
PRELIMINARY PRINT—ORDERS

VOLUME 593 U. S. PART 2

PAGES 1002–1051

OFFICIAL REPORTS
OF
THE SUPREME COURT

MAY 24 THROUGH JUNE 14, 2021

Page Proof Pending Publication

REBECCA A. WOMELDORF

REPORTER OF DECISIONS



NOTICE: This preliminary print is subject to formal revision before the bound volume is published. Users are requested to notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D. C. 20543, pio@supremecourt.gov, of any typographical or other formal errors.

REPORTER'S NOTE

Orders commencing with May 24, 2021, begin with page 1002. The preceding orders in 593 U. S., from April 5 through May 21, 2021, were reported in Part 1, at 901–1001. These page numbers are the same as they will be in the bound volume, thus making the *permanent* citations available upon publication of the preliminary prints of the United States Reports.

Page Proof Pending Publication

MAY 24, 2021

Certiorari Granted—Vacated and Remanded

No. 20–783. SUNCOR ENERGY (U. S. A.) INC. ET AL. *v.* BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF BOULDER COUNTY ET AL. C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari granted, judgment vacated, and case remanded for further consideration in light of *BP p.l.c. v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore*, 593 U. S. 230 (2021). Reported below: 965 F. 3d 792.

No. 20–884. CHEVRON CORP. ET AL. *v.* SAN MATEO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, ET AL. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari granted, judgment vacated, and case remanded for further consideration in light of *BP p.l.c. v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore*, 593 U. S. 230 (2021). JUSTICE ALITO took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition. Reported below: 960 F. 3d 586.

No. 20–900. SHELL OIL PRODUCTS CO., L. L. C., ET AL. *v.* RHODE ISLAND. C. A. 1st Cir. Motion of Energy Policy Advocates for leave to file brief as *amicus curiae* granted. Certiorari granted, judgment vacated, and case remanded for further consideration in light of *BP p.l.c. v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore*, 593 U. S. 230 (2021). JUSTICE ALITO took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion and this petition. Reported below: 979 F. 3d 50.

Certiorari Dismissed

No. 20–7506. GAKUBA *v.* GRISSOM. C. A. 7th Cir. Motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* denied, and certiorari dismissed. See this Court’s Rule 39.8.

No. 20–7698. ALLEN *v.* TOWN OF CARY POLICE DEPARTMENT ET AL. C. A. 4th Cir. Motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* denied, and certiorari dismissed. See this Court’s Rule 39.8. As petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court’s process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*). Reported below: 834 Fed. Appx. 31.

No. 20–7831. LASHER *v.* UNITED STATES. C. A. 2d Cir. Motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* denied,

593 U. S.

May 24, 2021

and certiorari dismissed. See this Court's Rule 39.8. As petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

Miscellaneous Orders

No. 20A157. *TOLLE v. NORTHAM, GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA, ET AL.* D. C. E. D. Va. Application for stay, addressed to JUSTICE GORSUCH and referred to the Court, denied.

No. 20M78. *SUMMERS v. TENNESSEE.* Motion to direct the Clerk to file petition for writ of certiorari out of time denied.

No. 20M79. *CRAYTON v. MASSACHUSETTS.* Motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari with supplemental appendix under seal granted.

No. 20–437. *UNITED STATES v. PALOMAR-SANTIAGO.* C. A. 9th Cir. [Certiorari granted, 592 U. S. 1163.] Motion of respondent for leave to file a supplemental brief after oral argument granted. Conditional cross-motion of petitioner for leave to file a supplemental brief after oral argument granted.

No. 20–827. *UNITED STATES v. HUSAYN, AKA ABU ZUBAYDAH, ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. [Certiorari granted, 593 U. S. 962.] Motion of petitioner to dispense with printing joint appendix granted.

No. 20–7000. *BROWN v. FOLEY, WARDEN.* C. A. 6th Cir. Motion of petitioner for reconsideration of order denying leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* [592 U. S. 1316] denied.

No. 20–7307. *IN RE BEATON.* Motion of petitioner for reconsideration of order denying leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* [592 U. S. 1317] denied.

No. 20–7862. *IN RE SIRLEAF.* Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied.

Certiorari Denied

No. 18–8776. *LE v. LOUISIANA.* Sup. Ct. La. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2018–0085 (La. 2/18/19), 263 So. 3d 422.

May 24, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 18–9297. *HALL v. MYRICK, SUPERINTENDENT, TWO RIVERS CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 740 Fed. Appx. 599.

No. 19–8711. *DUNN v. LOUISIANA*. Sup. Ct. La. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2019–0868 (La. 1/14/20), 286 So. 3d 1045.

No. 19–8740. *WILLIAMS v. LOUISIANA*. Sup. Ct. La. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2019–00867 (La. 1/22/20), 347 So. 3d 740.

No. 19–8875. *JONES v. LOUISIANA*. Sup. Ct. La. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2019–01127 (La. 3/9/20), 290 So. 3d 1126.

No. 20–880. *HOLLAND, AS TRUSTEE FOR THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA COMBINED BENEFIT FUND ET AL. v. WESTMORELAND COAL CO. ET AL.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 968 F. 3d 526.

No. 20–1060. *OLIVA v. NIVAR ET AL.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 973 F. 3d 438.

No. 20–1106. *DOE v. HARVARD PILGRIM HEALTH CARE, INC., ET AL.* C. A. 1st Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 974 F. 3d 69.

No. 20–1111. *INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BRIDGE, STRUCTURAL, ORNAMENTAL AND REINFORCING IRON WORKERS, LOCAL 229, AFL–CIO v. NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 941 F. 3d 902.

No. 20–1125. *JONES v. ALABAMA*. Ct. Crim. App. Ala. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 322 So. 3d 979.

No. 20–1167. *AZANO MATSURA v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 979 F. 3d 697.

No. 20–1272. *GARLAND, ATTORNEY GENERAL v. REYES-LUEVANOS*. C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 415.

No. 20–1288. *GENESS v. PENNSYLVANIA ET AL.* C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 974 F. 3d 263.

No. 20–1307. *WHITE v. KNAPP ET AL.* Ct. App. Mich. Certiorari denied.

593 U. S.

May 24, 2021

No. 20–1309. *CORCAMORE, LLC v. SFM, LLC*. C. A. Fed. Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 978 F. 3d 1298.

No. 20–1311. *LINSANGAN v. TERRITORY OF GUAM ET AL.* Sup. Ct. Guam. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2020 Guam 27.

No. 20–1320. *LASHEEN v. SUPREME COURT OF OHIO*. Sup. Ct. Ohio. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 161 Ohio St. 3d 1236, 2020-Ohio-4954, 162 N. E. 3d 834.

No. 20–1323. *PATMYTHES v. CITY OF MADISON, WISCONSIN*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1330. *DOMINO v. CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1331. *CLEMENS v. LOCAL ONE SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION ET AL.* C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 817 Fed. Appx. 297.

No. 20–1333. *SHERIDAN v. DLJ MORTGAGE CAPITAL, INC.* C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 975 F. 3d 358.

No. 20–1340. *ATSEMET v. TEXAS*. Ct. App. Tex., 11th Dist. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1343. *KIMNER v. WEB WATCHERS ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1345. *ARNOLD v. CITY OF AUBURN, WASHINGTON*. Ct. App. Wash. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1401. *DENNIS v. VIRGINIA*. Sup. Ct. Va. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1409. *SPANIER v. LIBBY, DIRECTOR, DAUPHIN COUNTY PROBATION SERVICES, ET AL.* C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 981 F. 3d 213.

No. 20–1431. *BROWN v. JONES, ACTING WARDEN*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 978 F. 3d 1029.

No. 20–1476. *BEHM v. MONTANA-DAKOTA UTILITIES Co.* Sup. Ct. N. D. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2020 ND 234, 951 N. W. 2d 208.

No. 20–1481. *PARBHUDIAL v. LAMANNA, SUPERINTENDENT, GREEN HAVEN CORRECTIONAL FACILITY*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied.

May 24, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–1498. *ALEXANDER v. JONES, ACTING WARDEN*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1504. *J. L., A CHILD v. HALAMAY ET AL.* Ct. App. Wash. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1506. *THOMAS v. STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA*. Sup. Ct. Cal. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–5003. *WOODS v. LOUISIANA*. Sup. Ct. La. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2019–01198 (La. 3/9/20), 291 So. 3d 222.

No. 20–5728. *DOTSON v. LOUISIANA*. Ct. App. La., 4th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–5813. *YOUNG v. VANNOY, WARDEN*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 809 Fed. Appx. 244.

No. 20–6045. *CHOAT v. COURSEY, SUPERINTENDENT, EASTERN OREGON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–6307. *LAWRENCE v. FLORIDA*. Sup. Ct. Fla. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 296 So. 3d 892.

No. 20–6724. *ALEXANDER v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 827 Fed. Appx. 1011.

No. 20–6775. *RAINES v. GEORGIA*. Sup. Ct. Ga. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 309 Ga. 258, 845 S. E. 2d 613.

No. 20–6786. *SHEPPARD v. LUMPKIN, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 967 F. 3d 458.

No. 20–6879. *FREEMAN v. FLORIDA*. Sup. Ct. Fla. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 300 So. 3d 591.

No. 20–6887. *PHILLIPS v. FLORIDA*. Sup. Ct. Fla. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 299 So. 3d 1013.

No. 20–6890. *CHONG LENG LEE v. WISCONSIN*. Ct. App. Wis. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2020 WI App 6, 390 Wis. 2d 426, 939 N. W. 2d 427.

No. 20–7234. *BARRETT v. PAE GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC., ET AL.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 975 F. 3d 416.

593 U. S.

May 24, 2021

No. 20–7479. *VELAYO v. FOX ET AL.* C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 826 Fed. Appx. 709.

No. 20–7484. *OLIVARES v. LONG ET AL.* C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7487. *GRIMES v. ALABAMA.* Ct. Crim. App. Ala. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 329 So. 3d 692.

No. 20–7490. *IVIE v. WASHINGTON.* Ct. App. Wash. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7502. *CROPPER v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 812 Fed. Appx. 927.

No. 20–7504. *GOUGH v. SULLIVAN, WARDEN.* C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7514. *JOHNSON v. ST. LOUIS COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES ET AL.* C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 817 Fed. Appx. 294.

No. 20–7515. *WOODY v. NEW JERSEY.* Super. Ct. N. J., App. Div. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7520. *RICE v. PENNSYLVANIA.* Super. Ct. Pa. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 237 A. 3d 453.

No. 20–7525. *KIKUCHI v. BAUMAN, WARDEN.* C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7526. *AMEEN v. HAMILTON, WARDEN.* C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 829 Fed. Appx. 864.

No. 20–7530. *MOORE v. BARTRAM ET AL.* C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7531. *MUKHERJEE v. CHILDRENS MERCY HOSPITAL.* C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 800 Fed. Appx. 447.

