

SCOTUS Application: Apply Supreme Court Decisions

1. Describe the facts, reasoning, decision, and opinion(s) of required Supreme Court cases.
2. Explain how a required Supreme Court case relates to a foundational document or to other primary or secondary sources.
3. Compare the reasoning, decisions, and opinion(s) of a required Supreme Court case to a non-required Supreme Court case.
4. Explain how required Supreme Court cases apply to scenarios in context.

SCOTUS Cases: List of Supreme Court cases to apply

Marbury v. Madison (1803)

McCulloch v. Maryland (1819)

Schenck v. U.S. (1919)

Brown v. Board of Education (1954)

Baker v. Carr (1961)

Engel v Vitale (1962)

Gideon v. Wainwright (1963)

Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District (1969)

New York Times v. U.S. (1971)

Wisconsin v. Yoder (1972)

Roe v. Wade (1973)

Shaw v. Reno (1993)

U.S. v. Lopez (1995)

McDonald v. Chicago (2010)

Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (2010)

Gibbons v. Ogden (1824)

Mapp v. Ohio (1961)

District of Columbia v. Heller (2008)

Miranda v. Arizona (1966)

Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission (2018)

POSSIBLE SOURCES: <https://www.oyez.org>, <https://www.law.cornell.edu>, <http://www.uscourts.gov>

For each case listed on the previous page, do the following:

1. Describe the facts, decision, reasoning, and opinion(s) of required Supreme Court cases.
2. Compare the reasoning, decisions, and opinion(s) of a required Supreme Court case to a non-required Supreme Court case.

Example: Miranda v. Arizona (1966)

1. Describe the facts, reasoning, decision, and opinion(s) of Miranda (in your own words!)

A. FACTS

-On March 13, 1963, Ernesto Miranda was arrested. He was questioned by police officers in connection with a kidnapping and rape. After two hours of interrogation, the police obtained a written confession from Miranda. The written confession was admitted into evidence at trial despite the objection of the defense attorney and the fact that the police officers admitted that they had not advised Miranda of his right to have an attorney present during the interrogation.

-The jury found Miranda guilty.

-One clause in the 5th Amendment states "...nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself..."

B. DECISION

-The Court ruled for the defendant 5-4

-The Supreme Court held that the Fifth Amendment's protection against self-incrimination is available in all settings.

C. REASONING and OPINION

-Certain procedural safeguards must be in place including proof that the suspect was aware of his right to be silent, that any statement he makes may be used against him, that he has the right to have an attorney present, that he has the right to have an attorney appointed to him, that he may waive these rights if he does so voluntarily, and that if at any points he requests an attorney there will be no further questioning until the attorney arrives.

D. COMPARE TO A NON-REQUIRED COURT CASE

- Elstad was suspected of committing a burglary. Before officers had given the warnings required by Miranda v. Arizona, Elstad made an incriminating statement. Once at the Sheriff's headquarters, Elstad was advised of his rights. Elstad then voluntarily executed a written confession.

-In a 6-to-3 decision, the Court held that while Miranda required that unwarned admissions must be suppressed, subsequent statements, if made knowingly and voluntarily, need not be.

-The case placed limits on the Miranda point that "Fifth Amendment's protection against self-incrimination is available in all settings."

Sources

"Miranda v. Arizona." Oyez, 4 Jun. 2018, www.oyez.org/cases/1965/759.

"Oregon v. Elstad." Oyez, 4 Jun. 2018, www.oyez.org/cases/1984/83-773.