foundation for Moral Law, On Behalf of Defendants-Appellees, in Support of Affirmance** (NO. 06-7098) " ★★

2468 CAL FARLEY'S BOYS RANCH and Cal Farley's Boys Ranch Foundation, Appellants, v. CITY OF GUYMON, A municipal Corporation, Appellee., 2006 WL 2688737, *2688737+ (Appellate Brief) (10th Cir. Aug 07, 2006) **Appellants' Brief in Support of Appellate Jurisdiction** (NO. 06-6221) ★★★

2469 ESTATE OF MICHELLE EVETTE MCCALL, by and through co-personal representatives Edward M. McCall, II, Margarita F. McCall, and Jason Walley, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant-Appellee., 2010 WL 2648070, *2648070+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. May 27, 2010) **Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. 09-16375-J) ★★

2470 Eva LOCKE, Patricia Anne Levenson, Barbara Vanderkolk Gardner, National Federation of Independent Business, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Joyce SHORE, John P. Ehrig, Aida Bao-Garciga, Roassana Dolan, Wanda Gozdz, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2010 WL 4057830, *4057830+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Apr 26, 2010) **Brief of the Interior Design Protection Council, Alabama Decorators, Artists, and Designers, Inc., Association of Design Education, Association of Interior Design Professionals, Decorating Den ...** (NO. 10-11052-EE) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2471 Eva LOCKE, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Joyce SHORE, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2010 WL 4057828, *4057828+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Apr 22, 2010) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation and National Kitchen and Bath Association in Support of Plaintiffs-Appellants and for Reversal** (NO. 10-11052) " ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2472 John and Theresa SOPHOCLEUS, Appellants, v. ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, et al., Appellees., 2009 WL 6763649, *6763649+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Jul 23, 2009) **Brief of Appellees** (NO. 09-11809-GG) ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2473 Bobbie Harris, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff-Appellant, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Intervenor-Plaintiff-Appellant, v. MEXICAN SPECIALTY FOODS, INC., d.b.a. La Paz Restaurante & Cantina, Defendant-Appellee, Julie Best Grimes, individually and as representative of all other persons similarly situated, Plaintiff-Appellant, Nimrod W.E. Long, III, et al., Plaintiffs, United States of America, Intervenor-Plaintiff-Appellant, v., 2008 WL 5262950, *5262950+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Nov 21, 2008) **Modified Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Appellees and for Affirmance** (NO. 08-13510-BB, 08-13616-BB) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2474 Bobbie Harris, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff-Appellant, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Intervenor-Plaintiff-Appellant, v. MEXICAN SPECIALTY FOODS, INC., d.b.a. La Paz Restaurante & Cantina, Defendant-Appellee, Julie Best Grimes, individually and as representative of all other persons similarly situated, Plaintiff-Appellant, Nimrod W.E. Long, III, et al., Plaintiffs, United States of America, Intervenor-Plaintiff-Appellant, v., 2008 WL 5262951, *5262951+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Nov 21, 2008) **Modified Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Appellees and for Affirmance** (NO. 08-13510-BB, 08-13616-BB) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2475 MACON COUNTY INVESTMENTS, Inc.; Reach One, Teach One of America, Appellants, v. Sheriff David A. WARREN, Appellee., 2008 WL 5507069, *5507069+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Sep 29, 2008) **Brief of the Appellee** (NO. 08-13897-BB) " ★★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2476 SWISHER INTERNATIONAL, INC., Appellant, v. Ed SHAFER, Secretary of Agriculture, Appellee., 2008 WL 401043, *401043+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Feb 04, 2008) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 07-15886-EE) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2477 MACON COUNTY INVESTMENTS, INC.; Reach One, Teach One of America, Appellants, v. Sheriff david A. WARREN, Appellee., 2008 WL 5507068, *5507068+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. 2008) **Brief of the Appellee** (NO. 08-13897-BB) ★★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2478 BATS a/k/a Gary Pelphrey, Edward Buckner, Roberto Moraes, Wesley Crowe, Jeffrey Selman, Marie Shockley, and Roberta ""Bobbi"" Goldberg, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. COBB COUNTY, Georgia; Sam Olens, Chairman of the Cobb County Commission; Philip T. ""Murray"" Homan, Chairman of the Cobb County Planning Commission, Defendants-Appellees/Crossappellants., 2007 WL 5444887, *5444887+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Dec 03, 2007) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Foundation for Moral Law, on Behalf of Defendants-Appellees/Cross-Appellants** (NO. 07-13611-JJ) " ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2479 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. 480.00 Acres of Land and Gilbert R. FORNATORA, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2007 WL 5030552, *5030552 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. Nov 07, 2007) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Appellants and Reversal** (NO. 07-13584-CC) ★★

2480 George HEALD, Harold Barrett, and Barrett Heald Partnership, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. NORFOLK SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY, Defendant/Appellee., 2006 WL 4706972, *4706972+ (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. 2006) **Redacted Brief of Appellants %n1%n** (NO. 06-12564-EE) ★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2481 Wayne Bertram WILLIAMS, Petitioner/Appellant, v. Bruce CHATMAN, Warden, respondent/Appellee., 2006 WL 5507737, *5507737 (Appellate Brief) (11th Cir. 2006) **Brief on Behalf of Respondent/Appellee** (NO. 06-16115-B) ★★

2482 INNOVAIR AVIATION LIMITED, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellant., 2010 WL 2155995, *2155995+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. May 10, 2010) **Brief for Plaintiff-Appellee Innovair Aviation Limited** (NO. 2010-5025) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2483 ACCEPTANCE INSURANCE COMPANIES, INC., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2009 WL 1044192, *1044192+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Mar 27, 2009) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 2009-5015) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2484 Nicholas C. GEORGALIS, Plaintiff-Appellant, v UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, Defendant-Appellee., 2008 WL 3524983, *3524983+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Jul 16, 2008) **Brief for Appellee United States Patent and Trademark Office** (NO. 2008-1260) ★★★ **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

2485 Richard CARY, Susan Cary, Patricia Geerts, Sharon Henry, James Herzog, Diane Knueffer, Patricia Martin Robert S. Martin, Janet Marie Priatt, Dona Schneider, Douglas Schwaebe, Carl Schweikert, Katherine Schweikert, David Southcott, and Mary Carol Wilder, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2008 WL 2740492, *2740492+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Jun 27, 2008) **Brief for Appellee the United States** (NO. 2008-5022) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2486 CASITAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2007 WL 4618650, *4618650 (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Dec 03, 2007) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Mountain States Legal Foundation In Support of Casitas Municipal Water District** (NO. 2007-5153) ★★

2487 AMERISOURCE CORPORATION, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant-Appellee., 2007 WL 2272379, *2272379+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Jul 13, 2007) **Brief of Plaintiff-Appellant Amerisource Corporation** (NO. 2007-5121) " ★★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2488 Carlos Armando AMADO, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. MICROSOFT CORPORATION, Defendant-Cross Appellant., 2007 WL 1833271, *1833271+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. May 25, 2007) **Brief of Plaintiff-Appellant Carlos Armando Amado** (NO. 2007-1236, 2007-1255) ★★

2489 Joyce EVANS, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant-Appellee., 2007 WL 1508336, *1508336+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Mar 28, 2007) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. 07-5045) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2490 CASITAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2007 WL 4984848, *4984848+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Feb 20, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Natural Resources Defense Council in Support of the United States** (NO. 2007-5153) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2491 Robert BRACE, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant-Appellee., 2007 WL 851295, *851295+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Feb 09, 2007) **Amicus Brief** (NO. 2007-5002) ★★

2492 OVERVIEW BOOKS, LLC and Lev Tsitrin, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2007 WL 460148, *460148+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Jan 23, 2007) **Brief**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

for Plaintiffs-Appellants Overview Books, LLC and Lev Tsitrin (NO. 2006-5138) ★★

2493 CIENEGA GARDENS et al., Plaintiffs/Appellees, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant/Appellant., 2006 WL 3243585, *3243585 (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Oct 16, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curie of New England Legal Foundation in Support of Plaintiffs/Appellees for Affirmance of the Judgment Below** (NO. 06-5051) ★

2494 ACADIA TECHNOLOGY, INC., and Global Win Technology, Ltd., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2006 WL 652551, *652551+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Feb 09, 2006) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. 05-5178) ★★

2495 ACADIA TECHNOLOGY, INC. and Global Win Technology, Ltd., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. THE UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2006 WL 276610, *276610+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Jan 05, 2006) **Brief and Supplemental Appendix of Defendant-Appellee** (NO. 05-5178) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2496 MEMBERS OF THE PEANUT QUOTA HOLDERS ASSOCIATION, INC. Augustus Garrett, Jerome Paulk, Faye Paulk, and D.U. Pullum, Plaintiff-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2005 WL 4814403, *4814403+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Nov 30, 2005) **Appellee's Opposition to Appellants' Petition for Rehearing en Banc** (NO. 04-5099) ★★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2497 ACADIA TECHNOLOGY, INC. & Global Win Technology, Ltd., Plaintifs-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2005 WL 3445899, *3445899+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Sep 30, 2005) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Defenders of Property Rights in Support of Appellants Acadia Technology, Inc. and Global Win Technology, Ltd.** (NO. 05-5178) " ★★★ **HN: 1,4 (S.Ct.)**

2498 ACADIA TECHNOLOGY, INC., and Global Win Technology, Ltd., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2005 WL 3569344, *3569344+ (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Sep 23, 2005) **Appellants' Opening Brief and Appendix** (NO. 05-5178) ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2499 CITY OF GETTYSBURG, South Dakota, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee., 2005 WL 2477450, *2477450 (Appellate Brief) (Fed.Cir. Aug 29, 2005) **Brief Of Amicus Curiae Defenders of Property Rights in Support of Plaintiff-Appellant City of Gettysburg, South Dakota** (NO. 05-5120) ★

2500 Robert GORDON, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Eric HOLDER, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2010 WL 4822482, *4822482+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Sep 30, 2010) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 10-5227) ★★

2501 Robert GORDON, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Eric HOLDER, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2010 WL 4822476, *4822476+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Aug 20, 2010) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 10-5227) ★★

2502 Rose RUMBER, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 2842730, *2842730+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Aug 31, 2009) **Reply Brief for Appellants** (NO. 09-7035) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2503 Rose RUMBER, et al., Appellants, v. DISTICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Appellees., 2009 WL 2842731, *2842731+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Aug 31, 2009) **Final Brief for the District of Columbia** (NO. 09-7035) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,6,7 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2504 Rose RUMBER, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2009 WL 2842732, *2842732+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Aug 31, 2009) **Brief for Appellants** (NO. 09-7035) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2505 PUERTO RICO PORTS AUTHORITY, Petitioner, v. FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, Respondent., 2007 WL 1432105, *1432105+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. May 14, 2007) **Petitioner's Brief** (NO. 06-1407) ★★

2506 PUERTO RICO PORTS AUTHORITY, Petitioner, v. FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, Respondent., 2007 WL 2344791, *2344791+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. May 14, 2007) **Petitioner's Brief** (NO. 06-1407) ★★

2507 Rose RUMBER, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2007 WL 763783, *763783+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Mar 09, 2007) **Brief for Appellants** (NO. 06-7004) " ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2508 NATIONAL MINING ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Dirk KEMPTHORNE, Secretary of the Interior; United States Department of the Interior; Brent Wahlquist, Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Defendants-Appellees, National Wildlife Federation; Citizens Coal Council; National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States; Kentucky Resources Council, Inc., Intervenor-Defendants-Appellees., 2007 WL 2287636, *2287636+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Feb 07, 2007) **Corrected Brief of Amicus Curiae, National Council of Coal Lessors, Inc., in Support of Plaintiff-Appellant National Mining Association and Advocating Reversal of District Court** (NO. 06-5199) ★★

2509 SOUTHEAST LAND DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, L.P.; and Square 706, L.L.C., Plaintiff-Appellants, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A Municipal Corporation; and Anthony A. Williams, In his official capacity, Defendants-Appellees., 2006 WL 338638, *338638+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Feb 06, 2006) **Reply Brief for Appellants** (NO. 05-7158) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2510 SOUTHEAST LAND DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, L.P. et. al. Plaintiff's-Appellants, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2006 WL 259874, *259874 (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Jan 27, 2006) **Brief for the Appellees** (NO. 05-7158) ★★

2511 SOUTHEAST LAND DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, L.P.; and Square 706, L.L.C., Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A Municipal Corporation; and Anthony A. Williams, In his official capacity, Defendants-Appellees., 2005 WL 3699998, *3699998+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Dec 29, 2005) **Brief for Appellants** (NO. 05-7158) " ★★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2512 PHARMACEUTICAL CARE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, Et Al., Defendants-Appellants., 2005 WL 2865981, *2865981+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Oct 31, 2005) **Reply Brief for the District of Columbia** (NO. 05-7007) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2513 PHARMACEUTICAL CARE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2005 WL 2544008, *2544008+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Oct 06, 2005) **Brief of Plaintiff-Appellee** (NO. 05-7007) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2514 PHARMACEUTICAL CARE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA and Anthony A. Williams, Mayor of the District of Columbia, Defendants-Appellants., 2005 WL 2228251, *2228251+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Sep 06, 2005) **Brief Amici Curiae of AARP, Legal Counsel for the Elderly, and The Prescription Access**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Litigation Project in Support of Defendant - Appellant (NO. 05-7007) ★★

2515 PHARMACEUTICAL CARE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, Et Al., Defendants-Appellants., 2005 WL 2228252, *2228252+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C.Cir. Aug 22, 2005) **Brief for the District of Columbia** (NO. 05-7007) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2516 UNITED STATES, Appellee, v. Walter F. BOYED Aviation Electrician's Mate Second Class (E-5) United States Navy, Appellant., 2007 WL 3325474, *3325474 (Appellate Brief) (U.S. Armed Forces Oct 29, 2007) **Supplement to Petition for Grant of Review** (NO. 07-0822) ★★

2517 EX PARTE MARBLE CITY PLAZA, INC., Petitioner. In re STATE OF ALABAMA, v. MARBLE CITY PLAZA, INC., 2006 WL 6312210, *6312210+ (Appellate Brief) (Ala. Aug 25, 2006) **Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 1051417) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2518 TOWN OF PIKE ROAD, Alabama, Appellant, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, Alabama, Appellee., 2006 WL 5432240, *5432240 (Appellate Brief) (Ala. Feb 21, 2006) **Reply Brief of Appellant** (NO. 1050151) ★★

2519 CONSOLIDATED PIPE & SUPPLY COMPANY, INC., Appellant, v. CITY OF BESSEMER, et al., Appellee., 2010 WL 1646536, *1646536+ (Appellate Brief) (Ala.Civ.App. Feb 16, 2010) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 2090095, 2090096) ★★

2520 Eleanor V. BODKIN and Maria D. L. Coleman, Appellants, v. COOK INLET REGION, INC., Appellee., 2007 WL 2776500, *2776500+ (Appellate Brief) (Alaska Jun 19, 2007) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. S-11870) " ★★★ **HN: 2,4 (S.Ct.)**

2521 Eleanor V. BODKIN and Maria D. L. Coleman, Appellants, v. COOK INLET REGION, INCORPORATED CIRI¨, Appellee., 2006 WL 4545027, *4545027+ (Appellate Brief) (Alaska Mar 13, 2006) **Appellants' Opening Brief** (NO. S-11870) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2522 SCIENCE FOUNDATION ARIZONA, INC., an Arizona corporation, Plaintiff/Petitioner, v. THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, in and for the County of Maricopa, and the Honorable John A. Buttrick, a judge thereof, Respondents, State of Arizona; Arizona Commerce and Economic Development Commission; Arizona Department of Commerce; Arizona Department of Administration; Kentennis, acting in his capacity as Interim Director of the Department of Commerce and as, 2009 WL 5149174, *5149174+ (Appellate Brief) (Ariz. Sep 04, 2009) **Petition for Review** (NO. CV-09-0258-PR) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2523 Meyer TURKEN; Kenneth D. Cheauvront; James Iannuzo; Justin Shafer; Zul Gillani; and Kathy Rowe, Plaintiffs-Appellants/Cross-Appellees, v. Phil GORDON, in his official capacity as Mayor of the City of Phoenix; Dave Siebert, in his official capacity as member of the Phoenix City Council and Vice Mayor; Peggy Neely, in her official capacity as member of the Phoenix City Council; Peggy Bilsten, in her official capacity as member of the Phoenix City Council; Tom, 2009 WL 2220230, *2220230+ (Appellate Brief) (Ariz. Jul 01, 2009) **Supplemental Brief** (NO. CV090042PR) " ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2524 Meyer TURKEN, et al., Plaintiffs/Appellants/Cross-Appellees, v. Phil GORDON, in his official capacity as Mayor of the City of Phoenix, et al., Defendants/Appellees, NPP CityNorth, LLC, Intervenor/Defendant/Appellee/Cross-Appellant., 2009 WL 1454872, *1454872+ (Appellate Brief) (Ariz. Apr 16, 2009) **Brief of Amicus Curiae League of Arizona Cities and Towns** (NO. CV09-0042PR) ★★

2525 SALT RIVER PROJECT AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND POWER DISTRICT,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Plaintiff/Appellant/Cross-Appellee, v. MILLER PARK, L.L.C; Miller Park II, L.L.C., Defendants/Appellees/Cross-Appellants., 2007 WL 4882790, *4882790+ (Appellate Brief) (Ariz. Dec 07, 2007) **Amicus Brief of City of Phoenix** (NO. CV-07-0207-PR) ★★

2526 LEAGUE OF ARIZONA CITIES AND TOWNS; Arizona Planning Association, a nonprofit corporation; Joseph C. Donaldson, a qualified elector; Thomas J. Hessler, a qualified elector John Keegan, a qualified elector; and Lawrence K. Nelson, a qualified elector, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. Janice K. BREWER, in her official capacity as Secretary of State for the State of Arizona; and The Boards of Supervisors of Apache Cochise, Coconino, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, La Paz,, 2006 WL 3383365, *3383365+ (Appellate Brief) (Ariz. Aug 23, 2006) **Brief of Real Party in Interest** (NO. CV-06-0286-AP/EL) ★★

2527 LEAGUE OF ARIZONA CITIES AND TOWNS; Arizona Planning Association, a nonprofit corporation; Joseph C. Donaldson, a qualified elector; Thomas J. Hessler, a qualified elector John Keegan, a qualified elector; and Lawrence K. Nelson, a qualified elector, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. Janice K. BREWER, in her official capacity as Secretary of State for the State of Arizona; and the Boards of Supervisors of Apache, Cochise, Coconino, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, LA Paz,, 2006 WL 6607314, *6607314+ (Appellate Brief) (Ariz. Aug 23, 2006) **Brief of Real Party in Interest** (NO. CV-06-0286-AP/EL) ★★

2528 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP TWO, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. CITY OF SANTEE, Defendant and Respondent. City of Santee, Plaintiff, Cross-Defendant and Respondent, v. MHC Financing Limited Partnership Two, Defendant, Cross-Complainant and Appellant., 2010 WL 2211547, *2211547+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal. Apr 27, 2010) **Petition for Review** (NO. S182192) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2529 SUMMIT ROAD ASSOCIATION, on behalf of itself, and as assignee of interests of the following, Robert Herman as trustee of the Herman Trust, Alica Herman, John H. Dukes and Gwyneth F. Dukes, Robert and Shelley Tucker, Lawrence H. and Martha J. Selman, Sidney S. Slade, as trustee for the Macdonald Family Trusts, dated 10/18/1979, Paul M. Carrick III, Alan and Kathleen Reid, Sherry Wothers, Brian Bean, Lawrence Howard, Judd Weisjahn, individually and jointly with Annalisa, 2009 WL 909080, *909080+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal. Feb 24, 2009) **Consolidated Reply Brief to the Answers Submitted By the Public Utility Commission and Real Party in Interest Verizon** (NO. S168976) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2530 Cheryl C. MURPHY, et al., Plaintiff/Respondent, v. Roger BURCH, et al., Defendants/Appellants., 2008 WL 2211911, *2211911+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal. Apr 25, 2008) **Answer Brief On the Merits of Defendants/appellants Roger Burch, Et Al.** (NO. S159489) ★★ **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

2531 Cheryl C. MURPHY, et al., Plaintiff/Respondent, v. Roger BURCH, et al., Defendants/Appellants., 2008 WL 1962473, *1962473+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal. Mar 28, 2008) **Opening Brief On the Merits By Plaintiff Cheryl C. Murphy** (NO. S159489) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2532 THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, a public corporation, Plaintiff and Petitioner, v. CAMPUS CRUSADE FOR CHRIST, INC., a California Nonprofit Religious Corporation; and Del Rosa Water Company, a California corporation, Defendants and Respondents., 2006 WL 3427310, *3427310+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal. Aug 04, 2006) **Amicus Curiae Brief in Support of Campus Crusade for Christ, Inc.** (NO. S141148) ★★

2533 Robert B. BLUE, Plaintiffs and Appellant, v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES, et al, Defendants and

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Respondents., 2006 WL 3244962, *3244962+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal. May 18, 2006) **Plaintiffs' and Appellants' Reply to Answer to Petition for Review** (NO. S142906) ★★

2534 MT. SAN JACINTO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, Petitioner, v. THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, Respondent, Azusa Pacific University, Real Party in Interest., 2005 WL 3942365, *3942365+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal. Nov 09, 2005) **Answer Brief of Mt. San Jacinto Community College District to Amicus Curiae Brief of Pacific Legal Foundation** (NO. E035868, S132251) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2535 MT. SAN JACINTO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, Petitioner, v. THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, Respondent; Azusa Pacific University, Real Party in Interest., 2005 WL 3598605, *3598605+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal. Aug 17, 2005) **Answer Brief on the Merits for Mt. San Jacinto Community College District** (NO. S132251) ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2536 MOUNT SAN JACINTO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, Petitioner, v. THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, Respondent, Azusa Pacific University, Real Party in Interest., 2005 WL 2236940, *2236940+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal. Jul 19, 2005) **Opening Brief on the Merits for Azusa Pacific University** (NO. S132251) ★★

2537 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, Plaintiff, Cross-Defendant and Respondent, Cross-Appellant, v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, Defendant, Cross-Complainant and Appellant, Cross-Respondent., 2010 WL 4953442, *4953442+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 1 Dist. Nov 18, 2010) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. A127554) ★★

2538 Cheryl C. MURPHY, et al., Plaintiff/Respondent, v. Roger BURCH, et al., Defendants/Appellants., 2007 WL 1986052, *1986052+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 1 Dist. Jun 07, 2007) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. A117051) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2539 Carol L. SLATER, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. COUNTY OF MENDOCINO, et al., Defendants and Respondents., 2007 WL 671163, *671163+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 1 Dist. Jan 26, 2007) **Respondents' Brief** (NO. A114374) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2540 Michael James GREENBERG, an individual, and Maria Fanara Greenberg, an individual, Appellants/Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE, a municipality, Robert Stanley, an individual, and Does 1-100, inclusive, Respondents/Defendants., 2010 WL 2593291, *2593291+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Jun 01, 2010) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. B213717) ★★

2541 CITY of SAN LUIS OBISPO, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. Wayne A. HANSON, et al., Defendants and Appellants., 2010 WL 326664, *326664+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Jan 04, 2010) **Respondent City of San Luis Obispo's Brief** (NO. B211412) ★★

2542 THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California, a public agency, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. Kramer METALS, et al, Defendants and Appellants., 2009 WL 2847986, *2847986+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Aug 05, 2009) **Respondent's Brief** (NO. B208726) ★★★

2543 CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO, A Public Body, Corporate and Politic, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. Wayne A. HANSON, et al., Defendants and Appellants., 2009 WL 2729543, *2729543+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Jul 27, 2009) **Appellants' Opening Brief** (NO. B211412) ★★★★

2544 M&A GABAEE, a California Limited Partnership, and Arman Gabay Defendants/Appellants, v. THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

public agency, City of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation, Plaintiffs/Respondents., 2008 WL 2703737, *2703737+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Jun 09, 2008) **Reply Brief of Appellants** (NO. B202796) ★★★★

2545 MANUFACTURED HOME COMMUNITIES, INC. and MHC Operating Limited Partnership, Plaintiffs/Petitioners and Appellants, v. THE COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO, The County of San Luis Obispo Rent Review Board, and The County of San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors Defendants and Respondents, Elizabeth Sisneros, Mary Jane Tate, Frank Greco, IDA Greco, Robert Meyer, Margaret Meyer, Anne Meyer, Louise Mcmanus, Laverne Jones, William Spurrier and June Spurrier, Real, 2008 WL 2328771, *2328771+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. May 27, 2008) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. B196426) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2546 THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, a public agency, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. M&A GABAEE, A California Limited Partnership; Arman Gabay, an individual named in his capacity as the General Partner of M&A Gabaee, et al, Defendants and Appellants., 2008 WL 2625083, *2625083+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. May 15, 2008) **Respondent's Brief** (NO. B202796) ★★★★

2547 M&A GABAEE, a California Limited Partnership, and Arman Gabay Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a public agency, City of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation Defendants/Respondents., 2008 WL 2076330, *2076330+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Apr 12, 2008) **Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 312 251 Honorable Bruce E. Mitchell, Commissioner, Presiding Honorable Helen I. Bendix, Judge** (NO. B202796) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2548 MANUFACTURED HOME COMMUNITIES, INC. and MHC Operating Limited Partnership, Appellants, v. THE COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO, the County of San Luis Obispo Review Board, and the County of San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors, Respondents, Elizabeth Sisneros, Mary Jane Tate, Frank Greco, Ida Greco, Robert Meyer, Margaret Meyer, Anne Meyer, Louise McManus, Laverne Jones, William Spurrier and June Spurrier, Real Parties in Interest., 2008 WL 1693570, *1693570+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Mar 04, 2008) **Respondents' Brief** (NO. B196426) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2549 MANUFACTURED HOME COMMUNITIES, INC. and MHC Operating Limited Partnership, Plaintiffs/Petitioners and Appellants, v. THE COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO, the County of San Luis Obispo Rent Review Board, and the County of San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors, Defendants and Respondents, Elizabeth Sisneros, Mary Jane Tate, Frank Greco, IDA Greco, Robert Meyer, Margaret Meyer, Anne Meyer, Louise McManus, Laverne Jones, William Spurrier and June Spurrier, Real, 2008 WL 618310, *618310+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Jan 02, 2008) **Appellants' Opening Brief** (NO. B196426) " ★★★ **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

2550 SOUTH CENTRAL FARMERS FEEDING FAMILIES, Elisa Avina Padilla, Ramon Ballesteros Medina, Pedro Barrera, Felipe Casillas Ramirez, Juan Gamboa, Zeferino Garcia Hurtado, Guadalupe Gonzalez, Rufina Juarez, Ediogenes Luvianos Rumbos, Luis Morales, Juan Reyes Cendejas, Margarito Salgado, Tezozomoc, and Maria Luisa Vallejo, Plaintiffs and Appellants, v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES, City of Los Angeles Harbor Department, Libaw-Horowitz Investment Company, Ralph Horowitz, individually and, 2007 WL 2988539, *2988539+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Sep 04, 2007) **Appellants' Opening Brief** (NO. B195906) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2551 REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA, a public entity, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. SOVANNA THACH DBA SUNRISE MARKET, Defendant and Cross Appellant., 2007 WL 2406044, *2406044+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Jul 20, 2007) **Cross Appellant's Response and Opening Brief** (NO. B187379, B189440) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2552 REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA, a public entity, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. SOVANNA THACH DBA SUNRISE MARKET, Defendant and Cross Appellant., 2007 WL 2406045, *2406045+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Jul 20, 2007) **Cross Appellant's Response and Opening Brief** (NO. B187379, B189440) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2553 REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. Richard F. NGUYEN, et al., Defendants and Respondents., 2007 WL 965193, *965193+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Mar 08, 2007) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. B187379, B189440) ★★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2554 Leah MORRIS, individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. Steve WESTLY, Controller of the State of California, Defendant and Respondent., 2007 WL 953237, *953237+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Feb 26, 2007) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. B194764) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2555 TEMPLE CITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, a public entity, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. BAYSIDE DRIVE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, Defendant and Appellant, Pi Yun Hou Wang, an individual, and Tcd Enterprises, Inc., etc., et al., Defendants and Respondents., 2006 WL 3446909, *3446909+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Sep 11, 2006) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. B189736, B189737) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2556 GRAND AVENUE ENTERPRISES, INC., A California Corporation; Luo Bochner LLC, A Limited Liability Company; Derek Luh, David Chew, Won Kim, and Bing Luh, Plaintiffs & Appellants, v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES, A Municipal Corporation, the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles, the Police Permit Review Board of the City of Los Angeles, Defendants & Respondents., 2006 WL 731805, *731805+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Jan 27, 2006) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. B183343) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2557 BEVERLY HILLS RESIDENTIAL-BUSINESS ALLIANCE FOR A LIVABLE COMMUNITY, a California non-profit corporation, Appellant, v. THE CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS, et al., Respondents., 2005 WL 3741854, *3741854+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Dec 12, 2005) **Appellant's Opening Brief on Appeal** (NO. B183973) ★★

2558 Robert B. BLUE, Betty L. Blue, Individually and dba Kitro Company, and as Trustees for the Blue Family Trust, John Walsh, Plaintiffs and Appellants, v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES, City Council of the City of los Angeles; the Community Redevelopement Agency of the City of Los Angeles; etc., et al., Defendants and Respondents., 2005 WL 2813847, *2813847+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 2 Dist. Aug 05, 2005) **Amicus Curiae Brief** (NO. B180319) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2559 THE PEOPLE EX REL, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. Balbir SOHAL, Defendant and Appellant, Darrel and Jane Smith Family Partnership, Defendant and Respondent., 2010 WL 2157960, *2157960 (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 3 Dist. Apr 22, 2010) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. C063301) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2560 NORTH STATE BUILDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION, a California non-profit organization, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants and Respondents., Sacramento Housing Alliance, et al., Intervenors and Respondents., 2007 WL 1278735, *1278735+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 3 Dist. Apr 03, 2007) **Respondent People's Answer to Pacific Legal Foundation's Amicus Curiae Brief** (NO. C052814) ★★

2561 NORTH STATE BUILDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION, Appellant, v. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Respondents., 2007 WL 922975, *922975 (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 3 Dist. Feb 22, 2007) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Appellant North State Building Industry Association** (NO. C052814) " ★★

2562 CITY OF STOCKTON, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. MARINA TOWERS, et al., Defendants and Appellant., 2007 WL 4791680, *4791680+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 3 Dist. 2007) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. C054495) ★★ **HN: 4,7 (S.Ct.)**

2563 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP TWO, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. CITY OF SANTEE, Defendant and Respondent., 2010 WL 438291, *438291+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Jan 22, 2010) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. D053345, D054298) ★★★

2564 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP TWO, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. CITY OF SANTEE, Defendant and Respondent., 2009 WL 5243451, *5243451+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Nov 02, 2009) **Respondent's Brief** (NO. D053345) ★★★

2565 COMMUNITY YOUTH ATHLETIC CENTER, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. CITY OF NATIONAL CITY, et al., Defendants and Respondents., 2008 WL 6137724, *6137724+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Jul 28, 2008) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. D052584, D052630) ★★

2566 GARDEN GROVE DOWNTOWN BUSINESS ASSOCIATION, Petitioner and appellant, v. CITY OF GARDEN GROVE, Garden Grove Agency for Community Development, Respondents, SHELDON PUBLIC RELATIONS, Real party in interest., 2008 WL 3993687, *3993687+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Jul 08, 2008) **Petitioner and Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. G039843) ★★

2567 FRIENDS OF RIVERSIDE'S HILLS, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. CITY OF RIVERSIDE, Defendant and Respondent., 2007 WL 1607167, *1607167+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Apr 30, 2007) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. E041576) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2568 FRIENDS OF RIVERSIDE'S HILLS, Petitioner and Appellant, v. CITY OF RIVERSIDE AND CITY OF RIVERSIDE CITY COUNCIL, Respondents and Real Parties in Interest., 2007 WL 1335129, *1335129+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Apr 10, 2007) **Respondents' and Real Parties in Interests' Opposition Brief** (NO. E041576) ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2569 Friends of RIVERSIDE'S Hills, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. City of RIVERSIDE, Defendant and Respondent., 2007 WL 841860, *841860+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Feb 21, 2007) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. E041576) ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2570 REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, Appellant, v. Ahmad MESDAQ, etc., et al., Respondent; Ahmad Mesdaq, Cross-Appellant, v. Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego, Cross-Respondent., 2006 WL 3614106, *3614106+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Nov 08, 2006) **Appellant's Combined Reply Brief to Respondent's Opposition to Opening Brief and Opposition to Cross-Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. D047927, D048490) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2571 REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, Plaintiff, Appellant, and

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Cross-Respondent, v. Ahmad MESDAQ, Defendant, Respondent and Cross-Appellant., 2006 WL 3614104, *3614104+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Oct 20, 2006) **Combined Respondent's/Cross-Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. D047927) ★★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2572 WESTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. ATOMIC INVESTMENTS, INC., Defendant and Appellant., 2006 WL 5157195, *5157195+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 4 Dist. Oct 12, 2006) **Brief of Respondent Western Municipal Water District** (NO. E038392) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2573 N.L. NEILSON, Association for Legal Desert Development, Ruth Schaefer, Bonnie Gail O'Bar, John Neumann, George Yelding, and Hector R. Martinez, Plaintiff, Interested Persons and Appellants, v. CALIFORNIA CITY, a City; California City Redevelopment Agency, Defendants and Respondents., 2006 WL 3367715, *3367715+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 5 Dist. Jun 07, 2006) **Appellants' Reply to Respondents' Brief** (NO. F049143) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2574 N.L. NEILSON, Association for Legal Desert Development, Ruth Schaefer, Bonnie Gail O'Bar, John Neumann, George Yelding, and Hector R. Martinez Plaintiff, Interested Persons and Appellants, v. CALIFORNIA CITY, a City; California City Redevelopment Agency, Defendants and Respondents., 2006 WL 1546851, *1546851 (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 5 Dist. Feb 07, 2006) **Appellants' Opening Brief** (NO. F049143) ★★

