Westlaw Journal Bonus Issue

SCOTUS SPOTLIGHT

2023 Term

VOLUME 31, ISSUE 10 / AUGUST 26, 2024

©By JHVEPhoto-stock.adobe.com

U.S. Supreme Court roundup: 2023 term

In this bonus issue for subscribers, Westlaw Journals shines a spotlight on U.S. Supreme Court cases from the 2023 term, including the groundbreaking decision on presidential immunity.

This issue includes an analysis of the unprecedented case involving former President Donald Trump's efforts to overturn the 2020 election in which the court ruled 6-3 that former presidents have absolute immunity from criminal prosecution for "official acts."

In addition, the issue analyzes two important decisions involving administrative agencies: one tossing the 40-year-old Chevron precedent regarding judicial deference to administrative agencies and the other involving the Securities and Exchange Commission's enforcement proceedings seeking monetary penalties.

This roundup also examines the high court's rulings on topics including abortion, banking, bankruptcy, civil rights, data privacy, employment law, energy and environmental law, gun regulation, intellectual property, social media, and tax law.

We hope you enjoy this special issue, a benefit of your regular subscription.

The Westlaw Journals editorial team

43254773

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Banking

SCOTUS: CFPB funding mechanism does not violate the appropriations clause (*CFPB v. Community Financial Services Association of America*) ... 3

SCOTUS: Federal agencies lack sovereign immunity to FCRA lawsuits (*USDA Rural Development Rural Housing Service v. Kirtz*) ... 5

U.S. Supreme Court clarifies standard for state regulation of national banks (*Cantero v. Bank of America*) ... 6

Bankruptcy

Supreme Court nixes Purdue Pharma bankruptcy settlement shielding Sacklers (*Harrington v. Purdue Pharma*) ... 7

High court rebuffs Chapter 11 debtors' attempt to recoup excess U.S. Trustee fees (*Office of the U.S. Trustee v. John Q. Hammons Fall 2006*) ... 8

Supreme Court says insurers can challenge policyholders' Chapter 11 plans (*Truck Insurance Exchange v. Kaiser Gypsum Co.*) ... 10

Civil Rights

SCOTUS rejects racial gerrymandering challenge to South Carolina election map (*Alexander v. South Carolina State Conference of the NAACP*) ... 11

Public sleeping ban doesn't violate rights of homeless, SCOTUS says (*City of Grants Pass v. Johnson*) ... 13

SCOTUS: Incompatible jury verdicts don't erase double jeopardy protections (*McElrath v. Georgia*) ... 14

Employment

SCOTUS: VA wrongly denied Army vet full post-9/11 education benefits (*Rudisill v. McDonough*) ... 15

SOX whistleblower need not show 'retaliatory intent,' SCOTUS says (*Murray v. UBS Securities*) ... 16

Transferred workers can show bias without 'significant disadvantage,' high court says (*Muldrow v. City of St. Louis*) ... 18

SCOTUS: FAA exception not limited to transportation industry workers (*Bissonnette v. LePage Bakeries Park St.*) ... 19

SCOTUS: Federal employees' deadline to appeal MSPB decisions isn't jurisdictional (*Harrow v. Department of Defense*) ... 20

4-part injunction test applies in NLRB cases, SCOTUS rules in Starbucks case (*Starbucks Corp. v. McKinney*) ... 21

SCOTUS: FAA requires courts to stay, not dismiss, suits pending arbitration (*Smith v. Spizzirri*) ... 23

Environmental

High court strikes down long-lived agency deference standard (*Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*) ... 24

Supreme Court hits pause on EPA 'good neighbor' pollution plan (*Ohio v. EPA*) ... 25

Landowner prevails in Supreme Court challenge to California land use fee (*Sheetz v. County of El Dorado*) ... 27

SCOTUS says Texas flood suit can proceed under state takings law (*Devillier v. Texas*) ... 28

SCOTUS scotches states' Rio Grande water deal (*Texas v. New Mexico*) ... 29

Gun Regulation

SCOTUS upholds federal domestic violence gun restriction (*U.S. v. Rahimi*) ... 30

Supreme Court strikes down federal bump stock ban (*Garland v. Cargill*) ... 32

Health Law

SCOTUS: Doctors lack standing to sue FDA over increased abortion pill access (*FDA v. Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine*) ... 33

SCOTUS nixes appeals, allowing emergency abortions in Idaho, for now (*Moyle v. U.S.*) ... 34

Immigration

SCOTUS OKs court review of deportation hardship determinations (*Wilkinson v. Garland*) ... 35

Immunity

SCOTUS: Presidents cannot be prosecuted for 'official acts' (*Trump v. U.S.*) ... 37

Insurance

SCOTUS keeps afloat insurer's choice-of-law provision in suit over damaged yacht (*Great Lakes Insurance v. Raiders Retreat Realty Co.*) ... 38

