

(ORDER LIST: 607 U.S.)

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2025

ORDERS IN PENDING CASES

- 25A30 MALDONADO, HUMBERTO A. V. GUERRERO, DIR., TX DCJ
The application for a certificate of appealability addressed to Justice Jackson and referred to the Court is denied.
- 25A74 NICHOLSON, HARRIET V. BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON
The application for stay addressed to Justice Jackson and referred to the Court is denied.
- 25A159 RYNN, RICHARD, ET AL. V. JENNINGS, CRAIG, ET AL.
The application for injunctive relief addressed to Justice Alito and referred to the Court is denied.
- 25M33 HESSLER, SIMON V. UNITED STATES
The motion to direct the Clerk to file a petition for a writ of certiorari out of time is denied.
- 161, ORIG. NEBRASKA V. COLORADO
The Solicitor General is invited to file a brief in this case expressing the views of the United States.
- 24-6385 TAAL, BABOUCAR B. V. CRONIN, JOHN, ET AL.
- 24-6779 HALL, DANIEL E. V. X CORP.
- 24-6955 IN RE DEXTER L. JOHNSON
- 24-7022 MARSHALL, DARRELL L. V. DETROIT, MI, ET AL.
The motions of petitioners for reconsideration of orders denying leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied.
- 25-5775 WALTON, EDWARD V. BOOZ ALLEN HAMILTON, ET AL.
The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma*

pauperis is denied. Petitioner is allowed until December 8, 2025, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) and to submit a petition in compliance with Rule 33.1 of the Rules of this Court.

CERTIORARI GRANTED

25-5 NOEM, SEC. OF HOMELAND, ET AL. V. AL OTRO LADO, ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted.

CERTIORARI DENIED

24-1187 VANDA PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. V. FDA, ET AL.
24-1244 McMASTER, DAVID A. V. PENNSYLVANIA
24-1261 CAMBRIDGE CHRISTIAN SCH., INC. V. FL HIGH SCH. ATHLETIC ASSN.
24-1280 GESTURE TECHNOLOGY PARTNERS, LLC V. APPLE INC., ET AL.
24-1281 GESTURE TECHNOLOGY PARTNERS, LLC V. UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC
24-1299 PLANET GREEN CARTRIDGES, INC. V. AMAZON.COM, INC., ET AL.
24-1310 ENGSTROM, DAVID, ET AL. V. DENBY, JAMES W.
24-7183 LITTLE, JAMES V. UNITED STATES
25-13 HENDERSON, MARCELLUS V. UNITED STATES
25-25 AVIANCA GROUP INT'L LTD. V. BURNHAM STERLING AND CO., ET AL.
25-106 VINES, RONALD D. V. UNITED STATES
25-163 CLAY, CORRIGAN V. UNITED STATES
25-184 LAW, DEAMONTE V. UNITED STATES
25-302 TALLEY, PATSY V. FOLWELL, DALE R., ET AL.
25-305 DeBERRY, LOUISE V. CHICAGO BD. OF ED., ET AL.
25-309 KIM, KAEUN V. ALI, MARK, ET AL.
25-318 MUMAW, ERIC M. V. McGINLEY, SUPT.
25-328 DIAMOND, NORMAN D. V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.
25-354 ZARATE PINA, PEDRO, ET AL. V. BONDI, ATT'Y GEN.
25-360 J. P. V. J. N.

25-371 CLARK'S BARBER LOUNGE, ET AL. V. DESTIN HEALTH & FITNESS, LLC

25-393 RAAD, PATRICIA, ET AL. V. BANK AUDI S.A.L.

25-401 CARTER, ALEXANDER, ET AL. V. DART, SHERIFF, ET AL.

25-405 CLEMENT, AUDREY V. WASHINGTON POST

25-408 BAINES, TAMARA V. ATLANTA, GA, ET AL.

25-422 DAWSON, DESHAWN M. V. UNITED STATES

25-424 DERGES, PATRICIA A. V. UNITED STATES

25-5038 WEIR, NICHOLAS V. MONTEFIORE MEDICAL, ET AL.

25-5040 WEIR, NICHOLAS V. USCIS, ET AL.

25-5063 ARMSTRONG, JOHN V. UNITED STATES

25-5251 BEHNAMIAN, SHAHRIAR V. STEWART, COKE, ET AL.