No. 20–7532. *TURNER v. TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 836 Fed. Appx. 227.

No. 20–7535. *MEDINA-JASSO v. GEORGIA.* Ct. App. Ga. Certiorari denied.

May 24, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–7537. *THIEME v. NEW JERSEY*. Super. Ct. N. J., App. Div. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7538. *JONES v. GEORGIA*. Sup. Ct. Ga. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7540. *CAIBY v. FERGUSON, SUPERINTENDENT, STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION AT PHOENIX*. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 788 Fed. Appx. 830.

No. 20–7541. *JO, AS PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ESTATE OF MEE JIN-JO v. JPMC SPECIALTY MORTGAGE, LLC*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 818 Fed. Appx. 103.

No. 20–7542. *CARTER v. ILLINOIS*. App. Ct. Ill., 2d Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2020 IL App (2d) 170695–U.

No. 20–7555. *PATEL*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7558. *PACKER v. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7612. *JOHNSON v. INDIANA*. Sup. Ct. Ind. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 157 N. E. 3d 1199.

No. 20–7614. *VON TOBEL v. GARRETT, WARDEN, ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 975 F. 3d 849.

No. 20–7618. *JASMIN v. SANTA MONICA POLICE DEPARTMENT ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 828 Fed. Appx. 347.

No. 20–7621. *PATTON v. SAUL, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7637. *JAMES v. FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS*. Dist. Ct. App. Fla., 1st Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 308 So. 3d 258.

No. 20–7645. *HORN v. WALMART STORES, INC.* Ct. App. Cal., 3d App. Dist. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7648. *JOASEUS v. FLORIDA*. Dist. Ct. App. Fla., 4th Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 309 So. 3d 663.

No. 20–7649. *JACKSON v. FLORIDA*. Dist. Ct. App. Fla., 4th Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 308 So. 3d 616.

593 U. S.

May 24, 2021

No. 20–7681. *BOGGS v. SAUL*, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 815 Fed. Appx. 172.

No. 20–7700. *IBARRA v. MONTGOMERY*, ACTING WARDEN. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 835 Fed. Appx. 247.

No. 20–7710. *MANN v. VOLUSIA COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT*. Sup. Ct. Fla. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7711. *CHATMAN v. IOWA*. Ct. App. Iowa. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 954 N. W. 2d 783.

No. 20–7725. *DEAN v. ENTZEL*, WARDEN, ET AL. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 805 Fed. Appx. 237.

No. 20–7734. *AFFIAH v. TEXAS SOUTHMOST COLLEGE ET AL.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 829 Fed. Appx. 52.

No. 20–7752. *JORDAN v. SAWYER ET AL.* C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7772. *JEFFERSON v. OHIO*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7774. *JOHNSON v. TEXAS*. Ct. App. Tex., 4th Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 613 S. W. 3d 613.

No. 20–7782. *GREER v. KORNEMAN*, WARDEN. C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7797. *ROSA-HERNANDEZ v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 828 Fed. Appx. 823.

No. 20–7806. *LEE v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 827 Fed. Appx. 289.

No. 20–7808. *MITCHELL v. CALIFORNIA*. Ct. App. Cal., 1st App. Dist., Div. 1. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7812. *BOWEN v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 830 Fed. Appx. 504.

No. 20–7816. *AFOLABI v. WARDEN*, FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION FORT DIX. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 821 Fed. Appx. 72.

May 24, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–7822. *WILEY v. LOUISIANA*. Ct. App. La., 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7824. *RICKER v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 983 F. 3d 987.

No. 20–7826. *JOHNSON v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 813 Fed. Appx. 250.

No. 20–7829. *BUSTAMANTE-MUNIZ v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 720.

No. 20–7832. *THOMPSON v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 984 F. 3d 431.

No. 20–7837. *BRADFORD v. MISSISSIPPI*. Sup. Ct. Miss. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7842. *LORENZANA-CORDON v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. D. C. Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 949 F. 3d 1.

No. 20–7847. *MINOR v. BAKER, WARDEN, ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 842 Fed. Appx. 98.

No. 20–7853. *MORGENSTERN v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7858. *ARMENDARIZ v. MARTINEZ, WARDEN, ET AL.* C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 834 Fed. Appx. 454.

No. 20–7861. *SHULAYA v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 853 Fed. Appx. 714.

No. 20–7866. *GRAY v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 830 Fed. Appx. 210.

No. 20–7877. *WASHINGTON v. GOMEZ, WARDEN*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7879. *CHAVEZ v. CATES, WARDEN*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 234.

No. 20–7882. *POTTER v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 834 Fed. Appx. 719.

593 U. S.

May 24, 2021

No. 20–7885. *PROCTOR v. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 837 Fed. Appx. 1021.

No. 20–7903. *GREEN v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 981 F. 3d 945.

No. 20–287. *JOHNSON v. PRECYTHE ET AL.* C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 954 F. 3d 1098.

JUSTICE BREYER, dissenting.

I join JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR’s dissent. The Eighth Circuit concluded that petitioner Ernest Johnson plausibly claims that because of a brain tumor operation, the State’s ordinary execution method, lethal injection of pentobarbital, is cruel. It risks causing him severe and painful seizures. See 954 F. 3d 1098, 1101–1102 (2020); *Johnson v. Precythe*, 901 F. 3d 973, 978 (CA8 2018), vacated and remanded, 587 U. S. 935 (2019). Johnson seeks relief to ask instead for what is today a highly unusual method of execution, namely, execution by firing squad, not used in Missouri since 1864 (nor in any State but one since 1913). See Death Penalty Information Center, *Methods of Execution* (2021), <https://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/executions/methods-of-execution>; *id.*, *Executions in the U.S. 1608–2002: The ESPY File, Executions by Date 255* (Apr. 10, 2019), <https://files.deathpenaltyinfo.org/legacy/documents/ESPYyear.pdf>. In other words, he asks that the courts decide between an execution that is “cruel” and one that is “unusual.”

For the reasons JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR sets forth, I believe the courts should resolve the merits of Johnson’s claim. Under the governing majority opinion in *Bucklew v. Precythe*, 587 U. S. 119 (2019), and consistent with my dissent in that case, the Eighth Amendment may not allow Missouri to execute Johnson by pentobarbital. See *id.*, at 160–163 (BREYER, J., dissenting) (no “‘alternative method’ requirement” where the State’s proposed method may cause excessive suffering because of a prisoner’s unique medical condition). I simply add that the difficulty of resolving this claim, 27 years after the murders, provides one more example of the special difficulties that the death penalty, as currently administered, creates for the just application of the law. See *United States v. Higgs*, 592 U. S. 1207, 1208–1209 (2021) (BREYER, J., dissenting); *Glossip v. Gross*, 576 U. S. 863, 945–946 (2015) (BREYER, J., dissenting).

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR, with whom JUSTICE BREYER and JUSTICE KAGAN join, dissenting.

Ernest Johnson is a death row inmate in Missouri who suffers from epilepsy as a result of a brain tumor and damage caused by significant brain surgery. In the operative complaint he filed in 2016, Johnson alleged that he will experience excruciating seizures if Missouri executes him by lethal injection of the drug pentobarbital. Johnson also alleged that Missouri should execute him by nitrogen gas instead, a method of execution authorized by state law. In 2018, the Eighth Circuit held that Johnson fully stated a claim for relief under the Eighth Amendment. *Johnson v. Precythe*, 901 F. 3d 973, 978–980.

Subsequently, in another case, *Bucklew v. Precythe*, 587 U. S. 119 (2019), this Court held that a State could decline to use nitrogen gas as an alternative method of execution because it lacked a “‘track record of successful use.’” *Id.*, at 142. *Bucklew* also announced that, to satisfy the track-record requirement, plaintiffs may look to well-established methods of execution in other States, even if they are not authorized in the State seeking to carry out the relevant execution. *Id.*, at 139–140. Given this option, the Court expected “little likelihood” that a plaintiff who alleges a serious risk of pain, like Johnson, would be unable to identify an adequate alternative method of execution. *Id.*, at 140.

Faced with these changes in the law, Johnson sought to amend his complaint to plead the firing squad as an alternative method of execution. Although not authorized in Missouri, the firing squad has a long history of successful use. See *id.*, at 134. Indeed, during oral arguments in *Bucklew*, Missouri itself suggested the firing squad as an available alternative. See *id.*, at 153 (KAVANAUGH, J., concurring). The Eighth Circuit, however, denied Johnson leave to amend his complaint. See 954 F. 3d 1098, 1103 (2020). In its view, Johnson should have pleaded the firing squad earlier, even before *Bucklew*. Given that view, and in the interest of resolving Johnson’s claim “‘fairly and expeditiously,’” the Eighth Circuit closed the case. 954 F. 3d, at 1103 (quoting *Bucklew*, 587 U. S., at 150 (majority opinion)).

The Eighth Circuit’s decision was an abuse of discretion. Leave to amend a complaint must be granted “when justice so requires.” Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 15(a)(2). Justice requires it here. The Eighth Circuit’s decision punishes Johnson for failing to antic-

ipate significant changes in the law brought about by *Bucklew*. Worse, it ensures that Johnson's claim will never be heard on the merits. Missouri is now free to execute Johnson in a manner that, at this stage of the litigation, we must assume will be akin to torture given his unique medical condition. To dispose of the case more quickly, the Eighth Circuit has sacrificed the Eighth Amendment's chief concern for preventing cruel and unusual punishment.

Accordingly, I dissent from the denial of Johnson's petition for a writ of certiorari. I would grant Johnson's petition, vacate the judgment below, and remand with instructions that Johnson be given leave to amend.

I

A

Johnson's second amended complaint alleges that he was diagnosed with a brain tumor and underwent major surgery in 2008. Although doctors removed roughly one-fifth of Johnson's brain tissue, they could not eliminate the tumor. The surgery scarred Johnson's brain tissue, leaving a lasting brain defect. The tumor cells, scar tissue, and brain defect have together caused Johnson to suffer from epilepsy, which produces violent, uncontrollable, and painful seizures.

Johnson alleges that, because of his unique medical condition, injecting him with the drug pentobarbital, as Missouri's lethal injection protocol requires, will create a "substantial" risk that he will suffer an extraordinarily painful seizure. App. to Pet. for Cert. 25a. Pentobarbital is part of a class of medications known to trigger seizures, even in those without seizure disorders. See *Johnson*, 901 F.3d, at 978. Pentobarbital also has "an anti-[analgesic] effect," which means that "it exaggerates pain." App. to Pet. for Cert. 27a. As a result, Johnson claims that executing him using pentobarbital is "sure or very likely to" trigger an exceptionally painful seizure and cause him "serious and needless pain." *Ibid.*

On the other hand, Johnson alleges that executing him using nitrogen gas would be painless. Notably, "Missouri law already permits execution by lethal gas, Mo. Rev. Stat. §546.720.1, and nitrogen, which is used commonly in welding and cooking, is easy to obtain." *Id.*, at 28a. By fitting a hood or mask over Johnson's head and administering the gas, Missouri could induce lethal hypoxia without triggering Johnson's seizure disorder. *Ibid.*

B

Johnson brings an as-applied Eighth Amendment challenge to Missouri's lethal injection protocol. Such a claim has two elements. First, Johnson must allege (and later prove) that the State's method of execution poses a "substantial risk of severe pain." *Glossip v. Gross*, 576 U. S. 863, 877 (2015) (internal quotation marks omitted). Second, he must propose an alternative method of execution that is "feasible" and "readily implemented," and will "significantly reduc[e]" the risk of severe pain. *Ibid.* (alteration and internal quotation marks omitted).

