

PACE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW
--

Federal Courts, Sec. 300
Syllabus

Professor Doernberg
Spring Term 2010

Page references are to FEDERAL COURTS, FEDERALISM AND SEPARATION OF POWERS (4th ed. 2008). “Supp.” refers to the printed 2009 casebook supplement. We will not read many pages of new material in the supplement, but you will need it for its four appendices, which contain all of the constitutional and statutory materials to which we will constantly refer throughout the semester. “Web” means that the materials will be available from my web page (<http://www.pace.edu/lawschool/dld>) and on TWEN®. The assignments for each week will also be available on the web page (and through TWEN®, which will direct you to the same place), and you can send e-mail either to our listserv (fedcts-L@list.pace.edu) or to me directly from that page. Please note that the assigned pages for each case include the notes following the case; be sure to read them carefully.

PROLOGUE

Henry J. Friendly, <i>Federalism: A Foreword</i>	1-8
Preliminary Thoughts on Separation of Powers and the Judiciary	8-13
Some Observations on Parity	13-14
Burt Neuborne, <i>The Myth of Parity</i>	14-16
Text	16-19
Erwin Chemerinsky, <i>Ending the Parity Debate</i>	19-21
Text	21
Note on the Class Action Fairness Act and the Parity Debate	Web

CHAPTER 3—FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION

Section A. Introduction	223-25
Section B. Constitutional and Statutory “Arising Under”—Separate Strands Intertwined	
U.S. CONST. Art. III, § 2	Supp. 122
<i>Osborn v. Bank of the United States</i>	225-236
<i>Textile Workers Union v. Lincoln Mills</i>	236-46
<i>There's No Reason for It; It's Just Our Policy: Why the Well-Pleaded Complaint Rule Sabotages the Purposes of Federal Question Jurisdiction</i>	246-49
28 U.S.C. § 1331	Supp. 141
<i>Louisville & Nashville R.R. v. Mottley</i>	249-55
<i>American Well Works v. Layne & Bowler Co.</i>	262-65
<i>Smith v. Kansas City Title & Trust</i>	265-70
<i>Gully v. First National Bank in Meridian</i>	270-72
<i>Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals v. Thompson</i>	272-90
<i>Grable & Sons Metal Products, Inc. v. Darue Engineering & Manufacturing</i>	290-302
Mushlin Proposal for Federal Question Jurisdiction	Web
<i>Verlinden, B.V. v. Central Bank of Nigeria</i>	255-62

Section C. The Special Problem of Declaratory Judgment Cases

28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02	Supp.	142
<i>Skelly Oil Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.</i>		302-06
<i>Franchise Tax Board v. Construction Laborers Vacation Trust</i> and Notes 1-6		306-20
Note 6.5	Supp.	41-44
Note 7		320
Complaints in <i>American Well Works v. Layne & Bowler Co.</i> and <i>E. Edelmann Co. v. Triple-A Specialty Co.</i>		Web

CHAPTER 5—FEDERAL COMMON LAW**Section A. Introduction 373-75****Section B. The Cornerstone**

28 U.S.C. § 1652	Supp.	161
<i>Erie Railroad v. Tompkins</i>		375-84
Henry J. Friendly, <i>In Praise of Erie—And of the New Federal Common Law</i>		384-86

Section C. Choosing the Applicable Law and Determining Its Content—Federal Interests or Lack Thereof

1. Spontaneous Generation		
<i>Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States</i>		387-95
<i>United States v. Kimbell Foods, Inc.</i>		395-406
<i>Boyle v. United Technologies, Inc.</i>		406-23
<i>Semtek International Incorporated v. Lockheed Martin Corporation</i>		423-31
Note on Discerning the Content of State Law		431-32
2. Construing a Jurisdictional Grant as a Command to Create Federal Common Law		
<i>Textile Workers Union v. Lincoln Mills</i> (Reprise)		433-40
3. Implying Private Rights of Action		
<i>Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics</i>		440-55
Introductory Note and Questions on Implying Private Rights of Action in Federal Statutes		455-57
<i>Cannon v. University of Chicago</i>		458-71
<i>California v. Sierra Club</i>		471-80
<i>Schweiker v. Chilicky</i>		480-99
4. Filling Statutory Interstices		499-506

