

(ORDER LIST: 607 U.S.)

MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2025

CERTIORARI -- SUMMARY DISPOSITION

25-133 MILLER, JOSEPH, ET AL. V. McDONALD, COMM'R, ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit for further consideration in light of *Mahmoud v. Taylor*, 606 U. S. 522 (2025).

ORDERS IN PENDING CASES

25A272 SADORRA, DENNIS D. V. STARLIGHT DUNES HOA

The application for stay addressed to Justice Thomas and referred to the Court is denied.

25A360 BERROCAL, HENRY B. V. SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPT-HQ, ET AL.

The application for injunctive relief addressed to Justice Sotomayor and referred to the Court is denied.

25A440 DEZFOOLI, MEELAD V. UNITED STATES

The application for bail addressed to Justice Sotomayor and referred to the Court is denied.

25M35 OPEIU V. SPACEX, ET AL.

The motion for leave to intervene to file a petition for writ of certiorari is denied.

25M36 MONTEMAYOR, ISRAEL V. BISIGNANO, COMM'R, SOCIAL SEC.

25M37 MABES, ERIKA, ET AL. V. THOMPSON, SHANNON, ET AL.

The motions for leave to file petitions for writs of certiorari with the supplemental appendices under seal are

granted.

24-1015 DOE, ET AL. V. HOCHUL, GOV. OF NY, ET AL.

The Solicitor General is invited to file a brief in this case expressing the views of the United States.

24-7281 WATSON, LAWRENCE B. V. IFILL, PAMERSON

The motion of petitioner for reconsideration of order denying leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied.

25-159 HOFFMANN, LEONARD W., ET AL. V. WBI ENERGY TRANSMISSION, INC.

25-183 CROWTHER, THOMAS, ET AL. V. BD. OF REGENTS UNIV. GA, ET AL.

The Solicitor General is invited to file briefs in these cases expressing the views of the United States.

25-5798 LERMAN, MIKHAEL Y. V. LERMAN, CELINE E.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied. Petitioner is allowed until December 29, 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 DENIED

24-994 NBA V. SALAZAR, MICHAEL

24-1255 WILLIAMS, MALCOM A. V. UNITED STATES

24-1305 TODD, MARCUS V. AM. FED'N OF STATE

24-1306 KLEE, TERRY V. INT'L UNION, LOCAL 501, ET AL.

24-1327 SPIRIT OF ALOHA TEMPLE, ET AL. V. MAUI COUNTY, HI, ET AL.

24-7354 STEWART, SETH V. AMERICAN FORK, UT

24-7461 MARTINEZ-MERCADO, PEDRO A. V. UNITED STATES

25-43 FREEDOM FOUNDATION V. INT'L BROTHERHOOD, ET AL.

25-107 GILLIAM, LEAH V. GERREGANO, DAVID, ET AL.