In 2017, the District Court concluded that Johnson had failed to allege either element adequately. The Eighth Circuit reversed. 901 F. 3d, at 976. As to the first element, the Eighth Circuit explained that Johnson had plausibly alleged "that a seizure will occur when the State injects pentobarbital and that such a seizure causes severe pain." *Id.*, at 978. As to the second element, the court cited Johnson's detailed allegations that "nitrogen gas is readily available on the open market, could be introduced through a 'medically enclosed device to be placed over the mouth or head of the inmate,' and would not require construction of a new facility." *Id.*, at 979. Under the law at the time, "this [was] sufficient." *Ibid.*

Missouri sought review in this Court. While Missouri's petition was pending, this Court decided *Bucklew*. In that case, another death row inmate challenged Missouri's lethal injection protocol under the Eighth Amendment and proposed nitrogen gas as an alternative. This Court rejected the claim. Among other things, this Court concluded that Missouri had a legitimate reason for declining to use nitrogen gas because it was "an entirely new method—one that had never been used to carry out an execution and had no track record of successful use." 587 U. S., at 142 (internal quotation marks omitted). Even assuming nitrogen gas was a readily available alternative, this Court held that *Bucklew* had failed to prove that nitrogen gas would significantly reduce a substantial risk of severe pain. *Id.*, at 143.

Bucklew also announced an "additional holding" on "a legal issue that had been uncertain." *Id.*, at 153 (opinion of KAVANAUGH, J.). Namely, "[a]n inmate seeking to identify an alternative method of execution is not limited to choosing among those presently authorized by a particular State's law." *Id.*, at 139–140 (ma-

jority opinion).¹ After *Bucklew*, an alternative method of execution may be feasible and readily implemented even if it is not currently legal in the State.

This Court subsequently vacated the Eighth Circuit's decision in Johnson's case and remanded for reconsideration in light of *Bucklew*. On remand, the Eighth Circuit recognized that *Bucklew* changed the law relevant to Johnson's claim in at least one respect. Previously, "[t]hat a method was new could make it more difficult for the prisoner to meet his burden," but it "did not foreclose the claim as a matter of law at the pleading stage." 954 F. 3d, at 1102. *Bucklew*, however, "superseded that reasoning." 954 F. 3d, at 1102. In the Eighth Circuit's view, the novelty of nitrogen gas as a method of execution now ruled it out as an alternative. See *ibid.*

Johnson asked the Eighth Circuit to remand his case to the District Court so that he could amend his complaint in light of *Bucklew*'s additional ruling that a suitable alternative method of execution need not be authorized in the State. On that point, however, the Eighth Circuit concluded that *Bucklew* did not "constitut[e] an intervening change in law" warranting leave to amend. 954 F. 3d, at 1103. Instead, the court determined that Johnson should have known, presumably when he filed his second amended complaint, that he needed to allege all possible alternative methods of execution "that he wished to pursue," whether authorized in Missouri or not. *Ibid.* In support, the Eighth Circuit relied on *McGehee v. Hutchinson*, 854 F. 3d 488 (2017) (*per curiam*) (en banc), in which the court had "first addressed" whether an alternative method of execution must be authorized by state law. 954 F. 3d, at 1103. In a single sentence, and citing no prior Eighth Circuit precedent, *McGehee* declined to "say that an alternative method must be authorized by statute or ready to use immediately." 854 F. 3d, at 493.

As the Eighth Circuit acknowledged in Johnson's case, however, *McGehee* was decided several months "after Johnson filed his lat-

¹ Indeed, just a few months after Johnson filed his second amended complaint, and over a year before this Court decided *Bucklew*, this Court allowed to stand a decision that denied an Eighth Amendment claim on the ground that "Alabama law does not expressly permit execution by firing squad, and so it cannot be a 'known and available' alternative under *Glossip*." *Arthur v. Dunn*, 580 U.S. 1141, 1142 (2017) (SOTOMAYOR, J., dissenting from denial of certiorari).

est amended complaint.” 954 F. 3d, at 1103; see Second Amended Complaint in No. 2:15-cv-4237, ECF Doc. 41 (WD Mo.). Thus, it could not have settled the question whether an alternative method of execution must be authorized by state law when Johnson filed his operative complaint. Nevertheless, the Eighth Circuit attempted to flip the script, arguing that no binding precedent forbade Johnson from pleading the firing squad prior to *Bucklew*. See 954 F. 3d, at 1103. Then, citing *Bucklew*’s admonition that method-of-execution challenges should be resolved “‘fairly and expeditiously,’” the Eighth Circuit concluded that Johnson should not be allowed to amend his complaint. 954 F. 3d, at 1103 (quoting 587 U. S., at 150).

Johnson now petitions for a writ of certiorari.

II

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure mandate that courts “should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires.” Rule 15(a)(2). This Rule reflects the “‘principle that the purpose of pleading is to facilitate a proper decision on the merits.’” *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U. S. 178, 182 (1962). “If the underlying facts or circumstances relied upon by a plaintiff may be a proper subject of relief, he ought to be afforded an opportunity to test his claim on the merits.” *Ibid.* For that reason, denying leave to amend a potentially viable claim requires a “justifying reason,” such as “undue delay, bad faith[,] or dilatory motive on the part of the movant.” *Ibid.* Absent such a justification, denying leave to amend “is not an exercise of discretion; it is merely abuse of that discretion and inconsistent with the spirit of the Federal Rules.” *Ibid.*

Johnson’s claim plainly may be a proper subject of relief. On remand, the Eighth Circuit identified just one defect in Johnson’s allegations: On its reading of *Bucklew*, nitrogen gas was no longer a viable alternative method of execution. Any such defect can be corrected easily. Now that *Bucklew* has announced that alternative methods of execution need not be authorized by state law, Johnson is prepared to allege that he should be executed by firing squad. Unlike nitrogen gas, the firing squad has a long track record of successful use. See, e. g., *Bucklew*, 587 U. S., at 134 (describing “traditionally accepted methods of execution[,] such as . . . the firing squad”). Missouri itself suggested the firing squad as an alternative to nitrogen gas during oral arguments in

Bucklew. See Tr. of Oral Arg. in *Bucklew v. Precythe*, O. T. 2018, No. 17–8151, p. 64 (“[I]f you really thought that he was going to suffer this excruciatingly, he has an option available. He can plead all kinds of alternative methods of execution that are not completely untested and completely unknown. . . . He can plead firing squad”).

Because amendment would not be futile, there must be a special justification to deny Johnson leave to amend. The Eighth Circuit offered two: Johnson “had ample opportunity to allege any alternative method that he wished to pursue” prior to *Bucklew*, and giving him a chance to do so now would be inconsistent with this Court’s instruction that “‘method-of-execution challenges’” should be “‘resolved fairly and expeditiously.’” 954 F. 3d, at 1103 (quoting *Bucklew*, 587 U. S., at 150).

The notion that Johnson had ample opportunity to allege the firing squad rests on a flawed assumption that Johnson should have anticipated *Bucklew*. Placing such an impossible burden on Johnson (a burden that even the Eighth Circuit failed to meet in 2018) undermines the basic purpose of our pleading system. Notice pleading is designed to “give the defendant fair notice of what the claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U. S. 89, 93 (2007) (*per curiam*) (internal quotation marks and ellipsis omitted). It is not meant to be “‘a game of skill in which one misstep’” prevents a potentially meritorious claim from being heard. *Foman*, 371 U. S., at 181. Missouri has had ample notice of the basis for Johnson’s claim, which fully satisfied the pleading standard prior to *Bucklew*, as the Eighth Circuit itself acknowledged. Johnson’s only misstep was to plead an alternative method of execution that was both adequate under existing precedent and already legal in Missouri, rather than an alternative method of execution that was not authorized by state law but had been successfully used in the past elsewhere. Put simply, his only misstep was failing to predict *Bucklew* and address it pre-emptively. He bears no fault for that.

The Eighth Circuit suggested that its decision in *McGehee* put Johnson on notice that he could plead an unauthorized method of execution like the firing squad. See 954 F. 3d, at 1103. But *McGehee* was decided “after Johnson filed his latest amended complaint,” and thus provided no advance notice. 954 F. 3d, at 1103. Even setting aside the timing of the decision, *McGehee*’s one-sentence comment that the Eighth Circuit declined to “say that

an alternative method must be authorized by statute,” 854 F. 3d, at 493, was beside the point for Johnson, who had properly alleged an alternative method of execution that was both authorized by statute and entirely adequate under Eighth Amendment precedent at the time. Only after *Bucklew* did Johnson need to look beyond Missouri law for an alternative method of execution. He is entitled to an opportunity to do so, especially because he seeks to allege the very method of execution that Missouri suggested during oral arguments in *Bucklew*.²

The Eighth Circuit’s invocation of *Bucklew*’s concern for fair and expeditious resolutions of claims does not justify its decision, either. *Bucklew* did not create an exception to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for method-of-execution claims. It certainly does not permit courts to ignore potentially meritorious claims for the sake of expediency. *Bucklew* sought only to guard against “attempts to use . . . challenges as tools to interpose unjustified delay.” 587 U.S., at 150.

There is no reason to think Johnson sought leave to amend as a delay tactic. The Eighth Circuit had already determined that Johnson plausibly alleged that executing him by lethal injection will cause serious pain. *Bucklew* suggested that plaintiffs in exactly this situation should have little trouble identifying an available alternative. See *id.*, at 140; *id.*, at 153 (opinion of KAVANAUGH, J.) (“[A]n inmate who contends that a particular method of execution is very likely to cause him severe pain should ordinarily be able to plead some alternative method of execution that would significantly reduce the risk of severe pain”). Johnson seeks only to take *Bucklew* up on that promise. Denying him leave to amend his complaint under these circumstances renders this Court’s words an empty gesture.

* * *

Think about what the Eighth Circuit has done in the interest of moving things along more quickly. Johnson has plausibly

²This is now the second time that Missouri has opposed an alternative method of execution that the State itself previously held out as an option. Johnson’s prior alternative method of execution, nitrogen gas, was the very method that Missouri’s Legislature had adopted as an alternative to lethal injection. This litigation strategy calls into question whether Missouri intends to allow for any alternatives to its lethal injection protocol, even if pentobarbital will cause constitutionally intolerable pain.