2575 CITY OF MILPITAS, a California Municipal Corporation, Plaintiff and respondent, v. Robert C. YEN, Defendant and appellant., 2008 WL 2959335, *2959335+ (Appellate Brief) (Cal.App. 6 Dist. Jun 29, 2008) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. H031293) ★★

2576 WHEAT RIDGE URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY, Petitioner, v. THE CORNERSTONE GROUP XXII L.L.C., Respondent., 2007 WL 833559, *833559+ (Appellate Brief) (Colo. Feb 23, 2007) **Opening Brief** (NO. 06SC591) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2577 THE COMMERCE CITY URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY, Petitioner/Appellant, v. ENVIROTEST SYSTEMS, CORP., A Delaware Corporation; Credit Suisse First Boston; South Adams County Water and Sanitation District; Public Service Company of Colorado; John Lefebvre as Treasurer of Adams County; Jeannie G. Reeser as Public Trustee of Adams County, Respondents/Appellees., 2007 WL 1257549, *1257549+ (Appellate Brief) (Colo.App. Mar 26, 2007) **Appellant's Answer-Reply Brief** (NO. 2006CA1351) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2578 NEW ENGLAND ESTATES, LLC, v. TOWN OF BRANFORD, et al., 2008 WL 5874899, *5874899+ (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Nov 14, 2008) **Reply Brief of Defendant-Appellant, Town of Branford** (NO. 18132) " ★★

2579 NEW ENGLAND ESTATES, L.L.C., Plaintiff / Appellee, v. TOWN OF BRANFORD, Defendant / Appellant, and Thomas Santa Barbara, Jr. and Frank Perrotti, Jr., Defendants/ Cross-Complaints/Appellees., 2008 WL 5874898, *5874898+ (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Aug 22, 2008) **Joint Brief of Plaintiff / Appellee New England Estates, L.L.C., and Defendants / Cross-Complainants / Appellees Thomas Santa Barbara, Jr., and Frank Perrotti, Jr.** (NO. 18132) " ★★★★

2580 NEW ENGLAND ESTATES, LLC, v. TOWN OF BRANFORD, et al., 2008 WL 5874897, *5874897+ (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Apr 23, 2008) **Brief of Defendant-Appellant, Town of Branford** (NO. 18132) ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2581 Minnie GONZALEZ, et al, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Shirley SURGEON, et al, Defendants-Appellees., 2007 WL 4547490, *4547490+ (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Sep 17, 2007) **Brief of the De-**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

fendants-Appellees (NO. 17969) ★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2582 CITY OF BRISTOL, v. OCEAN STATE JOB LOT STORES OF CT, INC., 2006 WL 5247543, *5247543+ (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Nov 22, 2006) **Brief of the Defendant-Appellant Ocean State Job Lot Stores of Ct, Inc.** (NO. SC17819) " ★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2583 PANSY ROAD, LLC, v. TOWN PLAN & ZONING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF FAIRFIELD., 2006 WL 5328713, *5328713+ (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Oct 17, 2006) **Brief of the Defendant** (NO. SC17713) ★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2584 FORT TRUMBULL CONSERVANCY, LLC, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. CITY OF NEW LONDON, et al., Defendants-Appellees., 2006 WL 5328732, *5328732+ (Appellate Brief) (Conn. Aug 10, 2006) **Brief of the Defendant-Appellee New London Development Corporation** (NO. SC17753) " ★★

2585 AMERICAN PROMOTIONAL EVENTS, INC. d/b/a TNT Fireworks, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Richard BLUMENTHAL, Attorney General, and Leonard C. Boyle, Commissioner of the Department of Public Safety, Defendants-Appellants., 2006 WL 5249687, *5249687+ (Appellate Brief) (Conn. 2006) **Brief of Plaintiff-Appellee, with Appendix** (NO. 17868) ★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2586 TOWN OF VERNON, v. Frederick M. GOFF, et al., 2007 WL 5878965, *5878965+ (Appellate Brief) (Conn.App. Jul 20, 2007) **Brief of the Defendant-Appellants** (NO. 28281) ★★

2587 Samuel N. FRANCO, Appellant, v. NATIONAL CAPITAL REVITALIZATION CORP., Appellee., 2006 WL 5444224, *5444224+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C. Nov 16, 2006) **Reply Brief of Appellant** (NO. 06-CV-000645) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2588 FIRST FSK LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, et al., Appellant, v. NATIONAL CAPITAL REVITALIZATION CORPORATION, Appellee. Samuel N. FRANCO, Appellant, v. NATIONAL CAPITAL REVITALIZATION CORPORATION, Appellee., 2006 WL 5444225, *5444225+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C. Oct 10, 2006) **Brief for Appellee National Capital Revitalization Corporation** (NO. 06-CV-000466, 06-CV-000645) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

2589 Samuel N. FRANCO, Appellant, v. NATIONAL CAPITAL REVITALIZATION CORP., Appellee., 2006 WL 5444226, *5444226+ (Appellate Brief) (D.C. Aug 07, 2006) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 06-CV-000645) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2590 KEY PROPERTIES GROUP, LLC, Appellant, v. CITY OF MILFORD, a Municipal Corporation of the State of Delaware, Appellee., 2009 WL 3563799, *3563799+ (Appellate Brief) (Del.Supr. Oct 22, 2009) **Appellee's Answering Brief** (NO. 2472009) ★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2591 KEY PROPERTIES GROUP, LLC, Appellant, v. CITY OF MILFORD, a Municipal Corporation of the State of Delaware, Appellee., 2009 WL 3563798, *3563798+ (Appellate Brief) (Del.Supr. Oct 19, 2009) **Appellee's Answering Brief** (NO. 2472009) ★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2592 JANEVE CO., INC. Adjile, Inc.; Stanley Wojciechowski, Hershey Wojciechowski, Readway, Inc. Trustee; Stanley C. Lowicki, Walter Lowicki, Trustee of Walter Lowicki Revocable Trust, Plaintiffs in Error/Petitioners/Appellants Below, v. CITY OF WILMINGTON, a Municipal corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware, Department of Licenses and Inspections; Jeffrey J. Starkey, Commissioner, Board of License and Inspection Review, Donald L. Gouge, Jr., 2009 WL 3423106, *3423106+ (Appellate Brief) (Del.Supr. Oct 16, 2009) **Plaintiffs in Error/ Petitioners/ Appellants Below Opening Brief** (NO. 2009, 486) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2593 JANEVE CO., INC. Adjile, Inc.; Stanley Wojciechowski, Hershey Wojciechowski, Readway,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Inc. Trustee; Stanley C. Lowicki, Walter Lowicki, Trustee of Walter Lowicki Revocable Trust, Plaintiffs in Error/Petitioners/Appellants Below, v. CITY OF WILMINGTON, a Municipal corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware, Department of Licenses and Inspections; Jeffrey J. Starkey, Commissioner, Board of License and Inspection Review, Donald L. Gouge, Jr., 2009 WL 3342266, *3342266+ (Appellate Brief) (Del.Supr. Oct 05, 2009) **Opening Brief** (NO. 2009, 486) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2594 KEY PROPERTIES GROUP, LLC, Appellant, v. CITY OF MILFORD, Appellee., 2009 WL 3169984, *3169984+ (Appellate Brief) (Del.Supr. Sep 18, 2009) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 2472009) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2595 KEY PROPERTIES GROUP, LLC, Appellant, v. CITY OF MILFORD, a Municipal Corporation of the State of Delaware, Appellee., 2009 WL 1162063, *1162063+ (Appellate Brief) (Del.Supr. Apr 14, 2009) **Appellee's Answering Brief** (NO. 2009, 41) ★★

2596 KEY PROPERTIES GROUP, LLC, Appellant, v. CITY OF MILFORD, Appellee., 2009 WL 926303, *926303+ (Appellate Brief) (Del.Supr. Mar 16, 2009) **Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. 2009, 41) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2597 NEW CASTLE COUNTY, a political subdivision of the State of Delaware, Defendant below, - appellant/Cross appellee, v. WILMINGTON HOSPITALITY, LLC, Plaintiff below - appellee/ Cross appellant., 2008 WL 2558669, *2558669+ (Appellate Brief) (Del.Supr. Jun 09, 2008) **Appellee's Answering Brief On Appeal and Cross-appellant's Opening Brief On Cross-Appeal** (NO. 2008, 24) ★★

2598 ST. JOHNS RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, Petitioner, v. Coy A. KOONTZ, Jr, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Coy A. Koontz, Respondent., 2010 WL 262547, *262547+ (Appellate Brief) (Fla. Jan 15, 2010) **Brief of Amici Curiae Florida Home Builders Association & National Association of Home Builders, in Support of Respondent** (NO. SC09-713) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2599 ST. JOHNS RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, Appellant, v. Coy A. KOONTZ, etc., Appellees., 2009 WL 4761534, *4761534+ (Appellate Brief) (Fla. Nov 20, 2009) **Brief of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, the Northwest Florida Water Management District, the South Florida Water Management District, and the Southwest Florida Water Management ...** (NO. SC09-713) ★★

2600 SYSTEM COMPONENTS CORPORATION, Petitioner, v. State of Florida, Department of Transportation, Respondent., 2008 WL 5161284, *5161284 (Appellate Brief) (Fla. 2008) **Answer Brief on the Merits of Respondent, State of Florida, Department of Transportation** (NO. SC08-1507) ★★

2601 Arvin Ritchey MASON and Claudia Mason, Appellants, v. THE HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC. and the Flecto Company, Inc., Appellees., 2008 WL 4419825, *4419825 (Appellate Brief) (Ga. Jan 24, 2008) **Appellants' Supplemental Brief in Response to Appellees' Post-Argument Supplemental Brief and the Three Post-Argument Briefs of Appellees' Amici** (NO. S07A1486) " ★★

2602 Arvin Ritchey MASON, and Claudia Mason, Appellants, v. THE HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC., and the Flecto Company, Inc., Appellees., 2007 WL 5542070, *5542070 (Appellate Brief) (Ga. Oct 26, 2007) **Reply Brief of Appellants** (NO. S07A1486) " ★★

2603 Deborah A. FOX, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. CITY OF CUMMING, GEORGIA, Defendant/Ap-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

pellee., 2007 WL 4447493, *4447493 (Appellate Brief) (Ga.App. Nov 01, 2007) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. A08A0412) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2604 COUNTY OF HAWAII, a municipal corporation, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Robert Nigel RICHARDS, Trustee under the Marilyn Sue Wilson Trust; Miles Hugh Wilson, et al., Defendants, C&J Coupe Family Limited Partnership, Defendant-Appellant., 2009 WL 4758692, *4758692+ (Appellate Brief) (Hawai'i App. Nov 12, 2009) **Opening Brief for the Appellant Appendices ""1''--""11'' Statement of Related Cases Certificate of Service** (NO. 29887) ★ ★★★

2605 STATEWIDE CONSTRUCTION, INC., Plaintiff/Respondent, v. Sequoia PIETRI, Luke Crawford, Jim Crawford and Maggie Crawford, Lonnie R. King and Charlene King, husband and wife, M&T Mortgage, Larry Monkarsh, First Horizon Home Loans, Estate of Raymond Piatt, Anthony F. Frontino, Gerry Lee Ikola and Ellen I. Ikola, Defendants/Appellants., 2010 WL 1555425, *1555425+ (Appellate Brief) (Idaho Apr 05, 2010) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. 36934) " ★★ ★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2606 STATEWIDE CONSTRUCTION, INC., Plaintiff/Respondent, v. Sequoia PIETRI, Luke Crawford, Jim Crawford and Maggie Crawford, Lonnie R. King and Charlene King, husband and wife, M&T Mortgage, Larry Monkarsh, First Horizon Home Loans, Estate of Raymond Piatt, Anthony F. Frontino, Gerry Lee Ikola and Ellen I. Ikola, Defendants/Appellants., 2010 WL 1229164, *1229164+ (Appellate Brief) (Idaho Mar 12, 2010) **Respondent's Brief** (NO. 36934) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2607 Katherine R. NAPLETON, as Trustee Under the Katherine R. Napleton Revocable Self-Declaration of Trust Dated October 1, 1992, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. THE VILLAGE OF HINSDALE, Defendant-Appellee., 2008 WL 5686841, *5686841+ (Appellate Brief) (Ill. Jan 03, 2008) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 105096) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2608 EMPRESS CASINO JOLIET CORPORATION, an Illinois corporation; Des Plaines Development Limited Partnership, an Illinois limited partnership d/b/a Harrah's Casino Cruises Joliet; Hollywood Casino-Aurora, Inc., an Illinois corporation; and Elgin Riverboat Resort-Riverboat Casino, an Illinois general partnership d/b/a Gant Victoria Casino, Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Alexi GIANNOULIAS, solely in his official capacity as Treasurer of the State of, 2007 WL 6081726, *6081726 (Appellate Brief) (Ill. Oct 23, 2007) **Reply Brief of the Intervenor-Appellant Racetracks** (NO. 104586, 104587, 104590) ★★

2609 EMPRESS CASINO JOLIET CORPORATION, an Illinois corporation, Des Plaines Development Limited Partnership, an Illinois limited partnership d/b/a Harrah's Casino Cruises Joliet, Hollywood Casino-Aurora, Inc., an Illinois corporation, and Elgin Riverboat Resort-Riverboat Casino, an Illinois general partnership d/b/a Grand Victoria Casino, Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Judy Baar TOPINKA, solely in her official capacity as Treasurer of the State of, 2007 WL 6081727, *6081727 (Appellate Brief) (Ill. Oct 23, 2007) **Reply Brief of the State Appellants** (NO. 104586, 104587, 104590) ★★

2610 EMPRESS CASINO JOLIET CORPORATION, an Illinois corporation, Des Plaines Development Limited Partnership, an Illinois limited partnership d/b/a Harrah's Casino Cruises Joliet, Hollywood Casino-Aurora, Inc., an Illinois corporation, and Elgin Riverboat Resort-Riverboat Casino, an Illinois general partnership d/b/a Grand Victoria Casino, Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Judy Barr TOPINKA, solely in her official capacity as Treasurer of the State of, 2007 WL 6081728,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

*6081728+ (Appellate Brief) (Ill. Sep 18, 2007) **Brief of Plaintiffs-Appellees** (NO. 104586, 104587, 104590) " ★★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2611 1350 LAKE SHORE ASSOCIATES, an Illinois limited partnership, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Lori T. HEALEY, Commissioner, Department of Planning and Development of the City of Chicago, and the City of Chicago, a Municipal Corporation, Defendants-Appellees, and Edward T. Joyce, Carl Hunter, John Stassen, John C. Mullen, Clark W. Fetridge, Respicio F. Vasquez and Bernard J. Miller, Intervenors-Appellees., 2006 WL 4526903, *4526903+ (Appellate Brief) (Ill. Jul 12, 2006) **Brief of Intervenors-Appellees** (NO. 102093) " ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2612 GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. The State of Illinois Motor Vehicle Review Board; Terrence M. O'Brien, in His Official Capacity as Chairperson of the Illinois Motor Vehicle Review Board; North Shore, Inc., d/b/a Muller Pontiac/GMC Mazda; Grossinger Autoplex, Inc.; Joe Mitchell Buick/GMC Truck, Inc.; and Castle Buick-Pontiac-GMC, Inc., Defendants-Appellees; Loren Buick, Inc., Defendant-Appellant., 2006 WL 4526845, *4526845+ (Appellate Brief) (Ill. Mar 14, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Plaintiff-Appellant** (NO. 101585, 101601) " ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2613 Darniece Bailey TURNIPSEED, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Dorothy BROWN, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, and County Of Cook, Defendants-Appellants., 2009 WL 7046583, *7046583+ (Appellate Brief) (Ill.App. 1 Dist. Jan 20, 2009) **Brief of Plaintiffs-Appellees Darniece Bailey Turnipseed, Ramon Turnipseed, and Raymond Thomas** (NO. 1-08-2571) ★★

2614 Darniece Bailey TURNIPSEED, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Dorothy BROWN, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, and County Of Cook, Defendants-Appellants., 2009 WL 7046584, *7046584+ (Appellate Brief) (Ill.App. 1 Dist. Jan 20, 2009) **Amended Brief of Plaintiffs-Appellees Darniece Bailey Turnipseed, Ramon Turnipseed, and Raymond Thomas** (NO. 1-08-2571) ★★

2615 Timothy W. PLANK, Individually and as Personal Representative of the Estate of Debra L. Plank, Deceased, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. COMMUNITY HOSPITALS OF INDIANA, INC., Defendant/Appellee., 2011 WL 495489, *495489+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Jan 07, 2011) **Appellant's Amended Brief** (NO. 49A04-1004-CT-254) ★★

2616 Timothy W. PLANK, Individually and as Personal Representative of the Estate of Debra L. Plank, Deceased, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. COMMUNITY HOSPITALS OF INDIANA, INC., Defendant/Appellee., 2010 WL 5079334, *5079334+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Nov 05, 2010) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 49A04-1004-CT-254) ★★

2617 WYMBERLEY SANITARY WORKS, Appellant/Cross-Appellee (Petitioner Below), v. Earl L. BATLINER, Jr., Thomas L. Cairns and Betty Jane Cairns, Edward Balmer, Jr. and Rosemary Balmer, Daniel Frank Danzl and Joanna Danzl, Appellees/Cross-Appellants (Respondents Below)., 2009 WL 2237959, *2237959+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Jun 22, 2009) **Appellees/ Cross-Appellants' Reply in Support of Transfer** (NO. 22A01-0802-CV-55) ★★★

2618 WYMBERLEY SANITARY WORKS, Appellant/Cross-Appellee (Petitioner below), v. Earl L. BATLINER, Jr., Thomas L. Cairns and Betty Jane Cairns, Edward Balmer, Jr. and Rosemary Balmer, Daniel Frank Danzl and Joanna Danzl, Appellees/Cross-Appellants (Respondents below)., 2009 WL 2237960, *2237960+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Jun 08, 2009) **Wymberley Sanitary Works' Opposition to Transfer** (NO. 22A01-0802-CV-55) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2619 WYMBERLEY SANITARY WORKS, Appellant, v. Earl L. BATLINER, Jr., Thomas L. Cairns and Betty Jane Cairns, Edward Balmer, Jr. and Rosemary Balmer, Daniel Frank Danzl and Joanna Danzl, Appellees., 2008 WL 6743574, *6743574+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Dec 22, 2008) **Wymberley's Reply Brief and Cross-Appellee's Brief** (NO. 22A01-0802-CV-00055) ★ ★

2620 WYMBERLEY SANITARY WORKS, Appellant/Cross-Appellees, (Petitioner below), v. Earl L. BATLINER, Jr., Thomas L. Cairns and Betty Jane Cairns, Edward Balmer, Jr. And Rosemary Balmer, Daniel Frank Danzl and Joanna Danzl, Appellees/Cross-Appellants (Respondents below)., 2008 WL 5585807, *5585807+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Nov 25, 2008) **Brief of Amicus Curiae, Institute for Justice in Support of Appellees/Cross-Appellants** (NO. 22A01-0802-CV-55) ★ ★ ★ ★

2621 WYMBERLEY SANITARY WORKS, Appellant/Cross-Appellee (Petitioner below), v. Earl L. BATLINER, Jr., Thomas L. Cairns and Betty Jane Cairns, Edward Balmer, Jr. And Rosemary Balmer, Daniel Frank Danzl and Joanna Danzl, Appellees/Cross-Appellants(Respondents below)., 2008 WL 5500170, *5500170+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Nov 24, 2008) **Brief of Appellees/cross-Appellants** (NO. 22A01-0802-CV-55) ★ ★

2622 WYMBERLEY SANITARY WORKS, Appellant, v. Earl L. BATLINER, Jr., Thomas L. Cairns and Betty-Jane Cairns, Edward Balmer, Jr. and Rosemary Balmer, Daniel Frank Danzl and Joanna Danzl, Appellees., 2008 WL 5023775, *5023775+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Oct 03, 2008) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 22A01-0802-CV-00055) ★ ★ ★

2623 WYMBERLEY SANITARY WORKS, Appellant/Cross-Appellee, (petitioner Below), v. Earl L. BATLINER, Jr., Thomas L. Cairns and Betty Jane Cairns, Edward Balmer, Jr. and Rosemary Balmer, Daniel Frank Danzl and Joanna Danzl, Appellees/Cross-Appellants (respondents Below)., 2008 WL 6331318, *6331318+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. 2008) **Brief of Amicus Curiae, Institute for Justice in Support of Appellees/cross-Appellant's Petition to Transfer** (NO. 22A01-0802-CV-55) ★ ★ ★ ★

2624 Lonnie R. WICKLIFFE, Appellant, v. COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS, INC. Homeowner's Association, Inc., Appellee., 2007 WL 1339687, *1339687+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Feb 27, 2007) **Title Ýe.g., Appellant's Brief¨** (NO. 49A04-0702-CV-86) " ★ ★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2625 Donald and Edyth JENSEN, Keith and Sharon Jensen, Appellants/Plaintiffs, v. THE CITY OF NEW ALBANY, Indiana; the New Albany, Indiana, Plan Commission; the New Albany, Indiana, Board of Zoning Appeals; and the Community Housing Development Organization, Inc., Appellees/Defendants., 2006 WL 3835012, *3835012+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Nov 16, 2006) **Reply Brief of the Appellants** (NO. 22A01-0605-CV-181) ★ ★ ★ ★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2626 State of Indiana, Appellant (Plaintiff below), v. O. Gene BAKER, Wanda M. Baker, John M. Schlick, and Pulaski County, Indiana, Appellees (Defendants below)., 2005 WL 3240561, *3240561+ (Appellate Brief) (Ind.App. Sep 22, 2005) **Reply Brief of Appellant and Brief in Response to Cross Appeal** (NO. 66A04-0503-CV-121) ★ ★ ★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2627 James MCALISTER, et al., Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. CITY OF FAIRWAY, KANSAS, et al., Defendants/Appellees., 2008 WL 5500085, *5500085+ (Appellate Brief) (Kan. Dec 17, 2008) **Brief of Amicus Curiae, Institute for Justice and the Castle Coalition in Support of Appellants** (NO. 08-99808-A) " ★ ★ ★

2628 YOUNG PARTNERS, LLC, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, Unified School

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

District No. 214 Grant County, Kansas, Defendant/Appellant., 2007 WL 508996, *508996+ (Appellate Brief) (Kan. Jan 10, 2007) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 06-97087) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2629 Greg D. ROLES and Brittani Roles, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. TransCanada Keystone PIPELINE, L.P., Defendant-Appellee., 2010 WL 5561334, *5561334+ (Appellate Brief) (Kan.App. Nov 24, 2010) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 10-104747-A) ★★★★

2630 James MCALISTER, et al., Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. CITY OF FAIRWAY, Kansas, et al., Defendants/Appellees., 2008 WL 5007661, *5007661+ (Appellate Brief) (Kan.App. Sep 30, 2008) **Reply Brief of Appellants** (NO. 08-99808-A) ★★

2631 Debra L. MILLER, Secretary of Transportation for the State of Kansas, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Amy L. BARTLE. et al, Defendants-Appellants., 2006 WL 498784, *498784+ (Appellate Brief) (Kan.App. Jan 17, 2006) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 05-95418-A) ★★

2632 Raymond W. RINK and Louise M. Rink, Trustees of the Raymond W. Rink and, Louise M. Rink Revocable Living Trust, Plaintiffs/Appellees, v. NINNESCAH TOWNSHIP, Defendant/Appellant., 2005 WL 2479716, *2479716+ (Appellate Brief) (Kan.App. Aug 18, 2005) **Reply Brief of Appellant Ninnescah Township** (NO. 04-93002-A) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2633 Raymond W. RINK and Louise M. Rink, trustees of the Raymond W. Rink and Louise M. Rink Revocable Living Trust, Plaintiffs/Appellees, v. NINNESCAH TOWNSHIP, Defendant/Appellant., 2005 WL 2479715, *2479715+ (Appellate Brief) (Kan.App. Jul 05, 2005) **Brief of Appellees, Raymond W. Rink and Louise M. Rink, Trustees of the Raymond W. Rink and Louise M. Rink Revocable Living Trust** (NO. 04-93002-A) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2634 KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, Appellant, v. COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY, ex rel. Gregory D. Stumbo, Attorney General, Appellee., 2009 WL 5803534, *5803534+ (Appellate Brief) (Ky. Jun 30, 2009) **Amicus Brief on Behalf of Kentucky Cabinet for Economic Development** (NO. 2008-SC-000483) ★★

2635 SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, L.P., Appellant, v. Albert E. LEGGETT III, as Trustee of the Albert E. Leggett Family Trust, Appellee; Albert E. Leggett III, as Trustee, etc., Cross-Appellant, v. Sprint Communications Company, L.P., Cross-Appellee., 2008 WL 5685531, *5685531+ (Appellate Brief) (Ky. Jun 06, 2008) **Brief for Appellee and Cross-Appellant Albert E. Leggett III, as Trustee, etc.** (NO. 2004CA-001739MR, 2005-SC-001023, 2007-SC-00273) " ★★★ **HN: 2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2636 Stephen EARLY, et. al., Appellants, v. OLDHAM COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, Appellee., 2007 WL 5750339, *5750339+ (Appellate Brief) (Ky. Sep 19, 2007) **Appellee Brief** (NO. 2007-SC-000008-D) ★★

2637 NEW ORLEANS REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Kittoria JOHNSON, Wife of/and Joseph Burgess, Jr., or Their Successions and Heirs, et al, Defendants/Appellants., 2008 WL 5041946, *5041946+ (Appellate Brief) (La.App. 4 Cir. Nov 03, 2008) **Original Brief Filed On Behalf of Appellee, New Orleans Redevelopment Authority** (NO. 2008-CA-1020) ★★★★

2638 Rev. James SMART, III, Eugene Smart, Janis Boatner Furbush and Justin Smart, Appellants/Petitioners, v. WEST JEFFERSON MEDICAL CENTER, Ebony Dickerson, Rn, Deborah Rodrigue, Rn, Mary Turner, Rn, Eloise Buras, LPN, Brigetta Yancy, M.D., and Billy R. Purcell, M.D., Appellees/Respondents, State of Louisiana through the Honorable James D. Buddy Caldwell, Attorney General, and Louisiana Patient's Compensation Fund Oversight Board, Appellees/Interven-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

ors., 2009 WL 2460517, *2460517+ (Appellate Brief) (La.App. 5 Cir. Aug 06, 2009) **Appellants' Brief in Reply** (NO. 09-CA-366) ★★

2639 PROVIDENCE AND WORCESTER RALROAD COMPANY, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. ENERGY FACILITIES SITING BOARD, Defendant-Appellee and, MOBIL PIPE LINE COMPANY, Intervenor-Appellee., 2008 WL 4750297, *4750297+ (Appellate Brief) (Mass. Aug 28, 2008) **Brief for the Intervenor-appellee Mobil Pipe Line Company** (NO. SJC-10214) ★★

2640 BELL ATLANTIC MOBILE OF MASSACHUSETTS, LLC, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, Plaintiff/Defendant/Appellant, v. COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE and Boards of Assessors of 220 Cities and Towns, Defendants/Appellees, and Board of Assessors of the City of Newton, Plaintiff/Appellee., 2008 WL 754079, *754079 (Appellate Brief) (Mass. Feb 25, 2008) **Brief of Amici Curiae New England Legal Foundation and Associated Industries of Massachusetts in Support of Plaintiff/Defendant/Appellant** (NO. SJC-10047) ★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2641 William J. DEVINE, Trustee of the Loomis Realty Trust, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. TOWN OF NANTUCKET, Acting by and through the Nantucket Memorial Airport and John H. Dunne, as he is the Building Commissioner for the Town of Nantucket, Defendant/Appellant., 2007 WL 1257190, *1257190 (Appellate Brief) (Mass. Mar 30, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New England Legal Foundation in Support of Plaintiff/Appellee** (NO. SJC-09837) ★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2642 John M. GIOVANELLA, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. TOWN OF ASHLAND CONSERVATION COMMISSION, Defendant/Appellee., 2006 WL 2929115, *2929115 (Appellate Brief) (Mass. Aug 31, 2006) **Brief of Amicus Curi%8A New England Legal Foundation in Support of Plaintiff/Appellant** (NO. SJC-09678) ★

2643 CENTRAL STEEL SUPPLY CO., INC., et al., Plaintiff/Appellant, v. PLANNING BOARD OF SOMERVILLE et al., Defendants/Appellees., 2006 WL 1267632, *1267632+ (Appellate Brief) (Mass. Mar 30, 2006) **Brief of Amicus Curia New England Legal Foundation in Support of Plaintiff/Appellant** (NO. SJC-09545) ★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2644 CENTRAL STEEL SUPPLY CO., INC. and 99 Foley Street LLC, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE, the Somerville Redevelopment Authority and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts acting by and through its Department of Housing and Community Development, Defendants-Appellees., 2005 WL 3954122, *3954122+ (Appellate Brief) (Mass. Nov 28, 2005) **Brief of the Institute for Justice and the Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research as Amicus Curiae in Support of Plaintiffs-Appellants** (NO. SJC-09545) " ★★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2645 Harlan MOSES, Clethra LLC, and Miles Jaffe, Plaintiffs, Jacqueline Carlin, Plaintiff/Appellant, Ryan Melcher, Appellant, v. Edwin C. COHEN and Andrew Flake, Inc., Defendants/Appellees/Cross-Appellants., 2007 WL 2250926, *2250926+ (Appellate Brief) (Mass.App.Ct. Jul 16, 2007) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 07-P-538) " ★★

2646 Bryce TINMOUTH, Trustee, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, Defendant-Appellee., 2006 WL 2922501, *2922501+ (Appellate Brief) (Mass.App.Ct. Sep 05, 2006) **Reply Brief for Appellant** (NO. 06-P-287) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2647 Bryce TINMOUTH, Trustee, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, Defendant-Appellee., 2006 WL 2630494, *2630494+ (Appellate Brief) (Mass.App.Ct. Aug 09, 2006) **Brief for Defendant-Appellee, Boston Redevelopment Authority** (NO. 06-P-287) ★ ★★★ **HN: 3,4,5 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2648 Bryce TINMOUTH, Trustee, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, Defendant-Appellee., 2006 WL 2189450, *2189450+ (Appellate Brief) (Mass.App.Ct. Jun 26, 2006) **Brief for Appellant** (NO. 06-P-287) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2649 EAST OLIVER STREET LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, Petitioner/Cross-Respondent, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, Respondent/Cross-Petitioner., 2010 WL 765976, *765976+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Feb 01, 2010) **Brief of Petitioner/Cross-Respondent** (NO. 142) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2650 120 WEST FAYETTE STREET, LLLP, Appellant, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, et al., Appellees., 2009 WL 4917127, *4917127+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Dec 01, 2009) **Reply Brief of Appellees** (NO. 96) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2651 120 WEST FAYETTE STREET, LLLP, Appellant, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, et al., Appellees., 2009 WL 4917128, *4917128+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Dec 01, 2009) **Brief Amici Curiae of The National Trust For Historic Preservation For Historic Preservation In The United States, Preservation Maryland, and Baltimore Heritage, Inc.** (NO. 96) ★★ **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2652 WEST FAYETTE STREET, LLLP, Appellant, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, et al., Appellees., 2009 WL 4548820, *4548820+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Nov 23, 2009) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 96) ★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2653 David TRAIL, et al., Petitioners, v. TERRAPIN RUN, LLC, et al., Respondents., 2007 WL 3170453, *3170453+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Oct 11, 2007) **Brief Amicus Curiae of American Planning Association and Maryland Chapter of Apa** (NO. 44) ★★ **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2654 Robert A. SAPERO, Appellant, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE CITY, Appellee., 2007 WL 693350, *693350+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Feb 16, 2007) **Brief and Appendix of Appellee, Mayor and City Council of Baltimore** (NO. 00072) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2655 MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE CITY, Appellant, v. George VALSAMAKI, et al., Appellees., 2006 WL 4091671, *4091671+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Dec 27, 2006) **Reply Brief of Appellant, Mayor and City Council of Baltimore** (NO. 00055) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2656 MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE CITY, Appellant, v. George VALSAMAKI, et al, Appellees., 2006 WL 3905933, *3905933+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Dec 08, 2006) **Appellees' Brief** (NO. 00055) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2657 MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE CITY, Appellant, v. George VALSAMAKI, et al., Appellees., 2006 WL 3381877, *3381877+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Oct 30, 2006) **Brief and Appendix of Appellant, Mayor and City Council of Baltimore** (NO. 00055) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2658 MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, Petitioner, v. George VALSAMAKI, et al., Respondents., 2006 WL 3905932, *3905932+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Sep Term 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Respondents** (NO. 55) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2659 CITY OF BALTIMORE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Petitioner, v. CARMEL REALTY ASSOCIATES, et al., Respondents., 2006 WL 2342979, *2342979+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Jul 26, 2006) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Institute for Justice in Support of Respondents** (NO. 14) " ★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2660 CITY OF BALTIMORE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Petitioner, v. CARMEL REALTY ASSOCIATES, et al, Respondents., 2006 WL 2342976, *2342976+ (Appellate Brief) (Md. Jul 25, 2006) **Brief of Respondents** (NO. 14) ★★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2661 Arthur W. LAMBERT, et al, Appellants, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, Appellee., 2009 WL 1009161, *1009161+ (Appellate Brief) (Md.App. Feb 20, 2009) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. 1434) ★★★

2662 Arthur LAMBERT, et al., Appellants, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, Appellee., 2009 WL 1145460, *1145460+ (Appellate Brief) (Md.App. Feb 11, 2009) **Brief and Appendix of Appellee, Mayor and City Council of Baltimore** (NO. 1434) ★★★

2663 Arthur W. LAMBERT, et al, Appellants, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, Appellee., 2009 WL 1145459, *1145459+ (Appellate Brief) (Md.App. Jan 12, 2009) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 1434) ★★★

2664 Robert T. MORGAN, Appellant, pro se, v. CIRCUIT COURT FOR ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, Appellee., 2007 WL 7283496, *7283496+ (Appellate Brief) (Md.App. Apr 03, 2007) **Brief of Pro Se Appellant** (NO. 2331) ★★