25-108 BUSH, DONALD, ET UX. V. UNITED STATES

25-115 MILLER, MONICA, ET AL. V. JAMES, ATT'Y GEN. OF NY
 25-117 IKOME, PETER M. V. BONDI, ATT'Y GEN.
 25-228 SOLOMON, DETRINA V. FLIPPS MEDIA, INC.
 25-233 MILLER, CATHARINE, ET AL. V. CIVIL RIGHTS DEPT.
 25-239 HUBER, TONYA C. V. WESTAR FOODS, INC.
 25-256 HILSENATH, LIBBY V. CHATHAMS SCH. DIST. BD. OF ED.
 25-284 LITTLE, LEILA G., ET AL. V. LLANO CTY., TX, ET AL.
 25-314 CULP, CARL V. CAUDILL, SCOTT
 25-350 BROOKS, CHARLES, ET AL. V. ALLEN, JEREMY J.
 25-357 LOCKRIDGE, ADRIAN M. V. MADISON SCH. DIST., ET AL.
 25-359 SOTOODEH, RAMBOD, ET AL. V. SOUTH EL-MONTE, CA, ET AL.
 25-370 WAKEFIELD, FRANZ A. V. BLACKBOARD, INC., ET AL.
 25-380 KUHLMAYER, SEAN V. LATOUR, ISABELLE
 25-394 BEIT HA KAVOD V. CANTON, OH
 25-398 TURTON, ADEAYO O. V. SAKS FIFTH AVENUE, LLC
 25-404 HUNT, MARK V. ZUFFA, LLC, ET AL.
 25-410 SCHNEIDER, SONDR A. J. V. SHAPIRO SHER GUINOT & SANDLER
 25-413 MORANCY, JEAN D. V. SALOMON, SABRINA A., ET AL.
 25-418 U.S., EX REL. USN4U, LLC V. WOLF CREEK FED. SERVICES, ET AL.
 25-420 RUED, JOSEPH D., ET AL. V. JAYSWAL, JAYKUMAR, ET AL.
 25-423 FOULIARD, DANIEL J. V. WISCONSIN
 25-443 VELLEFF, TED V. DART, SHERIFF, ET AL.
 25-456 CAPITAL HEALTH MEDICAL, ET AL. V. NEW JERSEY, ET AL.
 25-478 BILOTTI, CHRISTIN V. FL DOC
 25-486 PEREZ, DAVID V. DENVER, CO
 25-496 LAWYERS FOR FAIR RECIPROCAL V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.
 25-505 RECENTIVE ANALYTICS, INC. V. FOX CORP., ET AL.
 25-511 WILLIAMSON, WILLIAM E. V. SCH. BD. CHESAPEAKE CITY, ET AL.

25-513 POPE, ADELE J. V. SOUTH CAROLINA
25-515 KAIL, MICHAEL V. UNITED STATES
25-519 LORA, EFRAIN V. UNITED STATES
25-520 PARROT, ALAN H. V. UNITED STATES
25-525 DELAPENA, DAMION A. V. FL DOC
25-536 HICKS, ROBERT G. V. HOPKINSVILLE SEWERAGE & WATER
25-568 ROGOZINSKI, JAIME V. REDDIT, INC.
25-575 McLEMORE, WILL, ET AL. V. GUMUCIO, ROXANNA, ET AL.
25-5175 PAYNE, RAYON V. LaRUE, ERIC PARKE, ET AL.
25-5241 FRY, CLARENCE V. SHOOP, WARDEN
25-5279 JERALD, EVAN M. V. ARIZONA
25-5291 SALDANA, CONSUELO, ET AL. V. CAMPANA, WILLIAM
25-5765 ELLIOTT, MARKEISHA V. OLDS, WARDEN
25-5766 VALENTIN, JONATHAN V. PA DEPT. OF LABOR AND INDUS.
25-5770 HOLMES, CHARLES A. V. OKLAHOMA
25-5773 FLORES, KARINA Y. V. TEXAS
25-5774 JENSEN, JASON A. V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.
25-5778 ANDERSON, ASHLIE R. V. AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF CA, ET AL.
25-5779 SIBLEY, TEDDY R. V. JACKSON, SUPT., WSP, ET AL.
25-5784 VASQUEZ, DANIEL R. S. V. OKLAHOMA
25-5785 STEPHENS, ANTOINE D. V. TARRANT CTY. DIST. ATT'Y, ET AL.
25-5807 MELOM, TAMATHA L. V. STONE COUNTY, MS
25-5810 SINGH, MANISHA V. MEMORIAL SLOAN KETTERING, ET AL.
25-5813 BURCHFIELD, BRADLEY V. OHIO
25-5815 SAINTIL, WILCLIN V. FLORIDA
25-5822 ABIOYE, ADEDAYO V. LEE, RAYMOND O.
25-5826 DAVIS, DOVER V. SWANN, OFFICER
25-5827 VICTOR, ERROL V. LOUISIANA