593 U. S.

May 24, 2021

pleaded that, if he is executed using pentobarbital, he will experience pain akin to torture. Those factual allegations must be accepted as true at this stage of the litigation. Yet despite the risk of severe pain rising to the level of cruel and unusual punishment, the Eighth Circuit has ensured that no court will ever review the evidence in support of Johnson's Eighth Amendment claim.

Even if Johnson had full notice that he could have pleaded the firing squad before *Bucklew* (which he plainly did not), his decision to choose a different method of execution that was also authorized by state law is no reason to deny him an opportunity to be heard and subject him to the serious pain he alleges. "There are higher values than ensuring that executions run on time." *Id.*, at 174 (SOTOMAYOR, J., dissenting). The Eighth Amendment sets forth one: We should not countenance the infliction of cruel and unusual punishment simply for the sake of expediency. That is what the Eighth Circuit's decision has done. Because this Court chooses to stand idly by, I respectfully dissent.

No. 20–951. STEWART, AS ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ESTATE OF STEWART, DECEASED *v.* CITY OF EUCLID, OHIO, ET AL. C. A. 6th Cir. Motions of Legal Scholars, Professor Seth Stoughton et al., and Institute for Justice for leave to file briefs as *amici curiae* granted. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 970 F. 3d 667.

No. 20–1258. ONO PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD., ET AL. *v.* DANA-FARBER CANCER INSTITUTE, INC. C. A. Fed. Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE BREYER took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition. Reported below: 964 F. 3d 1365.

No. 20–1322. NEELY *v.* BOEING CO. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE ALITO took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition. Reported below: 823 Fed. Appx. 494.

No. 20–7527. JOHNSTON *v.* MCGINNIS ET AL. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE BARRETT took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

No. 20–7545. ROBINSON *v.* BUESGEN, WARDEN. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE BARRETT took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

No. 20–7851. CRUZ *v.* UNITED STATES. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR and JUSTICE KAGAN took no

May 24, 26, 2021

593 U. S.

part in the consideration or decision of this petition. Reported below: 826 Fed. Appx. 49.

Rehearing Denied

- No. 20–507. MAYS, WARDEN *v.* HINES, 592 U. S. 385;
No. 20–1007. STEWART *v.* RRL HOLDING COMPANY OF OHIO, LLC, ET AL., 592 U. S. 1352;
No. 20–1035. IN RE KIMBRELL, 592 U. S. 1351;
No. 20–6177. DAVIS *v.* GOODYEAR POLICE DEPARTMENT ET AL., 592 U. S. 1183;
No. 20–6295. RAIVELY *v.* WHELIHAN, 592 U. S. 1310;
No. 20–6483. MATUCK *v.* UNITED STATES, 592 U. S. 1223;
No. 20–6547. MCNEES *v.* MICHIGAN, 592 U. S. 1273;
No. 20–6654. ROMERO *v.* MADDEN, WARDEN, 592 U. S. 1276;
No. 20–6689. KWONG *v.* CHESWOLD (TL), LLC, ET AL., 592 U. S. 1277;
No. 20–6719. JACKSON *v.* WILLIAMS, 592 U. S. 1354;
No. 20–6856. ODEN *v.* TURNER, WARDEN, 592 U. S. 1282;
No. 20–6931. LANDRENEAU *v.* UNITED STATES, 592 U. S. 1284;
No. 20–6955. SKILLINGS *v.* CITY OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK, 592 U. S. 1355;
No. 20–7004. MATA *v.* MASSACHUSETTS COMMISSION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION, 592 U. S. 1324; and
No. 20–7074. NAVE *v.* VANIHEL, WARDEN, 593 U. S. 916. Petitions for rehearing denied.

No. 20–426. HUNTRESS ET AL. *v.* UNITED STATES, 592 U. S. 1171. Motion for leave to file petition for rehearing denied.

MAY 26, 2021

Miscellaneous Order

No. 20A161. OKLAHOMA *v.* BOSSE. Ct. Crim. App. Okla. Application to stay the mandate of the Court of Criminal Appeals of Oklahoma, case No. PCD–2019–124, presented to JUSTICE GORSUCH, and by him referred to the Court, granted pending the timely filing and disposition of a petition for writ of certiorari. Should the petition for writ of certiorari be denied, this stay shall terminate automatically. In the event the petition for writ of certiorari is granted, the stay shall terminate upon issuance of the mandate of this Court. JUSTICE BREYER, JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR, and JUSTICE KAGAN would deny the application.

593 U. S.

JUNE 1, 2021

Certiorari Granted—Vacated and Remanded

No. 20–6400. SANDERS *v.* UNITED STATES. C. A. 8th Cir. Motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* granted. Certiorari granted, judgment vacated, and case remanded for further consideration in light of *Caniglia v. Strom*, 593 U. S. 194 (2021). Reported below: 956 F. 3d 534.

JUSTICE KAVANAUGH, concurring.

In this Fourth Amendment case, the Eighth Circuit relied on the “community caretaking” doctrine to uphold the warrantless entry into a home. This Court’s recent decision in *Caniglia v. Strom*, 593 U. S. 194 (2021), rejected that doctrine as applied to homes. I therefore concur in the Court’s decision to grant, vacate, and remand to the Eighth Circuit in light of *Caniglia*. As I will explain, however, the Eighth Circuit on remand may still consider whether to uphold the entry under this Court’s long-standing precedents allowing officers to enter a home without a warrant when officers reasonably believe that an occupant is threatened with serious injury. See, *e. g.*, *id.*, at 200 (ROBERTS, C. J., concurring); *Brigham City v. Stuart*, 547 U. S. 398 (2006).

* * *

This case arises out of a domestic disturbance that occurred in Dubuque, Iowa. On February 16, 2018, 11-year-old N. R. called her grandmother and said that N. R.’s mother, Karina LaFrancois, and Karina’s boyfriend, Kenneth Sanders, were “‘fighting really bad’” and “‘they need[ed] someone to come.’” 956 F. 3d 534, 537 (CA8 2020). The grandmother called 911 and relayed that information to the operator. The grandmother also told the operator that two other small children were in the home.

When the Dubuque police officers arrived at Karina’s home shortly thereafter, one officer saw N. R. through an upstairs window “‘acting excited’” and gesturing. *Ibid.* Karina then came out of the home to talk to the officers. Karina had red marks on her face and neck and appeared visibly upset. The officers asked to speak with her boyfriend Sanders, and Karina responded that she would have Sanders come outside. When Karina opened the door to get Sanders, the officers heard a child crying inside. At

that point, the officers entered the home. They found Sanders just inside the door and an infant in a nearby playpen. They then went upstairs and located N. R., who informed them that there was a gun downstairs and that she had heard Karina yelling, “Put the gun down! Put the gun down!” *Id.*, at 538. N. R. also told the officers that she had heard what she thought was Sanders choking Karina. The officers then spoke with Karina, who told them that Sanders had a gun and that it could be in a couch on the first floor. The officers found the gun in the couch.

Sanders later conditionally pled guilty in federal court to the federal offense of unlawfully possessing a firearm, preserving his right to appeal with respect to the officers’ warrantless entry into Karina’s home.

On appeal, the Eighth Circuit held that the officers’ entry was reasonable under the Fourth Amendment. The court relied on Circuit precedent recognizing a “community caretaking” doctrine that justified certain warrantless entries into the home. The court explained that the officers “reasonably believed an emergency situation existed that required their immediate attention in the form of entering” Karina’s “home to ensure that no one inside was injured or in danger.” *Id.*, at 539.

The Court today vacates and remands the Eighth Circuit’s judgment in light of *Caniglia*. In *Caniglia*, the Court held that there is no standalone “community caretaking” doctrine that allows warrantless entries into the home. See 593 U. S., at 199. Because the Eighth Circuit relied on just such a standalone “community caretaking” doctrine, today’s decision to vacate and remand for reconsideration in light of *Caniglia* is appropriate.

To be clear, however, the fact that the Eighth Circuit used a now-erroneous label does not mean that the Eighth Circuit reached the wrong result. *Caniglia* did not disturb this Court’s longstanding precedents that allow warrantless entries into a home in certain circumstances. See *id.*, at 200 (ROBERTS, C. J., concurring). Of particular relevance here, the Court has long said that police officers may enter a home without a warrant if they have an “objectively reasonable basis for believing that an occupant” is “seriously injured or threatened with such injury.” *Brigham City*, 547 U. S., at 400, 403. On remand, the Eighth Circuit will be able to consider precedents such as *Brigham City*.

With those comments, I concur in the Court’s decision to grant, vacate, and remand.

593 U. S.

June 1, 2021

Miscellaneous Orders

No. 20A144. DEBENEDETTO *v.* LUMPKIN, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION. Application for certificate of appealability, addressed to JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR and referred to the Court, denied.

No. 20M69. DWYER *v.* UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT. Motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari under seal with redacted copies for the public record denied.

No. 20M80. ALLEN *v.* PARRIS, WARDEN. Motion to direct the Clerk to file petition for writ of certiorari out of time denied.

No. 20M81. ARIZONA ET AL. *v.* CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, ET AL. Movants in this matter have sought leave to intervene in this Court. They have also indicated their intention to file a petition for writ of certiorari respecting the denial of their motion for leave to intervene in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Motion for leave to intervene in this Court is hereby held in abeyance pending the timely filing and disposition of the petition for writ of certiorari respecting the denial of intervention below.

No. 20M82. BROOKS *v.* AGATE RESOURCES, INC. Motion of respondent for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari under seal with redacted copies for the public record granted.

No. 20M83. DURAN-GOMEZ *v.* UNITED STATES. Motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari under seal with redacted copies for the public record granted.

No. 142, Orig. FLORIDA *v.* GEORGIA. The Honorable Paul J. Kelly, Jr., of Santa Fe, N. M., the Special Master in this case, is hereby discharged with the thanks of the Court. [For earlier decision herein, see, *e. g.*, 592 U. S. 433.]

No. 20–7366. IN RE ALEXANDER. Motion of petitioner for reconsideration of order denying leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* [592 U. S. 1350] denied.

No. 20–1365. IN RE KUIGOUA; and

No. 20–7660. IN RE SULZNER. Petitions for writs of mandamus denied.

June 1, 2021

593 U. S.

Certiorari Granted

No. 20–915. UNICOLORS, INC. *v.* H&M HENNES & MAURITZ, L. P. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari granted limited to Question 1 presented by the petition. Reported below: 959 F. 3d 1194.

Certiorari Denied

No. 20–578. HEDGER ET AL. *v.* GRAVES. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 810 Fed. Appx. 414.

No. 20–885. NEXT ENERGY, LLC *v.* ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES. App. Ct. Ill., 5th Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2020 IL App (5th) 180582–U.

No. 20–1044. SAUL, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY *v.* RAMSEY ET AL. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 973 F. 3d 537.