2665 Robert A. SAPERO, Appellant, v. MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, Appellee., 2007 WL 407751, *407751+ (Appellate Brief) (Md.App. Jan 16, 2007) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 00072) " ★★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2666 Thomas I. WEEMS, Jr., et al., Appellants, v. COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CALVER COUNTY, Appellee., 2006 WL 3905715, *3905715 (Appellate Brief) (Md.App. Nov 29, 2006) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 192) ★★

2667 Arthur LAMBERT, Appellant, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL, Appellee., 2006 WL 2922540, *2922540+ (Appellate Brief) (Md.App. Aug 31, 2006) **Brief and Appendix of Appellee, Mayor and City Council of Baltimore** (NO. 01589) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2668 Arthur W. LAMBERT, et al, Appellants, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, Appellee., 2006 WL 2150986, *2150986+ (Appellate Brief) (Md.App. Jun 21, 2006) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 1589) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2669 THE PORTLAND COMPANY, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. THE CITY OF PORTLAND, Defendant-Appellant., 2009 WL 5501145, *5501145+ (Appellate Brief) (Me. May 18, 2009) **Reply Brief of Defendant-Appellant the City of Portland** (NO. CUM-08-684) ★★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2670 THE PORTLAND COMPANY, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. THE CITY OF PORTLAND, Defendant/ Appellant., 2009 WL 5501144, *5501144+ (Appellate Brief) (Me. Apr 22, 2009) **Plaintiff/Appellee's Brief** (NO. CUM-08-684) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,6,7 (S.Ct.)**

2671 THE PORTLAND COMPANY, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. THE CITY OF PORTLAND, Defendant-Appellant., 2009 WL 5501143, *5501143+ (Appellate Brief) (Me. Mar 25, 2009) **Brief of Defendant-Appellant the City of Portland** (NO. CUM-08-684) ★★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2672 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. David KIRCHER, Defendant-Appellant., 2008 WL 5748735, *5748735+ (Appellate Brief) (Mich. Nov 10, 2008) **Notice of Hearing; and Proof of Service By Hand Delivery** (NO. 137652) " ★★

2673 Frank J. TOMECEK, Jr and Janis Tomecek, Plaintiffs/Appellees, v. Andrew Lucian BAVAS, et al., Defendants/ appellants, WALLOON LAKE ASSOCIATION, Amicus curiae., 2008 WL 4380920, *4380920+ (Appellate Brief) (Mich. Sep 04, 2008) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Walloon**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Lake Association (NO. 134665) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2674 LAWSUIT FINANCING, INC., A Nevada corporation, and Rainmaker USA, LLC, A Nevada limited liability company, Plaintiffs/Appellants, v. Elias MUAWAD, an individual, and Law Offices of Muawad & Muawad, P.C., Defendants/Appellees., 2006 WL 4911855, *4911855+ (Appellate Brief) (Mich.App. Oct 02, 2006) **Plaintiffs'/Appellants' Brief on Appeal Oral Argument Requested** (NO. 272259) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2675 EAGAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, Appellant, v. U-HAUL COMPANY OF MINNESOTA a/k/a U-Haul Co. of Minnesota, et al., Respondents., 2009 WL 6735271, *6735271+ (Appellate Brief) (Minn. Nov 04, 2009) **Brief and Appendix of Amicus Curiae Institute for Justice** (NO. A08-0767) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2676 PORT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF ST. PAUL, petitioner, Respondent, v. RLR, INC., et al., Defendants, Insurance Auto Auctions, Inc., Appellant., 2008 WL 5551417, *5551417 (Appellate Brief) (Minn.App. Feb 29, 2008) **Appellant's Brief and Appendix** (NO. A07-2206) ★★

2677 THE HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY FOR THE CITY OF ST. ANTHONY, Minnesota, Petitioner/Respondent, v. Ronald RASMUSSEN, et al., Appellants; Ronald and Judith Rasmussen, Appellants, v. The Housing and Redevelopment Authority for the City of St. Anthony, Minnesota, Respondent., 2005 WL 4026714, *4026714+ (Appellate Brief) (Minn.App. Sep 30, 2005) **Reply Brief of Appellants Ronald and Judith Rasmussen** (NO. A05-1418, A05-1419) " ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2678 THE HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY FOR THE CITY OF ST. ANTHONY, Minnesota, Petitioner, Respondent, v. Ronald RASMUSSEN, et al., Appellants; Ronald and Judith Rasmussen, Appellants, v. The Housing and Redevelopment Authority for the City of St. Anthony, Minnesota, Respondent., 2005 WL 4026713, *4026713+ (Appellate Brief) (Minn.App. Sep 20, 2005) **Brief of Respondent the Housing and Redevelopment Authority for the City of St. Anthony, Minnesota** (NO. A05-1418, A05-1419) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2679 Dennis M. McLEMORE and Tammy C. McLemore, Appellants, v. MISSISSIPPI TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION TALBOT BROS. CONTRACTING CO., INC.; and Talbot Bros. Grading Co., Inc., Appellees., 2006 WL 4448129, *4448129+ (Appellate Brief) (Miss. Aug 09, 2006) **Brief for Appellants** (NO. 05-CA-02076) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2680 CORTEX WEST REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Plaintiff/Respondent, v. STATION INVESTMENTS #10 REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Station Investments #10 Partnership, Michael R. and Carol A. Travers, et al., Defendants/Appellants., 2008 WL 5480957, *5480957+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Dec 04, 2008) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Legal Services of Eastern Missouri, Inc.** (NO. SC89543) " ★★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2681 STATION INVESTMENTS #10 REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, et al., Appellants, v. CORTEX WEST DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Respondent., 2008 WL 5480958, *5480958+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Dec 04, 2008) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Pacific Legal Foundation, the Office of the Missouri Ombudsman for Property Rights, and the Show-Me Institute in Support of Appellants** (NO. SC89543) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2682 STATION INVESTMENTS #10 REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, et al., Property of Station Investments #10 Redevelopment Corporation, Station Investments #10 Partnership, and Travers, Appellants, v. CORTEX WEST REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Respondent., 2008 WL 5480959, *5480959+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Dec 2008) **Substitute Brief of Appellants Sta-**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

tion Investments #10 Redevelopment Corporation, Station Investments #10 Partnership, and Michael R. And Carol a. Travers (NO. SC89543) ★★

2683 U.S. METALS REALTY, LLC, Appellant, v. CORTEX WEST REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Respondent., 2008 WL 5480973, *5480973+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Oct 2008) **Reply Brief of Appellant U.S. Metals Realty, LLC** (NO. ED90992) ★★

2684 CITY OF ARNOLD, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. HOMER TOURKAKIS, et al., Defendants-Respondents., 2007 WL 5395280, *5395280+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Nov 29, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Show-Me Institute** (NO. SC88647) " ★★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2685 CITY OF ARNOLD, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Homer TOURKAKIS, et al., Respondents, Amerenue, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 5395277, *5395277+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Nov 2007) **Amicus Curiae Brief of the Institute for Justice and the Office of the Ombudsman for Property Rights in Support of Respondents** (NO. SC88647) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2686 State of Missouri ex rel. Ambassador Properties, L.L.C. and Karl Thomas, Relators, v. Honorable Thomas C. CLARK, Judge, Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri, Respondent, House Rescue Corporation, A Missouri Not-for-Profit Corporation, Real Party in Interest., 2007 WL 2858117, *2858117+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Jul 2007) **Relators' Statement, Brief, and Argument** (NO. SC88453) ★★

2687 CENTENE PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Plaintiff-Respondent, v. MINT PROPERTIES, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2007 WL 1494295, *1494295+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. May 14, 2007) **Substitute Brief of Respondent** (NO. SC88487) ★★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2688 CITY OF BRIDGETON, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, Defendant/Respondent., 2006 WL 3309378, *3309378+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Oct 30, 2006) **Amici Curiae Brief of the Office of the Public Counsel and the Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers** (NO. SC87744) ★★★

2689 DAVIDSON INSURANCE AGENCY, LTD., et al, Plaintiffs, Justin Rutledge and Sharon Kay Johnson, Appellants, v. WEST PLAINS R-7 SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al, Respondents., 2006 WL 2029731, *2029731+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Jun 27, 2006) **Appellants' Reply Brief** (NO. SC87281) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2690 DAVIDSON INSURANCE AGENCY, LTD., et al, Plaintiffs, Justin Rutledge and Sharon Kay Johnson, Appellants, v. WEST PLAINS R-7 SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al, Respondents., 2006 WL 2029728, *2029728 (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Apr 27, 2006) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. SC87281) ★★

2691 GRINNELL MUTUAL REINSURANCE COMPANY, Respondent, v. John BEST, et al., Appellants., 2006 WL 1287788, *1287788+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo. Feb 22, 2006) **Respondent Circuit Clerk's Brief** (NO. SC87199) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2692 LAND CLEARANCE FOR REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. Roy W. LEGENDRE, et al., Defendants-Respondents., 2009 WL 1465270, *1465270 (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. E.D. Apr 30, 2009) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. ED92045) ★★

2693 LAND CLEARANCE FOR REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS Plaintiff-Respondent, v. Mabel M. INSERRA, Defendant-Appellant., 2008 WL 5099350, *5099350+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. E.D. Nov 03, 2008) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. ED91760) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2694 U.S. METALS REALTY, LLC, Appellant, v. CORTEX WEST REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Respondent., 2008 WL 5042040, *5042040+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. E.D. Oct 06, 2008) **Reply Brief of Appellant U.S. Metals Realty, LLC** (NO. ED90992) ★★

2695 William E. MCCURDY, Jr., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. ST.LUKE'S EPISCOPAL-PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITALS and The Akin Family Partnership, L.P., Defendants-Respondents., 2008 WL 2110763, *2110763+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. E.D. Apr 29, 2008) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. ED90500) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2696 William E. MCCURDY, Jr., Plaintiff-Appellant, v. ST. LUKE'S EPISCOPAL-PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITALS, and The Akin Family Limited Partnership, L.P. (""AFLP""), Defendants-Respondents., 2008 WL 955942, *955942+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. E.D. Mar 21, 2008) **Respondent AFLP'S Brief** (NO. ED90500) ★★★

2697 CITY OF BRANSON, Missouri, Plaintiff/Respondent, v. BRANSON HILLS MASTER ASSOCIATION, INC. and Grant General Contractors, Inc., Defendant/Co-Respondent, v. Jista, Inc., Defendant/Appellant., 2009 WL 854561, *854561+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. S.D. Feb 05, 2009) **Respondent's Brief** (NO. SD29577) ★★

2698 HOUSE RESCUE CORPORATION, Respondent, v. Charles LASPY, Defendant; Karl Thomas and Ambassador Properties, L.L.C., Appellants., 2010 WL 718559, *718559+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. W.D. Jan 22, 2010) **Reply Brief** (NO. WD71087) ★★★

2699 HOUSE RESCUE CORPORATION, Respondent, v. Charles LASPY, Defendant, Karl Thomas and Ambassador Properties, L.L.C., Appellants., 2010 WL 718560, *718560+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. W.D. Jan 22, 2010) **Brief of Respondent House Rescue Corporation** (NO. 71087) ★★★

2700 PLANNED INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION AUTHORITY OF KANSAS CITY, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. IVANHOE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL and Brown-Caldwell Christian School, Defendants/Respondents., 2009 WL 5441619, *5441619+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. W.D. Dec 16, 2009) **Reply Brief of Planned Industrial Expansion Authority of Kansas City** (NO. WD70655) ★★★

2701 PLANNED INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION AUTHORITY OF KANSAS CITY, Plaintiff / Appellant, v. IVANHOE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL and Brown-Caldwell Christian School, Defendants / Respondents., 2009 WL 5113447, *5113447+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. W.D. Nov 13, 2009) **Respondent Ivanhoe Neighborhood Council's Brief** (NO. WD70655) ★★★★

2702 GREAT RIVERS HABITAT ALLIANCE, et al., Appellants, v. CITY OF ST. PETERS, Missouri, Respondent., 2007 WL 693436, *693436+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. W.D. Jan 25, 2007) **Appellants' Reply Brief and Response to Cross-Appeal** (NO. WD67047) ★★

2703 GREAT RIVERS HABITAT ALLIANCE, The Adolphus A. Busch, Revocable Living Trust, Adolphus A. Busch, Trustee, Andrew Riney, Dolores J. Wetzel, Randy F. Hudson, Allen C. Poggemoeller, and St. Charles County, Missouri, Appellants, v. CITY OF ST. PETERS, Missouri, and, The Missouri Attorney General., Respondents., 2006 WL 4050511, *4050511+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. W.D. Dec 26, 2006) **Brief of Respondent, the City of St. Peters, Missouri** (NO. WD67047) ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2704 GREAT RIVERS HABITAT ALLIANCE, et al., Appellants, v. CITY OF ST. PETERS, et al., Respondents., 2006 WL 4050510, *4050510+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. W.D. Dec 01, 2006) **Brief of Respondent Attorney General** (NO. WD67047) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2705 GREAT RIVERS HABITAT ALLIANCE, et al., Appellants, v. CITY OF ST. PETERS, Missouri, Respondent., 2006 WL 3424016, *3424016+ (Appellate Brief) (Mo.App. W.D. Oct 18, 2006) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. WD67047) ★★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2706 TOWN OF APEX, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Ann Sloan WHITEHURST, Individually, as Co-Executrix of the Estate of Beulah Corbett Sloan and as Trustee; Roberta Sloan Little, Individually, as Co-Executrix of the Estate of Beulah Corbett Sloan and as Trustee; Meredith Lynn Whitehurst; Stephen B. Little; David K. Whitehurst; and Wake County, Defendants-Appellants., 2010 WL 3012015, *3012015+ (Appellate Brief) (N.C.App. Jul 21, 2010) **Brief for the Defendant-Appellant** (NO. COA10-697) ★★

2707 NEW HANOVER COUNTY WATER AND SEWER DISTRICT, Plaintiff, v. James Ray THOMPSON, Defendant and third-Party plaintiff, v. T.A. LOVING, INC. and Dale Todd d/b/a Dale Todd Well Drilling, Third-Party defendants., 2008 WL 4574319, *4574319+ (Appellate Brief) (N.C.App. Apr 17, 2008) **Plaintiff Appellant's Brief** (NO. COA08-258) ★★

2708 Rethea C. MASSEY, Petitioner - Appellant, v. Douglas A. HOFFMAN, Defendant-Appellee., 2007 WL 119906, *119906+ (Appellate Brief) (N.C.App. Jan 03, 2007) **Brief of Detective Douglas a. Hoffman, Defendant - Appellee** (NO. COA06-1338) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2709 OCEAN HILL JOINT VENTURE, OCEAN HILL PROPERTIES, INC., et al., Petitioners-Appellees, v. THE CURRITUCK COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, Respondent-Appellee, Ocean Hill I Property Owners Association, Inc., Respondent-Appellant., 2005 WL 3609530, *3609530+ (Appellate Brief) (N.C.App. Dec 19, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners** (NO. COA05-1405) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2710 CITY OF OMAHA, NEBRASKA, A Municipal Corporation, Condemnor/Appellee, v. TRACT NO. 1 (a/k/a 1318, 1320, 1322 S. 72 Street), John A. Coil, a single person; John v. Haltom, a single person; American National Bank; Hastings State Bank; Norman Denenberg; Joseph Kuo and Alice Kuo, Husband and Wife, and John Ewing, Jr., Douglas County Treasurer, Condemnees/Appellants., 2009 WL 3223210, *3223210+ (Appellate Brief) (Neb.App. Sep 08, 2009) **Brief of City of Omaha, A Municipal Corporation, Condemnor/Appellee** (NO. A-09-00323) ★★★

2711 CITY OF OMAHA, Nebraska, A Municipal Corporation, Appellee, v. TRACT NO. 1 (a/k/a 1318, 1329 and 1322 S. 72nd Street), John A. Coil, a single person; John V. Haltom, a single person; American National Bank; Hastings National Bank; Norman Denenberg; Joseph Kuo and Alice Kuo, husband and wife, and John W. Ewing, Jr., Douglas County Treasurer, Appellants., 2009 WL 2859358, *2859358+ (Appellate Brief) (Neb.App. Aug 06, 2009) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. A-09-000323) ★★★

2712 CITY OF OMAHA, NEBRASKA, A Municipal Corporation, Appellee, v. TRACT NO. 1 (a/k/a 1318, 1329 and 1322 S. 72nd Street), John A. Coil, a single person; John V. Haltom, a single person; American National Bank; Hastings National Bank; Norman Denenberg; Joseph Kuo and Alice Kuo, husband And wife, and John W. Ewing, Jr., Douglas County Treasurer, Appellants., 2009 WL 2470948, *2470948+ (Appellate Brief) (Neb.App. Jul 21, 2009) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. A-09-00323) ★★★

2713 LAS VEGAS TAXPAYER ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE; Las Vegas Redevelopment Reform Committee; D. Taylor; Christopher Bohner; Ken Liu, Petitioners, v. CITY COUNCIL OF

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; Beverly K. Bridges, in her official capacity as City Clerk of the City of Las Vegas, Respondents., 2009 WL 3160687, *3160687+ (Appellate Brief) (Nev. Mar 27, 2009) **Petitioners' Reply Brief in Support of Petition for Writ of Mandamus** (NO. 53388) ★★ **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2714 PRIVERVALE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS, LLC, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. THE TOWNSHIP OF RIVER VALE; The Mayor of the Township of Priver Vale; and the Council of the Township of River Vale, Defendants-Respondents., 2006 WL 6605212, *6605212+ (Appellate Brief) (N.J.Super.A.D. Sep 05, 2006) **Plaintiff-Appellant Rivervale Development Partners, LLC's Appeal Brief** (NO. A-005863-05T3) ★★

2715 In the Matter of THE ADVISORY OPINION BY THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY, Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control, Pursuant to N.J.A.C. 13:2-36(b), Dated June 23, 2005, Regarding the Availability of Special Concessionaire Permits Allowing the Service of Alcoholic Beverages, Under N.J.A.C. 13:2-5.2, In the Xanadu Project at the Meadowlands Complex. In the Matter of the Determination by the Director of the Division of, 2006 WL 6659949, *6659949+ (Appellate Brief) (N.J.Super.A.D. Jun 22, 2006) **Brief of Respondent Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control** (NO. A-006348-04T5, A-006393-04T5) ★★

2716 State of New Mexico, Plaintiff-Petitioner and Cross-Respondent, v. Mark Joseph LIZZOL, Defendant -Respondent and Cross-Petitioner., 2007 WL 2299739, *2299739 (Appellate Brief) (N.M. Feb 06, 2007) **On Certiorari Review from the New Mexico Court of Appeals State of New Mexico's Answer Brief to Cross Petition** (NO. 30019) ★★

2717 IN THE MATTER OF the Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur and P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Petitioners-Respondents, For a judgment pursuant to Section 207 of the EDPL, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Appellant. In the Matter of the Application of Tuck-It-Away, Inc., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc. and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P.,, 2010 WL 2929490, *2929490+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. May 20, 2010) **Petitioners-Respondents' Brief in Response to Amicus Curiae Columbia University** (NO. 2010-0125) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2718 In the Matter of the Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur and P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Petitioners-Respondents, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Appellant; In the Matter of the Application of Tuck-It-Away, Inc., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133RD Street, Inc. and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P., Petitioners-Respondents, v. New York State Urban, 2010 WL 3952032, *3952032+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. May 07, 2010) **Reply Brief for Respondent-Appellant** ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2719 In the Matter of the Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur and P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Petitioners-Respondents, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Appellant; In the Matter of the Application of Tuck-It-Away, Inc., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc. and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P., Petitioners-Respondents, v. New York State Urban, 2010 WL 3952033, *3952033+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Apr 30, 2010) **Brief for Amicus Curiae Ben Totushek** " ★★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2720 IN THE MATTER OF the Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur and P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Petitioners-Respondents, For a judgment pursuant to Section 207 of the EDPL, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Appellant. In the Matter of the Application of Tuck-It-Away, Inc., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc. and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P.,, 2010 WL 2929493, *2929493+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Apr 23, 2010) **Brief for Amicus Curiae East Harlem Alliance of Responsible Merchants** (NO. 2010-0125) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2721 NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation Respondent-Appellant, v. Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur, P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Tuck-It-Away, Inc., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc., and Tuck-It-Away Associates, LP, Petitioners-Respondents., 2010 WL 3952034, *3952034+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Apr 23, 2010) **Brief of Amicus Curiae New York State Senator Bill Perkins** (NO. 2010-0125) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2722 IN THE MATTER OF the Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur, and P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Petitioners-Respondents, For a judgment pursuant to Section 207 of the EDPL, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Appellant. In the Matter of the Application of Tuck-It-Away, Inc., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc., and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P.,, 2010 WL 2929489, *2929489+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Apr 22, 2010) **Amicus Curiae Brief of Columbia University in Support of Respondent-Appellant and in Support of Reversal** (NO. 2010-0125) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

2723 IN THE MATTER OF the Application of Parminder KAUR, et al., Petitioners-Respondents, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Appellant, In the Matter of the Application of Tuck-It-Away Inc, et al., Petitioners-Respondents, v. New York State Urban Development Corporation d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Appellant., 2010 WL 2929492, *2929492+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Apr 22, 2010) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Institute for Justice on Behalf of Petitioners-Respondents** (NO. 2010-0125) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2724 In the Matter of the Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur and P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Petitioners-Respondents. For a judgment pursuant to Section 207 of the EDPL, v. New York State Urban Development Corporation d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Appellant; In the Matter of the Application of Tuck-It-Away, Inc., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc. and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P.,, 2010 WL 3952030, *3952030+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Apr 22, 2010) **Brief for Petitioners-Respondents** " ★★★★

2725 IN THE MATTER OF Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur, and P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Petitioners-Respondents, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Appellant. In the Matter of Application of Tuck-It-Away, Inc., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc. and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P., Petitioners-Respondents, v. New York State Urban, 2010 WL 2929491, *2929491+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Apr 21, 2010) **Amicus Curiae Brief of the City of New York** (NO. 2010-0125) ★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2726 In the Matter of the Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur and P.G. Singh Enterprises,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

LLP, Petitioners-Respondents, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Appellant; In the Matter of the Application of Tuck-It-Away, Inc., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc. and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P., Petitioners-Respondents, v. New York State Urban, 2010 WL 3952031, *3952031+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Mar 08, 2010) **Brief for Respondent-Appellant** ★★★

2727 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., The Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill Inc. d/b/a Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez and David Sheets, Petitioners-Appellants, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Respondent., 2009 WL 3810849, *3810849+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Sep 25, 2009) **Reply Brief for Petitioners-Appellants** (NO. 2009-0178) ★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2728 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., The Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill Inc., d/b/a Freddys Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez, and David Sheets, Petitioner-Appellants, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Respondent., 2009 WL 3810845, *3810845+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Sep 22, 2009) **Amicus Curiae Brief of the City of New York** (NO. 2009-0178) ★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2729 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., the Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's BAR and Grill Inc. d/b/a Freddy's BAR and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez and David Sheets, Petitioners-Appellants, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Respondent., 2009 WL 3810844, *3810844+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Sep 08, 2009) **Revised Brief for Respondent-Respondent** (NO. 2009-0178) ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2730 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., The Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill Inc., d/b/a Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez and David Sheets, Petitioners -Appellants, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Respondent., 2009 WL 3810847, *3810847+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Sep 03, 2009) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Institute for Justice** (NO. 2009-0178) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,7 (S.Ct.)**

2731 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., the Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill Inc. d/b/a Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez, and David Sheets, Petitioners-Appellants, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Respondent., 2009 WL 3810848, *3810848+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Sep 03, 2009) **Brief for Amici Curiae Fifth Avenue Committee, Pratt Area Community Council & Prospect Heights Neighborhood Development Council** (NO. 2009-0178) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2732 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., the Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill, Inc. d/b/a

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez and David Sheets, Petitioners-Appellants, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Respondent., 2009 WL 3810846, *3810846+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Aug 21, 2009) **Brief for Amicus Curiae Willets Point United, Inc.** (NO. 2009-0178) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2733 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty Corp., Pacific Carlton Development Corp., The Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill Inc. d/b/a Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez and David Sheets, Petitioners-Appellants, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent-Respondent., 2009 WL 3810843, *3810843+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Jul 31, 2009) **Brief for Petitioners-Appellants** (NO. 2009-0178) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2734 ASPEN CREEK ESTATES, LTD., Petitioner-Appellant, v. TOWN OF BROOKHAVEN and The Town Board of the Town of Brookhaven, Respondents-Respondents., 2008 WL 5644042, *5644042+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Jul 31, 2008) **Reply Brief for Petitioner-Appellant** (NO. 2009-0019) " ★★★★

2735 ASPEN CREEK ESTATES, LTD., Petitioner-Appellant, v. TOWN OF BROOKHAVEN and The Town Board of the Town of Brookhaven, Respondents-Respondents., 2008 WL 5644041, *5644041+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Jul 16, 2008) **Brief for Respondents-Respondents** (NO. 2009-0019) " ★★★★

2736 ASPEN CREEK ESTATES, LTD., Petitioner-Appellant, v. TOWN OF BROOKHAVEN and The Town Board of the Town of Brookhaven, Respondents-Respondents., 2008 WL 5644040, *5644040+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. May 30, 2008) **Brief for Petitioner-Appellant** (NO. 2009-0019) " ★★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2737 KAISER WOODCRAFT CORP. (Trade Fixture Claimant with respect to Block 2387, Lot 62), Claimant-Respondent, v. THE CITY OF NEW YORK, Condemnor-Appellant., 2008 WL 4659916, *4659916+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. May 20, 2008) **Brief and Appendix of Claimant-respondent** (NO. 2008-0156) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2738 In the Matter of the Application of the City of New York, relative to acquiring title in fee simple absolute to certain real property where not heretofore acquired for the same purpose, required as a site for the construction of the THIRD WATER TUNNEL, SHAFT 30B located on Grand Street, and bounded by Crosby Street and Lafayette Street, in the Borough of Manhattan, City and State of New York., 2006 WL 827884, *827884+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Jan 17, 2006) **Respondent's Brief** (NO. 2006-0030) " ★★★ **HN: 4,7 (S.Ct.)**

2739 In the Matter of the Application of the City of New York, relative to acquiring title fee simple absolute to certain real property where not heretofore acquired for the same purpose. required as a site for the construction of the THIRD WATER TUNNEL SHAFT 30 B Located on Grand Street, and bounded by Crosby Street and Lafayette Street. in the Borough of Manhattan, City and State of New York, Grand Lafayette Properties LLC, Movant-Appellant, v. The City of New York, New, 2005 WL 3938598, *3938598+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Dec 08, 2005) **Brief of the Real Estate Board of New York, Inc. as Amicus Curiae in Support of the Appeal** (NO. 2006-0030) ★★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2740 In the Matter of the Application of the City of New York, relative to acquiring title in fee simple

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

absolute to certain real property where not heretofore acquired for the same purpose, required as a site for the construction of the THIRD WATER TUNNEL, SHAFT 30 B Located on Grand Street, and bounded by Crosby Street and Lafayette Street, in the Borough of Manhattan, City and State of New York. Grand Lafayette Properties LLC, Appellant, v. The City of New York, New York City, 2005 WL 3938597, *3938597+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y. Dec 05, 2005) **Original Brief of Appellant Grand Lafayette Properties LLC** (NO. 2006-0030) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2741 In the Matter of the Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur and P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Petitioners, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent., 2009 WL 7446915, *7446915+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. May 01, 2009) **Reply Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 777) ★★★★

2742 In the Matter of the Application of TUCK-IT-AWAY, INC., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc. and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P., Petitioners, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent., 2009 WL 7446918, *7446918+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. May 01, 2009) **Reply Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 778) ★★★

2743 In the Matter of the Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur and P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Petitioners, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent., 2009 WL 7446914, *7446914+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Apr 22, 2009) **Brief for Respondent** (NO. 777) ★★

2744 In the Matter of the Application of TUCK-IT-AWAY, INC., Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc. and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P., Petitioners, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent., 2009 WL 7446917, *7446917+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Apr 22, 2009) **Brief for Respondent** (NO. 778) ★★

2745 In the Matter of the Application of Parminder KAUR, Amanjit Kaur and P.G. Singh Enterprises, LLP, Petitioners, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent., 2009 WL 7446913, *7446913+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Mar 23, 2009) **Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 777) ★★★★

2746 In the Matter of the Application of TUCK-IT-AWAY, INC, Tuck-It-Away Bridgeport, Inc., Tuck-It-Away at 133rd Street, Inc. and Tuck-It-Away Associates, L.P., Petitioners, v. NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, Respondent., 2009 WL 7446916, *7446916+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Mar 23, 2009) **Brief for Petitioners** (NO. 778) ★★★

2747 IN THE MATTER OF DEVELOP DON'T DESTROY (BROOKLYN), INC.; Council of Brooklyn Neighborhoods, Inc.; Atlantic Avenue Betterment Association, Inc.; Bergen Street Block Association, Inc.; Boerum Hill Association, Inc.; Brooklyn Bears Community Gardens, Inc.; Brooklyn Visionfoundation, Inc.; Carlton Avenue Association, Inc.; Carroll Street Block Association Between Fifth and Sixth Avenues, Inc.; Central Brooklyn Independent Democrats by its President Josh, 2008 WL 5771031, *5771031+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Aug 04, 2008) **Brief for Respondent-Defendant-Respondent Forest City Ratner Companies, LLC** (NO. 4206) ★★

2748 In the Matter of the Application of C/S 12TH AVENUE LLC, Valeray Real Estate Co., Inc.,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Mercedes-Benz Manhattan, Inc., 522 W. 38th St. NY LLC and Milstein Brothers 42nd Street, LLC, Petitioners, v. THE CITY OF NEW YORK and The Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Respondents., 2006 WL 4516451, *4516451+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Jan 12, 2006) **Respondents' Brief** (NO. 2006-07926) " ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2749 In the Matter of the Application of C/S 12TH AVENUE LLC, Petitioner, v. THE CITY OF NEW YORK, Respondent., 2005 WL 5420922, *5420922+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept. Dec 12, 2005) **Brief for Petitioner C/S 12th Avenue LLC** (NO. 2006-07926) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2750 SNYDER FULTON STREET, LLC, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. FULTON INTEREST, LLC, Defendant-Respondent., 2008 WL 5631743, *5631743+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. May 08, 2008) **Reply Brief for Plaintiff-Appellant** (NO. 2007-11097) ★★

2751 In the Matter of the Petition of the TOWN OF SOUTHOLD to acquire certain real properties necessary for the expansion of the Town of Southold town hall, Petitioner-Respondent, v. (SCTM 1000-61-1-p/o 3, George C. and Margaret A. Stankevich), Respondents-Appellants., 2007 WL 6870882, *6870882+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Oct 23, 2007) **Brief of the Attorney General as Intervenor Pursuant to Executive Law | 71** (NO. 2007-02278) ★★★

2752 Matter of ASPEN CREEK ESTATES, LTD., Petitioner, v. TOWN OF BROOKHAVEN and the Town Board of the Town of Brookhaven, Respondents., 2007 WL 2913518, *2913518+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Apr 30, 2007) **Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 2006-03815) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2753 Parviz NOGHERY, Plaintiff-Respondent-Appellant, v. THE TOWN OF BROOKHAVEN and The Planning Board of the Town of Brookhaven, Defendants-Appellants-Respondents., 2006 WL 5411439, *5411439+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Dec 04, 2006) **Brief for Defendants-Appellants-Respondents** (NO. 2006-05365) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2754 Matter of ASPEN CREEK ESTATES, LTD., Petitioner, v. TOWN OF BROOKHAVEN and the Town Board of the Town of Brookhaven, Respondents., 2006 WL 4845380, *4845380+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Nov 30, 2006) **Reply Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 2006-03815) " ★★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2755 ASPEN CREEK ESTATES, LTD., Petitioner, v. TOWN OF BROOKHAVEN and the Town Board of the Town of Brookhaven, Respondents., 2006 WL 4845379, *4845379+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Nov 15, 2006) **Brief for Respondents** (NO. 2006-03815) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2756 49 WB, LLC, Petitioner, v. VILLAGE OF HAVERSTRAW and the Board of Trustees of the Village of Haverstraw, Respondents., 2006 WL 4454932, *4454932+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Jun 12, 2006) **Brief for Respondents** (NO. 2006-00605) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2757 49 WB, LLC, Petitioner, v. VILLAGE OF HAVERSTRAW and the Board of Trustees of the Village of Haverstraw, Respondents., 2006 WL 4454931, *4454931+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. May 08, 2006) **Brief for Petitioner** (NO. 2006-00605) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2758 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, Respondent, v. Willie PEOPLES, Defendant-Appellant., 2006 WL 3831948, *3831948 (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Mar 20, 2006) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 2002-06564) ★★

2759 10 GARVIES POINT ROAD CORPORATION, Petitioner, v. GLEN COVE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY, Respondent., 2005 WL 4910517, *4910517+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept. Aug 12, 2005) **Brief for Respondent** (NO. 2005-02575) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2760 James G. DOYLE and Lawrence Doyle, Petitioners - Appellants, v. SCHUYLERVILLE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, Respondent - Respondent., 2006 WL 4720103, *4720103+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 3 Dept. Aug 14, 2006) **Brief of Petitioners - Appellants** (NO. 689) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2761 Edward KEEGAN, Petitioner, v. CITY OF HUDSON, New York, Respondent., 2005 WL 5727086, *5727086 (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 3 Dept. Jul 08, 2005) **Brief for Respondent** (NO. 97945) ★★

2762 In the Matter of the Application of THE CITY OF SYRACUSE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY, to acquire certain Interests in the Carousel Center site, which site which is generally Identified as 1 Carousel Center Drive (Lot 11K), SBL No. 114-02-05.6; 304 Hiawatha Boulevard W (Lot 11L), SBL No. 114-02-5.7 and 350 Hiawatha Boulevard W. Rear (Lot 11B), SBL No. 114-02-05.2 in the City of Syracuse, New York, which parcels comprise a portion of the site for the phased, 2006 WL 4706434, *4706434+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 4 Dept. Aug 14, 2006) **Brief On Behalf of Condemnor-Petitioner-Respondent** (NO. 1153) ★★