25-5832 WHITE, JAMES L. V. USPS
25-5833 THOMPSON, BRAUN V. UNITED STATES
25-5835 HARRIS, CARLOS D. V. DODD, WARDEN
25-5836 TAYLOR, JAMES S. V. TEXAS
25-5882 BROOMER, MICHAEL V. EMIG, WARDEN, ET AL.
25-5911 SMITH, DONICE N. V. KOTEK, GOV. OF OR
25-5943 MITCHELL, ROLLIE V. UNITED STATES
25-5950 SANUSI, ADEDAYO H. V. UNITED STATES
25-5955 FORD, JARRED J. V. UNITED STATES
25-5959 VOORHIS, JONATHAN V. DIGANGI, CINDY, ET AL.
25-5960 GRIGG, PETER V. MULLEN & MULLEN LAW FIRM
25-5963 CASTILLO-RODRIGUEZ, CESAR E. V. UNITED STATES
25-5965 ORUSA, SAMSON K. V. UNITED STATES
25-5966 GAGE, MALLY V. MAYO CLINIC, ET AL.
25-5967 GUYTON, LYNELL V. UNITED STATES
25-5971 RIVARD, JEFFREY V. VERMONT
25-5972 GOMEZ-REYES, RAMIRO V. UNITED STATES
25-5973 SCHUSTER, ERIC M. V. UNITED STATES
25-5974 BAKER, TERRANCE D. V. UNITED STATES
25-5975 dE SOUSA PRADO, THIAGO V. UNITED STATES
25-5977 WHARTON, DWAYNE E. V. TEXAS
25-5978 VELASQUEZ, EDGARD V. USDC CD CA
25-5981 PIZARRO-MERCADO, ERICK V. UNITED STATES
25-5983 CRUZ-WEBSTER, MAURICE V. EMIG, WARDEN, ET AL.
25-5985 LYNCH, ANNE M. V. UNITED STATES
25-5987 OCHOA-ANAYA, FRANCISCO J. V. UNITED STATES
25-5990 BROWN, TYLEE V. UNITED STATES
25-5991 JACOME, JAIRO A. V. UNITED STATES

25-5994 FINKEL, BRIAN L. V. ARIZONA
 25-5998 EDWARDS, SHADON D. V. UNITED STATES
 25-6003 TURNER, QUINN R. V. UNITED STATES
 25-6006 GREEN, JERRY W. V. UNITED STATES
 25-6007 ESCALERA-DIAZ, GABRIEL V. UNITED STATES
 25-6009 VARELA-ANGEL, JORGE A. V. UNITED STATES
 25-6021 MORGAN, DANNY R. V. FLORIDA
 25-6022 RODRIGUEZ-BECERRA, BRUNO V. UNITED STATES
 25-6023 HOLSTICK, WORLDLY D. V. UNITED STATES
 25-6026 HILL, MARTINO A. V. UNITED STATES
 25-6027 BAIN, DEONDRE L. V. UNITED STATES
 25-6028 LEYVA, ELIZABETH M. V. UNITED STATES
 25-6029 BALDWIN, KEITH V. FLETCHER, CAPTAIN
 25-6030 MIKSELL, TERRY L. V. UNITED STATES
 25-6042 SHAW, CALVIN V. UNITED STATES
 25-6052 RICHARDSON, DAVID D. V. UNITED STATES
 25-6053 MOORE, MARCHELLO V. UNITED STATES
 25-6055 MORGAN, TAMORI V. UNITED STATES
 25-6056 SANTOYO, RUBEN V. CHICAGO, IL, ET AL.
 25-6098 BONE, ELSTON V. MA, ET AL.

The petitions for writs of certiorari are denied.

25-5292 VOLUNGUS, JOHN C. V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Kagan took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition. See 28 U. S. C. §455(b)(3) and Code of Conduct for Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, Canon 3B(2)(e) (prior government employment).

25-5755 GABRIEL, DAWUD C. S. V. NOEM, SEC. OF HOMELAND

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*).

25-5800 LETTIERI, DAVID C. V. SAGE, WARDEN

25-5801 LETTIERI, DAVID C. V. SANTANDER BANK N.A.

The motions of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied, and the petitions for writs of certiorari are dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

25-5854 MACTRUONG, DMT V. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF U.S., ET AL.

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. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion and this petition.

HABEAS CORPUS DENIED

25-6043 IN RE ALEX SMITH

The petition for a writ of habeas corpus is denied.

25-6077 IN RE BRIAN W. SCHUMAKER

25-6120 IN RE STEVEN M. BACKSTROM

The motions of petitioners for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied, and the petitions for writs of habeas corpus are dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

MANDAMUS DENIED

25-5855 IN RE CALEB MCGILLVARY

25-5873 IN RE DONALD BOWERS

The petitions for writs of mandamus are denied.