No. 20–1318. SHACK *v.* NBC UNIVERSAL MEDIA, LLC, ET AL. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1325. PERKINS *v.* LIPSCOMBE, JUDGE, COUNTY COURT AT LAW NO. 3, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS, ET AL. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1336. QUINETTE *v.* REED ET AL. C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 805 Fed. Appx. 696.

No. 20–1347. ZECENA-VALDEZ *v.* NEVADA. Sup. Ct. Nev. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 136 Nev. 897, 462 P. 3d 1231.

No. 20–1348. TRUE HARMONY ET AL. *v.* UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1353. THOMAS *v.* ABEBE ET AL. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 833 Fed. Appx. 551.

No. 20–1358. ARMSTRONG *v.* UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1367. SPRUILL *v.* BRAGGS, WARDEN. C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 829 Fed. Appx. 308.

No. 20–1380. SECURITY PEOPLE, INC. *v.* HIRSHFELD, ACTING UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROP-

593 U.S.

June 1, 2021

ERTY AND DIRECTOR, UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, ET AL. C. A. Fed. Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 971 F. 3d 1355.

No. 20–1397. *LI WANG v. GARLAND, ATTORNEY GENERAL*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 830 Fed. Appx. 927.

No. 20–1398. *KATZ v. SAUL, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY*. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 798 Fed. Appx. 734.

No. 20–1404. *GARRETT v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 820 Fed. Appx. 275.

No. 20–1407. *AL-SAADON ET AL. v. GARLAND, ATTORNEY GENERAL, ET AL.* C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 973 F. 3d 794.

No. 20–1413. *BROWN v. FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION*. App. Ct. Mass. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 97 Mass. App. 1103, 140 N. E. 3d 955.

No. 20–1437. *OPTIMUM SERVICES, INC. v. HAALAND, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR*. C. A. Fed. Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 829 Fed. Appx. 527.

No. 20–1440. *ANAYA v. LUMPKIN, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 976 F. 3d 545.

No. 20–1446. *LACOURSE, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ESTATE OF LACOURSE, LIEUTENANT COLONEL, USAF (RET.) v. PAE WORLDWIDE INC. ET AL.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 980 F. 3d 1350.

No. 20–1464. *JOSHI v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 832 Fed. Appx. 921.

No. 20–1488. *BROOK v. MCCORMLEY ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 837 Fed. Appx. 433.

No. 20–1503. *LAITY v. HARRIS*. C. A. D. C. Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1528. *WILSON, AKA RASHID v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 828 Fed. Appx. 414.

June 1, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–1546. *BELLFLOWER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT v. LUA ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 832 Fed. Appx. 493.

No. 20–1547. *BROIDY CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LLC, ET AL. v. STATE OF QATAR.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 982 F. 3d 582.

No. 20–6049. *GONZALEZ-FERRETIZ v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 813 Fed. Appx. 837.

No. 20–6066. *SEGURA-VIRGEN v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 799 Fed. Appx. 214.

No. 20–6684. *SILVERIA v. CALIFORNIA*; and

No. 20–7252. *TRAVIS v. CALIFORNIA.* Sup. Ct. Cal. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 10 Cal. 5th 195, 471 P. 3d 412.

No. 20–6802. *JONES v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 969 F. 3d 192.

No. 20–6946. *CASHIN v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 822 Fed. Appx. 378.

No. 20–6947. *CAVE v. FLORIDA.* Sup. Ct. Fla. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 299 So. 3d 352.

No. 20–7005. *KING v. KENDALL, WARDEN.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 806 Fed. Appx. 242.

No. 20–7116. *DEL PINO ALLEN v. BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF MIAMI DADE COLLEGE.* Dist. Ct. App. Fla., 3d Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 308 So. 3d 122.

No. 20–7214. *PATRICK v. FLORIDA.* Sup. Ct. Fla. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 302 So. 3d 734.

No. 20–7238. *GARCIA v. MISSISSIPPI.* Sup. Ct. Miss. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 300 So. 3d 945.

No. 20–7251. *WILLIAMS v. TEXAS.* Ct. Crim. App. Tex. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7353. *SHARIPOFF v. PERSSON, SUPERINTENDENT, COFFEE CREEK CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7559. *OXENDINE-TAYLOR v. EASTERN BAND OF CHEROKEE INDIANS, COUNCIL.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 829 Fed. Appx. 672.

593 U.S.

June 1, 2021

No. 20–7560. *MORRIS v. CATE ET AL.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 826 Fed. Appx. 296.

No. 20–7568. *COFFEY v. SOUTH CAROLINA.* C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7571. *FULGHAM v. CROW, DIRECTOR, OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS.* C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 838 Fed. Appx. 355.

No. 20–7576. *RODRIGUEZ v. TEXAS.* Ct. Crim. App. Tex. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7577. *STUCKS v. FLORIDA.* Dist. Ct. App. Fla., 1st Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 306 So. 3d 373.

No. 20–7578. *SPATARU v. RAMSAY ET AL.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7579. *PHILLIPS v. TEXAS.* Ct. App. Tex., 1st Dist. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7581. *HERNANDEZ v. FLORIDA.* Dist. Ct. App. Fla., 3d Dist. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7583. *HILD v. COLORADO.* Ct. App. Colo. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7588. *GAY v. SHINN, DIRECTOR, ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, REHABILITATION AND REENTRY.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7590. *PARKER v. OKLAHOMA.* Ct. Crim. App. Okla. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7595. *THOMAS v. STANSON ET AL.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 816 Fed. Appx. 885.

No. 20–7596. *WARE v. LUMPKIN, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7600. *NAVARRO v. CALIFORNIA.* Ct. App. Cal., 2d App. Dist., Div. 4. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7602. *RODRIGUEZ v. KLEMM ET AL.* C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 827 Fed. Appx. 173.

June 1, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–7606. *AJJAHHON v. ST. JOSEPH’S UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER ET AL.* C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 840 Fed. Appx. 667.

No. 20–7616. *THOMAS v. LUMPKIN, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 968 F. 3d 352.

No. 20–7620. *MORET v. GARRETT ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7671. *JOHNSON v. SCHMIDT, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF KANSAS, ET AL.* C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 838 Fed. Appx. 319.

No. 20–7676. *RICHARDS v. VANNOY, WARDEN.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7757. *TOLIVER v. FLORIDA.* Dist. Ct. App. Fla., 1st Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 294 So. 3d 428.

No. 20–7810. *PROPHET v. TERRY, ACTING WARDEN.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 825 Fed. Appx. 139.

No. 20–7839. *FORD v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 821 Fed. Appx. 742.

No. 20–7845. *MINAYA v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 841 Fed. Appx. 301.

No. 20–7856. *AYALA v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 1st Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 991 F. 3d 323.

No. 20–7872. *MORTON v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 843 Fed. Appx. 699.

No. 20–7876. *TILLERY v. VANNOY, WARDEN.* Ct. App. La., 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7884. *MELENDEZ-DAVILA v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 836 Fed. Appx. 282.

No. 20–7888. *ROSS v. SHELTON ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7890. *SPENCER ET AL. v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied.

593 U. S.

June 1, 2021

No. 20–7904. *SIMMONS v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 814 Fed. Appx. 534.

No. 20–7906. *SILVA v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 1st Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7910. *AYBAR-ULLOA v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 1st Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 987 F. 3d 1.

No. 20–7914. *WILLIAMS v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 836 Fed. Appx. 310.

No. 20–7917. *LOWELL ET AL. v. VERMONT DEPARTMENT FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES ET AL.* C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 835 Fed. Appx. 637.

No. 20–7939. *JONES v. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7948. *BAKER v. OREGON DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 829 Fed. Appx. 800.

No. 20–1223. *JOHNSON & JOHNSON ET AL. v. INGHAM ET AL.* Ct. App. Mo., Eastern Dist. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE ALITO and JUSTICE KAVANAUGH took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition. Reported below: 608 S. W. 3d 663.

No. 20–1493. *NICHOLS v. WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN, ET AL.* C. A. 6th Cir. Motion of Restore the Fourth, Inc., for leave to file brief as *amicus curiae* granted. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 822 Fed. Appx. 445.

No. 20–7574. *RYMER v. UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE BARRETT took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

No. 20–7887. *SPELLS v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition. Reported below: 833 Fed. Appx. 890.

Rehearing Denied

No. 20–1023. *COULTER v. IGNELZI ET AL.*, 592 U. S. 1352;

No. 20–1342. *IN RE RADCLIFF*, 593 U. S. 925;

June 1, 3, 7, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–6357. *COOK v. APPELLATE DIVISION OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES*, 592 U. S. 1221;

No. 20–6965. *MILLER v. DUNN*, 593 U. S. 915;

No. 20–7009. *REED v. TOOLE, WARDEN, ET AL.*, 592 U. S. 1324; and

No. 20–7399. *CLANCY v. AUSTIN, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE*, 593 U. S. 918. Petitions for rehearing denied.

No. 20–656. *KINGHORN ET AL. v. UNITED STATES*, 592 U. S. 1176; and

No. 20–6677. *IN RE WRIGHT*, 592 U. S. 1234. Motions for leave to file petitions for rehearing denied.

No. 20–955. *NEWHOUSE, ADMINISTRATRIX OF THE ESTATE OF NEWHOUSE v. ETHICON, INC., ET AL.*, 592 U. S. 1343. Petition for rehearing denied. JUSTICE ALITO took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

JUNE 3, 2021

Dismissal Under Rule 46

No. 20–1010. *RRANXBURGAJ v. MAYORKAS, SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, ET AL.* C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari dismissed under this Court’s Rule 46. Reported below: 825 Fed. Appx. 278.

JUNE 7, 2021

Certiorari Granted—Vacated and Remanded

No. 20–896. *GRAHAM v. BARNETTE ET AL.* C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari granted, judgment vacated, and case remanded for further consideration in light of *Caniglia v. Strom*, 593 U. S. 194 (2021). Reported below: 970 F. 3d 1075.

Certiorari Dismissed

No. 20–8009. *CALHOUN v. PENNSYLVANIA ET AL.* C. A. 3d Cir. Motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* denied, and certiorari dismissed. See this Court’s Rule 39.8.

Miscellaneous Orders

No. 20M84. *ROSE v. SUNUNU, GOVERNOR OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, ET AL.*;

No. 20M85. *TOLIVER v. INCH, SECRETARY, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS*; and

593 U. S.

June 7, 2021

No. 20M86. ZAVALIDROGA *v.* HESTER ET AL. Motions to direct the Clerk to file petitions for writs of certiorari out of time denied.

No. 20M87. L. C. *v.* S. C. ET AL. Motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari under seal with redacted copies for the public record granted.

No. 20M88. DOE *v.* UNITED STATES. Motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari with supplemental appendix under seal granted.

No. 20–480. BABCOCK *v.* SAUL, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY. C. A. 6th Cir. [Certiorari granted, 592 U.S. 1302.] Motion of petitioner to dispense with printing joint appendix granted.

