

(ORDER LIST: 590 U.S.)

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 2020

**CERTIORARI -- SUMMARY DISPOSITION**

19-7007 FURLOW, BRYSHUN G. V. UNITED STATES

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petition for a writ of certiorari are granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit for further consideration in light of *Rehaif v. United States*, 588 U. S. \_\_\_\_ (2019).

**ORDER IN PENDING CASE**

19M139 ROBERSON, WILLIE V. ILLINOIS

The motion to direct the Clerk to file a petition for a writ of certiorari out of time is denied.

**CERTIORARI DENIED**

19-277 HSBC HOLDINGS, ET AL. V. PICARD, IRVING H., ET AL.

19-737 ) DOUSE, JAMES N. V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.

)  
19-982 ) BRYANT, ERICA Y., ET AL. V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.

19-767 NATIONAL ASSOC. FOR GUN RIGHTS V. MANGAN, JEFF, ET AL.

19-774 MARSH, MARCUS T. V. UNITED STATES

19-782 KELERCHIAN, VAHAN V. UNITED STATES

19-906 ANTICO, PHILIP N. V. UNITED STATES

19-1000 CHI, HEON-CHEOL V. UNITED STATES

19-1023 ) MORGAN, WARDEN V. WHITE, VINCENT D.

)  
19-8117 ) WHITE, VINCENT D. V. MORGAN, WARDEN

19-1044 FERREIRA, ROMILSON B. V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.

19-1052 DEWBERRY, ANDRE G. V. UNITED STATES  
 19-1066 COMCAST CORPORATION, ET AL. V. TILLAGE, CHARLES E., ET AL.  
 19-1078 AT&T MOBILITY LLC, ET AL. V. McARDLE, STEVEN  
 19-1165 WILLIS, CHUCK V. TOWER LOAN OF MISSISSIPPI  
 19-1185 WILDING, CAROL, ET AL. V. DNC SERVICES CORP., ET AL.  
 19-6939 HUNT, ANTHONY S. V. UNITED STATES  
 19-7043 TOTH, JOHN A. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.  
 19-7127 TOMLIN, PHILLIP W. V. PATTERSON, WARDEN  
 19-7361 ) SHEVTSOV, EDWARD V. UNITED STATES  
 )  
 19-7368 ) KUZMENKO, NADIA V. UNITED STATES  
 )  
 19-7729 ) NEW, AARON V. UNITED STATES  
 19-7481 MURPHY, PATRICK H. V. TEXAS  
 19-7706 ADAMS, TOMMY V. UNITED STATES  
 19-7738 H. K. V. V. FL DEPT. OF CHILDREN, ET AL.  
 19-7739 H. K. V. V. FL DEPT. OF CHILDREN, ET AL.  
 19-7751 THRASHER, CHRISTOPHER M. V. ALABAMA  
 19-7799 BAKER, DESMOND V. FLORIDA  
 19-8095 McCANTS, DEVILLE V. HANSEN, CHERYL, ET AL.  
 19-8101 MAMONE, ANGELO V. BURCH, ANGELA P.  
 19-8112 ALI, MUSTAFA V. OBERLANDER, SUPT., ET AL.  
 19-8114 WHITE, BRENDA V. SOUTHEAST MI HOSP., ET AL.  
 19-8116 WHITE, BRENDA F. V. MATTHEWS, O. L., ET AL.  
 19-8118 WISCONSIN, EX REL. WREN V. RICHARDSON, WARDEN  
 19-8119 WILLIAMS, WALTER E. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC  
 19-8123 BROWN, WENDELL V. SUPERIOR COURT OF IN, ET AL.  
 19-8128 BUCKNER, BOBBY J. V. DAVIS, DIR., TX DCJ  
 19-8132 CHEST, ANTOINE T. V. BALD, JUDGE  
 19-8140 DENNERLEIN, BENJAMIN V. GARMAN, SUPT., ROCKVIEW, ET AL.

19-8141 COWAN, ERIC J. V. GASTELO, WARDEN  
19-8142 SARHAN, ROBERT, ET UX. V. H & H INVESTORS, INC.  
19-8143 DOUCE AL DEY, OLIVER V. V. BREVARD CTY. TAX, ET AL.  
19-8150 JACKSON, MARCIA L. V. KANSAS CITY KS PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
19-8152 ANKH-EL, MENES V. CARTER, ROBERT, ET AL.  
19-8167 TALBERT, CHARLES V. CARNEY, BLANCHE, ET AL.  
19-8168 JUSTISE, CHARLES E. V. INDIANA  
19-8177 KEYS, CHRISTOPHER K. V. FLORIDA  
19-8180 M. H. V. IN DEPT. CHILD SERVICES  
19-8258 GOREE, DENVER M. V. MI PAROLE BOARD  
19-8287 TOURE, MUHAMMAD V. CA DOC  
19-8304 McVAY, TIMOTHY J. V. ILLINOIS  
19-8326 MARTIN, CHARLES B. V. MARYLAND  
19-8344 COMBS, BRETT V. NEVADA, ET AL.  
19-8353 STOKES, CURTIS V. INDIANA  
19-8366 CABEZAS, ANDRES F. V. UNITED STATES  
19-8380 MONDS, SAMORY A. V. UNITED STATES  
19-8381 O'DONNELL, JOSEPH B. V. UNITED STATES  
19-8382 EWING, CHRISTOPHER V. NEVADA  
19-8385 QUINTERO, ENRIQUE L. V. UNITED STATES  
19-8387 CALDWELL, ROBERT C. V. UNITED STATES  
19-8390 KIM, DO K. V. UNITED STATES  
19-8391 COFFMAN, JOSEPH M. V. ILLINOIS  
19-8393 TUCKER, JOSHUA V. UNITED STATES  
19-8399 TOLLIVER, RESHON V. UNITED STATES  
19-8400 NICHOLS, ROY A. V. UNITED STATES  
19-8401 LEWIS, RODERICK D. V. UNITED STATES  
19-8411 BURTON, CHARLES V. UNITED STATES