Section D. Concluding Note 506-08**CHAPTER 6—THE FEDERAL FORUM, THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT, AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871****Section A. Introduction 509-10****Section B. The Fourteenth Amendment and U.S.C. § 1983 in the Remedial Scheme**

1. Generally		
<i>Monroe v. Pape</i>		510-31
Addition to Note 7	Supp.	47

2. Municipalities as Defendants		
<i>Monell v. Department of Social Services</i> and Notes 1-3		531-555
<i>Board of County Commissioners v. Brown</i>		555-76
3. Officials' Immunities		
Text (through the first full paragraph on page 577)		576-77
Addition to text on page 577	Supp.	47
Text		577-80
<i>Harlow v. Fitzgerald</i>		580-85
Text (through last full paragraph on page 586)		585-86
Addition to text on page 586	Supp.	48-49
Text (up to first full paragraph on page 592)		586-92
Addition to text on page 592	Supp.	49-50
Text (up to <i>Richardson v. McKnight</i>)		592-97
Addition to text on page 597	Supp.	50-51
Text		597-98
4. Note on Protected and Unprotected Interests		598-605

CHAPTER 7—THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT

Section A. Introduction		607-08
U.S. CONST. amend. XI	Supp.	125
Section B. The Basic Doctrine—More Than Meets the Eye		
<i>Hans v. Louisiana</i>		608-19
<i>Giles v. Harris</i>		619-28
Section C. The Basic Doctrine—Less Than Meets the Eye		
<i>Ex parte Young</i> (through last full paragraph on page 639)		629-39
Addition to the middle of Note 4(a)	Supp.	53-54
Remainder of Note 4(a) and remaining notes		639-46
Section D. Extending and Cabining the Doctrine: The Limits of Limits		
<i>Edelman v. Jordan</i>		646-61
Note on <i>Idaho v. Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho</i>		661-65
<i>Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer</i>		666-75
Text		675-77
<i>Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama v. Garrett</i>		677-95
Text		695-96
<i>Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida</i>		697-736
<i>Pennhurst State School v. Halderman</i>		Web
Note on <i>Federal Maritime Commission v. South Carolina State Ports Authority</i>		741-43

CHAPTER 8—REFUSING TO ALLOW THE EXERCISE OF JURISDICTION: ABSTENTION AND RELATED DOCTRINES

Section A. Introduction		745-46
Section B. Congressional Doctrines of Restraint		
<i>Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company v. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers</i>		746-61
Section C. Judicial Doctrines of Restraint		
3. Abstention: The Doctrine of <i>Younger v. Harris</i>		

<i>Younger v. Harris</i>	785-801
<i>Steffel v. Thompson</i>	801-13
<i>Hicks v. Miranda</i>	813-22
<i>Huffman v. Pursue, Ltd.</i>	822-35
Note on Other Developments in <i>Younger</i> Abstention	835-41
 CHAPTER 9—SUPREME COURT REVIEW OF STATE COURT DECISIONS	
Section A. Introduction	879-81
28 U.S.C. § 1257	Supp. 117
Section B. Preliminary Jurisdictional Considerations	
Note on the Changing Statutory Structure of Supreme Court Review	882-83
<i>Murdock v. City of Memphis</i>	884-901
Section C. Insulating State Decisions from Supreme Court Review	
1. With Substantive Law	
a. Adequacy, Independence and Certainty	
<i>Fox Film Corp. v. Muller</i>	901-03
<i>Delaware v. Prouse</i>	903-06
<i>Minnesota v. National Tea Co.</i>	906-11
<i>Michigan v. Long</i>	911-26
2. With Procedural Law	
<i>Herndon v. Georgia</i>	948-56
Note on <i>Orr v. Orr</i>	956-57
<i>Henry v. Mississippi</i>	957-72
3. With the Final Judgment Rule	
<i>Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn</i>	972-91
 CHAPTER 1—JUSTICIABILITY	
Section F. Political Questions	
<i>Nixon v. United States</i>	144-62