No. 20–7994. IN RE SCOTT; and

No. 20–8044. IN RE ANNAMALAI. Petitions for writs of habeas corpus denied.

No. 20–1387. IN RE ARUNACHALAM. Petition for writ of mandamus denied. THE CHIEF JUSTICE took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

No. 20–7650. IN RE ZOU. Petition for writ of prohibition denied.

Certiorari Granted

No. 20–828. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION ET AL. *v.* FAZAGA ET AL. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari granted. Reported below: 965 F. 3d 1015.

Certiorari Denied

No. 20–1019. THOMPSON *v.* MARIETTA EDUCATION ASSN. ET AL. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 972 F. 3d 809.

No. 20–1062. BENNETT *v.* WASHINGTON. Ct. App. Wash. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 13 Wash. App. 2d 1114.

No. 20–1093. JUST ENERGY MARKETING CORP. ET AL. *v.* HURT, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED, ET AL. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 973 F. 3d 509.

June 7, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–1148. *SELLERS v. McDONOUGH, SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS*. C. A. Fed. Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 965 F. 3d 1328.

No. 20–1195. *KANSAS NATURAL RESOURCE COALITION v. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ET AL.* C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 971 F. 3d 1222.

No. 20–1197. *CLEMONS v. DUNN, COMMISSIONER, ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, ET AL.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 967 F. 3d 1231.

No. 20–1210. *SENECA COUNTY, NEW YORK v. CAYUGA INDIAN NATION OF NEW YORK*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 978 F. 3d 829.

No. 20–1220. *COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC v. PROMPTU SYSTEMS CORP. ET AL.* (two judgments). C. A. Fed. Cir. Reported below: 838 Fed. Appx. 551 (second judgment) and 555 (first judgment). Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1372. *CHAMBERS v. TEXAS*. Ct. App. Tex., 13th Dist. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1384. *EVERETT v. COBB COUNTY, GEORGIA, ET AL.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 823 Fed. Appx. 888.

No. 20–1386. *EISELE v. ESTATE OF SMITH*. Sup. Ct. N. H. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1399. *CAPUL ET AL. v. CITY OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK, ET AL.* C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 832 Fed. Appx. 766.

No. 20–1403. *HERNANDEZ v. EXCEL CONTRACTORS, INC.* Ct. App. La., 1st Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2019–1058 (La. App. 1 Cir. 5/11/20), 304 So. 3d 74.

No. 20–1406. *ARMSTRONG v. NORTH CAROLINA ET AL.* Sup. Ct. N. C. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 376 N. C. 886, 854 S. E. 2d 805.

No. 20–1433. *AGUILAR-MOLINA v. GARLAND, ATTORNEY GENERAL*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1454. *RUKORO ET AL. v. FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 976 F. 3d 218.

593 U. S.

June 7, 2021

No. 20–1467. *VARCO v. SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ET AL.* Ct. App. D. C. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1512. *DACANAY v. ILLINOIS.* App. Ct. Ill., 2d Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2020 IL App (2d) 190533–U.

No. 20–1517. *FAST 101 PTY. LTD. v. CITIGROUP INC. ET AL.* C. A. Fed. Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 834 Fed. Appx. 591.

No. 20–1554. *CITIZENS AGAINST CORPORATE CRIME, LLC v. LENNAR CORP.* C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 834 Fed. Appx. 747.

No. 20–1565. *MITCHAN v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 137.

No. 20–1576. *145 FISK, LLC v. NICKLAS.* C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 986 F. 3d 759.

No. 20–6399. *JONES v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 814 Fed. Appx. 553.

No. 20–6794. *GUEVARA SALAMANCA v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 821 Fed. Appx. 584.

No. 20–7101. *BILLINGS v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 829 Fed. Appx. 461.

No. 20–7162. *AGUILAR ET AL. v. SPECIALIZED LOAN SERVICING, LLC, ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7185. *ESPOSITO v. FORD, WARDEN.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 818 Fed. Appx. 962.

No. 20–7282. *MALLOY v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7284. *CURRY v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 833 Fed. Appx. 328.

No. 20–7285. *COLLINS v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 836 Fed. Appx. 842.

No. 20–7286. *DAVIS v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 828 Fed. Appx. 698.

No. 20–7287. *CIUS v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 465.

June 7, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–7304. *IVERS v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 967 F. 3d 709.

No. 20–7326. *VALENTINE v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7330. *LLOYD v. HUTCHINSON, WARDEN*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 822 Fed. Appx. 245.

No. 20–7341. *CODDINGTON v. FARRIS, WARDEN*. C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 959 F. 3d 947.

No. 20–7348. *YBARRA v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 827 Fed. Appx. 896.

No. 20–7359. *GAGARIN v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 950 F. 3d 596.

No. 20–7536. *COLEMAN v. BRADSHAW, WARDEN*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 974 F. 3d 710.

No. 20–7601. *SMITH v. NEW JERSEY BUREAU OF SECURITIES*. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7605. *MARTINEZ v. ARIZONA*. Super. Ct. Ariz., Pima County. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7613. *WOMACK v. OXLEY*. Sup. Ct. N. C. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7627. *SHABANI v. CITY OF MADISON, WISCONSIN, ET AL.* (Reported below: 828 Fed. Appx. 330); *SHABANI v. WISCONSIN ET AL.*; and *SHABANI v. KALKA ET AL.* C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7630. *MADLOCK v. LUMPKIN, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7631. *THOMPSON v. JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N. A., ET AL.* Ct. App. Cal., 1st App. Dist., Div. 3. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7638. *GOMEZ v. LUMPKIN, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7642. *FETZER v. HARRIS, SECRETARY, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, ET AL.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied.

593 U. S.

June 7, 2021

No. 20–7643. *FAISON v. WETZEL*, SECRETARY, PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, ET AL. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7646. *GATSON v. LUMPKIN*, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 813 Fed. Appx. 980.

No. 20–7651. *CURIEL v. CALIFORNIA*. Ct. App. Cal., 6th App. Dist. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7653. *DENTON v. DAVIDS*, WARDEN. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7654. *DOUGLAS v. STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA*. Sup. Ct. Cal. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7658. *RICE v. VANIHEL*, WARDEN. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7662. *LUEVANO v. YEAKEL*, JUDGE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, ET AL. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7665. *DILLBECK v. FLORIDA*. Sup. Ct. Fla. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 304 So. 3d 286.

No. 20–7666. *PONDER v. INCH*, SECRETARY, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS. C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7669. *JACKSON v. ALABAMA*. Ct. Crim. App. Ala. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7670. *DEAN v. WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD ET AL.* Ct. App. Cal., 4th App. Dist., Div. 2. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7682. *BARNES v. SALINAS SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7685. *HEARD v. PERRY*, WARDEN. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7690. *WINZER v. VANNOY*, WARDEN. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7696. *ARDANEH v. UNITED STATES ET AL.* C. A. 1st Cir. Certiorari denied.

June 7, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–7718. *PIERRE v. LOUISIANA*. Sup. Ct. La. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2020–01107 (La. 12/8/20), 305 So. 3d 849.

No. 20–7720. *THOMAS v. INCH, SECRETARY, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, ET AL.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7724. *WILSON v. NDOH, WARDEN*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 840 Fed. Appx. 947.

No. 20–7740. *VICKERS v. DIGGS, WARDEN*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 837 Fed. Appx. 999.

No. 20–7741. *WEN DONG ZHAO v. DEPARTMENT OF STATE*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 776 Fed. Appx. 733.

No. 20–7747. *PATEL v. ROBINSON ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7756. *TADEMY v. COLORADO*. Ct. App. Colo. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7759. *WILLIAMS v. PAYNE, DIRECTOR, ARKANSAS DIVISION OF CORRECTION*. C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7760. *WORTHINGTON v. OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY ET AL.* C. A. D. C. Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7762. *BINER MA v. CVS PHARMACY, INC., ET AL.* C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 833 Fed. Appx. 10.

No. 20–7766. *DAVIS v. REAGLE, WARDEN*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7771. *BATOR v. NILSSON ET AL.* Ct. App. Cal., 3d App. Dist. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7781. *GOULD v. BESS ET AL.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 832 Fed. Appx. 227.

No. 20–7787. *MILLSAP v. PAYNE, DIRECTOR, ARKANSAS DIVISION OF CORRECTION*. Sup. Ct. Ark. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2020 Ark. 401, 611 S. W. 3d 479.

No. 20–7809. *MILLER v. RADTKE, WARDEN*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

593 U. S.

June 7, 2021

No. 20–7849. *LOPEZ v. UNITED STATES ET AL.* C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 823 Fed. Appx. 34.

No. 20–7854. *OLSON v. OLSON.* Ct. App. N. Y. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 35 N. Y. 3d 965, 147 N. E. 3d 1163.

No. 20–7869. *TORRES v. BLACKSTONE GROUP.* C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 836 Fed. Appx. 49.

No. 20–7873. *MCBRIDE v. ZATECKY, SUPERINTENDENT, PENDLETON CORRECTIONAL FACILITY.* C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7898. *RIDLEY v. FLORIDA.* Sup. Ct. Fla. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7912. *GOMEZ-GOMEZ v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 841 Fed. Appx. 2.

No. 20–7913. *WIMS v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 836 Fed. Appx. 793.

No. 20–7931. *SEGURA-RESENDEZ v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 812 Fed. Appx. 283.

No. 20–7936. *PONCE-ULLOA v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 835 Fed. Appx. 227.

No. 20–7937. *LOGGINS v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 966 F. 3d 891.

No. 20–7940. *ELBEBLAWY v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 839 Fed. Appx. 398.

No. 20–7941. *ONICK v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 830 Fed. Appx. 442.

No. 20–7944. *BOBAL v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 981 F. 3d 971.

No. 20–7945. *ARNAUD v. VANNOY, WARDEN.* Ct. App. La., 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7946. *BIRON v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 1st Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7950. *SERRANO-PEREZ v. UNITED STATES.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 830 Fed. Appx. 457.

June 7, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–7956. *MONTALVO v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 836 Fed. Appx. 300.

No. 20–7959. *CONNERTON v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 843 Fed. Appx. 417.

No. 20–7961. *OLMEDA v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 837 Fed. Appx. 52.

No. 20–7964. *RILEY v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 122.

No. 20–7969. *AGUSTIN-PINEDA v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 830 Fed. Appx. 839.

No. 20–7970. *GLENN v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 839 Fed. Appx. 376.

No. 20–7973. *NUNLEY v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 119.

No. 20–7976. *THOMAS v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 816 Fed. Appx. 839.

No. 20–7981. *NIVENS v. MORGAN, WARDEN, ET AL.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 75.

No. 20–7991. *CONTRERAS-FIGUEROA, AKA CONTRERAS v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 826 Fed. Appx. 652.

No. 20–8008. *CONN v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–8011. *WEBB v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 842 Fed. Appx. 946.

No. 20–8014. *BAEZ v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 983 F. 3d 1029.