2763 In the Matter of the Application of THE CITY OF SYRACUSE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY, to Acquire Certain Interests in the Carousel Center Site, Which Site Which is Generaly Identified as 1 Carousel Center Drive (Lot 11k), Sbl No. 114-02-05.6; 304 Hiawatha Boulevard W (Lot 11l), Sbl No. 114-02-05.7 and 350 Hiawatha Boulevard W. Rear (Lot 11b), Sbl No. 114-02-05.2 in the City of Syracuse, New York, Which Parcels Comprise A Portion of the Site for the Phased, 2006 WL 4706435, *4706435+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 4 Dept. Aug 14, 2006) **Brief On Behalf of Condemnor-Petitioner-Respondent** (NO. 1153) ★★

2764 In the Matter of the Application of THE CITY OF SYRACUSE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY, to Acquire Certain Interests in the Carousel Center Site, Which Site Which is Generally Identified as 1 Carousel Center Drive (Lot 11k), Sbl No. 114-02-05.6; 304 Hiawatha Boulevard W (Lot 11l), Sbl No. 114-02-05.7 and 350 Hiawatha Boulevard W. Rear (Lot 11b), Sbl No. 114-02-5.2 in the City of Syracuse, New York, Which Parcels Comprise A Portion of the Site for the Phased, 2006 WL 4706436, *4706436+ (Appellate Brief) (N.Y.A.D. 4 Dept. Aug 11, 2006) **Brief On Behalf of Condemnor-Petitioner-Respondent** (NO. 1153) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2765 Joseph B. SERBIN, et al., Appellants, v. VILLAGE OF HARTVILLE, et al., Appellees., 2010 WL 620804, *620804 (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Feb 12, 2010) **Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction of Appellants Joseph B. Serbin, et al.** (NO. 10-0283) ★★

2766 B.J. ALAN COMPANY, et al., Plaintiffs/Appellees, v. CONGRESS TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS, et al., Defendants/Appellants., 2008 WL 4144045, *4144045 (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Aug 28, 2008) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Th E Planning Association and the Ohio Planning Conference** (NO. 08-0306) ★★

2767 CITY OF CINCINNATI, Appellant, v. STATE OF OHIO EX REL. HILLTOP BASIC RESOURCES, INC., STATE OF OHIO EX REL. QUEENSGATE TERMINALS, LLC, Appellees., 2008 WL 434413, *434413+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Jan 09, 2008) **Merit Brief of Appellee State of Ohio Ex Rel. Queensgate Terminals, LLC** (NO. 06-1544) " ★★

2768 State ex rel. CITIZEN ACTION FOR A LIVABLE MONTGOMERY, Relator, v. HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS, Respondent., 2007 WL 3090561, *3090561+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Oct 01, 2007) **Relator's Amended Reply Brief** (NO. 07-1732) ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2769 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Carl E. GAMBLE, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3670793, *3670793+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Dec 09, 2005) **Reply Brief of Amici Curiae National Federation of Independent Business Legal Foundation and the American Association of Small Property Owners in Support of Appellants Carl E. Gamble and Joy E. ...** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) ★★

2770 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3670794, *3670794 (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Dec 09, 2005) **Reply Brief of Appellants Joseph P. Horney, Carol S. Gooch, Carl E. Gamble and Joy E. Gamble** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) ★★

2771 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3630495, *3630495+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 29, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the American Planning Association and the Ohio Planning Conference in Support of Appellee, City of Norwood** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2772 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et. al., and Carl E. Gamble, Jr., et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3630496, *3630496 (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 29, 2005) **Brief on the Merits of Amicus Curiae Donna Laake, Paul Triance, and William Pierani in Support of Appellee** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2773 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al. and Carl E. Gamble, Jr., et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3630497, *3630497+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 29, 2005) **Amicus Brief of First Suburbs Consortium of Northeast Ohio, Central Ohio First Suburbs Consortium, First Suburbs Consortium of Southwest Ohio and First Tier Suburbs Consortium in Support of Appellee** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,6 (S.Ct.)**

2774 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3630498, *3630498+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 29, 2005) **Merit Brief of Appellee Rookwood Partners, Ltd.** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) " ★★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2775 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3630499, *3630499+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 29, 2005) **Merit Brief of Appellee City of Norwood** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) " ★★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2776 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et. al., and Carl E. Gamble, Jr., et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 5434440, *5434440 (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 29, 2005) **Brief on the Merits of Amicus Curiae Donna Laake, Paul Triance, and William Pierani in Support of Appellee** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2777 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3437999, *3437999+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 09, 2005) **Brief Amici Curiae of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation and the Hamilton County Farm Bureau in Support of Appellants** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2778 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3438000, *3438000+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 09, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the Ohio Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Persons and the National Institute for Urban Entrepreneurship in Support of Appellants** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) " ★★★ **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

2779 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3438001, *3438001+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 09, 2005) **Brief of Amici**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Curiae Ashbrook Center for Public Affairs and William G. Batchelder in Support of Appellants Urging Reversal (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) " ★★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2780 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3438002, *3438002+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 09, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the Ohio Association of Realtors in Support of Appellants** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2781 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Carl E. GAMBLE, Jr., et al. and Joseph P. Horney, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3438004, *3438004+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 09, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty in Support of Appellants** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2782 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3438007, *3438007+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 09, 2005) **Merit Brief of Appellants Joseph P. Horney, Carol S. Gooch, Carl E. Gamble and Joy E. Gamble** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) " ★★★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2783 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Carl E. GAMBLE, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3437997, *3437997+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 08, 2005) **Brief of Amici Curiae National Federation of Independent Business Legal Foundation and the American Association of Small Property Owners in Support of Appellants Carl E. Gamble and Joy E. Gamble, et ...** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) ★★

2784 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3438003, *3438003+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 08, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation and the Claremont Institute in Support of Appellants** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2785 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 3438005, *3438005+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Nov 08, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the Property & Environment Research Center in Support of Appellants.** (NO. 2005-1210, 2005-1211) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2786 CITY OF NORWOOD, Appellee, v. Joseph P. HORNEY, et al., and Carl E. Gamble, et al., Appellants., 2005 WL 2570260, *2570260+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio Sep 06, 2005) **Reply Brief of Appellants Joseph P. Horney, Carol S. Gooch, Carl E. Gamble and Joy E. Gamble** (NO. 2005-0227, 2005-0228) ★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2787 CITY OF CINCINNATI, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Richard C. BUCHER, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2006 WL 6141853, *6141853+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio App. 1 Dist. Sep 01, 2006) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. C-050831) ★★★

2788 CITY OF CINCINNATI, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Richard C. BUCHER, et al., Defendants-Appellants., 2006 WL 6141856, *6141856+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio App. 1 Dist. Jun 20, 2006) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. C-050831) ★★

2789 CITY OF CINCINNATI, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Vincent DIMASI, Emma Dimasi, Holly Dimasi, Defendants/Appellants., 2006 WL 6136799, *6136799+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio App. 1 Dist. May 31, 2006) **Brief of the Defendants/Appellants Vincent Dimasi, Emma Dimasi and Holly Dimasi** (NO. C060368) ★★

2790 VILLAGE OF BOSTON HEIGHTS, et al., Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Dennis CERNY, Defendant-Appellant., 2007 WL 4333033, *4333033+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio App. 9 Dist. Feb 21, 2007)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Amended Reply Brief of Appellant Dennis Cerny (NO. 23331) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2791 VILLAGE OF BOSTON HEIGHTS, et al., Plaintiff-Appellee, v. Dennis CERNY, Defendant-Appellant., 2007 WL 4333034, *4333034+ (Appellate Brief) (Ohio App. 9 Dist. Feb 12, 2007) **Reply Brief of Appellant Dennis Cerny** (NO. 23331) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2792 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma Corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. William H. EASTERLY, Judith A. Ecker and Harolyne K. Thielke, and the Garfield County Treasurer, Defendants/Appellants., 2010 WL 5122508, *5122508+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 29, 2010) **Brief in Chief of the Appellants** (NO. 108087) ★★

2793 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. John R. OLER and Donna K. Oler, Defendants/Appellants, The Blaine County Treasurer, Defendant., 2010 WL 3016921, *3016921+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Jun 21, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants** (NO. 107770) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2794 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Rick COMPTON and Lisa G. Lewis, Defendants/Appellants, Farm Credit Services of East Central Oklahoma, FLCA; and the Blaine County Treasurer, Defendants., 2010 WL 3016922, *3016922+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Jun 21, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants** (NO. 107771) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2795 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Gerald A. BEECHER and Lucy Beecher, husband and wife, Defendants/Appellants, Board of County Commissioners of Kingfisher County, a body corporate and politic; and Karen Mueggenborg, Kingfisher County Treasurer, Defendants., 2010 WL 3016942, *3016942 (Appellate Brief) (Okla. May 04, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants** (NO. 107839) ★★

2796 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Sandra NILES, Defendant/Appellant, Board of County Commissioners of Kingfisher County, a Body corporate and politic, and Karen Mueggenborg, Kingfisher County Treasurer, Defendants., 2010 WL 3016879, *3016879+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Apr 30, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellant** (NO. 107651) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2797 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. JASP, INC., an Oklahoma corporation, Defendant/Appellant, Jim Olig; Ed Olig; Board of County Commissioners of Kingfisher County, a body corporate and politic, and Karen Mueggenborg, Kingfisher County Treasurer, Defendants., 2010 WL 3022412, *3022412+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Apr 30, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellant** (NO. 107647) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2798 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Arnold L. and Phyllis J. SMITH, Trustees or their Successors in Trust under the Arnold and Phyllis J. Smith Living Trust dated April 27, 1998, Defendants/Appellants, Board of County Commissioners of Kingfisher County, a body corporate and politic, and Karen Mueggenborg, Kingfisher County Treasurer, Defendants., 2010 WL 3022414, *3022414+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Apr 30, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants** (NO. 107648) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2799 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Wade L. PATTERSON and Linda Patterson, husband and wife, Defendants/Appellants, Kenneth Yost; Board of County Commissioners of Kingfisher County, a body corporate and politic, and Karen Mueggenborg, Kingfisher County Treasurer, Defendants., 2010 WL 3022417, *3022417+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Apr 30, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants** (NO. 107649)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2800 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Mary Loretta KRETCHMAR and David Kretchmar, Defendants/Appellants, Board of County Commissioners of Kingfisher County, a body corporate and politic, and Karen Mueggenborg, Kingfisher County Treasurer, Defendants., 2010 WL 3022420, *3022420+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Apr 30, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants** (NO. 107650) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2801 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Charles O. SANDER, Defendant/Appellant, Woodward County Treasurer, Defendant., 2010 WL 2091237, *2091237+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Mar 12, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellant Charles O. Sander** (NO. 107446) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2802 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Alan ARTHAUD and Flora Mae Arthaud and Angela Irvin, Trustees of the Alan Arthaud and Flora Mae Arthaud Revocable Trust Agreement, Defendants/Appellants, Woodward County Treasurer, Defendant., 2010 WL 2097621, *2097621+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Mar 12, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants** (NO. 107444) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2803 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Alan ARTHAUD and Flora Mae Arthaud and Angela Irvin, Trustees of the Alan Arthaud and Flora Mae Arthaud Revocable Trust Agreement, Defendants/Appellants, Woodward County Treasurer, Defendant., 2010 WL 2097623, *2097623+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Mar 12, 2010) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants** (NO. 107445) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2804 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Preston W. MASQUELIER and Candy Masquelier, Defendants/Appellants., 2009 WL 4052068, *4052068+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 11, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants Preston W. Masquelier and Candy Masquelier** (NO. 107224) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2805 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Preston W. MASQUELIER and Candy Masquelier, Defendants/Appellants., 2009 WL 4052071, *4052071+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 11, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants Preston W. Masquelier and Candy Masquelier** (NO. 107226) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2806 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Preston W. MASQUELIER and Candy Masquelier, Defendants/Appellants., 2009 WL 4052076, *4052076+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 11, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants Preston W. Masquelier and Candy Masquelier** (NO. 107229) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2807 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Preston W. MASQUELIER and Candy Masquelier, Defendants/Appellants., 2009 WL 4052079, *4052079+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 11, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants Preston W. Masquelier and Candy Masquelier** (NO. 107231) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2808 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Preston W. MASQUELIER and Candy Masquelier, Defendants/Appellants., 2009 WL 4052083, *4052083+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 11, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants Preston W. Masquelier and Candy Masquelier** (NO. 107234) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2809 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Darla Kay MANKE, Personal Representative of the Estate of Dennis Manke, Defendant/Appellant., 2009 WL 4052084, *4052084+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 11, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Appellant Darla Kay Manke (NO. 107235) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2810 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Preston W. MASQUELIER and Candy Masquelier, Defendants/Appellants., 2009 WL 4052085, *4052085+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 11, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants Preston W. Masquelier and Candy Masquelier** (NO. 107236) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2811 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Darla Kay MANKE, Defendant/Appellant., 2009 WL 4052086, *4052086+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 11, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellant Darla Kay Manke** (NO. 107237) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2812 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. PURVINE FARMS, INC., Defendant/Appellant., 2009 WL 4052069, *4052069+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 08, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellant Purvine Farms, Inc.** (NO. 107225) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2813 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Jacqueline C. RUMSEY, Defendant/Appellant., 2009 WL 4052072, *4052072+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 08, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellant Jacqueline C. Rumsey** (NO. 107227) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2814 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Jimmie PURVINE and Faye Purvine, Defendants/Appellants., 2009 WL 4052074, *4052074+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 08, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants, Jimmie Purvine and Faye Purvine** (NO. 107228) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2815 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Jacqueline C. RUMSEY, Defendant/Appellant., 2009 WL 4052077, *4052077+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 08, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellant, Jacqueline C. Rumsey** (NO. 107230) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2816 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. Mikle K. MIKLES and Agnes F. Mikles, Defendants/Appellants., 2009 WL 4052080, *4052080+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Sep 08, 2009) **Brief-in-Chief of Appellants Mikle K. Mikles and Agnes F. Mikles** (NO. 107232) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

2817 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma Corporation, Plaintiff/Appellate, v. William H. EASTERLY, Judith A. Ecker and Harolyne K. Thielke, and the Garfield County Treasurer, Defendants/Appellants., 2009 WL 1156866, *1156866+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Feb 27, 2009) **Reply Brief of the Appellants** (NO. 106021) ★★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

2818 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma Corporation, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. William H. EASTERLY, Judith A. Ecker and Harolyne K. Thielke, and the Garfield County Treasurer, Defendants/Appellants., 2009 WL 1023654, *1023654+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Jan 08, 2009) **Brief in Chief of the Appellants** (NO. 106021) ★★★

2819 THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA ex rel. Board of Regents for the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. MCCLOSKEY BROTHERS, INC. an Oklahoma Corporation;, Defendant/Appellant, BANK OF NICHOLS HILLS, COUNTY TREASURER OF PAYNE COUNTY, State of Oklahoma, Defendants., 2003 WL 25759861, *25759861+ (Appellate Brief) (Okla. Jun 02, 2003) **Brief in Chief of the Appellant** (NO. 105228) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2820 PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC, COMPANY, an Oregon corporation. Plaintiff-Appellant, v. William Ray MEAD and Frances, Marie Mead, Husband and Wife. Defendants-Respondents, Fidelity National Title, Insurance Company of, Oregon And Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Defendants., 2008 WL 8046712, *8046712+ (Appellate Brief) (Or.App. Dec 09, 2008) **Plaintiff-Appellant's Opening Brief** (NO. A139931) ★★

2821 In re: Opening A Private Road for the Benefit of Timothy P. O'REILLY Over Lands of (a) Hickory on the Green Homeowners Association, and (b) Mary Lou Sorbara; Gregory E. Burgunder; Ann E. Cain; Don E. Cottrill & Norma J. Cottrill, h/w; Joseph K. Cupples; James D. Dragoo & Linda J. Dragoo, h/w; Kimberly M. Fonzi; Brian J. Gallagher & Diane J. Gallagher, h/w; Dolores M. Gembarosky; Michael J. Gralish, Jr. & Virginia A. Gralish, h/w; James Battista; Jeffery W., 2009 WL 6346599, *6346599+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa. Aug 12, 2009) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 10WAP2009) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,4 (S.Ct.)**

2822 In re: ERIE GOLF COURSE. Appeal of Lake Erie Region Conservancy, Inc. and Committee to Keep Erie Golf Course Open., 2009 WL 6346605, *6346605+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa. Aug 12, 2009) **Brief of Amicus Curiae, Borough of Downingtown** (NO. 12WAP2009) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2823 In re: Opening A Private Road for the Benefit of Timothy P. O'REILLY Over Lands of (a) Hickory on the Green Homeowners Association, and (b) Mary Lou Sorbara; Gregory E. Burgunder; Ann E. Cain; Don E. Cottrill & Norma J. Cottrill, h/w; Joseph K. Cupples; James D. Dragoo & Linda J. Dragoo, h/w; Kimberly M. Fonzi; Brian J. Gallagher & Diane J. Gallagher, h/w; Dolores M. Gembarosky; Michael J. Gralish, Jr. & Virginia A. Gralish, h/w; James Battista; Jeffery W., 2009 WL 6346598, *6346598+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa. Jun 09, 2009) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 10WAP2009) ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2824 In the Matter of: Opening a Private Road for the Benefit of Timothy P. O'REILLY Over Lands of (a) Hickory on the Green Homeowners Association, and (b) Mary Lou Sorbara; Gregory E. Burgunder; Ann E. Cain; Don E. Cottrill & Norma J. Cottrill; Joseph K. Cupples; Bart V. Delcimmuto; James D. Dragoo & Linda J. Dragoo; Kimberly M. Fonzi; Brian J. Gallagher & Diane J. Gallagher; Dolores M. Gembarosky; Michael J. Gralish, Jr. & Virginia A. Gralish; James Battista;, 2009 WL 6346601, *6346601+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa. Jun 09, 2009) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Institute for Justice in Support of Appellants** (NO. 10WAP2009) ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2825 A Condemnation Proceeding in Rem by the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia for the Purpose of Redevelopment of North Philadelphia Redevelopment Area Model Cities Urban Renewal Area Condemnation No. 30B Philadelphia, PA, Including Certain Land Improvements and Properties, Re: 1839 North Eighth Street., 2006 WL 4672485, *4672485+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa. Sep 29, 2006) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the City of Philadelphia** (NO. 36EAP2006) ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2826 A Condemnation Proceeding in Rem by the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia for the Purpose of Redevelopment of North Philadelphia Redevelopment Area Model Cities Urban Renewal Area Condemnation No 30B Philadelphia, PA, Including Certain Land Improvements and Properties, Re: 1839 North Eighth Street., 2006 WL 4672484, *4672484+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa. Sep 28, 2006) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Hope Partnership for Education** (NO. 36EAP2006) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,3,5 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2827 A Condemnation Proceeding in Rem by the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia for the Purpose of Redevelopment of North Philadelphia Redevelopment Area Model Cities Urban Renewal Area Condemnation No. 30B Philadelphia, PA, Including Certain Land Improvements and Properties, Re: 1839 North Eighth Street., 2006 WL 4672480, *4672480+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa. Sep 11, 2006) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 36EAP2006) ★★★★ **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

2828 Forest E. HAFER, Jr., v. THE CITY OF WILLIAMSPORT REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY., 2009 WL 6701614, *6701614+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Dec 14, 2009) **Brief for Appellan** (NO. 1702CD2009) ★★

2829 In re: Condemnation by the COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Department of Transportation, of Right-of-Way for State Route 1021, Section Pai, a Limited Access Highway in the Township of Logan, Appeal of PA Weiss Holdings, LLC., 2008 WL 6041493, *6041493+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Aug 11, 2008) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 531CD2008) ★★

2830 PA WEISS HOLDINGS, LLC, Appellant, v. THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Department of Transportation, of Right-of-Way for State Route 1021, Section Pai A Limited Access Highway Proceeding in the Township of Logan, Appellee., 2008 WL 6041494, *6041494+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Jul 11, 2008) **Brief of Appellant, PA Weiss Holdings, LLC** (NO. 531CD2008) ★★

2831 Lawrence W. SPENCER, Appellant, v. HANOVER TOWNSHIP SEWER AUTHORITY, Appellee., 2008 WL 5940496, *5940496+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. May 30, 2008) **Brief for Appellee, Hanover Township Sewer Authority** (NO. 2285CD2007) ★★

2832 Lawrence W. SPENCER, Appellant, v. HANOVER TOWNSHIP SEWER AUTHORITY, Appellee., 2008 WL 5940495, *5940495+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. May 05, 2008) **Brief for Appellant, Lawrence W. Spencer** (NO. 2285CD2007) ★★★

2833 In re: Opening a Private Road for the Benefit of Timothy P. O'REILLY Over Lands of (a) Hickory on the Green Homeowners Association, and (b) Mary Lou Sorbara; Gregory E. Burgunder; Ann E. Cain; Don E. Cottrill & Norma J. Cottrill, h/w; Joseph K. Cupples; James D. Dragoo & Linda J. Dragoo, h/w; Kimberly M. Fonzi; Brian J. Gallagher & Diane J. Gallagher, h/w; Dolores M. Gembarosky; Michael J. Gralish, Jr. & Virginia A. Gralish, h/w; James Battista; Jeffery W., 2008 WL 5940485, *5940485+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Apr 16, 2008) **Reply Brief of the Appellants** (NO. 2214CD2007) ★★

2834 In re: Opening a Private Road for the Benefit of Timothy P. O'REILLY Over Lands of (a) Hickory on the Green Homeowners Association, and (b) Mary Lou Sorbara; Gregory E. Burgunder; Ann E. Cain; Don E. Cottrill & Norma J. Cottrill, h/w; Joseph K. Cupples; James D. Dragoo & Linda J. Dragoo, h/w; Kimberly M. Fonzi; Brian J. Gallagher & Diane J. Gallagher, h/w; Dolores M. Gembarosky; Michael J. Gralish, Jr. & Virginia A. Gralish, h/w; James Battista; Jeffery W., 2008 WL 5940484, *5940484+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Apr 04, 2008) **Brief of the Appellee** (NO. 2214CD2007) ★★★★

2835 In re: Opening a Private Road for the Benefit of Timothy P. O'REILLY Over Lands of (a) Hickory on the Green Homeowners Association, and (b) Mary Lou Sorbara; Gregory E. Burgunder; Ann E. Cain; Don E. Cottrill & Norma J. Cottrill, h/w; Joseph K. Cupples; James D. Dragoo & Linda J. Dragoo, h/w; Kimberly M. Fonzi; Brian J. Gallagher & Diane J. Gallagher, h/w; Dolores M. Gembarosky; Michael J. Gralish, Jr. & Virginia A. Gralish, h/w; James Battista; Jeffery W., 2008 WL 5940483, *5940483+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Feb 19, 2008) **Brief of the Appel-**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

lants (NO. 2214CD2007) ★★★★

2836 In Re: CONDEMNATION BY THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF LAWRENCE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA in Fee Simple, Absolute Title, of Land of David C. Hamilton, situate in Neshannock Township, Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, being Parcel I.D. #25-168200, for the Millennium Park Redevelopment Project. Appeal of Estate of David C. Hamilton from the Orders June 15, 2007 and June 18, 2007 of the Lawrence County Court of Common Pleas, No. 70082 of 2004, M.D. Condemnation by the Redevelopment, 2008 WL 6610001, *6610001+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Jan 22, 2008) **Definitive Brief of Designated Appellants, the Estate of David C. Hamilton and Thomas R. and Christy L. Whittaker** (NO. 1293CD2007, 1294CD2007, 1323CD2007, 1324CD2007) ★★★★

2837 In Re: CONDEMNATION BY THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF LAWRENCE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA in Fee Simple, Absolute Title, of Land of David C. Hamilton, situate in Neshannock Township, Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, being Parcel I.D. #25-168200, for the Millennium Park Redevelopment Project. Appeal of Estate of David C. Hamilton from the Orders June 15, 2007 and June 18, 2007 of the Lawrence County Court of Common Pleas, No. 70082 of 2004, M.D. Condemnation by the Redevelopment, 2008 WL 6610002, *6610002+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Jan 22, 2008) **Second Brief of Designated Appellants, the Estate of David C. Hamilton and Thomas R. and Christy L. Whittaker** (NO. 1293CD2007, 1294CD2007, 1323CD2007, 1324CD2007) ★★★

2838 In Re: CONDEMNATION BY THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF LAWRENCE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, in Fee Simple, Absolute Title, of land of David C. Hamilton, situate in Neshannock Township, Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, being Parcel I.D. #25-168200, for the Millennium Park Redevelopment Project. Appeal of Estate of David C. Hamilton. In Re: Condemnation by the Redevelopment Authority of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, in Fee Simple, Absolute Title, of land of Thomas R. and, 2008 WL 6610000, *6610000+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Jan 18, 2008) **Definitive Brief for Redevelopment Authority of Lawrence County Appellee/Cross-Appellant** (NO. 1293CD2007, 1294CD2007, 1323CD2007, 1324CD2007) ★★★★

2839 In Re: CONDEMNATION BY THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF LAWRENCE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, in Fee Simple, Absolute Title, of land of David C. Hamilton, situate in Neshannock Township, Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, being Parcel I.D. #25-168200, for the Millennium Park Redevelopment Project. Appeal of Estate of David C. Hamilton. In Re: Condemnation by the Redevelopment Authority of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, in Fee Simple, Absolute Title, of land of Thomas R. and, 2007 WL 6839397, *6839397+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Dec 20, 2007) **Brief for Redevelopment Authority of Lawrence County Appellee/Cross-Appellant** (NO. 1293CD2007, 1294CD2007, 1323CD2007, 1324CD2007) ★★★★

2840 In Re: CONDEMNATION BY THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF LAWRENCE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA in Fee Simple, Absolute Title, of Land of David C. Hamilton, situate in Neshannock Township, Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, being Parcel I.D. #25-168200, for the Millennium Park Redevelopment Project. Appeal of Estate of David C. Hamilton. Condemnation by the Redevelopment Authority of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania in Fee Simple, Absolute Title, of Land of Thomas R. and Christy L., 2007 WL 6839396, *6839396+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Nov 21, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curiae, Institute for Justice in Support of**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Appellants, the Estate of David C. Hamilton, Thomas R. Whittaker and Christy Whittaker (NO. 1293CD2007, 1294CD2007, 1323CD2007, 1324CD2007) ★★★★

2841 In Re: CONDEMNATION BY THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF LAWRENCE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA in Fee Simple, Absolute Title, of Land of David C. Hamilton, situate in Neshannock Township, Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, being Parcel I.D. #25-168200, for the Millennium Park Redevelopment Project. Appeal of Estate of David C. Hamilton. Condemnation by the Redevelopment Authority of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania in Fee Simple, Absolute Title, of land of Thomas R. and Christy L., 2007 WL 6839398, *6839398+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Nov 21, 2007) **Advanced Brief of Appellants** (NO. 1293CD2007, 1294CD2007, 1323CD2007, 1324CD2007) ★★

2842 In re: Condemnation of Land for the South East Central Business District Redevelopment Area #1: (200 East Fifth Street, Chester, Pennsylvania)., 2007 WL 5786371, *5786371+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Jul 30, 2007) **Brief of Appellee Redevelopment Authority of the City of Chester** (NO. 478CD2007) ★★★

2843 In Re: CONDEMNATION OF LAND FOR THE SOUTH EAST CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT REDEVELOPMENT AREA #1: (405 Madison Street, City of Chester); Appeal of: Earnestine O. Brown (Condemnee); Appellee: Redevelopment Authority of the City of Chester (Condemnor)., 2007 WL 5786384, *5786384+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Jul 30, 2007) **Appellee Brief** (NO. 651CD2007) ★★

2844 In re: Condemnation of Land for the South East Central Business District Redevelopment Area #1: (200 East Fifth Street, Chester, Pennsylvania)., 2007 WL 5786370, *5786370+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Jun 26, 2007) **Brief for Appellant/Condemnee Alan Yarnall** (NO. 478CD2007) ★★

2845 In re: CONDEMNATION OF LAND FOR THE SOUTH EAST CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT REDEVELOPMENT AREA #1 (405 Madison Street, City of Chester., 2007 WL 5786383, *5786383+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Jun 08, 2007) **Brief of Appellant Earnestine O. Brown** (NO. 651CD2007) ★★★

2846 DOWN UNDER G.F.B., INC., Appellant/Cross-Appellee, v. REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, Appellee/Cross-Appellant., 2006 WL 5530075, *5530075+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Nov 01, 2006) **Brief for Appellant/Cross-Appellee Down Under G.F.B., Inc.** (NO. 884CD2006, 917CD2006) " ★★★

2847 BOROUGH OF DUNCANSVILLE, Appellee, v. Richard G. BEARD and Beth Ann Beard, his wife, Appellants., 2006 WL 4843878, *4843878+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Aug 07, 2006) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 1056CD2006) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2848 BOROUGH OF DUNCANSVILLE, Appellee, v. Richard G. BEARD and Beth Ann Beard, his wife, Appellants., 2006 WL 4015939, *4015939+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Feb 06, 2006) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 2315CD2005) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2849 CITY OF WILKES-BARRE, Appellee, v. Ali KAZIMI and Nasser Chafieian, Appellant., 2005 WL 4050694, *4050694+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Oct 11, 2005) **Brief of Appellee, City of Wilkes-Barre** (NO. 1015CD2005) " ★★★ **HN: 3,4 (S.Ct.)**

2850 ALLIED VENDING CORPORATION, Appellant, v. PENNSYLVANIA TURNPIKE COMMISSION, Appellee., 2005 WL 3863126, *3863126+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Aug 22, 2005) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 0840CD2005) " ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2851 R & J HOLDING COMPANY and RJ Florig Industrial Company, Inc., v. THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, Appellant., 2005 WL 4050717, *4050717+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Aug 08, 2005) **Reply Brief of Appellees and Cross Appellants R & J Holding Company and Rj Florig Industrial Company, Inc. to Briefs of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and the Pennsylvania Association ...** (NO. 0217CD2005, 0352CD2005) ★★

2852 R & J HOLDING COMPANY and RJ Florig Industrial Company, Inc., v. THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, Appellant., 2005 WL 4050716, *4050716+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Jul 20, 2005) **Brief of Appellees and Cross Appellants R & J Holding Company and RJ Florig Industrial Company, Inc.** (NO. 0217CD2005, 0352CD2005) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2853 A Condemnation Proceeding in Rem by the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia for the Purpose of Redevelopment of North Philadelphia Redevelopment Area Model Cities Urban Renewal Area Condemnation No. 30 B Philadelphia, PA Including Certain Land Improvements and Properties, Re: 1839 North Eighth Street., 2005 WL 4718736, *4718736+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. Jun 24, 2005) **Reply Brief for Appellants** (NO. 0150CD2005) " ★★★★

2854 BOROUGH OF DUNCANSVILLE, Appellee, v. Richard G. BEARD and Beth Ann Beard, his wife, Appellants., 2005 WL 5383523, *5383523+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Cmwlth. 2005) **Brief of Appellants** (NO. 2315CD2005) " ★★★ **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

2855 Raymond S. PARKER, III, Appellant, v. Elizabeth R. CLARK and Betty Lou Bumeder-Constantine, Appellees., 2008 WL 6492048, *6492048+ (Appellate Brief) (Pa.Super. Dec 02, 2008) **Brief for Appellee** (NO. 680EDA2008) ★★

2856 RHODE ISLAND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Petitioner-Appellee, v. THE PARKING COMPANY, L.P., Fleet National Bank, Fleet Real Estate, Inc., Respondents-Appellants., 2005 WL 5903740, *5903740+ (Appellate Brief) (R.I. Oct 21, 2005) **Brief Amicus Curiae of the Institute for Justice in Support of Appellant, the Parking Company, L.P.** (NO. 2004-0357-A, KM2004-0665) ★★★★

2857 THE PARKING COMPANY, L.P., Fleet National Bank and Fleet Real Estate, Inc., Appellants, v. RHODE ISLAND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Appellee., 2005 WL 5903741, *5903741+ (Appellate Brief) (R.I. Aug 31, 2005) **Reply Brief of Appellants Fleet National Bank and Fleet Real Estate Inc. In Opposition to Brief of Appellee, Rhode Island Economic Development Corporation** (NO. 2004-0357-A) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2858 RHODE ISLAND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Petitioner-Appellee, v. THE PARKING COMPANY, L.P., Fleet National Bank, Fleet Real Estate, Inc., Respondents-Appellants., 2005 WL 5903742, *5903742+ (Appellate Brief) (R.I. Aug 31, 2005) **Reply Brief of Respondent-Appellant the Parking Company, L.P.** (NO. 2004-0357-A) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2859 Richard CONTI, Appellant, v. RHODE ISLAND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Appellee., 2004 WL 5463976, *5463976+ (Appellate Brief) (R.I. Sep 27, 2004) **Answer Brief of Rhode Island Economic Development Corporation** (NO. 2004-0109-A) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2860 RHODE ISLAND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. THE PARKING COMPANY, L.P., Fleet National Bank, Fleet Real Estate, Inc., Defendants-Appellants., 2004 WL 5464010, *5464010+ (Appellate Brief) (R.I. 2004) **Brief of Attorney General**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

As Amicus Curiae (NO. 2004-357-A) ★★

2861 THE METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY, Appellee, v. THE ALLEN FAMILY TRUST, Dean R. Allen and Shirlee A. Allen, Trustees, Appellants., 2008 WL 5008651, *5008651+ (Appellate Brief) (Tenn.Ct.App. Oct 14, 2008) **Brief of Appellee the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County** (NO. M2008-00886-COA-R3-C) ★★

2862 THE METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY, Petitioner/Appellee, v. THE ALLEN FAMILY TRUST, Dean R. Allen and Shirlee A. Allen, Trustees, Respondents/Appellants., 2008 WL 6041752, *6041752+ (Appellate Brief) (Tenn.Ct.App. Sep 22, 2008) **Brief of Appellants, the Allen Family Trust, Dean R. Allen and Shirlee A. Allen, Trustees** (NO. M2008-00886-COA-R3-C) ★★★

2863 CITY OF AUSTIN, Petitioner, v. Harry M. WHITTINGTON, et al., Respondents., 2011 WL 127883, *127883+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Jan 09, 2011) **City of Austin's Response to Texas Farm Bureau's Amicus Curiae Brief** (NO. 10-0316) ★★