19-8412 McLEAN, LENROY V. UNITED STATES  
19-8415 STANLEY, ARTHUR V. UNITED STATES  
19-8416 WILLIAMS, HADORI K. V. UNITED STATES  
19-8423 GIES, CHRISTOPHER V. OHIO

The petitions for writs of certiorari are denied.

19-8156 STANCU, JOHN V. HYATT CORPORATION

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Breyer took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

**MANDAMUS DENIED**

19-7756 IN RE FRANK DEVILLE  
19-8136 IN RE LAWRENCE CRAWFORD

The petitions for writs of mandamus are denied.

**REHEARINGS DENIED**

19-690 NEVILLE, TINA V. DHILLON, CHAIR, EEOC, ET AL.  
19-994 HILL, JEFFREY L. V. JOHNSON, LEANDRA G., ET AL.  
19-7354 MARTIN, LAWRENCE V. KELLEY, DIR., AR DOC  
19-7496 STRONER, GARRY D. V. DAVIS, DIR., TX DCJ  
19-7708 ALJINDI, AHMAD J. V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.

The petitions for rehearing are denied.

THOMAS, J., dissenting

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

ADAM JARCHOW, ET AL. *v.* STATE BAR OF  
WISCONSIN, ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED  
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 19–831. Decided June 1, 2020

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

JUSTICE THOMAS, with whom JUSTICE GORSUCH joins, dissenting from the denial of certiorari.

A majority of States, including Wisconsin, have “integrated bars.” Unlike voluntary bar associations, integrated or mandatory bars require attorneys to join a state bar and pay compulsory dues as a condition of practicing law in the State. Petitioners are practicing lawyers in Wisconsin who allege that their Wisconsin State Bar dues are used to fund “advocacy and other speech on matters of intense public interest and concern.” App. to Pet. for Cert. 10. Among other things, petitioners allege that the Wisconsin State Bar has taken a position on legislation prohibiting health plans from funding abortions, legislation on felon voting rights, and items in the state budget. Petitioners’ First Amendment challenge to Wisconsin’s integrated bar arrangement is foreclosed by *Keller v. State Bar of Cal.*, 496 U. S. 1 (1990), which this petition asks us to revisit. I would grant certiorari to address this important question.

In *Abood v. Detroit Bd. of Ed.*, 431 U. S. 209 (1977), the Court held that a law requiring public employees to pay mandatory union dues did not violate the freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment, *id.*, at 235–236. In *Keller*, the Court extended *Abood* to integrated bar dues based on an “analogy between the relationship of the State Bar and its members, on the one hand, and the relationship of employee unions and their members, on the other.” 496

THOMAS, J., dissenting

U. S., at 12. Applying *Abood*, the Court held that “[t]he State Bar may . . . constitutionally fund activities germane to [its] goals” of “regulating the legal profession and improving the quality of legal services” using “the mandatory dues of all members.” 496 U. S., at 13–14.

Two Terms ago, we overruled *Abood* in *Janus v. State, County, and Municipal Employees*, 585 U. S. \_\_\_ (2018). We observed that “*Abood* was poorly reasoned,” that “[i]t has led to practical problems and abuse,” and that “[i]t is inconsistent with other First Amendment cases and has been undermined by more recent decisions.” *Id.*, at \_\_\_ (slip op., at 1). After considering arguments for retaining *Abood* that sounded in both precedent and original meaning, we held that “States and public-sector unions may no longer extract agency fees from nonconsenting employees.” 585 U. S., at \_\_\_ (slip op., at 48).

Our decision to overrule *Abood* casts significant doubt on *Keller*. The opinion in *Keller* rests almost entirely on the framework of *Abood*. Now that *Abood* is no longer good law, there is effectively nothing left supporting our decision in *Keller*. If the rule in *Keller* is to survive, it would have to be on the basis of new reasoning that is consistent with *Janus*.\*

Respondents argue that our review of this case would be hindered because it was dismissed on the pleadings. But any challenge to our precedents will be dismissed for failure to state a claim, before discovery can take place. And in any event, a record would provide little, if any, benefit to our review of the purely legal question whether *Keller* should be overruled.

Short of a constitutional amendment, only we can rectify

---

\* Respondents resist this conclusion by citing *Harris v. Quinn*, 573 U. S. 616 (2014), which predates *Janus*. But all we said in *Harris* was that “a refusal to extend *Abood*” would not “call into question” *Keller*. *Harris*, 573 U. S., at 655. Now that we have overruled *Abood*, *Keller* has unavoidably been called into question.

THOMAS, J., dissenting

our own erroneous constitutional decisions. We have admitted that *Abood* was erroneous, and *Abood* provided the foundation for *Keller*. In light of these developments, we should reexamine whether *Keller* is sound precedent. Accordingly, I respectfully dissent from the denial of certiorari.