25-5777 IN RE TYRONE MOORE

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

REHEARINGS DENIED

24-1164 EVERSON, JACQUELINE R. V. THE COCA-COLA CO., ET AL.

24-7221 CENANOVIC, FIKRETA V. HAMDARD CENTER FOR HHS

24-7224 DELEHOY, DEVON V. SOUTH DAKOTA, ET AL.

24-7404 AJJAHNON, ZOE V. SANDLER, EDWARD

24-7441 IN RE AMY R. W. GURVEY

24-7502 IN RE AARON F. JOHNSON

25-63 CLINTON, JUDITH V. BABCOCK, CHAD, ET AL.

25-94 DeBOSE, ANGELA V. USDC ND FL

25-105 BELAND, BRIAN, ET UX. V. UNITED STATES

25-110 PRIESTER, SALLY V. PR DEPT. OF HEALTH, ET AL.

25-185 ROSEN, BARRY V. HAWTHORNE, CA

25-199 CONCEPCION, DANIEL, ET AL. V. COMM'R OF BASEBALL, ET AL.

25-270 KHAN, NAZIR V. MERIT MEDICAL SYS., INC.

25-5023 REED, MYCHAL A. V. SUPERIOR COURT OF CA, ET AL.

25-5044 BAISE, ROBERT V. MITCHELL, WARDEN, ET AL.

25-5059 LOWE, JAMES R. V. ND WORKFORCE SAFETY AND INS.

25-5140 PICKETT, AMY V. TTUHSC, ET AL.

25-5186 ELLAR, DONNA V. MESA, AZ, ET AL.

25-5285 KOGER, FREDERICK V. SAID ISKAN INVESTMENTS, LLC

25-5330 DUGAN, RAYMOND V. UNITED STATES

25-5587 NEMAN, SHERVIN V. UNITED STATES

25-5593 IN RE JEFFREY L. CHRONISTER

The petitions for rehearing are denied.

25-21 KAETZ, WILLIAM F. V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.

The petition for rehearing is denied. Justice Thomas took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE

D-3155 IN THE MATTER OF DISBARMENT OF RICHARD JOSEPH SILVERBERG

Richard Joseph Silverberg, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, having been suspended from the practice of law in this Court by order of September 5, 2025; and a rule having been issued and served upon him requiring him to show cause why he should not be disbarred; and a response having been filed;

It is ordered that Richard Joseph Silverberg is disbarred from the practice of law in this Court.

Per Curiam

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**JOHN DOE v. DYNAMIC PHYSICAL
THERAPY, LLC, ET AL.****ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT
OF APPEAL OF LOUISIANA, FIRST CIRCUIT**

No. 25–180. Decided December 8, 2025

PER CURIAM.

Louisiana immunizes healthcare providers from civil liability during public health emergencies. La. Rev. Stat. Ann. §29:771(B)(2)(c)(i) (West 2022). Below, the Louisiana Court of Appeal held that this state statute barred plaintiff’s federal claims. 2024–0723, pp. 11–12 (1 Cir. 12/27/24), 404 So. 3d 1008, 1017–1018, writ denied, 2025–00105 (La. 4/29/25), 407 So. 3d 623. That decision is incorrect. Defining the scope of liability under state law is the State’s prerogative. But a State has no power to confer immunity from *federal* causes of action. See, e.g., *Howlett v. Rose*, 496 U. S. 356, 383 (1990); *Haywood v. Drown*, 556 U. S. 729, 740 (2009); *Williams v. Reed*, 604 U. S. 168, 174 (2025). “[T]he Judges in every State” are bound to follow federal law, “any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any state to the Contrary notwithstanding.” U. S. Const., Art. VI, cl. 2.

Plaintiff’s federal claims may well fail on other federal grounds. Cf. *Cummings v. Premier Rehab Keller*, 596 U. S. 212, 222 (2022). But that is for the Louisiana courts to decide in the first instance. The petition for certiorari is granted, the judgment of the Louisiana Court of Appeal is reversed, and the case is remanded for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ANTONIO NATHANIEL DAVENPORT, JR. *v.*
UNITED STATES

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

No. 24–7435. Decided December 8, 2025

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Statement of JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR respecting the denial
of certiorari.