2864 CITY OF AUSTIN, Petitioner, v. Harry M. WHITTINGTON, et al., Respondents., 2010 WL 2660110, *2660110+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Jun 21, 2010) **Reply By City of Austin to Response to Petition for Review** (NO. 10-0316) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2865 Thomas O. BENNETT, Jr. and James B. Bonham Corporation, Petitioners, v. Randy REYNOLDS, Respondent., 2009 WL 4248170, *4248170+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Nov 10, 2009) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation in Support of Neither Party** (NO. 08-0074) ★★

2866 CITY OF DALLAS, Petitioner, v. VSC, LLC, Respondent., 2008 WL 5326454, *5326454+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Nov 26, 2008) **Petitioner's Brief on the Merits and Appendix** (NO. 08-0265) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2867 In Re 3M COMPANY., 2007 WL 4580589, *4580589 (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Dec 05, 2007) **Brief on the Merits in Support of Petition for Writ of Mandamus of 3M Company** (NO. 07-00260) ★★

2868 THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, Petitioner/Cross-Respondent, v. EL DORADO AMUSEMENT COMPANY, INC., Respondent/Cross-Petitioner., 2006 WL 3830812, *3830812+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Dec 04, 2006) **The City of San Antonio's Brief on the Merits** (NO. 06-0481) ★★

2869 MALCOMSON ROAD UTILITY DISTRICT, Petitioner, v. Frank George NEWSOM, Respondent., 2006 WL 985261, *985261+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Mar 31, 2006) **Reply By Malcomson Road Utility District to Frank George Newsom's Response to the District's Brief on the Merits** (NO. 05-0626) ★★

2870 MALCOMSON ROAD UTILITY DISTRICT, Petitioner, v. Frank George NEWSOM, Respondent., 2006 WL 900593, *900593+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Mar 16, 2006) **Malcomson Road Utility District's Response to Brief on the Merits of Frank George Newsom** (NO. 05-0626) " ★★ ★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2871 MALCOMSON ROAD UTILITY DISTRICT, Petitioner, v. Frank George NEWSOM, Respondent., 2006 WL 900732, *900732+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Mar 16, 2006) **Frank Newsom's Response To the Brief on the Merits of Malcolmson Road Utility District** (NO. 05-0626) " ★★ ★★ **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2872 Frank George NEWSOM, Petitioner. v. MALCOMSON ROAD UTILITY DISTRICT., Respond-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

ent., 2006 WL 683966, *683966+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Feb 24, 2006) **Brief on the Merits of Frank George Newsom** (NO. 05-0626) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2873 CITY OF HEATH, TEXAS, Petitioner, v. Mark DUNCAN, Et Al, Respondent., 2005 WL 2396720, *2396720+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex. Jul 05, 2005) **Brief on the Merits for Petitioner** (NO. 05-0139) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2874 CITY OF AUSTIN, Appellant, v. Harry M. WHITTINGTON, et al., Appellees., 2008 WL 5317577, *5317577+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Austin Oct 27, 2008) **Appellees' Brief of the Whittingtons** (NO. 03-07-00729-CV) ★★★

2875 CITY OF AUSTIN, Appellant, v. Harry M. WHITTINGTON, et al., Appellees., 2008 WL 4682100, *4682100+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Austin Aug 26, 2008) **Amended Brief of Appellant City of Austin** (NO. 03-07-00729-CV) ★★

2876 CITY OF AUSTIN, Appellant, v. Harry M. WHITTINGTON, et al., Appellees., 2008 WL 6048800, *6048800+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Austin Aug 18, 2008) **Brief of Appellant City of Austin** (NO. 03-07-00729-CV) ★★

2877 Carla T. MAIN and Encounter for Culture and Education, Inc., Defendants--Appellants, v. H. Walker ROYALL, Plaintiff--Appellee., 2010 WL 4018920, *4018920+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas Sep 02, 2010) **Appellants' Second Amended Brief** (NO. 05-09-01503-CV) ★★★

2878 Carla T. MAIN and Encounter for Culture and Education, Inc., Defendants-Appellants, v. H. Walker ROYALL, Plaintiff-Appellee., 2010 WL 3141576, *3141576+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas Jul 12, 2010) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Liberty Institute in Support of Defendants-Appellants Carla T. Main and Encounter for Culture and Education, Inc.** (NO. 05-09-01503-CV) ★★★★

2879 Carla T. MAIN and Encounter for Culture and Education, Inc., Defendants--Appellants, v. H. Walker ROYALL, Plaintiff--Appellee., 2010 WL 2933909, *2933909+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas Jun 02, 2010) **Appellants' Amended Brief** (NO. 05-09-01503-CV) ★★★

2880 Carla T. MAIN and Encounter for Culture and Education, Inc., Defendants--Appellants, v. H. Walker ROYALL, Plaintiff--Appellee., 2010 WL 1861450, *1861450+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas Mar 18, 2010) **Appellants' Brief** (NO. 05-09-01503-CV) ★★★

2881 THE CITY OF COPPELL, TEXAS, Appellant, v. CB PARKWAY BUSINESS CENTER VI, Ltd. And Trammel Crow Company No. 43, Ltd., Appellees., 2008 WL 4223172, *4223172+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas Jul 03, 2008) **Amended Brief of Appellant** (NO. 05-07-00331-CV) ★★

2882 THE CITY OF COPPELL, Texas, Appellant, v. CB PARKWAY BUSINESS CENTER VI, LTD. And Trammell Crow Company No. 43, Ltd., Appellees., 2008 WL 4223173, *4223173+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas Jul 03, 2008) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 05-07-00331-CV) ★★

2883 CITY OF COPPELL, Texas, Plaintiff and appellant, v. CB PARKWAY BUSINESS CENTER VI, LTD., Trammell Crow Company No. 43, Ltd., and City of Dallas, Texas, Defendant and appellees., 2008 WL 2209444, *2209444+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas Apr 08, 2008) **Brief for Appellees CB Parkway Business Center VI, Ltd. and Trammell Crow Company No. 43, Ltd.** (NO. 05-07-00331-CV) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2884 DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, Appellant, v. CLEAR CHANNEL OUTDOOR, INC., Appellee., 2008 WL 2209447, *2209447+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas Mar 24, 2008) **Brief of Appellee Clear Channel Outdoor, Inc.** (NO. 05-07-00701-CV) ★★

2885 THE CITY OF COPPELL, Texas, Appellant, v. CB PARKWAY BUSINESS CENTER VI, LTD. And Trammel Crow Company No. 43, Ltd., Appellees., 2007 WL 4928108, *4928108+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas 2007) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 05-07-0331-CV) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2886 CITY OF DALLAS, Appellant, v. VRC LLC, Appellee., 2006 WL 3915074, *3915074+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas Nov 20, 2006) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 05-06-01056-CV) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2887 CITY OF COPPELL, TEXAS, Plaintiff and appellant, v. CB PARKWAY BUSINESS CENTER VI, LTD., Trammell Crow Company No. 43, Ltd., and City of Dallas, Texas, Defendants and appellees., 2005 WL 6161682, *6161682+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Dallas 2005) **First Amended Brief for Appelle's Cb Parkway Business Center Vi, Ltd. And Trammel Crow Company No.43,ltd.** (NO. 05-07-00331-CV) ★★

2888 CASCOTT, L.L.C., Appellant, v. CITY OF ARLINGTON, Appellee., 2008 WL 2766865, *2766865+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Fort Worth Jun 11, 2008) **Brief of Appellee City of Arlington** (NO. 02-08-00042-CV) ★★

2889 TEXAS BAY CHERRY HILL, L.P., Appellant, v. THE CITY OF FORT WORTH, TEXAS, and Becky L. Haskin, Appellees., 2007 WL 1378812, *1378812+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Fort Worth Mar 30, 2007) **Brief of Appellees City of Fort Worth and Becky L. Haskin** (NO. 02-06-00325-CV) ★★

2890 APARTMENTS OF VILLA DEL RIO, L.P., and apartments of Oak hollow FW, L.P., Appellants, v. THE CITY OF FORT WORTH, Texas, Appellee., 2006 WL 1759501, *1759501+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Fort Worth May 09, 2006) **Brief of Appellee, City of Fort Worth** (NO. 02-06-00086-CV) ★★★ **HN: 1,2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2891 FREEPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Appellant, v. WESTERN SEAFOOD COMPANY, Appellee., 2008 WL 657599, *657599+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) Feb 12, 2008) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Institute for Justice** (NO. 01-07-00074-CV) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2892 THE FREEPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Appellant, v. WESTERN SHELLFISH CORPORATION, Appellee., 2007 WL 4712328, *4712328+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) Dec 05, 2007) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation In Support of Appellee Western Shellfish Corporation** (NO. 01-07-00698-CV) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2893 FREEPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Appellant, v. WESTERN SEAFOOD COMPANY, Appellee., 2007 WL 4712251, *4712251+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) Nov 29, 2007) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 01-07-00074-CV) " ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2894 THE FREEPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, appellant, v. WESTERN SHELLFISH CORPORATION, Appellee., 2007 WL 4712331, *4712331+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) Nov 21, 2007) **Brief Amicus Curiae of Pacific Legal Foundation In Support of Appellee Western Shellfish Corporation** (NO. 01-07-00698-CV) ★★ **HN: 2**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

(S.Ct.)

2895 FREEPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Appellant, v. WESTERN SEAFOOD COMPANY, Appellee., 2007 WL 4349847, *4349847+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) Nov 09, 2007) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 01-07-00074-CV) " ★★★

2896 FREEPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Appellant, v. WESTERN SEAFOOD COMPANY, Appellee., 2007 WL 3339080, *3339080+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) 2007) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 01-07-00074-CV) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2897 FREEPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Appellant, v. WESTERN SHELLFISH COMPANY, Appellee., 2007 WL 4349873, *4349873+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) 2007) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 01-07-00698-CV) " ★★★ **HN: 4,7 (S.Ct.)**

2898 FREEPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Appellant, v. WESTERN SHELLFISH COMPANY, Appellee., 2007 WL 4712326, *4712326+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) 2007) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 01-07-00698-CV) " ★★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2899 FREEPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Appellant, v. WESTERN SHELLFISH COMPANY, Appellee., 2007 WL 4712333, *4712333+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) 2007) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 01-07-00698-CV) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2900 TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY, Appellant, v. STATE STREET BANK & Trust Co., Cms Viron Corp. and CMS Energy Resource Management Co., Appellees., 2006 WL 583949, *583949 (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) Feb 02, 2006) **Reply Brief of Appellant Texas Southern University** (NO. 01-05-758-CV) ★★

2901 TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY, Appellant, v. STATE STREET BANK and Trust Company, CMS Viron Corporation, and CMS Energy Resource Management Company, Appellees., 2005 WL 3675896, *3675896+ (Appellate Brief) (Tex.App.-Hous. (1 Dist.) Dec 23, 2005) **Brief of CMS Appellees** (NO. 01-05-00758-CV) ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2902 THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH in the Diocese of Virginia, Appellant, v. Truro CHURCH, et al., Appellees., 2009 WL 7405752, *7405752+ (Appellate Brief) (Va. Dec 21, 2009) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 090682) ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2903 HOFFMAN FAMILY, L.L.C., Peggy L. Hoffman, Hubert N. Hoffman, III, and Linda L. Hoffman, Appellants, v. CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, Appellee., 2006 WL 3421220, *3421220+ (Appellate Brief) (Va. Apr 28, 2006) **Brief of Appellee** (NO. 052506) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2904 HOFFMAN FAMILY, LLC., et al., Appellants, v. CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, Appellee., 2006 WL 3421219, *3421219+ (Appellate Brief) (Va. Apr 05, 2006) **Opening Brief of Appellant** (NO. 052506) ★★★ **HN: 3,7 (S.Ct.)**

2905 Harley GRICE, et al., v. VERMONT ELECTRIC POWER CO., et al., IN RE PETITION OF VERMONT ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY, INC., 2007 WL 4642069, *4642069+ (Appellate Brief) (Vt. Apr 11, 2007) **Brief of Intervenor State of Vermont, Office of the Attorney General** (NO. 2006-352, 2006-510) " ★★★

2906 Harley GRICE, et al., Appellants, v. VERMONT ELECTRIC POWER CO. et al., Appellees., 2007 WL 4642094, *4642094+ (Appellate Brief) (Vt. Feb 21, 2007) **Appellants' Brief** (NO.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2006-352, 2006-510) ★★

2907 FLEECE ON EARTH, Appellant, v. VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, Appellee., 2005 WL 4905735, *4905735 (Appellate Brief) (Vt. Nov 2005) **Brief of Amici Curiae New England Legal Foundation Foundation and National Federation of Independent Business Legal Foundation in Support of Appellant** (NO. 2005-367) ★★

2908 Kimme PUTMAN, Appellant, v. WENATCHEE VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER, P.S., a Washington Professional Service Corporation; Patrick J. Wendt, M.D.; David B. Levitsky, M.D.; Shawn C. Kelley, M.D.; and John Doe No. 1; John Doe No. 2; Jane Doe No. 1; and Jane Doe No. 2, Respondents., 2008 WL 5484279, *5484279+ (Appellate Brief) (Wash. Apr 04, 2008) **Corrected Opening Brief of Appellant Kimme Putman** (NO. 80888-1) " ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2909 Kimme PUTMAN, Appellant, v. WENATCHEE VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER, P.S., a Washington professional service corporation; Patrick J. Wendt, M.D.; David B. Levitsky, M.D.; Shawn C. Kelley, M.D.; and John Doe No. 1; John Doe No. 2; Jane Doe No. 1; and Jane Doe No. 2, Respondents., 2008 WL 6196624, *6196624+ (Appellate Brief) (Wash. Apr 04, 2008) **Corrected Opening Brief of Appellant Kimme Putman** (NO. 80888-1) " ★★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2910 Leo C. BRUTSCHE, Petitioner, v. CITY OF KENT, Respondent., 2007 WL 6560781, *6560781+ (Appellate Brief) (Wash. Dec 28, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Institute for Justice Washington Chapter** (NO. 79252-6) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2911 Leo C. BRUTSCHE, Petitioner, v. CITY OF KENT, Respondent., 2007 WL 4939152, *4939152 (Appellate Brief) (Wash. Dec 18, 2007) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Institute for Justice Washington Chapter** (NO. 79252-6) ★★

2912 PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 2 OF GRANT COUNTY, Respondent, v. NORTH AMERICAN FOREIGN TRADE ZONE INDUSTRIES, LLC, Appellant/Petitioner., 2005 WL 3950684, *3950684+ (Appellate Brief) (Wash. Aug 30, 2005) **Brief of Amicus Curiae Institute for Justice Washington Chapter** (NO. 76755-6) " ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2913 PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 2 OF GRANT COUNTY, Respondent, v. NORTH AMERICAN FOREIGN TRADE ZONE INDUSTRIES, LLC, Appellant/Petitioner., 2005 WL 2492303, *2492303+ (Appellate Brief) (Wash. Aug 11, 2005) **Supplemental Brief of Petitioner** (NO. 76755-6) " ★★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2914 APPLE VALLEY GARDENS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff-Respondent, v. Gloria MACHUTTA and Steven Machutta, Defendants-Appellants-Petitioners., 2008 WL 8225912, *8225912+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis. Jul 18, 2008) **Wisconsin Realtors%2F Association Amicus Curiae Brief** (NO. 2007AP191) ★★

2915 WISCONSIN MALL PROPERTIES, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, Plaintiff-Appellant-Petitioner, v. YOUNKERS, INC., Saks, Inc., and Parisian, Inc., Defendants-Respondents, CITY OF GREEN BAY AND CITY OF GREEN BAY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, Intervenors-Respondents., 2006 WL 5444076, *5444076+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis. Mar 27, 2006) **Wisconsin Mall Properties, Llc's Combined Reply Brief** (NO. 2005AP323) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2916 WISCONSIN MALL PROPERTIES, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, Plaintiff-Appellant-Petitioner, v. YOUNKERS, INC., Saks, Inc., and Parisian, Inc., Defendants-Respondents, CITY OF GREEN BAY AND CITY OF GREEN BAY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, Intervenors-Respondents., 2006 WL 5444073, *5444073+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis. Feb 27,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2006) **Wisconsin Mall Properties, LLC's Initial Brief** (NO. 2005AP323) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2917 Andrew J. Van STELLE and Michelle R. Van Stelle, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, Defendant-Respondent. Robert M. Schnell and Dorothy J. Schnell, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Defendant-Respondent., 2010 WL 2934851, *2934851+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis.App. II Dist. Jul 14, 2010) **Brief of Defendant-Respondent Wisconsin Department of Transportation** (NO. 2010AP972) ★★★

2918 Andrew J. Van STELLE and Michelle R. Van Stelle, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, Defendant-Respondent. Robert M. Schnell and Dorothy J. Schnell, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Defendant-Respondent., 2010 WL 2587978, *2587978+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis.App. II Dist. Jun 14, 2010) **Brief of Plaintiffs - Appellants** (NO. 2010AP972) ★★

2919 Judi LUCHAU and Milt Luchau, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, Defendant-Respondent., 2010 WL 1606641, *1606641+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis.App. IV Dist. Apr 07, 2010) **Brief and Appendix of Defendant-Respondent** (NO. 2010AP49) ★★

2920 Thomas R. JORNS, Petitioner-Appellant, v. THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF JACKSONPORT, Door County, Wisconsin, consisting of and acting by and through Alvin Birnschein, Chairman, George Bagnall, Supervisor, and Jeanne Majeski, Supervisor, Respondent-Respondent., 2005 WL 6161238, *6161238+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis.App. III Dist. Dec 22, 2005) **Brief of Petitioner-Appellant** (NO. 2005AP2677) ★★

2921 CITY OF MILWAUKEE POST 2874, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE, Defendant-Respondent., 2005 WL 5806108, *5806108+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis.App. I Dist. Jul 25, 2005) **Response Brief and Supplemental Appendix of Defendant-Respondent, Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee** (NO. 2004-AP-003266) ★★ **HN: 3,5 (S.Ct.)**

2922 CITY OF JANESVILLE, Plaintiff-Respondent, v. CC MIDWEST, INC. a foreign corporation, Defendant-Appellant., 2005 WL 5808082, *5808082+ (Appellate Brief) (Wis.App. IV Dist. Jul 22, 2005) **Brief and Appendix of Defendant-Appellant** (NO. 04-0267) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2923 James D. MACDONALD and Debbie Macdonald, Petitioners/Plaintiffs, v. CITY HOSPITAL, INC. and Sayeed Ahmed, M.D., Respondents/Defendants., 2010 WL 5820180, *5820180+ (Appellate Brief) (W.Va. Nov 03, 2010) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 35543) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2924 James D. MACDONALD and Debbie Macdonald, Petitioners/Plaintiffs, v. CITY HOSPITAL, INC. and Sayeed Ahmed, M.D., Respondents/Defendants., 2010 WL 5820170, *5820170+ (Appellate Brief) (W.Va. Sep 13, 2010) **Appellant's Brief** (NO. 35543) " ★★

2925 CONTRACTOR ENTERPRISE, INC., a West Virginia Corporation, Appellant, v. WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, Division of Highways, a West Virginia Agency, Appellee., 2008 WL 4540917, *4540917 (Appellate Brief) (W.Va. May 20, 2008) **Appellant's Reply Brief** (NO. 33869) ★

2926 CONTRACTOR ENTERPRISE, INC., a West Virginia Corporation, Appellant, v. WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, Division of Highways, appellee., 2008 WL 4540916, *4540916+ (Appellate Brief) (W.Va. May 05, 2008) **Brief of Appellee, West Virginia**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Department of Transportation, Division of Highways (NO. 33869) ★★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2927 CONTRACTOR ENTERPRISE, INC., a West Virginia Corporation, Appellant, v. WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS, a West Virginia Agency, Appellee., 2008 WL 4540915, *4540915+ (Appellate Brief) (W.Va. Apr 01, 2008) **Brief of Appellant** (NO. 33869) ★★

2928 Steven M. KRENNING and Joyce C. Krenning, husband and wife, Appellants (Plaintiffs), v. HEART MOUNTAIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT and James Flowers, Appellees (Defendants)., 2008 WL 5746339, *5746339+ (Appellate Brief) (Wyo. Feb 21, 2008) **Brief of Appellee Heart Mountain Irrigation District** (NO. S-07-0271) ★★

Trial Court Documents (U.S.A.)

Trial Pleadings

2929 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP TWO, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF SANTEE; and Does 1 through 100, Defendants., 2007 WL 4601135, *4601135 (Trial Pleading) (S.D.Cal. Oct 29, 2007) **First amended complaint for Violation of Civil Rights** (NO. 07CV0849-IEG, LSP) ★★

2930 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP TWO, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF SANTEE; and Does 1 through 100, Defendants., 2007 WL 1972995, *1972995 (Trial Pleading) (S.D.Cal. May 10, 2007) **Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights** (NO. 07CV849J, LSP) ★★

2931 CONNECTICUT ASSOCIATION OF HEALTH CARE FACILITIES, INC., Plaintiff, v. M. Jodi RELL, in her official capacity as Governor of the State of Connecticut, Defendant., 2010 WL 390941, *390941 (Trial Pleading) (D.Conn. Jan 28, 2010) **Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief** (NO. 10CV00136) ★★

2932 JPI APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT, L.P., v. TOWN OF HAMDEN; Hamden Legislative Council and Members; Craig Henrici, Mayor; Dale Kroop, Director of Economic and Community Development; and Vera Morrison, Town Clerk., 2006 WL 3888693, *3888693 (Trial Pleading) (D.Conn. Nov 28, 2006) **Verified Complaint** (NO. 06CV01797) ★

2933 ALBERT EINSTEIN MEDICAL CENTER; Jeanes Hospital; Jefferson Health System, Inc.; Main Line Hospitals, Inc.; Penn Presbyterian Medical Center; Pennsylvania Hospital; Temple East, Inc. d/b/a Northeastern Hospital; Temple University Children's Medical Center; Temple University Health System, Inc.; Temple University Hospital, Inc.; The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia; The Frankford Hospital of the City of Philadelphia; The Hospital of the University of, 2006 WL 4226159, *4226159 (Trial Pleading) (D.D.C. Dec 27, 2006) **Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief** (NO. 106-CV-02220) ★★

2934 KEYSTONE PROPERTIES, LLC, Plaintiff, v. JACKSONVILLE PORT AUTHORITY, Tony D. Nelson, Ricardo Morales, Jr., William C. Mason, Ed.D., Marilyn McAfee, Jerry W. Davis, T. Martin Fiorentino, Jr., and Thomas P. Jones, Jr., in their official capacities as Chairman and Members of the Board of Directors of the Jacksonville Port Authority, Defendants., 2006 WL 3609178, *3609178 (Trial Pleading) (M.D.Fla. Oct 11, 2006) **Complaint for Declaratory Judgment and Injunctive Relief** (NO. 306-CV-894-A-20TEM) ★★

2935 ISP ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES INC., Plaintiff, v. THE CITY OF LINDEN, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey; John T. Gregorio, individually and in his capacity as

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Mayor of the City of Linden; the Council of the City of Linden; the Union County Improvement Authority; the Morris Companies; Morris Linden Associates, LLC; Joseph D. Morris, individually and in his capacity as a principal of The Morris Companies and Morris Linden Associates, LLC; John Does, 2007 WL 811522, *811522+ (Trial Pleading) (D.N.J. Jan 22, 2007) **Amended Complaint and Jury Demand** (NO. 05-4249, GEB) ★★★

2936 ISP ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES INC., Plaintiff, v. The City of Linden, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey; John T. Gregorio, individually and in his capacity as Mayor of the City of Linden; the Council of the City of Linden; the Union County Improvement Authority; the Morris Companies; Morris Linden Associates, LLC; Joseph D. Morris, individually and in his capacity as a principal of The Morris Companies and Morris Linden Associates, LLC; John Does, 2006 WL 3625823, *3625823 (Trial Pleading) (D.N.J. Oct 06, 2006) **Amended Complaint and Jury Demand** (NO. 05-4249, GEB) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2937 Donna M. JAMES, Plaintiff, v. THE STATE OF NEW YORK And Commissioner of The The Department of Social, Servicers for the City of New York, Defendants., 2010 WL 1704985, *1704985 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.N.Y. Jan 29, 2010) **Complaint** (NO. CV10-470) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2938 Molly HARRIS-GORDON, Pro Se, Plaintiffs, v. MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, Mila, Inc, The Law Offices of John D. Clunk Co., L.P.A. Wealthbridge Mortgage Corp., Defendants., 2009 WL 5467363, *5467363 (Trial Pleading) (N.D.Ohio Nov 24, 2009) **Complaint** (NO. 09CV02700) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

2939 Earnestine O. BROWN, Petitioner, v. CITY OF CHESTER REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, Respondent., 2009 WL 498388, *498388 (Trial Pleading) (U.S.Tax Ct. Feb 17, 2009) **Petition for Writ of Certiorari** (NO. 08-1069) " ★★

2940 Jerry David CORIE and Genie H. Corie, together as Husband and Wife, and Coalition for Property Rights, Inc., a Florida nonprofit corporation, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF RIVIERA BEACH; Riviera Beach City Council; Riviera Beach Community Redevelopment Agency; an Michael Brown, Mayor of the City of Riviera Beach, and Norma Duncombe, Ann Iles, James Jackson, Vanessa Lee, and Elizabeth Wade, Members of the Riviera Beach City Council, all in their official capacities, Defendants., 2006 WL 6180389, *6180389 (Trial Pleading) (Fla.Cir.Ct. Jun 12, 2006) **Verified Complaint for Declartory and Injunctive Relief** (NO. 2006CA005799XXXXMB) ★★

Expert Testimony

2941 LOVE TERMINAL PARTNERS LP, et al, v. THE CITY OF DALLAS TEXAS, et al., 2006 WL 3921550, *3921550+ (Expert Report and Affidavit) (N.D.Tex. Aug 22, 2006) **(Report or Affidavit of Richard A. Epstein)** (NO. 306CV01279) ★★★

Trial Motions, Memoranda and Affidavits

2942 MACON COUNTY INVESTMENTS, INC.; Reach One, Teach One of America, Inc., Plaintiffs, v. Sheriff David WARREN, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Macon County, Alabama, Defendant., 2007 WL 4349348, *4349348+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Ala. Mar 31, 2007) **Sheriff David Warren's Memorandum Brief in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 306-CV-224-WKW) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2943 Lisa BARNETTE, Jerry Barnette, Sara Cruz, C.B., a minor, by and through his mother and next friend, Lisa Barnette Plaintiff, v. CITY OF PHENIX CITY, Officer Lahr, Officer Walker, Officer Bailey, Officer Nolin, Officer Mitchell, Officer Coreano, Officer McLaughlin Officer Barr, Deputy Grover Goodrich, Deputy Heath Taylor, Defendants., 2005 WL 2303071, *2303071+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Ala. Jul 18, 2005) **Plaintiffs' Response to Defendant Grover Goodrich and Defendant Heath Taylor's Motion for Partial Dismissal** (NO. 305-CV-00473-MHT-DRB) ★★

2944 SOUTHEAST ALASKA CONSERVATION COUNCIL, et al., Plaintiffs, v. UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS; et al., Defendants, Coeur Alaska, Inc., et al., Defendant-Intervenors., 2006 WL 1832674, *1832674 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Alaska May 05, 2006) **Coeur Alaska, Inc.'s Brief in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. J05-0012CV, JKS) ★★

2945 Tracy COLLINS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Janice K. BREWER, in her official capacity as Governor of the State of Arizona, et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 1459048, *1459048+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Ariz. Apr 01, 2010) **Plaintiffs' Motion and Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Preliminary** (NO. CV09-2402-PHX-JWS) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2946 Tracy COLLINS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Janice K. BREWER, in her official capacity as Governor of the State of Arizona, et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 545311, *545311+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Ariz. Feb 11, 2010) **Plaintiffs' Response to Motion to Dismiss** (NO. CV09-2402-PHX-JWS) ★★

2947 Jose Angel GALAZ, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STEEL WORKERS OF AMERICA, Afl-Cio; and United Steel Workers of America Local Union 470; and, Manny Armenta, Defendants., 2005 WL 2509036, *2509036 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Ariz. Aug 02, 2005) **Plaintiff's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. CV03-385-TUC-RCC) ★★

2948 Rashida JOHNSON, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Ruth A. Hawkins, Deceased and Wilkins King, Jr., as Special Representative of the Estate of Ruth A. Hawkins, Deceased, Plaintiffs, v. Vartan ALLAHVERDI, Art Express, Inc., Gilbert Central Corporation, Defendants. Betty Mosley and Gregory Harvey, As Personal Representatives of the Estate of Antoin Harvey, Sr., Deceased, Plaintiffs, v. Vartan Allahverdi, Art Express, Inc., Gilbert Central, 2006 WL 1200241, *1200241+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Ark. Mar 15, 2006) **Brief in Support of Joint Motion to Apply the Substantive Law of Wisconsin or, in the Alternative, to Declare the Application of Joint and Several Liability Unconstitutional** (NO. 303CV00059, SMR) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2949 Rashida JOHNSON, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Ruth A. Hawkins, Deceased and Wilkins King, Jr., as Special Representative of the Estate of Ruth A. Hawkins, Deceased, Plaintiffs, v. Vartan ALLAHVERDI, Art Express, Inc., Gilbert Central Corporation, Defendants. Betty Mosley and Gregory Harvey, As Personal Representatives of the Estate of Antoin Harvey, Sr., Deceased, Plaintiffs, v. Vartan Allahverdi, Art Express, Inc., Gilbert Central, 2006 WL 1200277, *1200277+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Ark. Mar 15, 2006) **Brief in Support of Joint Motion to Apply the Substantive Law of Wisconsin or, In the Alternative, to Declare the Application of Joint and Several Liability Unconstitutional** (NO. 303CV00059, SMR) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2950 Rashida JOHNSON, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Ruth A. Hawkins, Deceased and Wilkins King, Jr., as Special Representative of the Estate of Ruth A. Hawkins, Deceased, Plaintiffs, v. Vartan ALLAHVERDI, Art Express, Inc., Gilbert Central Corporation, Defendants. Betty Mosley and Gregory Harvey, As Personal Representatives of the Estate of Antoin Harvey, Sr., Deceased, Plaintiffs, v. Vartan Allahverdi, Art Express, Inc., Gilbert Central, 2006 WL 1200514, *1200514+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Ark. Mar 15, 2006) **Brief in Support of Joint Motion to Apply the Substantive Law of Wisconsin or, in the Alternative, to Declare the Application of Joint and Several Liability Unconstitutional** (NO. 303CV00059, SMR) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2951 COLONY COVE PROPERTIES, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF CARSON, a municipal corporation; City of Carson Mobilehome Park Rental Review Board, a public administrative body; and Does 1 to 50, inclusive, Defendants., 2009 WL 4247463, *4247463+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (C.D.Cal. Jan 20, 2009) **Defendant City of Carson's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss** (NO. CV08-07065PA, JWJX) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

2952 COLONY COVE PROPERTIES, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF CARSON, a municipal corporation; City of Carson Mobilehome Park Rental Review Board, a public administrative body; and Does 1 to 50, inclusive, Defendants., 2009 WL 4247462, *4247462+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (C.D.Cal. Jan 12, 2009) **Plaintiff Colony Cove Properties, LLC's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss** (NO. CV08-07065PA(JWJX)) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2953 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Plaintiff, v. COUNTRYWIDE FINANCIAL CORPORATION, et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 4233780, *4233780 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (C.D.Cal. Aug 27, 2008) **Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Remand** (NO. 208CV04861) ★★

2954 THE MILTON H. GREENE ARCHIVES, INC., Plaintiff, v. CMG WORLDWIDE, INC., Indiana Corporation, Marilyn Monroe, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, and Anna Strasberg, an individual, Defendants., 2007 WL 5313664, *5313664+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (C.D.Cal. Dec 10, 2007) **Reply in Support of Marilyn Monroe, LLC's Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's May 14, 2007 Order Granting Summary Judgment** (NO. 205CV02200) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2955 Brenda GRIGGS, Plaintiff, v. Wayne STRUMPFER, Acting California Corporations Commissioner., Defendant., 2006 WL 1836687, *1836687+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Cal. May 09, 2006) **Reply to Opposition to Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) for Failure to State A Claim on which Relief Can be Granted** (NO. 105-CV-01313-REC-SMS) ★★

2956 Brenda GRIGGS, Plaintiff, v. Wayne STRUMPFER, Acting California Corporations Commissioner, Defendant., 2006 WL 1465672, *1465672+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Cal. Apr 04, 2006) **Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) for Failure to State A Claim on which Relief Can be Granted** (NO. 105-CV-01313-REC-SMS) ★★★

2957 Dennis ROBINSON; Spencer Robinson, Jr.; Ricke Robinson; Cynthia Robinson; Vickie Robinson, Plaintiffs, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, as Trustee for the Indians of the Mooretown

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Rancheria, aka Maidu Indians of California, Department of the Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs¨ and Does 1-50, inclusive, Defendants., 2005 WL 4115336, *4115336 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Cal. Jul 06, 2005) **Federal Defendants' Supplemental Memorandum in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss or for Summary Judgment** (NO. CIVS-04-0734DFL/KJM) ★★

2958 Karen GOLINSKI, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, and John Berry, Director of the United States Office of Personnel Management, in his official capacity, Defendants., 2010 WL 5065245, *5065245+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Nov 29, 2010) **Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Her Supplemental Brief Pursuant to the October 15 Order** (NO. 310-CV-0257-JSW) ★★

2959 Karen GOLINSKI, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, and John Berry, Director of the United States Office of Personnel Management, in his official capacity, Defendants., 2010 WL 4530146, *4530146+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Nov 08, 2010) **Plaintiff Golinski's Supplemental Brief Pursuant to October 15 Order** (NO. 310-CV-0257-JSW) ★★

2960 VALDEZ, v. AMERICAN FUNDING et al., 2010 WL 2849979, *2849979 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Jun 14, 2010) **Plaintiffs' Notice of Motion and Motion to Remand and Request for an Award of Attorney's Fees and Costs** (NO. 510CV02292) ★★