No. 20–8018. *TISDALE v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 980 F. 3d 1089.

No. 20–8024. *BIRON v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 1st Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–850. *BIG TIME VAPES, INC., ET AL. v. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION ET AL.* C. A. 5th Cir. Motion of 19 National

593 U. S.

June 7, 2021

and State Electronic Nicotine Delivery System Product Advocacy Associations for leave to file brief as *amici curiae* granted. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 963 F. 3d 436.

No. 20–928. NATIONAL COALITION FOR MEN ET AL. *v.* SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM ET AL. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 969 F. 3d 546.

Statement of JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR, with whom JUSTICE BREYER and JUSTICE KAVANAUGH join, respecting the denial of certiorari.

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits the Federal Government from discriminating on the basis of sex absent an “‘exceedingly persuasive justification.’” *Sessions v. Morales-Santana*, 582 U. S. 47, 58 (2017) (quoting *United States v. Virginia*, 518 U. S. 515, 531 (1996)); see *Califano v. Westcott*, 443 U. S. 76 (1979); *Califano v. Goldfarb*, 430 U. S. 199 (1977); *Weinberger v. Wiesenfeld*, 420 U. S. 636 (1975); *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U. S. 677 (1973). Cf. *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U. S. 497 (1954). The Military Selective Service Act requires men, and only men, however, to register for the draft upon turning 18. See 85 Stat. 353, 50 U. S. C. § 3802(a). In *Rostker v. Goldberg*, 453 U. S. 57 (1981), this Court upheld the Act’s gender-based registration requirement against an equal protection challenge, citing the fact that women were “excluded from combat” roles and hence “would not be needed in the event of a draft.” *Id.*, at 77.

The role of women in the military has changed dramatically since then. Beginning in 1991, thousands of women have served with distinction in a wide range of combat roles, from operating military aircraft and naval vessels to participating in boots-on-the-ground infantry missions. See Brief for Modern Military Association of America et al. as *Amici Curiae* 11–18. Women have become Army Rangers and been awarded the Green Beret, and a woman has recently completed the Navy’s demanding assessment and selection process to qualify for SEAL training. See Brief for General Michael Hayden et al. as *Amici Curiae* 11–13. As of 2015, there are no longer any positions in the United States Armed Forces closed to women. See Memorandum from Secretary of Defense to Secretaries of the Military Departments et al. Re: Implementation Guidance for the Full Integration of Women in the Armed Forces 1 (Dec. 3, 2015). Petitioners ask the Court to overrule *Rostker* in light of these developments.

June 7, 2021

593 U. S.

Petitioners, however, are not the only ones asking whether a male-only registration requirement can be reconciled with the role women can, and already do, play in the modern military. In 2016, Congress created the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service (NCMNPS) and tasked it with studying whether Selective Service registration should be conducted “regardless of sex.” National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, §§551(a), 555(c)(2)(A), 130 Stat. 2130, 2135.

On March 25, 2020, the Commission released its final report, in which it recommended “eliminat[ing] male-only registration.” Inspired to Serve: The Final Report of the [NCMNPS] 111. Among other things, the Commission found that “[m]ale-only registration sends a message to women not only that they are not vital to the defense of the country but also that they are not expected to participate in defending it.” *Id.*, at 118. Just a few months ago, the Senate Armed Services Committee held a hearing on the report, where Chairman Jack Reed expressed his “hope” that a gender-neutral registration requirement will be “incorporated into the next national defense bill.” Tr. of Hearing on Final Recommendations and Report of the [NCMNPS] before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, 117th Cong., 1st Sess., 21 (Mar. 11, 2021).

It remains to be seen, of course, whether Congress will end gender-based registration under the Military Selective Service Act. But at least for now, the Court’s longstanding deference to Congress on matters of national defense and military affairs cautions against granting review while Congress actively weighs the issue. I agree with the Court’s decision to deny the petition for a writ of certiorari.

No. 20–1305. DOUGLAS J. HOLDINGS, INC., ET AL. *v.* EBERLINE ET AL. C. A. 6th Cir. Motion of American Association of Cosmetology Schools for leave to file brief as *amicus curiae* granted. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 982 F. 3d 1006.

No. 20–1373. COLE *v.* WAKE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION. C. A. 4th Cir. Motion of Constitutional Accountability Center for leave to file brief as *amicus curiae* granted. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 834 Fed. Appx. 820.

No. 20–1381. FOX ET AL. *v.* SUMMERS. Sup. Ct. Ohio. Motions of Buckeye State Sheriffs’ Association, Legal Momentum et al., and Ohio Prosecuting Attorneys Association for leave

593 U.S.

June 7, 2021

to file briefs as *amici curiae* granted. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 163 Ohio St. 3d 217, 2020-Ohio-5585, 169 N. E. 3d 625.

No. 20–1563. RASHID *v.* UNITED STATES. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE ALITO took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

No. 20–7668. WEIDRICK *v.* BIDEN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, ET AL. C. A. D. C. Cir. Certiorari before judgment denied.

No. 20–7966. RUDZAVICE *v.* UNITED STATES. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE KAGAN took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 731.

Rehearing Denied

No. 20–938. WALKER ET AL. *v.* DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST CO., AS TRUSTEE FOR HARBORVIEW MORTGAGE LOAN TRUST MORTGAGE LOAN PASS-THROUGH CERTIFICATES, SERIES 2007–6, 592 U.S. 1318;

No. 20–1321. LEE *v.* UNITED STATES, 593 U.S. 930;

No. 20–1361. HEISLER, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS THE EXECUTRIX OF THE SUCCESSION OF HEISLER *v.* GIROD LOANCO, LLC (three judgments), 593 U.S. 964;

No. 20–5817. LEWIS *v.* DECKER ET AL., 592 U.S. 1128;

No. 20–6385. DEVERS *v.* NEBRASKA, 592 U.S. 1237;

No. 20–6404. LIGGINS *v.* VASHAW, WARDEN, 592 U.S. 1237;

No. 20–6614. JARVIS *v.* LEGGETT ET AL., 592 U.S. 1274;

No. 20–6839. TOWNSEND *v.* TAYLOR, SUPERINTENDENT, EASTERN OREGON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, 592 U.S. 1282;

No. 20–6847. TORRES *v.* LIVINGSTON ET AL., 592 U.S. 1322;

No. 20–6981. WALTER *v.* TEXAS, 592 U.S. 1355;

No. 20–7117. TROY-MCKOY *v.* MOUNT SINAI BETH ISRAEL, 593 U.S. 931;

No. 20–7141. BROWN *v.* UNITED STATES, 592 U.S. 1327;

No. 20–7321. DOUGLAS *v.* SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, 593 U.S. 977;

No. 20–7389. UDOH *v.* DOOLEY, WARDEN, 593 U.S. 918; and

No. 20–7390. UDOH *v.* KNUTSON, WARDEN, 593 U.S. 918. Petitions for rehearing denied.

June 10, 14, 2021

593 U. S.

JUNE 10, 2021

Dismissals Under Rule 46

No. 20–1339. *SOWINSKI v. CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD*. C. A. Fed. Cir. Certiorari dismissed under this Court's Rule 46.1. Reported below: 971 F. 3d 1371.

No. 20–1509. *TIMBES v. DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST CO., AS INDENTURE TRUSTEE*. Super. Ct. Glynn County, Ga. Certiorari dismissed under this Court's Rule 46.

JUNE 14, 2021

Certiorari Granted—Vacated and Remanded

No. 19–1116. *LINKEDIN CORP. v. HIQ LABS, INC.* C. A. 9th Cir. Motion of Electronic Privacy Information Center for leave to file brief as *amicus curiae* granted. Certiorari granted, judgment vacated, and case remanded for further consideration in light of *Van Buren v. United States*, 593 U. S. 374 (2021). Reported below: 938 F. 3d 985.

No. 20–1250. *MAURICIO-BENITEZ, AKA SANCHEZ-FARJARDO v. GARLAND, ATTORNEY GENERAL*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari granted, judgment vacated, and case remanded for further consideration in light of *Niz-Chavez v. Garland*, 593 U. S. 155 (2021). Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 120.

Miscellaneous Orders

No. D–3068. *IN RE BLATT*. Stuart Richard Blatt, of Boca Raton, Fla., having requested to resign as a member of the Bar of this Court, it is ordered that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to the practice of law before this Court. The rule to show cause, issued on March 29, 2001, [592 U. S. 1349] is discharged.

No. 20M89. *SMITH v. TEHAMA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT ET AL.* Motion to direct the Clerk to file petition for writ of certiorari out of time denied.

No. 20M90. *WHITEHEAD v. PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORP. ET AL.* Motion for leave to proceed as a veteran denied. JUSTICE KAVANAUGH took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion.

593 U. S.

June 14, 2021

No. 20M91. MURPHY *v.* CITIGROUP GLOBAL MARKETS, INC., ET AL. Motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari with supplemental appendix under seal granted.

No. 20M92. MARQUES *v.* JPMORGAN CHASE, N. A. Motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari under seal with redacted copies for the public record denied.

No. 20–1199. STUDENTS FOR FAIR ADMISSIONS, INC. *v.* PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF HARVARD COLLEGE. C. A. 1st Cir. The Acting Solicitor General is invited to file a brief in this case expressing the views of the United States.

No. 20–7266. MARTIN *v.* CAPRON ET AL. C. A. 7th Cir. Motion of petitioner for reconsideration of order denying leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* [593 U. S. 910] denied. JUSTICE BARRETT took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion.

No. 20–7715. IN RE DECARO. Motion of petitioner for reconsideration of order denying leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* [593 U. S. 972] denied.

No. 20–8067. IN RE YBARRA. Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied.

No. 20–7817. IN RE BENNETT. Petition for writ of prohibition denied.

Certiorari Denied

No. 20–575. ROYAL TRUCK & TRAILER SALES AND SERVICE, INC. *v.* KRAFT ET AL. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 974 F. 3d 756.

No. 20–911. JACKSON *v.* HUDSON, WARDEN. C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 822 Fed. Appx. 821.

No. 20–925. AFEWORK *v.* BABBITT ET AL. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 816 Fed. Appx. 111.

No. 20–939. WILCOX *v.* LYONS ET AL. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 970 F. 3d 452.

No. 20–1100. RODRIGUEZ ET AL. *v.* NEWSOM, GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA, ET AL. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 974 F. 3d 998.

June 14, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–1161. *KOSINSKI v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 976 F. 3d 135.

No. 20–1207. *BALBUENA v. CATES, ACTING WARDEN*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 980 F. 3d 619.

No. 20–1224. *O'REILLY AUTO ENTERPRISES, LLC, DBA O'REILLY AUTO PARTS v. BELL*. C. A. 1st Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 972 F. 3d 21.

No. 20–1238. *GARCIA-DIAZ v. GARLAND, ATTORNEY GENERAL*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1241. *MISELIS v. UNITED STATES*; and

No. 20–7377. *DALEY v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 972 F. 3d 518.