25-5331 FARRIS, MAURICE V. UNITED STATES

25-5338 GUIDEN, AVONTAE V. UNITED STATES

25-5347 LUSK, DANIEL L. V. UNITED STATES

25-5357 SULLIVAN, JESSIE D. V. UNITED STATES

25-5412 RICHMOND, RYAN D. V. UNITED STATES

25-5533) GUILLORY, STANTON V. UNITED STATES

25-5539) AGE, LOUIS V. UNITED STATES

25-5556) AGE, LOUIS, ET AL. V. UNITED STATES

25-5604 RAHAIM, CHRISTOPHER J. V. LEY, FORMER JUDGE, ET AL.

25-5613 GARNICA, ANDRES S. V. THORNELL, DIR., AZ DOC, ET AL.

25-5615 SHAKOURI, SHAHRAM V. BECKER, FORMER JUDGE, ET AL.

25-5621 BANKS, JA'KROI A. V. TEXAS

25-5635 ECHOLS, ROY F. V. CSX TRANSP., INC.

25-5638 AMADI, OKECHUKWU V. BONDI, ATT'Y GEN., ET AL.

25-5640 RUSSELL, JASON V. ILLINOIS

25-5641 GAUSE, WALTER T. V. ZIMMERMAN, FRANK

25-5642 MCGEE, TONNERRIOUS J. V. TEXAS

25-5647 MOORE, KOLBY R. V. LOUISIANA
25-5648 SMITH, IKEIE R. V. BONN, WARDEN
25-5659 OH, EX REL. DODSON V. SMITH, WARDEN
25-5670 AJAI, SARAI H. V. ND DEPT. OF TRANSP., ET AL.
25-5675 HARRIS, ROSALIND D. V. AT&T
25-5679 ANDERSON, LEWIS V. CALIFORNIA
25-5682 DUNBAR, DAMON N. V. OKLAHOMA
25-5687 GORHAM, CURTIS V. JENKINS, MICHAEL A., ET AL.
25-5689 GAGE, KENNETH E. V. CALIFORNIA
25-5692 SZMURLO, PETE V. TK ELEVATOR CORP., ET AL.
25-5711 WILLIAMS, JERMAL V. LOUISIANA
25-5720 BARTUNEK, GREGORY V. UNITED STATES
25-5732 BAUM, JEREMY V. MISSOURI
25-5752 DAVIE, OLIVIA C. V. MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD
25-5780 MAYBERRY, TIMOTHY M. V. HALL, STACY
25-5792 NESDAHL, TIMOTHY V. C. GARRETT, WARDEN
25-5794 GOLDEN, JASMINE E. V. AMAZON
25-5803 DURALEV, GRIGORII V. BONDI, ATT'Y GEN.
25-5806 DIXON, RICKY V. UNITED STATES
25-5811 BLAND, RICKY J. V. UNITED STATES
25-5814 MCGHEE, JAYLYN D. V. UNITED STATES
25-5816 SPEED, WILLIAM L. V. UNITED STATES
25-5820 JONES, KEVIN D. V. UNITED STATES
25-5821 RODVELT, GREGORY L. V. UNITED STATES
25-5823 FULTON, STEVEN N. V. UNITED STATES
25-5824 CACERES, LUIS M. V. UNITED STATES
25-5825 THOMAS, LATERRENCE V. UNITED STATES
25-5828 BARROW, JOSHUA D. V. UNITED STATES

25-5830 MOORE, KORTNEY V. UNITED STATES
25-5837 CROWE, MOSES V. UNITED STATES
25-5838 SHANNON, KENNETH K. V. UNITED STATES
25-5841 RAY, MELVIN V. UNITED STATES
25-5844 TITTLE, MICHAEL L. V. UNITED STATES
25-5847 GREEN, CHARLIE V. UNITED STATES
25-5848 MILBURN, CEDRIC V. UNITED STATES
25-5853 SANTIAGO, CLARENCE V. UNITED STATES
25-5857 JACKSON, RUSSELL K. V. UNITED STATES
25-5859 WISCONSIN, EX REL. NIGL V. EPLETT, WARDEN
25-5860 BOWMAN, ROBERT M. V. UNITED STATES
25-5861 RUCKS, JULIUS V. UNITED STATES
25-5862 REYES-AYALA, BYRON V. UNITED STATES
25-5863 KUYKENDALL, JONATHAN H. V. UNITED STATES
25-5864 BARNETT, RODNEY E. V. ARKANSAS
25-5867 VLHA, JAMES B. V. UNITED STATES
25-5868 KIRUI, KENNETH K. V. ARIZONA
25-5885 HAYES, VASQUEZ D. V. PAYNE, DIR., AR DOC

The petitions for writs of certiorari are denied.