2961 Kristin M. PERRY, Sandra B. Stier, Paul T. Katami, and Jeffrey J. Zarrillo, Plaintiffs, City and County of San Francisco, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. Arnold SCHWARZENEGGER, in his official capacity as Governor of California; Edmund G. Brown, Jr., in his official capacity as Attorney General of California; Mark B. Horton, in his official capacity as Director of the California Department of Public Health and State Registrar of Vital Statistics; Linette Scott, in her, 2010 WL 742342, *742342+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Feb 26, 2010) **Defendant-Intervenors' Response to Amicus Submissions** (NO. 09-CV-2292VRW) " ★★

2962 Kristin M. PERRY, et al., Plaintiffs, City and County of San Francisco, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. Arnold SCHWARZENEGGER, et al., Defendants, Proposition 8 Official Proponents Dennis Hollingsworth, et al., Defendant-Intervenors., 2010 WL 391010, *391010+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Feb 03, 2010) **Brief of Amici Curiae American Civil Liberties Union, Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc., and National Center for Lesbian Rights** (NO. 09-CV-2292VRW) " ★★★

2963 SPPI-SOMERSVILLE, INC., et al., v. TRC COMPANIES INC., et al., 2009 WL 1893916, *1893916 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. May 18, 2009) (NO. 04-CV-2648) " ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

2964 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership; and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, Defendant, CONTEMPO MARIN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, Defendant-Intervener., 2008 WL 2149627, *2149627+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Mar 31, 2008) **City of San Rafael's Response to Plaintiffs' Opposition to the City's Motion to Stay Injunction** (NO. 300CV03785) " ★★★ **HN: 4,7 (S.Ct.)**

2965 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership, and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, a municipal corporation, and Contempo Marin Homeowner's Association, a California corporation, Defendants.,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

2008 WL 2149628, *2149628+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Mar 31, 2008) **Contempo Marin Homeowners Association's Response to Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion for Stay of Injunction** (NO. 300CV03785) ★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

2966 MHC FINANCING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois limited partnership, and Grapeland Vistas, Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, a municipal corporation, Defendant, CONTEMPO MARIN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, a California corporation, Defendant-Intervenor., 2008 WL 2149629, *2149629+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Mar 31, 2008) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Points and Authorities In Opposition to the City's and Association's Motions to Stay Injuction By Fax** (NO. 300CV03785) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2967 Joseph M. RIMAC, Plaintiff, v. Randy DUNCAN, Randy Crawford, County of Del Norte, and Fort Dick Fire Protection District, Defendants., 2007 WL 1211009, *1211009+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Mar 09, 2007) **Reply of Defendant Duncan in Support of Motion to Dismiss Complaint** (NO. C-07-0298-SC) ★★

2968 REDWOOD CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 617400, *617400+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Jan 04, 2007) **Defendants' Opposition to Redwood's Motions in Limine Ð 1 & 2 (to Exclude Evidence of Interests That are Not ""Compelling'' or That Were Not ""Already Alleged'')** (NO. C01-4282SCADR) ★★

2969 BESARO MOBILE HOME PARK, LLC, dba Besaro Mobile Home Park, Plaintiff, v. THE CITY OF FREMONT, Defendant., 2006 WL 3847428, *3847428+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Nov 24, 2006) **Reply Brief in Support of Motion for New Trial, to Alter or Amend Judgment and for Relief from an Adverse Judgment ÝFederal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rules 59 and 60¨.** (NO. C05-02886CW) ★★

2970 BESARO MOBILE HOME PARK, LLC, dba Besaro Mobile Home Park, Plaintiff, v. THE CITY OF FREMONT, Defendant., 2006 WL 3609716, *3609716+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Oct 06, 2006) **Plaintiff Besaro Mobile Home Park's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint Pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6)** (NO. C05-02886CW) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2971 CONCORD COMMUNITIES, L.P., d/b/a Adobe Mobile Lodge and d/b/a Diablo Mobile Lodge; Adobe Associates, LLC, d/b/a Adobe Mobile Lodge; Diablo Associates, LLC, d/b/a Diablo Mobile Lodge, Petitioners, v. CITY OF CONCORD; City of Concord City Council; and City of Concord Rent Review Borad, Respondents, Tenants Residing at Adobe Mobile Lodge and Diablo Mobile Lodge, Real Parties in Interest., 2006 WL 729893, *729893+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Feb 10, 2006) **Respondents' Reply Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion to Dismiss; Summary of Argument** (NO. C05-04094JSW) ★★

2972 BESARO MOBILE HOME PARK, LLC, dba Besaro Mobile Home Park, Plaintiff, v. THE CITY OF FREMONT, Defendant., 2006 WL 735040, *735040+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Cal. Feb 07, 2006) **Plaintiff Besaro Mobile Home Park's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in opposition to motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint Pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6)** (NO. C05-02886SBA) ★★★

2973 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. David B. St. GERMAIN and Randy Overley, De-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

fendants., 2005 WL 2837133, *2837133 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Colo. Aug 11, 2005) **United States' Opposition to Defendant Randy Overley's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 03-CV-1041-PSF) ★★

2974 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. David B. ST. GERMAIN, and Randy Overley, Defendants., 2005 WL 2837129, *2837129 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Colo. Jul 22, 2005) **Defendant Overley's Opening Brief in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 03-F-1041(BNB)) ★★

2975 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. David B. St. GERMAIN, and Randy Overley, Defendants., 2005 WL 2837132, *2837132 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Colo. Jul 22, 2005) **Defendant Overley's Opening Brief in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 03-F-1041(BNB)) ★★

2976 CONNECTICUT ASSOCIATION OF HEALTH CARE FACILITIES, INC., Plaintiff, v. M. Jodi RELL, in her official capacity as Governor of the State of Connecticut, Defendant., 2010 WL 1506652, *1506652+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Conn. Apr 09, 2010) **Consolidated Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction and Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 310-CV-136, PCD) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

2977 Lisa HOPKINS, et al., v. John DESTEFANO, Jr., et al., 2009 WL 4312964, *4312964 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Conn. Aug 07, 2009) **Plaintiffs' Amended Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment** (NO. 307CV1742(CSH)) ★★

2978 Lisa HOPKINS, et al., v. John DESTEFANO, Jr., et al., 2009 WL 4312963, *4312963 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Conn. Aug 06, 2009) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment** (NO. 307CV1742(CSH)) ★★

2979 EUREKA V LLC, Plaintiff, v. THE TOWN OF RIDGEFIELD, et al, Defendants., 2007 WL 4703234, *4703234 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Conn. Oct 12, 2007) **Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Exclude Expert Report and Testimony** (NO. 302CV356, DJS) ★

2980 EUREKA V LLC, Plaintiff, v. THE TOWN OF RIDGEFIELD, the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Ridgefield, the Board of Finance of the Town of Ridgefield, the Economic Development Commission of the Town of Ridgefield, the Bennett's Farm Development Authority, and Barbara Serfilippi, in her Official Capacity as the Town Clerk of the Town of Ridgefield, Defendants., 2007 WL 4703224, *4703224 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Conn. May 07, 2007) **Defendants' Objection to Motion to Vacate Stay and for Expedited Discovery Dated April 5 2007** (NO. 302CV356, DJS) ★★

2981 SECURITIES INDUSTRY AND FINANCIAL MARKETS ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff, v. Jeffrey B. GARFIELD, in his official capacity as Executive Director and General Counsel of the State Elections Enforcement Commission, Richard Blumenthal, in his official capacity as Attorney General of the State of Connecticut, Defendants., 2006 WL 3856087, *3856087+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Conn. Dec 15, 2006) **Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Support of its Motion for a Preliminary Injunction** (NO. 306-CV-02005) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2982 ZARMACH OIL SERVICES, INC., Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Defendant., 2010 WL 3555370, *3555370 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Apr 28, 2010) **Defendant's Reply Memorandum**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

in Support of Motion to Dismiss and Motion for Summary Judgment (NO. 09-02164, ESH) ★★

2983 ZARMACH OIL SERVICES, INC., v. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, Office of Foreign Assets Control., 2010 WL 2551504, *2551504 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Apr 15, 2010) **Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 109CV02164) ★★

2984 Rose RUMBER, et al., Plaintiffs, v. THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 4364146, *4364146+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Nov 01, 2007) **Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Renewed Motion to Dismiss Third Amended Complaint** (NO. 104CV0117055) ★★

2985 FOGGY BOTTOM ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICE OF PLANNING, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 1781320, *1781320 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. May 19, 2006) **Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Opposition to Preliminary Injunction** (NO. 06-746, PLF) ★★

2986 PHARMACEUTICAL CARE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 1780906, *1780906 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. May 12, 2006) **Defendants' Reply Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Their Motion to Vacate Preliminary Injunction and Supplemental Motion for Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Plaintiff's ...** (NO. 04-1082, RMU) ★★

2987 PHARMACEUTICAL CARE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff, v. THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 1028218, *1028218+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Mar 27, 2006) **Pcma's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Vacate Preliminary Injunction and Supplemental Motion for Summary Judgment; and in Support of Pcma's Supplemental ...** (NO. 04-1082, RMU) ★★

2988 PHARMACEUTICAL CARE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff, v. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 644681, *644681 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Feb 24, 2006) **Defendants' Motion to Vacate Preliminary Injunction and Supplemental Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 04-1082, RMU) ★★

2989 SOUTHEAST LAND DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, L.P., et al., Plaintiffs, v. THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al., Defendants., 2005 WL 2453336, *2453336+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. Aug 04, 2005) **Plaintiffs' Combined Memoranda of Points and Authorities in Reply to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Application for Preliminary Injunction and in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss ...** (NO. 05-1413, RWR) ★★★

2990 Rose RUMBER, et al., Plaintiffs, v. THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA and National Capital Revitalization Corporation, Defendants., 2005 WL 2095956, *2095956+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. 2005) **Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendants' Joint Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction Based on the Supreme Court Decision in Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut** (NO. 104-CV-01170, RMU) ★★★★

2991 Rose RUMBER, et al., Plaintiffs, v. THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA and National Capital Revitalization Corporation, Defendants., 2004 WL 3507163, *3507163+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.D.C. 2004) **Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Third Amended Complaint (NO. 104-CV-01170, RMU) ★★★★

2992 M.D., a Minor, by and through his guardian, Anna Rodriguez, and Anna Rodriguez, as personal representative of the Estate of Arlene Delgado, deceased, Plaintiffs, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant., 2010 WL 3570282, *3570282+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Fla. Jul 09, 2010) **Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Fifteenth Affirmative Defense** (NO. 809-CV-438-EAK-TGW) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

2993 Jorg BUSSE, Plaintiff, v. LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA; Board of Lee County Commissioners; Kenneth M. Wilkinson; Lee County Property Appraiser's Office; State of Florida, Board of Past & Present¨ Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund, State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection, and Division of Recreation and Parks; Lee County Attorney; Jack N. Peterson, Defendants., 2008 WL 7765228, *7765228 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Fla. Jan 14, 2008) **Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defendant County's Motion to Strike (Doc. # 283) Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 12 and 11, and for Permission to File His Submitted Pleadings from the Court and Assigned United ...** (NO. 207-CV-228-FTM-29JES) ★★

2994 SWISHER INTERNATIONAL, INC., Plaintiff, v. Mike JOHANNS, Secretary of Agriculture, Defendant., 2006 WL 3053832, *3053832+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Fla. Sep 01, 2006) **Reply Brief in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 305-CV-871-JHM-TEM) ★★★ **HN: 2,3 (S.Ct.)**

2995 SWISHER INTERNATIONAL INC., Plaintiff, v. Mike JOHANNS, Secretary of Agriculture, Defendant., 2006 WL 5023682, *5023682+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Fla. Aug 22, 2006) **Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and in Support of Plaintiff's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 305-CV-871-JHM-TEM) ★★

2996 DIXIE PROPERTIES OF ST. AUGUSTINE, INC., Plaintiff, v. James E. BRYANT, Karen R. Stern, Cyndi Stevenson, Bruce A. Mcguire, Ben Rich, each individually and in their official capacities, Board of County Commissioners of St. Johns County, St. Johns County, and Sgt. Francescia Anderson, individually and in her official capacity, Defendants., 2006 WL 2446423, *2446423 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Fla. Jul 24, 2006) **Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss of Defendant Francescia Anderson With Incorporated Memorandum of Law** (NO. 306CV-462-J-32MMH) ★★

2997 DIXIE PROPERTIES OF ST. AUGUSTINE, INC., Plaintiff, v. James E. BRYANT, Karen R. Stern, Cyndi Stevenson, Bruce A. Mcguire, Ben Rich, each individually and in their official capacities, Board of County Commissioners of St. Johns County, St. Johns County, and Sgt. Francescia Anderson, individually and in her official capacity, Defendants., 2006 WL 2446422, *2446422 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Fla. Jul 21, 2006) **Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition to the Defendants, Bryant, Stern, Stevenson, Maguire, Rich, and St. Johns County's, Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint** (NO. 306CV-462-J-32MMH) ★★

2998 State of Florida, by and through Bill McCollum, et al., Plaintiffs, v. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH and Human Services, et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 5184233, *5184233+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Fla. Dec 06, 2010) **Reply in Support of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 310-CV-91-RV/EMT) ★★ **HN: 1**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

(S.Ct.)

2999 State of Florida, by and through Bill McCollum, Attorney General of the State of Florida; State of South Carolina, by and through Henry McMaster, Attorney General of the State of South Carolina; State of Nebraska, by and through Jon Bruning, Attorney General of the State of Nebraska; State of Texas, by and through Greg Abbott, Attorney General of the State of Texas; State of Utah, by and through Mark L. Shurtleff, Attorney General of the State of Utah;, 2010 WL 4876894, *4876894+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Fla. Nov 23, 2010) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 310-CV-91-RV/EMT) ★★

3000 Estate of Michelle Evette MCCALL, by and through co-personal representatives Edward M. McCall, II, Margarita F. McCall, and Jason Walley, Plaintiffs, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant., 2008 WL 4771783, *4771783+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Fla. Oct 20, 2008) **Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment to Strike the Defendant's Affirmative Defenses Based on Section 766.118, Florida Statutes and Memorandum of Law in Support Thereof** (NO. 307CV508/MCR/EMT) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

3001 MCZ/CENTRUM FLAMINGO II, LLC, a Delaware limited liability corporation, et al., Plaintiffs/Counter-Defendants, v. CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, a Florida municipal corporation, Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff., 2009 WL 4054410, *4054410+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Jul 15, 2009) **Defendant City of Miami Beach's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment as to Counts I & II** (NO. 08-22419-CIV-ALTONAG) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

3002 MCZ/CENTRUM FLAMINGO II, LLC, a Delaware limited liability corporation, et al., Plaintiffs/Counter-Defendants, v. CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, a Florida municipal corporation, Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff., 2009 WL 4054403, *4054403 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Jul 02, 2009) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment on Counts I & II** (NO. 08-22419-CIV-ALTONAG) ★★

3003 MCZ/CENTRUM FLAMINGO II, LLC, a Delaware limited liability corporation, MCZ/Centrum Flamingo III, LLC, a Delaware limited liability corporation, and Morton Towers Apartments, L.P., a Delaware limited partnership, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, a Florida municipal corporation, Defendant., 2009 WL 4054421, *4054421 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Jan 02, 2009) **Defendant City of Miami Beach's Reply to Plaintiffs' Response in Opposition to Its Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint** (NO. 08-22419-CIV-ALTONAG) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3004 MCZ/CENTRUM FLAMINGO II, LLC, et al., Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, Defendant., 2008 WL 7144986, *7144986 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Nov 22, 2008) **Memorandum of Law in Opposition to City's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 08-22419-CIV-ALTONAG) ★★

3005 MCZ/CENTRUM FLAMINGO II, LLC, a Delaware limited liability corporation, MCZ/Centrum Flamingo III, LLC, a Delaware limited liability corporation, and Morton Towers Apartments, L.P., a Delaware Limited Partnership, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, a Florida municipal corporation, Defendant., 2008 WL 7144984, *7144984+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Oct 03, 2008) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant City of Miami Beach's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint** (NO. 08-22419-CIV-ALTONAG) "

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

★★★

3006 CARNIVAL CORPORATION, Plaintiff-Petitioner, v. PUERTO RICO PORTS AUTHORITY, Defendant-Respondent., 2008 WL 6124439, *6124439 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Jan 02, 2008) **Amicus Curiae Memorandum in Support of the Motion to Dismiss of the Puerto Rico Ports Authority** (NO. 107MC21850) ★★

3007 Velva TURNER, through her Plenary Guardian, Roan Smith, Patricia Ware, Karen Mcnair, And Gisele Bien-Aime, Plaintiffs, v. THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, Defendant., 2007 WL 616895, *616895 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Fla. Jan 10, 2007) **Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint** (NO. 05-61635-CIV-UNGARO-) ★★

3008 Logie W. TALLEY, Plaintiff, v. HOUSING AUTHORITY OF COLUMBUS, Georgia, et al., Defendants., 2009 WL 5128487, *5128487 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Ga. Oct 08, 2009) **Brief of Defendant State of Georgia in Support of Pre-Answer Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 509CV00308) " ★★ **HN: 3,6 (S.Ct.)**

3009 Alfred BOYAJIAN, Plaintiff, v. THE CITY OF ATLANTA, Defendant., 2010 WL 5602568, *5602568 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ga. Oct 08, 2010) **Defendant's Brief in Reply to the Plaintiff's Response to the Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 109-CV-3006-RWS) " ★★

3010 Mark MEEKS and Regina Meeks, Plaintiffs, v. THE CITY OF STOCKBRIDGE, Georgia; R.G. Kelley, in his official capacity as Mayor of the City of Stockbridge; Harold L. Cochran, in his official capacity as a member of the Stockbridge City Council; Fred Evans, in his official capacity as a member of the Stockbridge City Council; W.A. Gardner, in his official capacity as a member of the Stockbridge City Council; Fletcher Turner, in his official capacity as a member of the, 2005 WL 2658088, *2658088 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ga. Sep 16, 2005) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction** (NO. 105-CV-02422-CAF) ★★

3011 Ernestine Ching YOUNG, et al., Plaintiffs, v. CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU, Defendant., 2009 WL 4024915, *4024915+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Hawai'i Mar 24, 2009) **Amicus Curiae First United Methodist Church's Memorandum Regarding Defendant City and County of Honolulu's Motion for Summary Judgment On Counts I, II and III, and Plaintiffs Ernestine Ching Young, ...** (NO. 107CV00068) ★★

3012 Maria ALFANO and Frank Alfano, Husband & Wife, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF SPRING VALLEY, ILLINOIS, an Illinois Local Governmental Entity, James Narczewski, Mayor of the the City of Spring Bay in His Individual Capacity, Lena Mautino, Individually and John R. Widman d/b/a Widman Excavating, Individually, Defendants., 2008 WL 7182897, *7182897 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (C.D.Ill. Sep 17, 2008) **Plaintiffs' Objections to September 3, 2008 Report of Magistrate Judge** (NO. 07-1297) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

3013 Maria ALFANO and Frank Alfano, Husband & Wife, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF SPRING VALLEY, ILLINOIS, an Illinois Local Governmental Entity, James Narczewski, Mayor of the City of Spring Bay in His Individual Capacity, Lena Mautino, Individually and John R. Widman d/b/a Widman Excavating, Individually, Defendants., 2008 WL 7182893, *7182893+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (C.D.Ill. Feb 19, 2008) **Plaintiffs' Response to Motion to Dismiss of Defendants, City of Spring Valley, Illinois & James Narczewski, Mayor of Spring Valley**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

(NO. 07-1297) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3014 Thomas NIEMEYER; Shuntisha Carpenter; Erica Little; and James Cassidy, Individually and as Representatives of Class of Persons Similarly Situated, Plaintiffs, v. Sonni WILLIAMS, Assistant Corporation Counsel of the City of Peoria, in her individual capacity; Steven M. Settingsgaard, Chief of the City of Peoria Police Department, in his individual capacity; City of Peoria, Illinois, an Illinois Local Governmental Entity; Wells Fargo Financial Acceptance, Inc., a, 2008 WL 7182872, *7182872 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (C.D.Ill. Jan 07, 2008) **Defendant's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Plaintiff's Objections to the Report and Recommendation of November 21, 2007** (NO. 07-1103) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

3015 Thomas NIEMEYER, Shuntisha Carpenter, Erica Little, and James Cassidy, Individually and as Representatives of Class of Persons Similarly Situated, Plaintiffs, v. Sonni WILLIAMS, Assistant Corporation Counsel of the City of Peoria, in Her Individual Capacity Steven M. Settingsgaard, Chief of the City of Peoria Police Department, in His Individual Capacity, City of Peoria, Illinois, An Illinois Local Governmental Entity, Wells Fargo Financial Acceptance, Inc., a, 2007 WL 6962154, *6962154+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (C.D.Ill. Dec 10, 2007) **Plaintiffs' Objections to November 21, 2007 Report & Recommendation** (NO. 07-1103) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3016 Tod CURTIS, individually and as beneficiary, First United Trust Company, as Trustee under Trust No. 10510, and Elto Restaurant Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs, v. Irvana K. WILKS, Village of Mount Prospect Mayor and Local Liquor Control Commissioner, Michael E. Janonis, Village of Mount Prospect Manager, William Cooney, Village of Mount Prospect Economic Director, William Schroeder, Village of Mount Prospect Building Commissioner, Robert Roels,, 2009 WL 4388108, *4388108+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. Oct 27, 2009) **Defendants' Joint Reply Memorandum in Further Support of Their Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on Count I of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint and Mount Prospect Defendants' Motion for Summary ...** (NO. 08C3527) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3017 Tod CURTIS, individually and as beneficiary, First United Trust Company, as Trustee under Trust No. 10510, and Elto Restaurant Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs, v. Irvana K. WILKS, Village of Mount Prospect Mayor and Local Liquor Control Commissioner, Michael E. Janonis, Village of Mount Prospect Manager, William Cooney, Village of Mount Prospect Economic Director, William Schroeder, Village of Mount Prospect Building Commissioner, Robert Roels,, 2009 WL 3023583, *3023583 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. Aug 12, 2009) **Defendants' Joint Memorandum of Law Supporting Their Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on Count I and the Mount Prospect Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Counts II, III and IV of the ...** (NO. 108CV03527) ★★

3018 EASTERN DIVISION TOD CURTIS, individually and as beneficiary, First United Trust Company, as Trustee under Trust No. 10510, and Elto Restaurant Inc., an Illinois corporation, Plaintiffs, v. Irvana K. WILKS, Village of Mount Prospect Mayor and Local Liquor Control Commissioner, Michael E.janonis, Village of Mount Prospect Manager, William Cooney, Village of Mount Prospect Economic Director, William Schroeder,village of Mount Prospect Building, 2009 WL 3023582, *3023582 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. Jul 24, 2009) **Defendants' Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment On Counts II, III and IV of the Amended Complaint for Relief of Civil Rights and Rico Violations** (NO. 108CV03527) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3019 John LAFLAMBOY, Plaintiff, v. Steven LANDEK, et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 2850476, *2850476 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. Jun 23, 2008) **Vincent Cainkar's Memorandum of Law In Support of Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 105CV04994) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

3020 RIVER OF LIFE KINGDOM MINISTRIES, Plaintiff, v. VILLAGE OF HAZEL CREST, ILLINOIS, Defendant., 2008 WL 7255972, *7255972 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. Feb 22, 2008) **Defendant Village of Hazel Crest Memorandum in Opposition to Motion for Temporary Restraining Order** (NO. 08C0950) ★★

3021 John LAFLAMBOY, Plaintiff, v. Steven LANDEK et al, Defendants., 2006 WL 1773126, *1773126 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. May 15, 2006) **Defendant Vincent Cainkar's Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Dismiss Counts I and II of Second Amended Complaint** (NO. 05C4994) ★★

3022 Eileen L. BENSON, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF CHICAGO, Defendant., 2006 WL 1773660, *1773660 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. May 10, 2006) **City of Chicago's Memorandum in Support of its Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 06CV1123) ★★

3023 John LaFLAMBOY, Plaintiff, v. Steven LANDEK, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 427886, *427886 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. Jan 13, 2006) **Plaintiff's Response to Defendant Vincent Cainkar's Memorandum in Support of Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 05C4994) ★★

3024 John LAFLAMBOY, Plaintiff, v. Steven LANDEK, individually and as Village Mayor; Kenneth DeVries; Steven Reynolds; Adriana Mazutis; Fred Pascente; Vincent Cainkar, individually and as Attorney for the Village; John Curry, individually and as Building Inspector for the Village; Joseph Kaput, individually and as Building Inspector for the Village; Butch Sloan, individually and as employee of the Village Police Department; and Alan Gustafson, Defendants., 2005 WL 3710028, *3710028 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ill. Nov 18, 2005) **Defendant Vincent Cainkar's Memorandum in Support of Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 05C4994) ★★

3025 Frank R. SUNDVALL and Shirlene Sundvall, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF SHELBYVILLE, Indiana, et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 7295808, *7295808 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Ind. Jun 04, 2008) **Plaintiffs' Response to the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 107-CV-01557-SEB-WTL) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3026 IOWA ASSURANCE CORPORATION, Ron's Automotive, L.C., Ronald L. Inman, III, Vinton Philip Watson, and Judith Ann Watson, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF INDIANOLA, IOWA, Randy Gathers, Bob Kreamer, Shirley Clark, Pete Berry, Steve Richardson, and Mark Vickroy, in their Official and Individual Capacities., Defendants., 2009 WL 4676238, *4676238 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Iowa Jul 08, 2009) **Plaintiffs' Supplemental Memorandum Brief in Support of Resistance to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and in Support of Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (Regarding Ordinances 1389 and 1432)** (NO. 407CV00581) ★★

3027 IOWA ASSURANCE CORPORATION, RON'S AUTOMOTIVE, L.C., Ronald L. Inman, III, Vinton Philip Watson, and Judith Ann Watson, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF INDIANOLA, Iowa, Randy Gathers, Bob Kreamer, Shirley Clark, Pete Berry, Steve Richardson, and Mark Vickroy, in their Official and Individual Capacities., Defendants., 2008 WL 7254357, *7254357 (Trial Mo-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

tion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Iowa Jul 31, 2008) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum Brief in Support of Resistance to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and in Support of Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 407CV00581) ★★

3028 CONTINENTAL COAL, INC., Plaintiff, v. Matt CUNNINGHAM, Laura Cunningham, and Board of County Commissioners of Linn County, Kansas, Defendants., 2008 WL 3093244, *3093244+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Kan. Feb 11, 2008) **Continental Coal, Inc.'s Response and Memorandum in Opposition to Linn County's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 206CV02122) " ★★

3029 NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE UNITED STATES, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, et al., Defendants., 2009 WL 5840883, *5840883+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.La. Dec 07, 2009) **Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 09-5460) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3030 STATE OF LOUISIANA, et al, v. AAA INSURANCE, et al. In Re KATRINA CANAL BREACHES PERTAINS TO INSURANCE Chehardy, 06-1672 Chehardy, 06-1673 Chehardy, 06-1674., 2009 WL 1717931, *1717931 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.La. May 22, 2009) **Supplemental Brief in Further Support of Motion to Dismiss, Stay or Sever Louisiana Citizens Motion for Preliminary Injunction, in Further Opposition to the Motion for Injunction, and in Further ...** (NO. 207CV05528) " ★★

3031 Yolanda ANDERSON, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Alphonso JACKSON, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 4540697, *4540697 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.La. Nov 10, 2007) **Memorandum in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for A Temporary Restraining Order and A Preliminary Injunction** (NO. 06-3298) ★★

3032 William DEVILLE, v. THE REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY and Transit Management of Southeast Louisiana and Mark Major., 2007 WL 2708119, *2708119 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.La. Aug 03, 2007) **Defendant, Transit Management of Southeast Louisiana, Inc.'s, Motion to Dismiss and/or for More Definite Statement in response to Plaintiff's First Supplemental and Amended Complaint and Jury Demand** (NO. 07-1345) ★★

3033 Samuel E. SCHUDMAK, III and Kenner Acquisitions, LLC, v. Patrick D. BOSSETTA, individually and as President of the Board of Commissioners for the East Jefferson Levee District, R.L. ""Rocky Daigle, individually and as Chief of Police for East Jefferson Levee District, and the East Jefferson Levee District., 2006 WL 1785767, *1785767+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.La. May 02, 2006) **Reply Memorandum in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 06-0893) ★★

3034 UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Plaintiff, v. LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, and in Their Capacity as Commissioners, Eric Skrmetta, James M. Field, Lambert C. Boissiere, III, Clyde C. Holloway and Foster L. Campbell, Defendants., 2010 WL 5606171, *5606171+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.La. Oct 01, 2010) **Union Pacific Railroad Company's Memorandum in Opposition to State of Louisiana's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 09-396) ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3035 Rosario DIAZ, Individually and as Representative of the Estate of Evaristo Fernandez and as Natural Tutrix of Rosa Estela Fernandez, Leopoldo Fernandez Diaz, and Jose Fernandez Diaz, v.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

GOODYEAR TIRE AND RUBBER COMPANY, Compania Good Year Du Brazil and Cajun Auto Sales, Inc., 2007 WL 4567533, *4567533 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.La. Nov 15, 2007) **The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company's Memorandum in Support of Motion for Protective Order** (NO. 307-CV-00353) ★★

3036 Richard Max STRAHAN, Jeremy SHUGAR, Plaintiffs, v. Ellen ROY-HERZFELDER, in her official capacity as Secretary of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, David M. Peters, in his official capacity as Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game, Paul Diodati, in his official capacity As Director of the Massachuetts Division of Marine Fisheries, Defendants., 2006 WL 5951918, *5951918 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Mass. Nov 07, 2006) **Memorandum of Amicus Curiae New England Legal Foundation In Support of Defendants and In Opposition to Motion for An Injunction** (NO. 105CV10140) ★

3037 WARNER STREET, INC., Plaintiff, v. BALTIMORE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 6974637, *6974637 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Md. Jun 01, 2007) **Reply in Further Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 107CV00986) ★★

3038 WARNER STREET, INC., Plaintiff, v. BALTIMORE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 6974636, *6974636+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Md. May 25, 2007) **Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 107CV00986) ★★★ **HN: 3,5,7 (S.Ct.)**

3039 WARNER STREET, INC., Plaintiff, v. BALTIMORE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION and the Mayor and City Council of Rai Timore and M.J. Brodie, Individually and as President of Baltimore Development Corporation and Phil E. Croskey, Individually and as Director of Economic Development-West of Baltimore Development Corporation and Michael Pokorny, Individually and as Senior Economic Development Officer of Baltimore Development Corporation, Defendants., 2007 WL 6974640, *6974640+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Md. Apr 18, 2007) **Memorandum in Support of Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction** (NO. 107CV00986) " ★★★★ **HN: 1,3,7 (S.Ct.)**

3040 In Re: PREMIER AUTOMOTIVE SERVICES, INC., Debtor; Premier Automotive Service, Inc., Appellant, v. Maryland Port Administration, Appellee; Premier Automotive Services, Inc., Appellant, v. Robert L. Flanagan and F. Brooks Royster, III, in their official capacities, Appellees., 2006 WL 5162959, *5162959+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Md. Aug 04, 2006) **Brief of Appellant Premier Automotive Services, Inc.** (NO. 106-CV-1733-WMN) ★★

3041 FRANKLIN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, Plaintiff, v. Brenda M. HARVEY, In Her Official Capacity as the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Defendant., 2007 WL 4603142, *4603142 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Me. Oct 22, 2007) **Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Count II of Plaintiff's Complaint, with Incorporated Memorandum of Law** (NO. 07-CV-00125-GZS) ★★

3042 INTERNATIONAL METAL TRADING INC., and Paul Terrault, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF ROMULUS, Charles Kirby, Chief of Police, Romulus, Michigan, and Joshua Monte, Detective, Defendants., 2009 WL 3397385, *3397385+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mich. Aug 18, 2009) **Plaintiffs Response to Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 208CV11605) ★★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3043 INTERNATIONAL METAL TRADING INC., and Paul Terrault, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF ROMULUS, Charles Kirby, Chief of Police, Romulus, Michigan, and Joshua Monte, Detective, Defendants., 2009 WL 3397384, *3397384 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mich. Aug 17, 2009) **Plaintiffs' Response to Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 208CV11605) ★

3044 COLUMBIA PROPERTIES OF MICHIGAN, Plaintiff, v. COUNTY OF WAYNE, et al, Defendants., 2007 WL 4604549, *4604549+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mich. Aug 07, 2007) **Wayne County's Motion for Summary Judgment and Judgment on the Pleadings** (NO. 206-CV-10624) ★★

3045 CITY OF ECORSE, a Michigan Municipal corporation, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, Defendant., 2006 WL 5165551, *5165551+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mich. Oct 06, 2006) **Response in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 205CV73826) ★★★

3046 COLUMBIA PROPERTIES OF MICHIGAN, Plaintiff, v. COUNTY OF WAYNE, et al, Defendants., 2006 WL 1735743, *1735743+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mich. May 26, 2006) **Wayne County's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 206-CV-10624) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

3047 Jeffrey KLIMAS, individually, and as a class representative, Plaintiff, v. COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, INC., Defendant., 2003 WL 23472184, *23472184 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mich. Jan 29, 2003) **Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint** (NO. 02-72054) ★★

3048 THE SAINT PAUL BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, COMMUNITY STABILIZATION PROJECT, a Minnesota non-profit corporation, Aurora/Saint Anthony Neighborhood Development Corporation, a Minnesota non-profit corporation, Pilgrim Baptist Church, Shear Pleasure, Inc., Metro Bar & Grill, Inc. d/b/a Arnellia's, Carolyn Brown, Deborah Montgomery, Michael Wright, Leetta Douglas, and Gloria Presley Massey, Plaintiffs,, 2010 WL 4853576, *4853576 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Minn. Aug 09, 2010) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment and for Injunctive Relief** (NO. 10-147, DWF/AJB) " ★★

3049 Jimmy J. MICIUS, Elsie M. Mayard, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF ST. PAUL, John M. Harrington, Chief of Police, Saint Paul Police Department, Officer Etienne, Officer Yunker, Officer Cheshier, John Does, Jane Roes, Defendants., 2007 WL 4588590, *4588590 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Minn. Aug 20, 2007) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 06-3989PAM/JSM) ★★

3050 MINNESOTA INDUSTRIAL VENTURES, LLC, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF ROSEVILLE and Roseville Twin Lakes, LLC, Defendants., 2006 WL 580871, *580871+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Minn. Jan 20, 2006) **Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants' Motions to Dismiss** (NO. 05-CV-2488, RHK/JSM) ★★★★