No. 20–1252. *SIMONI v. JERSEY SHORE UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER ET AL.* C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 835 Fed. Appx. 660.

No. 20–1302. *MCWHORTER v. DUNN, COMMISSIONER, ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, ET AL.* C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 824 Fed. Appx. 773.

No. 20–1383. *DIAMOND ET AL. v. PENNSYLVANIA STATE EDUCATION ASSN. ET AL.* C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 972 F. 3d 262.

No. 20–1405. *FARAG v. WAQAS*. App. Ct. Ill., 2d Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2020 IL App (2d) 200284–U.

No. 20–1412. *NETSOC, LLC v. MATCH GROUP, LLC, ET AL.* C. A. Fed. Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 838 Fed. Appx. 544.

No. 20–1415. *MOON v. MOON ET AL.* C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 833 Fed. Appx. 876.

No. 20–1417. *ESTIVILL ET UX. v. VON KAHLE*. Dist. Ct. App. Fla., 3d Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 303 So. 3d 540.

No. 20–1420. *ROADIE, INC. v. BAGGAGE AIRLINE GUEST SERVICES, INC.* C. A. Fed. Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 828 Fed. Appx. 721.

593 U. S.

June 14, 2021

No. 20–1424. *ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE CO. ET AL. v. MSP RECOVERY CLAIMS, SERIES LLC*. C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 974 F. 3d 1305.

No. 20–1435. *GALVAN v. NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC*. Ct. App. Nev. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 136 Nev. 810, 466 P. 3d 948.

No. 20–1436. *FOUST v. LAWRENCE BROTHERS, INC., ET AL.* Sup. Ct. Va. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1450. *MURPHY v. BLALOCK, AS EXECUTRIX OF THE ESTATE OF MURPHY-WALLACE*. Ct. App. Tenn. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1469. *ZAVALA DE GOMEZ ET AL. v. GARLAND, ATTORNEY GENERAL*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 835 Fed. Appx. 931.

No. 20–1485. *CROSSETT v. EMMET COUNTY, MICHIGAN, ET AL.* C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1487. *GILBERT ET AL. v. WEAHKEE, REAR ADMIRAL, ET AL.* C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 830 Fed. Appx. 496.

No. 20–1489. *BALDWIN v. SEIDA ET AL.* Ct. App. Ore. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 303 Ore. App. 363, 460 P. 3d 556.

No. 20–1490. *MAREZ v. ALLISON, SECRETARY, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1513. *PATEL v. TRUMP CORP. ET AL.* C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1534. *DOUGHTY ET AL. v. STATE EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, SEIU LOCAL 1984, CTW, CLC*. C. A. 1st Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 981 F. 3d 128.

No. 20–1548. *FRIDMAN v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 974 F. 3d 163.

No. 20–1557. *ANAND v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 851 Fed. Appx. 247.

June 14, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–1568. *MILLER v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1571. *RAYMOND ET AL. v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 980 F. 3d 30.

No. 20–1578. *GRAVEN v. ARIZONA*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 342.

No. 20–1581. *ARCIERO v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 835 Fed. Appx. 196.

No. 20–1586. *McGOWAN v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 816 Fed. Appx. 387.

No. 20–1593. *SANDERS v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 834 Fed. Appx. 742.

No. 20–1600. *SAE HAN SHEET Co., LTD. v. EASTMAN PERFORMANCE FILMS, LLC*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 829 Fed. Appx. 601.

No. 20–1619. *EXPENSIFY, INC. v. WHITE*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 268.

No. 20–6731. *FRANCIS v. MASSACHUSETTS*. Sup. Jud. Ct. Mass. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 485 Mass. 86, 147 N. E. 3d 491.

No. 20–6905. *MAY-SHAW v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 955 F. 3d 563.

No. 20–7083. *BROWN v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7188. *MARION v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 821 Fed. Appx. 264.

No. 20–7198. *BRADLEY v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 969 F. 3d 585.

No. 20–7207. *GORDILLO-ESCANDON v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 832 Fed. Appx. 158.

No. 20–7355. *REED v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 972 F. 3d 946.

No. 20–7368. *HOOKS v. ATOKI ET AL.* C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 983 F. 3d 1193.

593 U. S.

June 14, 2021

No. 20–7386. *CHAPNICK v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7406. *ROBINSON v. INCH, SECRETARY, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS*. C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7599. *TUCKER v. McDONOUGH, SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS*. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7615. *OWEN v. FLORIDA*. Sup. Ct. Fla. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 304 So. 3d 239.

No. 20–7688. *LEWIS v. FLORIDA*. Sup. Ct. Fla. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7691. *WASHINGTON v. WILLIAMS, WARDEN, ET AL.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 823 Fed. Appx. 179.

No. 20–7692. *VIOLETT v. GRISE*. Sup. Ct. Ky. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7695. *JONES v. TILDEN ET AL.* C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 827 Fed. Appx. 591.

No. 20–7704. *SHAHEED ET AL. v. KROSKI ET AL.* C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 833 Fed. Appx. 868.

No. 20–7706. *VESTER v. HENLOPEN LANDING HOMEOWNERS ASSN., INC., ET AL.* Sup. Ct. Del. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 241 A. 3d 217.

No. 20–7712. *SINGLETON v. ORANGEBURG COUNTY DISABILITIES SPECIAL NEEDS BOARD*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 822 Fed. Appx. 206.

No. 20–7713. *SHARP v. LONG, JUDGE, SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT OF SOUTH DAKOTA, ET AL.* C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7717. *MORRIS v. JUMPER ET AL.* C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7719. *TATUM v. TRETTIN ET AL.* C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7721. *DOTSON v. TUNICA-BILOXI GAMING COMMISSION ET AL.* C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 835 Fed. Appx. 710.

June 14, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–7722. *CHURCH v. VIRGINIA*. Sup. Ct. Va. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7727. *SHAREEF v. PALKO ET AL.* C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 839 Fed. Appx. 766.

No. 20–7735. *HARRIS v. MICHIGAN*. Ct. App. Mich. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7736. *SCHOPPE v. UTAH ET AL.* C. A. 10th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 830 Fed. Appx. 267.

No. 20–7739. *GAGE v. RICHARDSON, WARDEN*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 978 F. 3d 522.

No. 20–7748. *McKEN v. FLORIDA*. Dist. Ct. App. Fla., 2d Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 305 So. 3d 528.

No. 20–7751. *LOPEZ v. LUMPKIN, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7754. *YERTON v. OKLAHOMA*. Ct. Crim. App. Okla. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7758. *VANCE v. BISHOP, WARDEN, ET AL.* C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 827 Fed. Appx. 333.

No. 20–7765. *MARTIN v. CALIFORNIA*. Ct. App. Cal., 2d App. Dist., Div. 7. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7819. *LOGAN v. TOWN OF WINDSOR, NEW YORK, ET AL.* C. A. 2d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 833 Fed. Appx. 919.

No. 20–7825. *McGINN v. KANSAS*. Ct. App. Kan. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 56 Kan. App. 2d xlv, 422 P. 3d 687.

No. 20–7850. *LAROSE v. MISSOURI*. Ct. App. Mo., Eastern Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 611 S. W. 3d 553.

No. 20–7857. *AYALA v. NEW YORK*. App. Div., Sup. Ct. N. Y., 2d Jud. Dept. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 172 App. Div. 3d 1084, 100 N. Y. S. 3d 103.

No. 20–7899. *MIDDLETON v. GEORGIA*. Sup. Ct. Ga. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 310 Ga. 365, 850 S. E. 2d 126.

593 U. S.

June 14, 2021

No. 20–7901. *MERRIHEW v. FLORIDA*. Dist. Ct. App. Fla., 4th Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 308 So. 3d 620.

No. 20–7952. *BASTIDAS v. ATCHLEY, WARDEN*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7953. *ALEYKINA v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 827 Fed. Appx. 708.

No. 20–7955. *PELICHET v. WAYNE CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE ET AL.* Ct. App. Mich. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–7990. *MEZA v. SHERMAN, WARDEN*. C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 836 Fed. Appx. 585.

No. 20–8002. *CAVAZOS v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 130.

No. 20–8003. *METIVIER v. HAALAND, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR*. C. A. 8th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 821 Fed. Appx. 673.

No. 20–8004. *L. M. C. v. WEST VIRGINIA*. Sup. Ct. App. W. Va. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–8013. *ANCHONDO-QUEZADA v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 138.

No. 20–8033. *MINJAREZ-MOLINA v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 717.

No. 20–8036. *MCKOY v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 844 Fed. Appx. 637.

No. 20–8039. *O’NEAL v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 835 Fed. Appx. 70.

No. 20–8051. *SABATINO v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 4th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 827 Fed. Appx. 330.

No. 20–8052. *QUIROZ v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–8054. *REINWAND v. NOVAK, WARDEN*. C. A. 7th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–8055. *AVILES v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 938 F. 3d 503.

June 14, 2021

593 U. S.

No. 20–8058. *ROSE v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–8060. *POFF v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 830 Fed. Appx. 145.

No. 20–8062. *PANOPIO v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 11th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 836 Fed. Appx. 839.

No. 20–8064. *GRANT v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 6th Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 979 F. 3d 1141.

No. 20–8065. *GREAVES v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 831 Fed. Appx. 52.

No. 20–8066. *HILL v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 3d Cir. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–8069. *MERRITTE v. ILLINOIS*. Sup. Ct. Ill. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–8080. *JOHNSON v. ILLINOIS*. App. Ct. Ill., 4th Dist. Certiorari denied. Reported below: 2020 IL App (4th) 180620–U.

No. 20–8091. *ZAPATA v. KENTUCKY*. Sup. Ct. Ky. Certiorari denied.

No. 20–1089. *CHEVRON CORP. ET AL. v. CITY OF OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, ET AL.* C. A. 9th Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE ALITO took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition. Reported below: 969 F. 3d 895.

No. 20–6832. *HARRIS v. UNITED STATES*. C. A. 5th Cir. Certiorari denied. JUSTICE KAGAN took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition. Reported below: 815 Fed. Appx. 793.

Rehearing Denied

No. 20–948. *KOBE v. BUSCEMI ET AL.*, 593 U. S. 927;

No. 20–1022. *COULTER v. JAMSAN HOTEL MANAGEMENT, INC., ET AL.*, 592 U. S. 1352;

No. 20–6374. *BROWN v. UNITED STATES*, 593 U. S. 965;

No. 20–7084. *HILL v. GOOGLE LLC ET AL.*, 593 U. S. 931;

No. 20–7261. *REDMOND v. UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT*, 593 U. S. 966;

593 U.S.

June 14, 2021

No. 20–7295. SAUCEDA *v.* SHINN, DIRECTOR, ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, REHABILITATION AND REENTRY, ET AL., 593 U.S. 934; and

No. 20–7567. COLE *v.* UNITED STATES, 593 U.S. 938. Petitions for rehearing denied.

Page Proof Pending Publication