SCOTUS: Feds must pay tribes for certain health care overhead costs (*Becerra v. San Carlos Apache Tribe*) ... 39

Intellectual Property

Supreme Court assumes 'discovery rule' applies to copyright damages (*Warner Chappell Music v. Nealy*) ... 40

Justices battle trademark speech theories to reach contentious consensus on 'names clause' (*Vidal v. Elster*) ... 42

Securities

SCOTUS sidesteps broader questions on SEC judge constitutionality in 'pointed' *Jarkesy* ruling (*SEC v. Jarkesy*) ... 44

Social Media

SCOTUS punts on constitutionality of Florida, Texas social media laws (*Moody v. NetChoice*) ... 45

SCOTUS won't block government's efforts to sway social media content moderation policies (*Murthy v. Missouri*) ... 46

Tax

Life insurance proceeds used to redeem shares were properly included in estate's value, SCOTUS says (*Connelly v. U.S.*) ... 47

SCOTUS OKs Tax Cuts and Jobs Act transition tax in *Moore* (*Moore v. U.S.*) ... 48

Case and Document Index ... 49

Westlaw Journal Bonus Issue: SCOTUS Spotlight

Director, Content Strategy and Editorial:
Jim Scott

Desk Editors:
Jody Peters, Patty Pryor-Nolan,
Maggie Tacheny

Westlaw Journal Intellectual Property
Published since August 1989
(ISSN 2155-0913) is published by
Thomson Reuters.

Thomson Reuters
610 Opperman Drive, Eagan, MN 55123
www.westlaw.com
Customer service: 800-328-4880

Reproduction Authorization
Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use by specific clients, is granted by Thomson Reuters for libraries or other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) for a fee to be paid directly to the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923; 978-750-8400; www.copyright.com.

For more information, or to subscribe, please call 800-328-9352 or visit legalsolutions.thomsonreuters.com.

Thomson Reuters is a commercial publisher of content that is general and educational in nature, may not reflect all recent legal developments and may not apply to the specific facts and circumstances of individual transactions and cases. Users should consult with qualified legal counsel before acting on any information published by Thomson Reuters online or in print. Thomson Reuters, its affiliates and their editorial staff are not a law firm, do not represent or advise clients in any matter and are not bound by the professional responsibilities and duties of a legal practitioner.

© 2024 Thomson Reuters

of whether the statute "has room for such a rule."

Rather than make the assumption that the majority did, Justice Gorsuch said he would have dismissed the case as improvidently granted and waited for a more appropriate dispute to review.

Kannon K. Shanmugam of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP argued for the petitioners. Wes Earnhardt of Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP argued for Nealy. WJ

Attorneys:
Petitioners: Kannon K. Shanmugam, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP, Washington, DC

Respondents: Wes Earnhardt, Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP, New York, NY

Related Filing:
Opinion: 2024 WL 2061137
Oral argument: 2024 WL 729720
Certiorari petition: 2023 WL 3306517
11th Circuit opinion: 60 F.4th 1325
District Court opinion: 2021 WL 2280025

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Justices battle trademark speech theories to reach contentious consensus on 'names clause'

By Kteba Dunlap, Esq.

The U.S. Supreme Court has held that the Lanham Act's "names clause" is constitutional, upholding the Patent and Trademark Office's decision to bar the trademark "Trump too small" from being registered.

Vidal v. Elster, No. 22-704, 2024 WL 2964139 (U.S. June 13, 2024).

In a fractured 9-0 ruling that featured a disputed opinion by Justice Clarence Thomas and two lengthy concurrences, the court on June 13 ruled that the prohibition against trademarks that include a person's name without consent is constitutional as it is viewpoint-neutral and necessarily content-based.

ATTEMPTED REGISTRATION

The trademark dispute began when Steve Elster tried to federally register a mark as a T-shirt slogan with a visual gag criticizing Donald Trump.

An examining attorney refused, finding that the mark violates the names clause because it "consists of or comprises a name, portrait or signature identifying a particular living individual."

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit sided with Elster and reversed, saying that a trademark is not government speech, which the government can restrict. Rather, a trademark is private speech "entitled to some form of First Amendment protection." *In re Elster*, 26 F.4th 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2022).

PTO Director Kathi Vidal took the case to the Supreme Court.

3 THEORIES

At least three legal theories were posited in *Vidal v. Elster*, with a conservative faction relying heavily — in some cases, exclusively — on its interpretation of the history of trademark law against a more liberal set proffering tests from precedent cases.

At least three legal theories were posited in *Vidal v. Elster*, with a conservative faction relying heavily — in some cases, exclusively — on its interpretation of the history of trademark law.

Justice Amy Coney Barrett partly agreed with each side and put forth her own analogous standard, with support from the three liberal justices.