3051 MINNESOTA INDUSTRIAL VENTURES, LLC, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF ROSEVILLE and Roseville Twin Lakes, LLC, Defendants., 2005 WL 4114025, *4114025+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Minn. Dec 05, 2005) **City of Roseville's Memorandum in Support of its Rule 12 Motion** (NO. 05-CV-2488, RHK/JSM) ★★★

3052 MINNESOTA INDUSTRIAL VENTURES, LLC, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF ROSEVILLE and Roseville Twin Lakes, LLC, Defendants., 2005 WL 3841765, *3841765+ (Trial Motion, Memor-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

andum and Affidavit) (D.Minn. Jan 27, 2005) **City of Roseville's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Rule 12 Motion** (NO. 05-CV-2488, RHK/JSM) ★★

3053 METAL MANAGEMENT MISSISSIPPI, INC., Plaintiff, v. Governor Haley BARBOUR, In His Official Capacity Only as Governor of the State of Mississippi, Defendant., 2008 WL 7296083, *7296083 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Miss. Jul 11, 2008) **Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction and Incorporated Memorandum of Law** (NO. 308CV431HTW-LRA) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

3054 KLOPFENSTEIN, et ux., v. P. & C. CREATIVE INVESTMENTS LLC., 2007 WL 4682936, *4682936 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Mo. May 17, 2007) **Memorandum Opposing Farmers' Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 107CV00047LMB) ★★

3055 Harley Z. KULKIN, Deanna S. Kulkin, Plaintiffs, v. COUNTY OF NYE, a Political Subdivision of the State of Nevada and doing business as the Nye County Planning Department for the Pahrump Regional Planning District and the Nye County Sheriffs Office; Ron Williams, individually and as Nye County Manager; Cheryl Beeman, individually and as Acting Director of Nye County Planning Department; Nye County Board of Commissioners Roberta Midge Carver, individually and as Nye County, 2009 WL 4835996, *4835996 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Oct 14, 2009) **Defendants' Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment on Bifurcated Fire Issues** (NO. 207-CV-01027-JCM-PAL) ★★

3056 In Re: CEH PROPERTIES, LTD., Debtor. Vacation Village, Inc. d/b/a Vacation Village Hotel & Casino, et al, Plaintiffs, v. Clark County, Nevada, a public entity organized and existing under the laws of the State of Nevada, et al., Defendants., 2009 WL 166439, *166439 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Jan 12, 2009) **Trial Brief** (NO. CV-S-05-0010-RCJ-RJJ) ★★

3057 ADVANCED SPECIALTY GASES, INC., a Nevada Corporation Plaintiff, v. LYON COUNTY and Its Board of County Commissioners, a political subdivision of the State of Nevada, and Bob Milz, individually and in his official capacity as a Member of the Lyon County Board of Commissioners, and Does I through X, inclusive Defendants., 2006 WL 812887, *812887+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Feb 10, 2006) **Plaintiff Advanced Specialty Gases, Inc.'s Sur-Reply Brief in Opposition To Defendant Lyon County's Motion To Dismiss** (NO. CV-N-03-0561-ECR-VPC) ★★★

3058 ADVANCED SPECIALTY GASES, INC., A Nevada corporation, Plaintiff, v. LYON COUNTY and its Board of County Commissioners, a political subdivision of the State of Nevada; and Bob Milz, individually and in his official capacity as a Member of the Lyon County Board of Commissioners, etc. Does I through X, inclusive, Defendants., 2006 WL 520086, *520086+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Jan 17, 2006) **Defendant Lyon County's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. CV-03-0561-ECR-VPC) ★★

3059 ADVANCED SPECIALTY GASES, INC., A Nevada corporation, Plaintiff, v. LYON COUNTY and Its Board of County Commissioners, a political subdivision of the State of Nevada; and Bob Milz, individually and in his official capacity as a Member of the Lyon County Board of Commissioners, etc. Does I through X, inclusive, Defendants., 2005 WL 3780388, *3780388+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Nev. Sep 30, 2005) **Defendant Lyon County's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. CV-N-033-0561-ECR-VP) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3060 ROUTE 27 LLC, et al., Plaintiffs, v. GETTY PETROLEUM MARKETING, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 4597837, *4597837+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Jun 17, 2010) **Defendants' Brief in Support of Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint** (NO. 310-CV-03080FLW) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

3061 MT. HOLLY CITIZENS IN ACTION, INC., et al., Plaintiffs, v. THE TOWNSHIP OF MT. HOLLY, et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 2319910, *2319910+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Feb 19, 2010) **Township of Mount Holly Brief in Support of Summary Judgment** (NO. 108CV-02584) ★★

3062 THE ESTATE OF PAUL E. PROSKE, Laura O'Hara, Executrix, Plaintiff, v. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant., 2009 WL 4890766, *4890766+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Jul 31, 2009) **Plaintiff's Brief in Opposition to Defendant's Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings on Count I and for Partial Summary Judgment on Count II** (NO. 09-670) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

3063 MT. HOLLY CITIZENS IN ACTION, INC., et al., Plaintiffs, v. THE TOWNSHIP OF MT. HOLLY et al., Defendants., 2009 WL 705117, *705117+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Jan 14, 2009) **Township Defendants' Brief in Support of Its Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's 2nd Amended Complaint Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6)** (NO. 108CV02584) ★★

3064 SB BUILDING ASSOCIATES, L.P., a New Jersey Limited Partnership; SB Milltown Industrial Realty Holdings, LLC, a New Jersey Limited Liability Corporation, and Alsol Corp., a New Jersey Corporation, Plaintiffs, v. THE BOROUGH OF MILLTOWN, The Mayor and Council of Milltown, and The Milltown Ford Avenue Redevelopment Agency, Defendant., 2008 WL 7294963, *7294963+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Nov 24, 2008) **Reply Brief in Further Support Of Borough's Motion For Judgment on the Pleadings** (NO. 07-4127, AET) ★★ **HN: 6 (S.Ct.)**

3065 SB BUILDING ASSOCIATES, L.P., et al, Plaintiffs, v. THE BOROUGH OF MILLTOWN, et al, Defendants., 2008 WL 7294961, *7294961+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Nov 17, 2008) **Brief of Plaintiffs SB Building Associates Et Al in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint on Pleadings** (NO. 07-4127, AET) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

3066 SB BUILDING ASSOCIATES, L.P., et al, Plaintiffs, v. THE BOROUGH OF MILLTOWN, et al, Motion returnable, Defendants., 2008 WL 7294962, *7294962+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Nov 17, 2008) **Brief of Plaintiffs SB Building Associates Et Al in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint on Pleadings** (NO. 07-4127, AET) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

3067 SB BUILDING ASSOCIATES, L.P., et al, Plaintiffs, v. THE BOROUGH OF MILLTOWN, et al, Defendants., 2008 WL 7294959, *7294959+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Oct 23, 2008) **Brief of Plaintiffs SB Building Associates Et Al in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Counts 1 and 4 of Their Amended Complaint** (NO. 07-4127, AET) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3068 GALLENTHIN REALTY DEVELOPMENT, INC., George Gallenthin and Cyndy Gallenthin, Plaintiff, v. THE BOROUGH OF PAULSBORO AND THE GLOUCESTER COUNTY IMPROVEMENT AUTHORITY., 2008 WL 7294567, *7294567+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Jul 17, 2008) **Plaintiffs' Brief in Response to Defendants' Motion for Dismissal** (NO. 08-CV-01267JBS) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3069 SILVER ENTERPRISES, INC., Plaintiff, v. THE TOWNSHIP OF FREEHOLD and the Freehold Township Committee, and John Does 1-20, Defendants., 2008 WL 7294893, *7294893+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Apr 07, 2008) **Plaintiff's Brief in Opposition to Defendant Freehold Township's Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6)** (NO. 307-2322-JAP-JJH) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

3070 RLR INVESTMENTS, LLC, Plaintiff, v. TOWN OF KEARNY, Alberto G. Santos, Mayor, Council of the Town of Kearny, Planning Board of the Town of Kearny, Kearny-Harrison, LLC, Defendants., 2007 WL 4802513, *4802513+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Nov 12, 2007) **Brief of Plaintiff RLR Investments, LLC in Opposition to Defendants' Motions to Dismiss** (NO. 07-3648, DMC) ★★

3071 RLR INVESTMENTS, LLC, Plaintiff, v. TOWN OF KEARNY, Alberto G. Santos, Mayor, Council of the Town of Kearny, Planning Board of the Town of Kearny, Kearny-Harrison, LLC, Defendants., 2007 WL 4678117, *4678117+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Oct 22, 2007) **Brief on Behalf of Defendant Kearny-Harrison, LLC in Support of Motion to Dismiss Complaint Pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(1) and (6)** (NO. 07-3648(DMC)) ★★

3072 66 EAST ALLENDALE, LLC, a limited liability company of the State of New Jersey, et als., Plaintiffs, v. BOROUGH OF SADDLE RIVER, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 7003548, *7003548+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. May 22, 2007) **Defendants' Reply Brief in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Points I and II** (NO. 07-CV-446, JAG) ★★ **HN: 1,3 (S.Ct.)**

3073 CITIZENS FOR A BETTER LAWNSIDE, INC., a New Jersey Not-for-Profit Corporation; Willia Coletrane, Anthony Elzey; Charles Butler; Debra Butler; Wesley Reid and Gloria Reid, Plaintiffs, v. Mark K. BRYANT, Juanita Johnson-Clark, Walter Lacey Stephen Moore, Junious Stanton, Clifford Still, Mary Ann Wardlow, each individually and in their official capacities, jointly, severally and in the alternative; Borough of Lawnside Planning Board, except Clinton Higgs; the, 2006 WL 1782025, *1782025+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. May 22, 2006) **Plaintiffs' Brief in Support of Motion to Deny Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 05-4286, RBK) ★★★

3074 SHERWOOD GROUP ASSOCIATES, LLC and Carol Segal., Plaintiffs, v. TOWNSHIP OF UNION, a municipal corporation in the County of Union, Joseph Florio, individually and in his official capacity as former Mayor and member of the Township Committee of the Township of Union, Peter Capodice, individually and in his official capacity as a member of the Township Committee of the Township of Union, Anthony Terrezza, individually and in his official capacity as a member, 2006 WL 1352921, *1352921+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Apr 24, 2006) **Brief on Behalf of Plaintiffs, Sherwood Group Associates, LLC and Carol Segal, in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 06-0535(DMC)) ★★

3075 CITIZENS FOR A BETTER LAWNSIDE, INC., A New Jersey Not-for-Profit Corporation; Willia Coletrane, Anthony Elzey; Charles Butler; Debra Butler; Wesley Reid; and Gloria Reid, Plaintiffs, v. Mark K. BRYANT; Juanita Johnson-Clark; Walter Lacey; Stephen Moore; Junious Stanton; Clifford Still; Mary ann Wardlow, each individually and in their official capacities, jointly, severally, and in the alternative; Borough of Lawnside Planning Board, (Except Clinton Higgs); the, 2006 WL 1042923, *1042923+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Mar 30, 2006) **Defendants' Brief in Support of Motion** (NO. 5-4286, RBK) ★★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3076 ISP ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES INC., Plaintiff, v. THE CITY OF LINDEN, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey; John T. Gregorio, individually and in his capacity as Mayor of the City of Linden; The Council of the City of Linden; The Union County Improvement Authority; the Morris Companies; Morris Linden Associates, LLC; Joseph D. Morris, individually and in his capacity as a principal of The Morris Companies and Morris Linden Associates, LLC; John Does, 2005 WL 3630811, *3630811+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Nov 23, 2005) **Brief of Plaintiff isp Environmental Services Inc. in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions to Dismiss** (NO. 05-4249, JCL) ★★★★

3077 ISP ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC., Plaintiff, v. THE CITY OF LINDEN; John T. Gregorio; the Council of the City of Linden; the Union County Improvement Authority; the Morris Companies; Morris Linden Associates, LLC; Joseph D. Morris; John Does, individually and John Does, entities, Defendants., 2005 WL 3630810, *3630810+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. Oct 20, 2005) **Memorandum of Law On Behalf of Defendants Morris Companies, Morris Linden Associates, LLC and Joseph D. Morris in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss the Complaint Pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and ...** (NO. 05-4249(JCL)) ★★★

3078 CITIZENS FOR A BETTER LAWNSIDE, INC. A New Jersey Not-for-Profit Corporation, Plaintiff, v. Mark K. BRYANT, Juanita Johnson-Clark, Walter Lacey, Stephen Moore, Junious Stanton Clifford Still, Mary Ann Wardlow, each individually and in their official capacities, jointly, severally and in the alternative; Borough of Lawnside Planning Board; The Borough Council of Lawnside, Defendants., 2005 WL 2899415, *2899415 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. 2005) **Memorandum of Law In Support of The Motion for Preliminary Injunction** (NO. 05CV4286) ★★

3079 ISP ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES INC., Plaintiff, v. THE CITY OF LINDEN, a Municipal Corporation of the State of New Jersey; John T. Gregorio, Individually and in his Capacity as Mayor of the City of Linden; The Council of the City of Linden; the Union County Improvement Authority; the Morris Companies; Morris Linden Associates, LLC; Joseph D. Morris, Individually and in his Capacity as a Principal of The Morris Companies and Morris Linden Associates, LLC; John Does, 2005 WL 3782297, *3782297+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.N.J. 2005) **Sur-Reply Brief of Plaintiff Isp Environmental Services Inc. in Further Opposition to Defendants' Motions to Dismiss** (NO. 05-4249, JCL) ★★

3080 RIVERA et al, v. THE INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF FARMINGDALE et al., 2010 WL 3159907, *3159907+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.Y. May 13, 2010) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant, the Incorporated Village of Farmingdale's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 206CV02613) ★★

3081 RIVERA et al, v. THE INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF FARMINGDALE et al., 2010 WL 3159908, *3159908+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.Y. May 13, 2010) **Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant, the Incorporated Village of Farmingdale's, Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 206CV02613) ★★

3082 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. George E. PATAKI, et al., Defendants. Aaron Piller and Rockwell Property Management, LLC, Plaintiffs, v. George E. Pataki, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 1132487, *1132487+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.Y. Mar 23, 2007) **ESDC Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Objections to Magistrate Judge Levy's Report and Recommendation** (NO. 06CV5827, NGG) ★★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3083 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. George E. PATAKI, et al., Defendants; Aaron Piller, et ano., Plaintiffs, v. George E. Pataki, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 1143442, *1143442+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.Y. Mar 23, 2007) **Response of Forest City Ratner Defendants to Plaintiffs' Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation of February 23, 2007** (NO. 06CV5827, NGG) ★★

3084 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Jerry Campbell, as the putative administrator of the estate of Oliver St. Clair Stewart and in his individual capacity, the Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill Inc., d/b/a Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez, Huda Mufleh-Odeh, Jan Akhtar, David Sheets, Joseph Pastore, Peter Williams, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., Henry Weinstein, 535 Carleton Ave. Corp. and Pacific Carlton Development, 2007 WL 539990, *539990+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.Y. Jan 19, 2007) **Forest City Ratner Defendants' Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint** (NO. 06CV5827, NGG) ★★★★

3085 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. George E. PATAKI, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 539991, *539991+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.Y. Jan 19, 2007) **Memorandum of Law of ESDC Defendants in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint** (NO. CV065827, NGG) ★★★★

3086 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Jerry Campbell, as the putative administrator of the estate of Oliver St. Clair Stewart and in his individual capacity, the Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill Inc., d/b/a Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez, Huda Mufleh-Odeh, Jan Akhtar, David Sheets, Joseph Pastore, Peter Williams, Peter Williams Enterprises, Inc., Henry Weinstein, 535 Carleton Ave. Realty Corp., 535 Carlton Ave. Realty, 2007 WL 539989, *539989+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.Y. Jan 05, 2007) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 06-CV-5827, NGG) ★★★★

3087 Daniel GOLDSTEIN, Jerry Campbell, as the putative administrator of the estate of Oliver St. Clair Stewart and in his individual capacity, the Gelin Group, LLC, Chadderton's Bar and Grill Inc., d/b/a Freddy's Bar and Backroom, Maria Gonzalez, Jackie Gonzalez, Yesenia Gonzalez, Huda Mufleh-Odeh, Jan Akhtar and David Sheets, Plaintiffs, v. George E. PATAKI, Charles A. Gargano, New York State Urban Development Corporation d/b/a Empire State Development, 2006 WL 4643896, *4643896+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.N.Y. Dec 15, 2006) **Forest City Ratner Defendants' Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss the Complaint** (NO. 06CV5827, NGG) ★★★★

3088 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. ALL RIGHT, TITLE, AND INTEREST OF ASSA CORPORATION, Assa Company Limited, And Bank Melli Iran in 650 Fifth Avenue Company, Including But Not Limited to the Real Property and Appurtenances Located at 650 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York, with all Improvements and Attachments Thereon, et al, Defendants in rem., 2009 WL 4008871, *4008871+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.N.Y. Jul 10, 2009) **Memorandum of Claimants Assa Corp. and Assa Limited s/h/a Assa Company Limited in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 08-CV-10934, RJH) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3089 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. NATIVE WHOLESALE SUPPLY COMPANY, Defendant., 2010 WL 4543141, *4543141+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.N.Y. Aug 27, 2010) **Native Wholesale Supply Company's Memorandum of Law in**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (NO. 08-CV-00850RJA-HKS) ★★

3090 Faith Temple CHURCH, Plaintiff, v. TOWN OF BRIGHTON, Sandra L. Frankel, in her official capacity as Brighton Town Supervisor, Thomas Low, in his official capacity as Brighton Commissioner of Public Works, Ramsey Boehner, in his official capacity as Brighton Town Planner, and James R. Vogel, Raymond Tierney Iii, Jill Vigdor Feldman, and Sherry Kraus, in their official capacity as Brighton Town Board Members, Defendants., 2005 WL 2912124, *2912124+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.N.Y. Oct 03, 2005) **Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment** (NO. 604-CV-06355-DGL-MWP) ★★

3091 Edwin M. COLES, et al., Plaintiffs, v. BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS, Erie Metroparks, et al., Defendants., 2009 WL 4994156, *4994156 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ohio Jul 10, 2009) **The Individual Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 308-CV-2968) " ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3092 Nicholas C. GEORGALIS, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, Defendant., 2006 WL 5244286, *5244286+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Ohio Dec 15, 2006) **Defendant's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Cross-motion For Partial Dismissal and Summary Judgment** (NO. 106CV1183) ★★★

3093 Bradley W. CROSBY et al., Plaintiffs, v. PICKAWAY COUNTY GENERAL HEALTH DISTRICT et al., Defendants., 2005 WL 3659722, *3659722 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Ohio Nov 29, 2005) **Defendant Pickaway County General Health District's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. C204974) ★★

3094 THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC. and Conoco Phillips Company, Plaintiffs, v. C. Brad HENRY, Governor of the State of Oklahoma, W.A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, and their Agents and Successors, Defendants, Nordam Group, Inc.; Norris; DP Manufacturing, Inc.; Tulsa Winch, Inc.; Ramsey Winch, Inc.; and Auto Crane Company, Intervenors., 2005 WL 2414647, *2414647+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Okla. Aug 10, 2005) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Rifle Association of America in Support of Defendants, and in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motions for Permanent Injunctive and Declaratory Relief** (NO. 04-CV-820-TCK-PJC) ★★

3095 THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC. and Conoco Phillips Company, Plaintiffs, v. C. Brad HENRY, Governor of the State of Oklahoma, W.A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, and their Agents and Successors, Defendants, Nordam Group, Inc.; Norris; DP Manufacturing, Inc.; Tulsa Winch, Inc.; Ramsey Winch, Inc.; and Auto Crane Company, Intervenors., 2005 WL 2414645, *2414645+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Okla. Jul 29, 2005) **Brief of Amicus Curiae National Rifle Association of America in Support of Defendants, and in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Permanent Injunctive and Declaratory Relief** (NO. 04-CV-820-TCK-PJC) ★★

3096 B. WILLIS, C.P.A., INC., an Oklahoma corporation, Plaintiff, v. BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY, a foreign corporation, Union Pacific Railroad Company, a foreign corporation, and Public Service Company of Oklahoma, an Oklahoma corporation, Defendants., 2005 WL 4133915, *4133915 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Okla. Jul 29, 2005) **Joint Response of Defendants BNSF Railway Company and Public Service Company of Oklahoma on Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Brief in Support** (NO.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

04-CV-163-TCK-PJC) ★★

3097 Robert J. BARTON, et al., Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF MIDWEST CITY, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 4719755, *4719755+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Okla. Jul 09, 2007) **Defendants' Response and Objection to Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Remand of Pendant State Claims and Abatement of Federal Claims Pending Determination of the State Claims** (NO. CIV-07-578-HE) ★★

3098 Robert J. BARTON, et al., Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF MIDWEST CITY, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 1478560, *1478560+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Okla. 2006) **Defendants' Motion and Brief to Dismiss** (NO. CIV-06-179-HE) ★★

3099 (1) Moshe TAL; (2) Bricktown 2000, Inc.; and (3) Tal Technologies, Inc., Plaintiffs. v. (1) Dan Randolph HOGAN; (2) TMK/Hogan Joint Venture, a/k/a Commercial Real Estate Services Joint Venture; (3) Hogan Property Management, L.L.C.; (4) Bricktown-TMK Hogan/Parking, L.L.C. a/k/a Bricktown-Smc/Hogan, L.L.C.; (5) Bricktown-TMK Hogan Entertainment, L.L.C. a/k/a Bricktown-Entertainment, L.L.C.; (6) Mark D. Elgin; (7) Stonegate Management Company, L.L.C.; (8) Elgin, 2005 WL 2889835, *2889835+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Okla. Sep 26, 2005) **Defendants' TMK/Hogan Joint Venture, a/ka/Commercial Real Estate Services Joint Venture; Hogan Property Management, L.L.C.; Bricktown-TMK/Hogan Parking, L.L.C. a/k/a Bricktown-SMC/Hogan, L.L.C., ...** (NO. CIV-05-991-F) ★★

3100 SAVE ARDMORE COALITION Eni Foo; Peggy Savery Hugh Gordon; Sharon Eckstein Richard Gosweiler, Plaintiffs, v. LOWER MERION TOWNSHIP, Montgomery County Plaining Commission, Jennifer Dorn, as Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit AutorityY (SEPTA), Defendants., 2005 WL 6171776, *6171776+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Pa. Sep 21, 2005) **Memorandum of Law on Behalf of Plaintiffs in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss by Defendants Jennifer Dorn, Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration, Southeastern Pennsylvania ...** (NO. 205CV01668) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3101 SAVE ARDMORE COALITION ENI FOO; Peggy Savery Hugh Gordon; Sharon Eckstein Richard Gosweiler, Plaintiffs, v. LOWER MERION TOWNSHIP, Montgomery County Planning Commission, Jennifer Dorn, as Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority (SEPTA), Defendants., 2005 WL 2849528, *2849528+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Pa. Sep 20, 2005) **Memorandum of Law on Behalf of Plaintiffs in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss by Defendants Jennifer Dorn, Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration, Southeastern Pennsylvania ...** (NO. 05-1668) ★★

3102 SAVE ARDMORE COALITION, Eni Foo, Peggy Savery, Hugh Gordon, Sharon Eckstein and Richard Gosweiler, Plaintiffs, v. LOWER MERION TOWNSHIP, Montgomery County Planning Commission, Jennifer Dorn, as Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration, and Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority, Defendants., 2005 WL 2685170, *2685170 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Pa. Aug 18, 2005) **Defendant Lower Merion Township'S Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and Memorandum of Law in Support Thereof** (NO. 05-1668, BMS) ★★

3103 SAVE ARDMORE COALITION ENI FOO; Peggy Savery Hugh Gordon; Sharon Eckstein

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Richard Gosweiler, Plaintiffs, v. LOWER MERION TOWNSHIP MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION JENNIFER DORN, as Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority (SEPTA), Defendants., 2005 WL 6171774, *6171774+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Pa. Jul 20, 2005) **Memorandum of Law on Behalf of Plaintiffs in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss By Defendants Jennifer Dorm, Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration, Southeastern Pennsylvania ...** (NO. 205CV01668) ★★

3104 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Plaintiff, v. SUSQUEHANNA AREA REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY, Defendant., 2005 WL 3590217, *3590217+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (M.D.Pa. Nov 07, 2005) **Defendant's Reply Brief in Support of Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6)** (NO. 1CV05-1814) ★★★

3105 Mel M. MARIN, Plaintiff, v. Joseph FRAGEL, Sharon City Council, Mike Donato, Victor S. Heutsche, Robert Messina, Darin D. Flower, Frank P. Connelly, and Mercer County, Defendants., 2010 WL 1978971, *1978971 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Pa. Jan 27, 2010) **Reply Brief to Plaintiff's Opposition to Sharon Defendants' Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 209CV01333) ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

3106 Harry S. NEIL, Plaintiff, v. C & C MARINE MAINTENANCE COMPANY, Defendant., 2007 WL 1090920, *1090920 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Pa. Feb 20, 2007) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 06-1328) ★★

3107 Edward Eugene YOUNG, Plaintiff, v. A.T.WALL, Individually and in his capacity as the Director of the Rhode Island Department of Corrections, Defendants., 2007 WL 4768004, *4768004 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.R.I. Jul 25, 2007) **Supplemental Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Dismiss Introduction** (NO. 07-34S) ★★

3108 HAMILTON COUNTY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS DISTRICT, Plaintiff, v. ORBACOM COMMUNICATIONS JUDGE COLLIER INTEGRATOR CORP., Orbacom Systems, Inc., OCI Liquidating LLC, IPC Information Systems Holding, Inc., Herbert Cohen, and Ronald Newfield, Defendants., 2005 WL 2657716, *2657716 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tenn. Sep 09, 2005) **Supplemental Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 104-CV-7) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

3109 PHYSICIAN HOSPITALS OF AMERICA, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Secretary SEBELIUS, Defendant., 2010 WL 3526180, *3526180+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Sep 07, 2010) **I. Plaintiffs' Response in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 610-CV-277-MHS) ★★

3110 PHYSICIAN HOSPITALS OF AMERICA, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Secretary SEBELIUS, Defendant., 2010 WL 3526181, *3526181 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Sep 07, 2010) **Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 610-CV-277-MHS) ★★

3111 PHYSICIAN HOSPITALS OF AMERICA and Texas Spine & Joint Hospital, Ltd., Plaintiffs, v. Kathleen SEBELIUS, in her official capacity as Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Defendant., 2010 WL 2286897, *2286897 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Jun 07, 2010) **Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction** (NO. 610-CV-277) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3112 PHYSICIAN HOSPITALS OF AMERICA and Texas Spine & Joint Hospital, Ltd., Plaintiffs, v. Kathleen SEBELIUS, in her official capacity as Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Defendant., 2010 WL 2243160, *2243160 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Jun 03, 2010) **Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction** (NO. 10CV00277) ★★

3113 WATSON et al, v. HORTMAN et al., 2009 WL 4497575, *4497575+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Sep 28, 2009) **Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 208-CV-00081) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3114 Chong Ann KIM, Appellant, v. Odes Ho KIM, et al., Appellees., 2010 WL 2115583, *2115583+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Tex. Apr 26, 2010) **Reply Brief for the Appellee, Odes Ho Kim** (NO. 309-CV-1082-N, 309-CV-1083-N, 309-CV-1187-N) " ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3115 ENCLAVE ARLINGTON ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF ARLINGTON, TEXAS, Defendant., 2009 WL 5075371, *5075371+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Tex. Oct 15, 2009) **Defendant's Reply Brief in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 409-CV-155-A) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

3116 ENCLAVE ARLINGTON ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF ARLINGTON, TEXAS, Defendant., 2009 WL 5075370, *5075370+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Tex. Jul 24, 2009) **Brief in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 409-CV-155-A) ★★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3117 ENCLAVE ARLINGTON ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF ARLINGTON, TEXAS, Defendant., 2009 WL 5075369, *5075369+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Tex. Jun 15, 2009) **Defendant's Reply Brief in Support of Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Alternative Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings** (NO. 409-CV-155-A) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3118 ENCLAVE ARLINGTON ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF ARLINGTON, TEXAS, Defendant., 2009 WL 5075367, *5075367+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.D.Tex. May 27, 2009) **Defendant's Response to Plaintiff's Application for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction and Expedited Discovery, and Brief in Support** (NO. 409-CV-155-A) " ★★★ **HN: 7 (S.Ct.)**

3119 WESTERN SEAFOOD COMPANY, Plaintiff, v. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; City of Freeport, Texas; and Freeport Economic Development Corporation, Defendants., 2007 WL 2958589, *2958589+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Tex. Aug 10, 2007) **Plaintiff Western Seafood Company's Response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Issues Remaining After Remand** (NO. 303-CV-811) ★★★

3120 WESTERN SEAFOOD COMPANY, Plaintiff, v. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; City of Freeport, Texas; and Freeport Economic Development Corporation, Defendants., 2007 WL 5042688, *5042688+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Tex. Jul 20, 2007) **Plaintiff Western Seafood Company's Motion for Summary Judgment, Alternatively, for Abstention** (NO. 303CV00811) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3121 WESTERN SEAFOOD COMPANY, Plaintiff, v. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; City of Freeport, Texas; and Freeport Economic Development Corporation, Defendants., 2007 WL 5042689, *5042689+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.Tex. Jul 20, 2007)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Plaintiff Western Seafood Company's Motion for Summary Judgment, Alternatively, for Abstention (NO. 303CV00811) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3122 Erwin B. PATTERSON, Jr., Plaintiff, v. CITY OF CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA, Commonwealth of Virginia, Stephen E. Mills, John C. Lumpkin, P.C., Teide Enterprises, Inc., Towne Bank, City of Norfolk, Virginia, City of Norfolk, Virginia, Police Department, City of Chesapeake, Virginia, Police Department, William T. Hodsden, W.A. Copeland, Stuart Gordon, and Clarendon National Insurance Company, Defendants., 2008 WL 8210623, *8210623 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Va. Mar 13, 2008) **Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1)** (NO. 207CV611) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

3123 CARNELL CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION, Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant, v. DANVILLE REDEVELOPMENT & HOUSING AUTHORITY, Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff, v. Blaine Square, LLC, Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff, v. International Fidelity Insurance Company, Counterclaim Defendant., 2010 WL 5811519, *5811519 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Va. Nov 30, 2010) **Danville Redevelopment & Housing Authority's Brief in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 410-CV-7) ★★

3124 GRANT COUNTY BLACK SANDS IRRIGATION DISTRICT (GSBSID), et al., Plaintiffs, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 7043139, *7043139+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Wash. Sep 18, 2007) **Federal Defendants' Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss or, Alternatively, for Judgment on the Pleadings** (NO. CV-06-204-RHW) ★★

3125 GRANT COUNTY BLACK SANDS IRRIGATION DISTRICT (GCBSID), et al., Plaintiffs, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 7043150, *7043150 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Wash. Sep 05, 2007) **Corrected Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Opposition to Federal Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Alternatively, Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings** (NO. 206-CV-204) ★★

3126 Bridgette JEFFRIES, as Guardian for Melvin Eason, an incapacitated person, Plaintiff, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, d/b/a G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery V.A. Medical Center, Defendants., 2009 WL 5161711, *5161711 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Wash. Nov 16, 2009) **Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Judgment** (NO. C08-1514RSL) " ★★

3127 Shirley-Ann and Herbert LEU, Plaintiffs, v. INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION (U.S. Section), a United States Agency; David Bernhardt, in his official capacity as United States International Boundary Commissioner, Defendants., 2007 WL 2981358, *2981358 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.D.Wash. Aug 03, 2007) **Defendants' Memorandum of Law in Support of Dismissal of the Complaint** (NO. C07-0510MJP) ★★

3128 Ernest GIBSON, Minor, by his guardian ad litem, Susan M. Gramling, Plaintiff, v. AMERICAN CYANAMID, et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 4219455, *4219455 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Wis. Jul 26, 2010) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant the Sherwin-Williams Company's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 07-CV-864) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3129 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, v. Carl Evan TOOLEY, II., 2010 WL 2848160, *2848160 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.W.Va. Jan 06, 2010) **Response of the United States of America to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 309-00194) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3130 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, v. Mark A. STATEN., 2009 WL 7114980, *7114980 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.W.Va. Dec 21, 2009) **Response of the United States of America to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Indictment** (NO. 209-00235) ★★

3131 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, v. Benjamin Tod CARTER., 2009 WL 3811899, *3811899 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.W.Va. May 06, 2009) **Response of the United States of America to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and Memorandum Filed in Support Thereof** (NO. 209-CR-00055) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

3132 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, v. George William BUMM, III., 2008 WL 7087966, *7087966 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (S.D.W.Va. Dec 22, 2008) **Response of the United States of America to Defendant's Supplemental Memorandum** (NO. 208-CR-00158) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

3133 J. P. OIL COMPANY, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, Plaintiff, v. Patrick MILLER and Beverly J. Miller, Wyoming citizens, Defendants., 2008 WL 7195406, *7195406+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Wyo. Apr 25, 2008) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 07-CV-185-J) " ★★ **HN: 1,2 (S.Ct.)**

3134 FIDEICOMISO DE LA TIERRA DEL CANO MARTIN PENA, Plaintiff, v. Luis G. FORTUNO et al, Defendants., 2009 WL 5120056, *5120056 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Puerto Rico Oct 26, 2009) **Complaint for Declaratory Relief; Temporary Restraining Order; Preliminary and Permanent Injunction** (NO. 2009-1581, FAB) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

3135 FIDEICOMISO DE LA TIERRA DEL CANO MARTIN PENA, Plaintiff, v. Luis G. FORTUNO, et al., Defendants., 2009 WL 5120055, *5120055 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Puerto Rico Oct 06, 2009) **Defendants Motion in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction** (NO. 09-1581, FAB) ★★

3136 FIDEICOMISO DE LA TIERRA DEL CANO MARTIN PENA, Plaintiff, v. Luis G. FORTUNO et al, Defendants., 2009 WL 5120053, *5120053+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Puerto Rico Sep 17, 2009) **Complaint for Declaratory Relief; Temporary Restraining Order; Preliminary and Permanent Injunction** (NO. 2009-1581, DRD) ★★