25-377 NORTH AMERICAN CREDIT SERVICES V. CRAWFORD, ABDUL

The motion to substitute Lisa J. Crawford, authorized representative, as respondent in place of Abdul Crawford, Deceased is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

25-5643 PHILLIPS, DELORIS V. TX DEPT. OF INS.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly

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

HABEAS CORPUS DENIED

25-5945 IN RE DERRICK L. JOHNSON

The petition for a writ of habeas corpus is denied.

25-5956 IN RE SANTOS CUEVAS

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

MANDAMUS DENIED

25-5660 IN RE DAVID C. WHITE

The petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition is denied.

REHEARINGS DENIED

25-5065 IN RE DERRICK L. JOHNSON

25-5645 IN RE DERRICK L. JOHNSON

The petitions for rehearing are denied.

ALITO, J., dissenting

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATESSUSAN HUTSON *v.* UNITED STATES, ET AL.ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 24–1022. Decided November 17, 2025

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. JUSTICE GORSUCH would grant the petition for a writ of certiorari.

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

I would have granted certiorari to terminate the longstanding and unlawful prison-building order at the center of this case. In 2019, the District Court ordered New Orleans to construct a new facility for inmates with mental-health needs. Yet the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (PLRA) specifically states that “[n]othing in this section shall be construed to authorize the courts, in exercising their remedial powers, to order the construction of prisons.” 18 U. S. C. §3626(a)(1)(C). If a court issued an injunction in violation of the PLRA, then a party “shall be entitled to the immediate termination of any prospective relief.” §3626(b)(2); see *Miller v. French*, 530 U. S. 327, 331 (2000). Thus, because the prison-building injunction was illegal from the beginning, the courts below should have terminated it.

The lower courts further erred by failing to terminate the injunction for a second, independent reason. Even if an injunction complied with the PLRA when it was issued, the injunction “shall be terminable . . . 2 years after the date the court granted or approved the prospective relief.” §3626(b)(1)(A)(i). Here, the New Orleans sheriff filed a “motion to terminate all orders regarding the construction of the Phase III jail” four years after the court granted the injunction. App. to Pet. for Cert. 81a. At that point, the

ALITO, J., dissenting

District Court could maintain the injunction only if it found the injunction “remains necessary to correct a current and ongoing violation,” “extends no further than necessary,” and “is narrowly drawn and the least intrusive means to correct the violation.” §3626(b)(3). There is a Circuit split about which party bears the burden at this stage of the litigation.* But Fifth Circuit precedent places the burden on the party supporting the injunction—not the party seeking termination. *Guajardo v. Texas Dept. of Crim. Justice*, 363 F. 3d 392, 395–396 (2004) (*per curiam*). Here, the lower courts did not hold the Government or private plaintiffs to their burden. Rather, the courts below denied the sheriff’s termination motion because it provided no “basis for the district court to grant it.” *Anderson v. Hutson*, 114 F. 4th 408, 420 (CA5 2024). That gets the inquiry backwards. It was not the sheriff’s burden to provide a basis for termination; it was the opposing parties’ burden to show a basis for maintaining the injunction.

In short, the Fifth Circuit erroneously resolved an important issue of federal law on which there is a Circuit split. This case cried out for our review. By failing to intervene, we leave New Orleans to pay for the Fifth Circuit’s serious errors. I respectfully dissent.

*Compare *Balla v. Idaho*, 29 F. 4th 1019, 1025 (CA9 2022) (“[T]he burden is on the movant to demonstrate that there are no ongoing constitutional violations, that the relief ordered exceeds what is necessary to correct an ongoing constitutional violation, or both”), with *Laaman v. Warden, N. H. State Prison*, 238 F. 3d 14, 20 (CA1 2001) (“[T]he burden remains on the plaintiffs to show that such violations persist”).