JUSTICE THOMAS: HISTORY AND TRADITION ARE ENOUGH

Noting that the case offered an open question of law — whether a viewpoint-neutral trademark restriction merits heightened First Amendment scrutiny — Justice Thomas wrote the main opinion that other conservatives joined.

In his view, the history of necessarily content-based trademark restrictions extending back to 18th-century England is enough to show that trademark law has had a "longstanding, harmonious relationship" with the First Amendment.

He interpreted this to mean that a viewpoint-neutral statute such as the names clause requires no further scrutiny to confirm its constitutionality. But the ruling is narrow, he added.

JUSTICE BARRETT: LIMITED PUBLIC FORUM ANALOGY

Justice Barrett disagreed that "loosely related cases" from history formed the sole basis for the names clause's constitutionality. She also took issue with Justice Thomas' analytical framework, characterizing it as "hunting for historical forebears on a restriction-by-restriction basis."

She would rather test the constitutionality of a content-based trademark restriction through a test borrowed from limited public forum jurisprudence, she said. Speech restrictions on public forums, like those on trademark registration, are implicitly content-based, she noted.

As long as the restrictions reasonably serve the purposes of trademark law, they pass constitutional muster, Justice Barrett said.

 © 2024 Thomson Reuters

ATTORNEYS WEIGH IN ON 'TRUMP TOO SMALL' TRADEMARK RULING

"This case is about the intersection between trademark law, the First Amendment, rights of privacy, rights of publicity and political criticisms. The majority had a good opportunity to decide if the denial of trademark registrations restricted speech because the act of the denial is chilling, but they passed on this opportunity."

– Fara Sunderji, partner, Dorsey & Whitney LLP



"In this decision, the slim majority expanded the realm of cases in which 'history and tradition' decide a constitutional question. With this decision elevating the importance of this analytical approach favored by Justice [Clarence] Thomas, we can expect attorneys to increasingly litigate competing views of history when arguing constitutional questions — even in the IP context."

– Mark Lezama, litigation partner, Knobbe Martens

"The court held here that the so-called names clause of the Lanham Act is viewpoint-neutral. Accordingly, the government only needs to show that there is a reasonable reason for such restriction — here, to support the 'trademark system's purpose of facilitating source identification.' While the decision was unanimous, the various opinions of the justices expose the rift between the majority and the concurrences on whether and to what extent history and tradition should guide the court's reasoning."

– Muzamil Huq, of counsel, Morrison Foerster

"This decision should give some clarity as to the constitutionality of other types of 'viewpoint neutral' marks deemed unregistrable in Section 2 of the Lanham Act, such as Section (b) relating to flags and insignia, or even geographical indications in Section (a)."

– Monica Riva Talley, director, Sterne Kessler



"While the narrow ruling upholding the names clause restriction was expected, the court's heavy reliance on history was not. It's unlikely to significantly affect trademark practice going forward, since the names clause has been on the books for decades, but it means that any applicant trying to challenge other content-based restrictions in the Lanham Act (such as the prohibition on registering marks containing the flag or coat of arms of any country, state or municipality) will need to make sure they do a thorough investigation into the history of similar restrictions over the past couple hundreds of years."

– Aaron D. Johnson, partner, Lewis Roca

"Ultimately, the court didn't take the opportunity to rule more broadly as to whether a refusal of trademark registration is an impingement on First Amendment rights. Rather, the court more narrowly kept the living names provision intact, and without extensive analysis of free speech principles to reach its majority decision."

– David Bell, partner, Haynes Boone

"Content-based criteria for trademark registration do not abridge the right to free speech so long as they reasonably relate to the preservation of the mark owner's goodwill and the prevention of consumer confusion," she said.

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: MAJORITY'S TEST IS NO GOOD

Although Justice Sonia Sotomayor largely agreed with Justice Barrett, she differed in viewing trademark registration as a government benefit and thus subject to the same constitutional check that a rule withholding benefits undergoes.

No new standard is required, she wrote, because precedent holds that "withholding benefits for content-based, viewpoint-neutral reasons does not violate the free speech clause when the applied criteria are reasonable and the scheme is necessarily content based."

Justice Sotomayor, like Justice Barrett, sharply criticized the main opinion's reliance on what they consider less-than-stellar historical research. But she went further, saying the majority had abandoned legal precedent for a "judge-made" history-and-tradition test.

She quoted the late conservative Justice Antonin Scalia several times to make her point that courts must rely on litigants' arguments and First Amendment doctrine. WJ

Attorneys:
Petitioner: Malcolm L. Stewart, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Solicitor General, Washington, DC

Respondent: Jonathan E. Taylor, Gupta Wessler LLP, Washington, DC

Related Filing:
Supreme Court opinion: 2024 WL 2964139
Reply brief: 2023 WL 3345737
Opposition brief: 2023 WL 3173153
Certiorari petition: 2023 WL 1392051
Federal Circuit opinion: 26 F.4th 1328

© 2024 Thomson Reuters