3137 FIDEICOMISO DE LA TIERRA DEL CANO MARTIN PENA, Plaintiff, v. Luis G. FORTUNO, in his official capacity as Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Antonio Sagardia, in his official capacity as Secretary of Justice of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Municipality of San Juan, Jorge Santini, in his official capacity as the Mayor of the Municipality of San Juan; Autoridad De Energia Electrica, Autoridad De Carreteras Administracion De Terrenos, Defendants., 2009 WL 5120046, *5120046+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Puerto Rico Aug 20, 2009) **Declaratory Relief; Temporary Restraining Order; Preliminary and Permanent Injunction** (NO. 2009-1581, FAB) ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3138 FIDEICOMISO DE LA TIERRA DEL CANO MARTIN PENA, Plaintiff, v. Luis G. FORTUNO, in His Official Capacity As Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Antonio M. Sagardia-de Jesus, in His Official Capacity As Secretary of Justice of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Municipality of San Juan; Jorge Santini, in His Official Capacity As the Mayor of the Municipality of San Juan; Autoridad De Energia Electric De Puerto Rico (Aee); Autoridad De, 2009 WL 5120065, *5120065 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Puerto Rico Jul 31, 2009) **Land Administration's Motion to Dismiss Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

(NO. 09-1581, FAB) ★★

3139 FIDEICOMISO DE LA TIERRA DEL CANO MARTIN PENA, Plaintiff, v. Luis G. FORTUNO, et al., Defendants., 2009 WL 5120066, *5120066+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Puerto Rico Jul 31, 2009) **Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 09-1581, FAB) " ★★★★ **HN: 2,4,7 (S.Ct.)**

3140 PUERTO RICO PORTS AUTHORITY, Petitioner, v. CARNIVAL CORPORATION, Respondent., 2008 WL 822349, *822349 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Puerto Rico Feb 14, 2008) **Amicus Curiae Memorandum in Support of the Motion to Remand of the Puerto Rico Ports Authority** (NO. 307CV01937) " ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3141 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, SE and EL Comandante Management Company, LLC., Plaintiffs, v. Jorge Silva PURAS,, et als., Defendants., 2006 WL 4087572, *4087572 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Puerto Rico Nov 21, 2006) **Reply to Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition to the Administrator Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 06-1623, JAG) ★★

3142 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, S.E.; El Comandante Management Company LLC, Plaintiffs, v. Jorge Silva PURAS, et al., Defendants., 2006 WL 4087571, *4087571+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.Puerto Rico Nov 17, 2006) **Reply Brief in Support of Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and for Withdrawal of Reference** (NO. 06-1623, JAG) ★★★

3143 In re: GLOBAL HOME PRODUCTS LLC, et al., Debtors., 2006 WL 1525486, *1525486 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Bankr.D.Del. Apr 26, 2006) **Objection to Motion Filed and Interim Order Entered Regarding Motion of the Debtors for an Order under Section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code (A) Prohibiting Utility Providers from Altering, Refusing or ...** (NO. 06-10340, KG) ★★

3144 In re: DANA CORPORATION, et al.,, 2006 WL 1203860, *1203860 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Bankr.S.D.N.Y. Mar 29, 2006) **Motion to Permit Untimely Filing of Objection to Debtors' Motion, and Objection, if Permitted Untimely, to Motion of the Debtors and Debtors in Possession, Pursuant to Section 366 of THE Bankruptcy ...** (NO. 06-10354, BRL) ★★

3145 In re: DANA CORPORATION, et al.,, 2006 WL 1204361, *1204361 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Bankr.S.D.N.Y. Mar 29, 2006) **Motion to Permit Untimely Filing of Objection to Debtors' Motion, and Objection, If Permitted Untimely, to Motion of the Debtors and Debtors in Possession, Pursuant to Section 366 of the Bankruptcy ...** (NO. 06-10354, BRL) ★★

3146 In Re: DANA CORPORATION, et al., 2006 WL 1628127, *1628127 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Bankr.S.D.N.Y. Mar 28, 2006) **Motion to Permit Untimely Filing of Objection to Debtors' Motion, and Objection, if Permitted Untimely, to Motion of the Debtors and Debtors in Possession, Pursuant to Section 366 of the Bankruptcy ...** (NO. 06-10354, BRL) ★★

3147 In re: DANA CORPORATION, et al.,, 2006 WL 1204352, *1204352 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Bankr.S.D.N.Y. Mar 20, 2006) **Objection to Motion of the Debtors and Debtors in Possession, Pursuant to Section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code, for Interim and Final Orders: (a) Prohibiting Utilities from Altering, Refusing or ...** (NO. 06-10354, BRL) ★★

3148 In re: CALPINE CORPORATION, et al., 2006 WL 1202585, *1202585 (Trial Motion, Memor-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

andum and Affidavit) (Bankr.S.D.N.Y. Jan 10, 2006) **Objection of Joe Wheeler Electric Membership Corporation to Motion of the Debtors for Interim and Final Orders Determining Adequate Assurance of Payment for Future Utility Services and Request for ...** (NO. 05-60200, BRL) ★★

3149 OVERVIEW BOOKS, LLC and Lev Tsitrin, Plaintiffs, v. THE UNITED STATES, Defendant., 2006 WL 5534766, *5534766+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Fed.Cl. Jul 31, 2006) **Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration and Relief from Order and Judgement** (NO. 05-775C) ★★

3150 OVERVIEW BOOKS, LLC and Lev Tsitrin, Plaintiffs, v. THE UNITED STATES, Defendant., 2006 WL 5534764, *5534764+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Fed.Cl. Jun 15, 2006) **Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant's Response to Plaintiffs' Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 05-775C) ★★

3151 OVERVIEW BOOKS, LLC and Lev Tsitrin, Plaintiffs, v. THE UNITED STATES, Defendant., 2006 WL 5534762, *5534762+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Fed.Cl. Mar 13, 2006) **Plaintiff's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 05-775C) ★★

3152 SEDONA GRAND, LLC, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF SEDONA, Defendant., 2009 WL 6700794, *6700794 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Ariz.Super. Feb 27, 2009) **Plaintiff's Memorandum in Support of Motion for Partial Summary or Declaratory Judgment** (NO. CV82008-0129) ★★

3153 Meyer TURKEN, et al, Plaintiffs, v. Phil GORDON, et. al., Defendants, NPP CITYNORTH, L.L.C., Intervenor-Defendant., 2008 WL 5875065, *5875065+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Ariz.Super. Jan 22, 2008) **City of Phoenix Defendants' Combined Reply in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment and Response to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. CV2007-013766) ★★

3154 Meyer TURKEN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. PHIL GORDON, et. al., Defendants, and NPP Citynorth, L.L.C., Intervenor-Defendant., 2007 WL 5402868, *5402868+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Ariz.Super. Nov 26, 2007) **City of Phoenix Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. CV2007-013766) ★★

3155 Meyer TURKEN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Phil GORDON, et. al., Defendants, NPP CITYNORTH, L.L.C., Intervenor-Defendant., 2007 WL 6225907, *6225907+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Ariz.Super. Nov 26, 2007) **City of Phoenix Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. CV2007-013766) ★★

3156 GREAT WESTERN ASSOCIATES I, L.L.C., an Arizona limited liability company, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF TUCSON, an Arizona municipal corporation, Defendant., 2007 WL 5770151, *5770151 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Ariz.Super. Sep 20, 2007) **Reply to the City's Opposition to Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Filed by Great Western Associates I, L.L.C.** (NO. C20054381) ★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

3157 COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA, a public body, corporate and politic, Plaintiff, v. THE LILY COMPANY, a California limited partnership; et al., Defendants. THE LILY COMPANY, a California limited partnership, Cross-Complainant, v. COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA, a public body, corporate and politic; and Does 1 through 10; Doe entity 11; Does 12

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

through 20; and Does 21 through 30, Cross-Defendants., 2010 WL 5795768, *5795768+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Cal.Superior Oct 08, 2010) **Plaintiff Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Rancho Cordova's Response to Defendant Lily's Amended Trail Brief Re: Right to Take** (NO. 34200900043404CUEIGD) ★★★ **HN: 5 (S.Ct.)**

3158 COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA, et al., Plaintiffs, v. THE LILY COMPANY, et al, Defendants., 2010 WL 5795754, *5795754 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Cal.Superior Oct 04, 2010) **Lily Company's Amended Trial Brief Re: Right to Take** (NO. 34200900043404CUEIGD) ★★

3159 CITY OF INGLEWOOD, a municipal corporation, Plaintiff, v. L. William CHRISTOPHER ; et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 7185286, *7185286 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Cal.Superior Nov 07, 2008) **Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Judgment On the Pleadings** (NO. BC394617) ★★

3160 CITY OF INGLEWOOD, a municipal corporation, Plaintiffs, v. L. William CHRISTOPHER, et al., Defendant., 2008 WL 7185285, *7185285+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Cal.Superior Oct 09, 2008) **Motion for Judgment On the Pleadings and Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support Thereof** (NO. BC394617) ★★

3161 Manuel ANGULO; Roberto Cristales; Marsha Cristales; Claudia Hernandez; and Eva Roman de Angulo, Plaintiffs, v. CONTINENTAL TIRE NORTH AMERICA, INC., Toyota Motor Corporation; Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A. Inc.; and Does 1 through 100, inclusive, Defendants., 2007 WL 4672527, *4672527 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Cal.Superior Nov 09, 2007) **Reply of Defendant, Continental Tire North America, Inc. to Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Protective Order; Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support Thereof; Declaration of ...** (NO. BC374740) ★★

3162 ALJACKS RETAIL PARTNERS, I., LP, Plaintiff, v. JACKSON & MONROE MASTER ASSOCIATION, INC., Members of the Development Committee of the Jackson & Monroe Master Association, Weintraub Financial Services, Inc., 450460 North Palm Drive, L.L.C., Richard E. Weintraub, Liane C. Weintraub, and Louis Heilbron, and Does 1 Through 10, inclusive, Defendants., 2007 WL 6120740, *6120740 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Cal.Superior May 10, 2007) **Plaintiff Aljacks Retail Partners, I LP'S Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for Summary Adjudication** (NO. INP019767) ★★

3163 THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California, a Public Agency, Plaintiff, v. Kramer METALS. A California Partnership, et al., Defendants. And Related Cross Complaint., 2005 WL 3520923, *3520923 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Cal.Superior Aug 19, 2005) **Trial Brief of Defendants Kramer Metals, Stanley J. Kramer and Susan M. Kramer Re Blight Finding** (NO. BC318563) ★★

3164 BURCH FAMILY PARTNERSHIP, LLP, a Colorado Limited Liability Partnership, et al., Plaintiffs, v. THE CITY OF COMMERCE CITY, Colorado, a Home-Rule Colorado municipal corporation; the City Council of the City of Commerce City, Colorado, Defendants. Sinclair Marketing, Inc., a Wyoming Corporation; Sinclair Oil Corporation, a Wyoming Corporation; and Sinclair Transportation Company, a Wyoming corporation, Plaintiffs, v. The City of Commerce City, Colorado, a, 2008 WL 8190187, *8190187 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Colo.Dist.Ct. Jun 16, 2008) **Commerce City's Answer Brief to Burch Plaintiffs' Opening**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

Brief (NO. 08CV289, 08CV304) ★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

3165 BURCH FAMILY PARTNERSHIP, LLP, a Colorado Limited Liability Partnership, et. al, Plaintiffs, v. THE CITY OF COMMERCE CITY, Colorado, a Home-Rule Colorado municipal corporation; and the City Council for the City of Commerce City Colorado, Defendants. Sinclair Marketing, Inc., a Wyoming Corporation; Sinclair Oil Corporation, a Wyoming Corporation; and Sinclair Transportation Company, a Wyoming Corporation., Plaintiffs, v. The City of Commerce City, Colorado, a, 2008 WL 8190188, *8190188 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Colo.Dist.Ct. May 14, 2008) **Burch Plaintiffs' Opening Brief** (NO. 08CV289, 08CV304) " ★★ **HN: 2 (S.Ct.)**

3166 NEW ENGLAND ESTATES. L.L.C., v. TOWN OF BRANFORD, et al., 2007 WL 3045862, *3045862 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Conn.Super. Aug 07, 2007) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant Town of Branford's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. UWYX06CV030183606S) ★★

3167 NEW ENGLAND ESTATES. L.L.C., v. TOWN OF BRANFORD, et al., 2007 WL 3045871, *3045871 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Conn.Super. Aug 06, 2007) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant Town of Branford's Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. UWYX06CV030183606S) ★★

3168 NATIONAL CAPITAL REVITALIZATION CORPORATION, Plaintiff, v. 3.98 ACRES OF LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (2800-2834 Alabama Avenue, S.E.) and First FSK Limited Partnership, et al., Defendants., 2005 WL 4755528, *4755528 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (D.C.Super. Aug 22, 2005) **Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defenses** (NO. 05-0005333) ★★

3169 Bruce E. OSBORNE; Grubb Property, LLC; Fieni Enterprises, LLC; Harvin Partners, LLC; E-Tegos, LLC; Carriage House Associates, LLC; William D. Shellady, Inc.; Phyllis and Leonard C. Ploener Trust; Lee Tibbett and Shirley Tibbett, Plaintiffs, v. THE CITY OF WILMINGTON, a municipal corporation, Defendant., 2008 WL 2213530, *2213530+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Del.Ch. Mar 12, 2008) **Reply Brief in Support of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 3347-CC) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

3170 THE CITY OF MILFORD A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE, Plaintiff, v. MG DEVELOPMENT, LLC, A limited Liability Company of the State of Delaware and; 7,577 Square Feet of Land as a Permanent Utility Easement, 7,574 Square Feet of Land as a Temporary Construction Easement, 22,687 Square Feet of Land as a Permanent Utility Easement and 22,686 Square Feet of Land as a Temporary Construction Easement, all Situate in the City of Milford, Cedar Creek Hundred, Sussex, 2007 WL 7135201, *7135201+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Del.Super. Dec 17, 2007) **Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 07C-07-023ESB) ★★

3171 THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, et al., Plaintiffs, v. FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES, et al., Defendants., 2009 WL 4110175, *4110175 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Fla.Cir.Ct. Aug 14, 2009) **Defendant National Collegiate Athletic Association's Pre-Hearing Memorandum** (NO. 372009CA2298) ★★

3172 THE ASSOCIATED PRESS; et al., Plaintiffs, v. FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES; T.K. Wetherell, in his official capacity as President of Florida State University; National Collegiate Athletic Association; and Grayrobinson, P.A., Defendants., 2009 WL 4110181,

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

*4110181 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Fla.Cir.Ct. Jul 27, 2009) **Defendant National Collegiate Athletic Association's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint or Alternative Motion for Summary Judgment and Memorandum of Law in Support** (NO. 372009CA2298) ★★

3173 INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT OF BOISE CITY, Plaintiff, v. HARRIS FAMILY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Idaho limited partnership, Defendant. HARRIS FAMILY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Idaho limited partnership, Third party plaintiff, v. BRIGHTON INVESTMENTS LLC, an Idaho limited liability company; and State of Idaho, By and Through the State Board of Eduction Acting As Board of Trustees of Boise State University, Third party defendants., 2007 WL 5534806, *5534806 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Idaho Dist. Oct 25, 2007) **Harris Family Limited Partnership's Corrected Memorandum In Opposition to Brighton Investments LLC's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. CVOC0709072) ★★

3174 Stephen T. MALEC, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF BELLEVILLE, ILLINOIS, an Illinois Municipal Corporation, Green Mount Development, LLC, a Missouri limited liability company, and Gmcr, LLC, a Missouri limited liability company, Defendants., 2007 WL 6514944, *6514944 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Ill.Cir. Jun 18, 2007) **Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and in Support of Plaintiff's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 06MR45) ★★

3175 Randy GEISLER, Michael Van Winkle, and Stacey M. Curtis, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF WOOD RIVER, ILLINOIS, an Illinois municipal corporation, and Wood River Partners, L.L.C., an Illinois limited liability company, Defendants., 2007 WL 6867893, *6867893 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Ill.Cir. Feb 05, 2007) **Plaintiffs' Closing Argument** (NO. 04CH943) ★★

3176 NEW ORLEANS REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, v. Kittoria JOHNSON, Wife of/and Joseph Burgess, Jr., or Their Successions and Heirs, If Deceased; the City of New Orleans; and the United States of America., 2008 WL 7379836, *7379836+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (La.Civil D.Ct. Jan 11, 2008) **Memorandum in Opposition to Curator's Exception of Unconstitutional Expropriation** (NO. 2007-3102) ★★★

3177 NEW ORLEANS REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, v. Kittoria JOHNSON, Wife of/and Joseph Burgess, Jr., et al., 2007 WL 7021722, *7021722 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (La.Civil D.Ct. Sep 19, 2007) **Memorandum in Support of Exception of Unconstitutional Expropriation** (NO. 2007-3102) ★★

3178 Dennis GODT, and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. ANTHONY'S PIER 4, INC., Hawthorne By The Sea, Inc. and Anthony Athanas, Jr., Defendants., 2009 WL 3868352, *3868352 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Mass.Super. Sep 02, 2009) **Defendants' Trial Memorandum Concerning Proof of Ownership and ""Managerial Responsibility''** (NO. 07-3919-BLS1) ★★

3179 MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL FOR BALTIMORE CITY, Plaintiff/Appellee, v. EAST OLIVER STREET LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, Defendant/Appellant., 2009 WL 6409876, *6409876 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Md.Cir.Ct. Apr 07, 2009) **Appellant East Oliver Street Limited Partnership's Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment on, Appellee's Petition for Appointment of a Vacant Building Receiver, and Request ...** (NO. 24-C-09-001356) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3180 Arthur W. LAMBERT, et al, Plaintiffs, v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE City Hall, Defendant., 2007 WL 6475717, *6475717 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Md.Cir.Ct. 2007) **Supplement to Motion for Summary Judgment on Count I** (NO. 24-C-04-009153) ★★

3181 HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY IN AND FOR THE CITY OF BLOOMINGTON, Petitioner, v. BLOOMINGTON PROFESSIONAL BUILDING, LLC, et al., Respondents., 2005 WL 3751439, *3751439+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Minn.Dist.Ct. Nov 03, 2005) **The Hra's Reply Memorandum in Support of Petition in Condemnation and Motion for Transfer of Title and Possession Under Minn. Stat. | 117.042** (NO. COURTCD2783) ★★

3182 HOUSING and Redevelopment Authority In Judge Lloyd B. Zimmerman and For the City of Bloomington, Petitioner, v. BLOOMINGTON PROFESSIONAL BUILDING, LLC; Wells Fargo Bank, National Association; Premier Bank, Minnesota; Foreman & Airhart, Ltd.; G. Martin Johnson, Ltd.; J/COM Technologies, Incorporated; Kruger Financial Services, Inc.; MN Loan Processing, Inc.; Maximum Marketing, Inc.; Independence Coin Services, Inc.; County of Hennepin; City of Bloomington, and all other, 2005 WL 3751440, *3751440+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Minn.Dist.Ct. Oct 19, 2005) **Respondents' Pre-Trial Statement of Law** (NO. COURTCD-2783) ★★

3183 HOUSING and Redevelopment Authority in and for the City of Bloomington, Petitioner, v. FOREMAN & AIRHART, LTD, Jcom Technologies, Inc., G. Martin Johnson, attorney at law; Kendall Kline Professional Recruitment, Distinctive Images by Jason; Kruger Financial Services, Minnesota Loan Processing City of Bloomington; Hennepin County; and all other persons unknown claiming any right, title, estate, interest, or lien in the real estate described herein,, 2005 WL 3751437, *3751437+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Minn.Dist.Ct. Aug 19, 2005) **Memorandum in Support of Petition in Condemnation and Motion for Transfer of Title and Possession Under Minn. Stat. | 117.042** (NO. COURTCD2783) ★★★

3184 Alexander HAWKINS, et. al., Plaintiffs, v. PLANNED INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION AUTHORITY, et. al., Defendants., 2005 WL 6050303, *6050303+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Mo.Cir. Jul 21, 2005) **Plaintiffs' Suggestions in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, and Alternatively to Dismiss; and Plaintiffs' Cross Motion for Summary Judgment** (NO. 04CV208335) ★★

3185 NEVADA RESORT ASSOCIATION, a Nevada nonprofit corporation, and Las Vegas Sands, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, Plaintiffs, v. NEVADA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, a Nevada nonprofit corporation; Lynn Warne, an individual; Doug Bache, an individual; Tim Weekley, an individual; Ross Miller, in his capacity as Secretary of State of the State of Nevada; and Does 1 though 20, inclusive, Defendants., 2007 WL 6874067, *6874067 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Nev.Dist.Ct. Dec 31, 2007) **Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Complaints** (NO. 07OC015401B) ★★

3186 NEVADANS FOR THE PROTECTION OF PROPERTY RIGHTS, INC., a Nevada corporation, et al, Plaintiffs, v. Dean HELLER, in his capacity as Secretary of State, et al, Defendants., 2006 WL 6167240, *6167240+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Nev.Dist.Ct. Jul 20, 2006) **Motion for Declaratory Relief and Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition** (NO. A525099) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3187 HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK, a body corporate and politic, and the redevelopment entity the City of Newark, a public body corporate and politic, and Station Plaza Newark Downtown Core Urban Renewal Company, LLC, a limited liability corporation, Plaintiffs, v. BERKOWITZ COMPANY, L.P., Iron Mountain Information Management, Inc., Defendants., 2006 WL 6315214, *6315214 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.J.Super.L. Jun 01, 2006) **Defendant's Brief in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Order to Show Cause Seeking Preliminary Entry to the Property** (NO. ESX-L-4105-06) ★★

3188 ALL AMERICAN CRANE SERVICE INC., Cranes Express Inc., G & C Crane Service, LLC, CNB Crane Rental Inc., William Sackaris, Vasillios Sitaras, Gary Camarda and Ikutiel Stern, Plaintiffs, v. Ashraf OMRAN, Executive Director of the Cranes & Derricks Division of the Department of Buildings of the City of New York, Robert Limandri, As Acting Commissioner of the Department of Buildings of the City of New York, The Department of Buildings of the City of New York, The, 2008 WL 8103567, *8103567 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.Y.Sup. Sep 04, 2008) **Plaintiffs' Affirmation in Opposition to City's Motion to Dismiss and in Support of Plaintiff's Cross Motion to Amend** (NO. 108032/2008) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

3189 In the Matter of DEVELOP DON'T DESTROY (BROOKLYN), INC., et al., Petitioners-Plaintiffs, v. URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, et al., Respondents-, Defendants., 2008 WL 7311102, *7311102+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.Y.Sup. Jan 22, 2008) **Memorandum of Law of Respondent-Defendant Forest City Ratner Companies, LLC in Opposition to the Petition-Complaint and the Motion for a Preliminary Injunction and in Support of Its Cross-Motion for ...** (NO. 104597/2007) ★★

3190 COMMUNITY HOSPITAL AT DOBBS FERRY, and St. John's Riverside Hospital, Plaintiffs, v. Antonia C. NOVELLO, as Commissioner of the New York State Department of Health, The New York State Commission on Healthcare Facilities in the 21st Century, Stephen Berger, as Commissioner of the New York State Commission on Healthcare Facilities in the 21st Century, Eliot Spitzer, as Governor of the State of New York, Sheldon Silver, as Speaker of the New York State Assembly,, 2007 WL 7291415, *7291415+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.Y.Sup. Jul 10, 2007) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction** (NO. 24650/06) " ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

3191 In the Matter of DEVELOP DON'T DESTROY BROOKLYN, INC., et al., Petitioners-Plaintiffs, v. URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, et al., Respondents-Defendants., 2007 WL 4928258, *4928258+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.Y.Sup. May 02, 2007) **Petitioners' Reply Memorandum of Law in Further Support of Their Article 78 Petition-Complaint** (NO. 104597/07) ★★★

3192 In the Matter of DEVELOP DON'T DESTROY (BROOKLYN), INC., et al., Petitioners-Plaintiffs, v. URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, et al., Respondents-Defendants., 2007 WL 4928245, *4928245+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.Y.Sup. Apr 25, 2007) **Memorandum of Law of Respondent-Defendant New York State Urban Development Corporation d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation in Opposition to Article 78 Petition and the Motion for A Preliminary ...** (NO. 104597/07) ★★

3193 In the Matter of DEVELOP DON'T DESTROY (BROOKLYN), INC., et al., Petitioners-Plaintiffs, v. URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Cor-

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

poration, et al., Respondents-Defendants., 2007 WL 4928248, *4928248+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.Y.Sup. Apr 25, 2007) **Memorandum of Law of Respondent-Defendant Forest City Ratner Companies, LLC in Opposition to the Petition-Complaint and the Motion for a Preliminary Injunction and in Support of its Cross-Motion for ...** (NO. 104597/07) ★★

3194 In the Matter of DEVELOP DON'T DESTROY (BROOKLYN), INC., et al., Petitioners-Plaintiffs, v. URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation, et al., Respondents-Defendants., 2007 WL 4928250, *4928250 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (N.Y.Sup. Apr 17, 2007) **Affirmation in Opposition to T.R.O. Application** (NO. 104597/07) ★★

3195 NOVA HEALTH SYSTEMS, d/b/a Reproductive Services, on behalf of itself, its staff, and its patients, Plaintiff, v. (1) W.A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his official capacity as Attorney General of Oklahoma; (2) Tim Harris, in his official capacity as Tulsa County District Attorney; (3) Rocky D. McElvany, in his official capacity as Oklahma Commissioner of Helth; (4) Lyle Kelsey, in his official capacity as Executive Director of the Oklahoma State Board of Medical, 2009 WL 3378224, *3378224 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Okl.Dist. May 04, 2009) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment** (NO. CJ-2008-9119) ★★

3196 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY An Oklahoma Corporation, Plaintiff, v. Marietta D. HENSON, Steven D. Henson, and Brian H. Henson, Co-trustees of Harold Henson, Jr., Revocable Trust, and the Garfield County Treasurer, Defendants., 2007 WL 5387447, *5387447+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Okl.Dist. Sep 21, 2007) **Motion for Summary Judgment and Brief In Support** (NO. CJ200780) ★★

3197 OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, an Oklahoma Corporation, Plaintiff, v. William H. EASTERLY, Judith A. Ecker and Harolyne K. Thielke, and the Garfield County Treasurer, Defendants., 2000 WL 35722165, *35722165+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Okl.Dist. Sep 21, 2000) **Motion for Summary Judgment and Brief In Support** (NO. CJ200782) ★★

3198 In re: CONDEMNATION OF LAND FOR THE SOUTH EAST CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT REDEVELOPMENT AREA #1., 2006 WL 6153919, *6153919+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Pa.Com.Pl. Dec 11, 2006) **Trial Memorandum** (NO. 05-8011) ★★★

3199 BOROUGH OF DUNCANSVILLE, Condemnor, v. Richard G. BEARD and Beth Ann Beard, Condemnees., 2005 WL 6046177, *6046177+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Pa.Com.Pl. Sep 02, 2005) **Brief in Support of Preliminary Objections of Condemnees Richard and Beth Ann Beard to Declaration of Taking** (NO. 04GN3324) ★★

3200 TEXAS BAY CHERRY HILL, L.P., v. THE CITY OF FORT WORTH, Texas, Woodhaven Community Development, Inc., and Becky L. Haskin., 2005 WL 5630780, *5630780+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Tex.Dist. Oct 28, 2005) **City's Plea to the Jurisdiction** (NO. 153-214307-05) ★★

3201 APARTMENTS OF VILLA DEL RIO, L.P., and Apartments of Oak Hollow FW, L.P., v. THE CITY OF FORT WORTH, Texas, Woodhaven Community Development, Inc., and Becky L. Haskin., 2005 WL 4903187, *4903187+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Tex.Dist. Oct 26, 2005) **City's Plea to the Jurisdiction** (NO. CAUSE236-214186-05) ★★

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3202 CITY OF AUSTIN, Plaintiff, v. Harry M. WHITTINGTON, et al., Defendants., 2007 WL 7307788, *7307788 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Tex.Co.Ct. Dec 06, 2007) **The Whittingtons' Response to the City of Austin's Traditional and No-Evidence Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and First Supplement** (NO. D-1-GV-07-000942) ★★

3203 QUESTAR GAS COMPANY, a Utah corporation, Plaintiff, v. Cindy L. CHRISTENSEN, Trustee of the Cindy L. Christensen Family Living Trust, Defendant., 2006 WL 4718653, *4718653+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Utah Dist.Ct. May 08, 2006) **Memorandum in Support of Motion to Occupy the Subject Properties by July 1, 2006** (NO. 060400880) ★★

3204 CITY OF TACOMA, a municipal corporation, Petitioner, v. Kenneth A. ROBBLEE, an unmarried person in his separate estate; Columbia State Bank, a Washington corporation; Jerry Barnett and Katherine B. Barnett, husband and wife; Mark Morris, an unmarried person in his separate estate; Maureen Morris, an unmarried person in her separate estate; Hee N. Rho; Kumok Rho; William H. Rho; Carol K. Rho; Morris Jaffe; Edith Jaffe; Ball Ventures, LLC, a Washington limited, 2007 WL 5515143, *5515143+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Wash.Super. Nov 09, 2007) **Respondent Kenneth A. Robblee's Memorandum Opposing City Petition for Order Adjudicating Public USE and Necessity** (NO. 07-2-11489-6) ★★

3205 CLEAR CHANNEL OUTDOOR, a Delaware corporation, successor in interest to AK Media Washington, Plaintiff, v. SCHREM PARTNERSHIP, a Washington partnership; and Jeffrey Oliphant, an individual, Defendants., 2005 WL 4908265, *4908265 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Wash.Super. Oct 21, 2005) **Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Remaining Claim** (NO. 05-2-08970-9KNT) ★★

3206 In the Matter of the Rehabilitation of: SEGREGATED ACCOUNT OF AMBAC ASSURANCE CORPORATION., 2010 WL 2154221, *2154221 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (Wis.Cir. Apr 05, 2010) **Brief by Wells Fargo Bank, National Association, in Its Capacity As Trustee for the Benefit and Protection of Certain Bondholders, in Support of Its Motion to Modify Temporary Injunction Order and to ...** (NO. 10CV1576) ★★

3207 THE MARSHALL UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS, Petitioner, v. CARTEE LAND DEVELOPMENT, INC., An Ohio Corporation, Defendant., 2005 WL 4739689, *4739689+ (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (W.Va.Cir.Ct. Aug 04, 2005) **Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Order Reversing Grant of Defeasible Title and Returning Property to Cartee Land Development, Inc. as the Rightful Owner of the Property** (NO. 03C1078) " ★★★ **HN: 3 (S.Ct.)**

Trial Transcripts

3208 Osborne, et al. v. The City of Wilmington., 2008 WL 4058062, *4058062 (Trial Transcript) (Del.Ch. May 29, 2008) **Trial - AM Session: Motion Hearing** (NO. 3347-CC) ★★ **HN: 4 (S.Ct.)**

Trial Filings

3209 In re ST. JAMES & ENNIS HANFORD INVESTMENT, LLC, Debtor., 2010 WL 2311811, *2311811 (Trial Filing) (Bankr.E.D.Cal. Feb 16, 2010) **Citizens Business Bank's Opposition and Objections to Confirmation; and Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support Thereof** (NO. 09-17500-A-11) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

3210 In Re: PLIANT CORPORATION., 2009 WL 7265275, *7265275 (Trial Filing) (Bankr.D.Del. Mar 03, 2009) **Objection of Municipal and Cooperative Utilities to Motion of the Debtors for an Interim Order and a Final Order Pursuant to Sections 105(a) and 366 of the Bankruptcy Code (I) Prohibiting Utility ...** (NO. 109BK10443) ★★

3211 In re: BUFFETS HOLDINGS, INC., et al., 2008 WL 1961893, *1961893 (Trial Filing) (Bankr.D.Del. Feb 06, 2008) **Objection to Debtors' Motion for Interim and Final Orders Pursuant to Section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code (I) Prohibiting Utility Companies from Altering, Refusing, or Discontinuing Utility Services, ...** (NO. 08-10141, MFW) ★★ **HN: 1 (S.Ct.)**

3212 NEW STANLEY ASSOCIATES, L.L.L.P., a Colorado Limited Liability Limited Partnership, Nancy A. Baker, Allan Renner and Charles B. Hall, residents of the Town of Estes Park, Larimer County, Colorado, Plaintiffs, v. THE TOWN OF ESTES PARK, a Colorado municipal corporation, Lot4ed, LLC, a Colorado Limited Liability Company, and Estes Winds, LLC, a Colorado Limited Liability Company, Defendants., 2007 WL 2666978, *2666978 (Trial Filing) (Colo.Dist.Ct. Jan 29, 2007) **Plaintiffs' Post-Trial Supplemental Authority** (NO. 06CV546) ★★

3213 NEW ORLEANS REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, v. Kittoria JOHNSON, Wife of/and Joseph Burgess Jr., et al., 2002 WL 34529774, *34529774+ (Trial Filing) (La.Civil D.Ct. May 02, 2002) **Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Submitted on Behalf of New Orleans Redevelopment Authority.** (NO. 2007-3102) ★★

Jury Instructions

3214 NEW ENGLAND ESTATES, L.L.C., v. TOWN OF BRANFORD, et al., 2007 WL 3045865, *3045865+ (Jury Instruction) (Conn.Super. Aug 27, 2007) **Frank Perrotti, Jr.'s and Thomas Santa Barbara's Request to Charge** (NO. UWYX06CV030183606S) ★★

3215 NEW ENGLAND ESTATES, L.L.C., v. TOWN OF BRANFORD, et al., 2007 WL 3045866, *3045866+ (Jury Instruction) (Conn.Super. Aug 27, 2007) **Plaintiff New England Estates, L.L.C.'s Revised Requests to Charge** (NO. UWYX06CV030183606S) ★★

Secondary Sources (Canada)

3216 President George W. Bush's Theory of a Unitary Executive Branch and the Rule of Law in the United States, 1 Journal of Parliamentary and Political Law 237 (2008)

3217 Person, Place, or Thing? Property and the Structuring of Social Relations, 60 U. Toronto L.J. 445, 458+ (2010)

Secondary Sources (Singapore)

3218 Regulatory Property and the Jurisprudence of Quasi-Public Trust, 2010 Singapore Journal of Legal Studies 58 (2010)

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.