I concur in the denial of certiorari because the petition is untimely and petitioner’s counsel gave no explanation for the delay. See this Court’s Rule 13.1; *Schacht v. United States*, 398 U. S. 58, 64 (1970) (the deadline to file a petition in a criminal case may be “relaxed by the Court in the exercise of its discretion when the ends of justice so require”). I write separately to address a statement made by the District Court when declining to give a jury instruction requested by petitioner.

Petitioner was charged with, as relevant, murder in aid of racketeering. See 18 U. S. C. §1959(a)(1). To make its case, the Government had to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that petitioner committed murder under North Carolina state law. At trial, the proposed jury instructions at no point defined what it means to prove an element of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt. Petitioner asked the District Court to give a jury instruction defining reasonable doubt for the underlying murder charge drawn from a North Carolina template jury instruction: “For these elements of murder, proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that fully satisfies or entirely convinces you of the Defendant’s guilt of murder.” App. in No. 22–4660 (CA4), p. 1579 (CA4 App.).

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

The District Court demurred, stating that federal courts are “specifically prohibited from giving a definition of reasonable doubt.” *Id.*, at 1493. After further consideration, the District Court denied the request and explained that “the federal rule . . . prohibits a court from defining reasonable doubt over and above what’s included in the instructions already.” *Id.*, at 1661. As a result, the jury did not receive an instruction on what reasonable doubt means.

The District Court was mistaken. Federal courts are not prohibited from defining reasonable doubt for the jury. In *Victor v. Nebraska*, 511 U. S. 1 (1994), this Court held that “the Constitution neither prohibits trial courts from defining reasonable doubt nor requires them to do so as a matter of course.” *Id.*, at 5. Almost all the Courts of Appeals abide by this understanding. See, e.g., *United States v. Walton*, 207 F. 3d 694, 696–697 (CA4 2000) (en banc) (“[T]he well-established rule of this Circuit is that although the district court may define reasonable doubt to a jury upon request, the district court is not required to do so”); see also *United States v. Alt*, 58 F. 4th 910, 921, and n. 1 (CA7 2023) (Kirsch, J., concurring) (explaining that “all” circuits “but [the Seventh Circuit] give district judges at least some discretion to” define reasonable doubt). Here, the District Court should have recognized that it had discretion over whether to grant petitioner’s request and define reasonable doubt for the jury.

To be sure, in some cases, it may be wise not to define reasonable doubt. See *Holland v. United States*, 348 U. S. 121, 140 (1954) (“Attempts to explain the term “reasonable doubt” do not usually result in making it any clearer to the minds of the jury”). In this case, for example, the District Court expressed concern that giving petitioner’s requested instruction as to the state-law murder charges, but no other aspects of the federal offense, might confuse the jury by suggesting they should apply different reasonable-doubt standards to different elements. CA4 App., 1662–1663.

Statement of SOTOMAYOR, J.

Still, there are cases where defining reasonable doubt may be appropriate. “While judges and lawyers are familiar with the reasonable doubt standard, the words ‘beyond a reasonable doubt’ are not self-defining for jurors.” *Victor*, 511 U. S., at 26 (Ginsburg, J., concurring in part and concurring in judgment). “Several studies of juror behavior have concluded that ‘jurors are often confused about the meaning of reasonable doubt’ when that term is left undefined.” *Ibid.* (quoting Note, Defining Reasonable Doubt, 90 Colum. L. Rev. 1716, 1723 (1990)).

In view of the central importance of the reasonable-doubt standard to criminal procedure, balanced against the potential for confusion from a reasonable-doubt instruction, district courts should weigh the circumstances of each individual case to decide whether to provide a definition to the jury. For example, a judge may choose to give an explanation to clear up potential confusion caused by a party’s misstatement of the standard. Or a judge may give one if the jury asks for it. This careful consideration will ensure that the reasonable-doubt standard retains its “indispensable” role in “command[ing] the respect and confidence of the community in applications of the criminal law.” *In re Winship*, 397 U. S. 358, 364 (1970).