



Georgetown University Law Center
Scholarship @ GEORGETOWN LAW

2015

Supreme Court Institute Annual Report, 2014-2015

Georgetown University Law Center, Supreme Court Institute

This paper can be downloaded free of charge from:
http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/sci_papers/5

This open-access article is brought to you by the Georgetown Law Library. Posted with permission of the author.
Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/sci_papers



Part of the [Courts Commons](#), and the [Judges Commons](#)



GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER • Office Memorandum

DATE: MAY 14, 2015
TO: GEORGETOWN LAW FACULTY AND STAFF
FROM: DORI BERNSTEIN, IRV GORNSTEIN,
STEVEN GOLDBLATT
RE: SUPREME COURT INSTITUTE ANNUAL REPORT

Executive Summary:

During the 2014-2015 academic year – corresponding to the U.S. Supreme Court’s October Term (OT) 2014 – the Supreme Court Institute (SCI) provided moot courts for advocates in 100% of the cases heard by the Supreme Court, offered a variety of programs related to the Supreme Court, and continued to integrate the moot court program into the education of Georgetown Law students.

A list of all SCI moot courts held in OT 2014 – arranged by argument sitting and date of moot and including the name and affiliation of each advocate and the number of observers – follows the narrative portion of this report. Some facts and figures about SCI moot courts this Term appear immediately below (comparable figures from the past four Terms, OT 2013, OT 2012, OT 2011, and OT 2010, appear in brackets):

OT 2014 SCI Moot Court Statistics

MOOTS:

Total Number of Moots:	69 moots
[OT 2013:	67 moots]
[OT 2012:	78 moots]
[OT 2011:	68 moots]
[OT 2010:	73 moots]
Number of Arguments Mooted:	69 of 69 arguments mooted
[OT 2013:	67 of 70 arguments mooted]
[OT 2012:	75 of 75 arguments mooted (2 moots in 3 cases)]
[OT 2011:	65 of 69 arguments mooted]
[OT 2010:	73 of 78 arguments mooted]
% of Arguments Mooted:	100% of arguments
[OT 2013:	96% of arguments (95.7)]
[OT 2012:	100% of arguments]
[OT 2011:	94% of arguments (94.2)]
[OT 2010:	94% of arguments (93.58)]

JUSTICES:

Number of Justice Seats Filled:	340
[OT 2013:	334]
[OT 2012:	391]
[OT 2011:	342]
[OT 2010:	366]

Number of Unique Justices:	232
[OT 2013:	228]
[OT 2012:	234]
[OT 2011:	201]
[OT 2010:	215]

Most Frequent GULC Justice: **Marty Lederman (8)**
Most Frequent External Justice: **Brian Wolfman (5)**

Our pool of moot court Justices includes many members of the practicing Supreme Court bar, including former Supreme Court law clerks and faculty from Georgetown Law as well as other law schools. Because a panelist's participation in any specific moot is confidential, identities are not disclosed here.

OBSERVERS:	1580
[OT 2013:	1485]
[OT 2012:	1895]
[OT 2011:	1378]
[OT 2010:	1173]

Best Attended Moot Court:	<i>DeBoer v. Snyder/Bourke v. Beshear</i>: 199
[OT 2013:	<i>Walden v. Fiore</i> : 208]
[OT 2012:	<i>Maryland v. King</i> : 370]
[OT 2011:	<i>Zivotofsky v. Clinton</i> : 136]
[OT 2010:	<i>Wal-Mart v. Dukes</i> : 107]

ADVOCATES:

Petitioners' Counsel: 43 Moots - 62%

[OT 2013:	43 – 64% ¹
[OT 2012:	42 – 54%]
[OT 2011:	37 – 54%]
[OT 2010:	39 – 53.5%]

Respondents' Counsel: 26 Moots - 38%

[OT 2013:	25 – 39% ²
[OT 2012:	32 – 41%]
[OT 2011:	30 – 44%]
[OT 2010:	34 – 46.5%]

Court-Appointed Amicus: 0 Moots – 0%

[OT 2013:	0 – 0%]
[OT 2012:	4 – 5%]
[OT 2011:	1 – 1.5%]
[OT 2010:	0 – 0%]

Total Advocates Mooted: 60 advocates³

[OT 2013:	54]
[OT 2012:	63]
[OT 2011:	61]
[OT 2010:	68]

1st-Time S.Ct. Advocates: 32 mooted: 53% of all advocates mooted were first-timers

[OT 2013:	25: 46%]
[OT 2012:	33: 52%]
[OT 2011:	29: 47.5%]
[OT 2010:	32: 47%]

¹ Combined percentages exceed 100% because we held a single moot for Paul Clement, who argued on behalf of respondents in *Sebelius v. Hobby Lobby Stores*, No. 1354, and on behalf of petitioners in *Conestoga Wood Specialties Corp. v. Sbelius*, No. 13-356 (consolidated for argument); that single moot court is therefore counted twice in calculating the number and percentage of moots for petitioners' counsel and respondents' counsel.

² See note 1, *supra*.

³ In two instances, two advocates were mooted together for a divided argument in consolidated cases: Eric Schnapper and Rick Pildes were mooted together for divided argument in *AL Legis. Black Caucus v. AL* and *AL Democratic Conf. v. AL*; and Aaron Lindstrom and William Brownell were mooted together for divided argument in *Michigan v. EPA* and *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA*.

Female Advocates: 10 mooted/12 arguments/17% of all advocates mooted were female

Kate Menendez (2): *Johnson v. U.S. I*
Johnson v. U.S. II
Allyson Ho (2): *M&G Polymers USA v. Tackett*
Perez/Nickols v. Mortgage Bankers Assoc.
Sheila Birnbaum: *Warger v. Shauers*
Alyza Lewin: *Zivotofsky v. Kerry*
Catherine Steege: *Wellness International Network v. Sharif*
Robin Urbanski: *Chappell v. Ayala*
Christine Van Aken: *City & County of San Francisco v. Sheehan*
Danielle Spinelli: *Bank of America v. Caulkett/Toledo-Cardona*
Wendy Ward: *Kingsley v. Hendrickson*
Mary Bonauto: *DeBoer v. Snyder/Bourke v. Beshear*

[OT 2013: 5 mooted/5 arguments/9%]

[OT 2012: 12 mooted/11 arguments/19%: L.Blatt (2)]

[OT 2011: 8 mooted/9 arguments/13%: P.Millett (2)]

[OT 2010: 7 mooted/8 cases/9%: L.Blatt (2)]

Male Advocates: 50 mooted/57 arguments/83% of all advocates mooted were male

Multiple Arguments: Seth Waxman (4): *Jesinoski v. Countrywide Home Loans*
Gelboim v. Bank of America
AZ State Legislature v. AZ Indept. Redist. Comm.
Commil USA v. Cisco Systems
Tom Goldstein (3): *Omnicare v. Laborers' District Council*
Mach Mining v. EEOC
City of Los Angeles v. Patel
Neal Katyal (2): *Dept. of Homeland Security v. MacLean*
Oneok v. Learjet
Jeff Fisher (2): *T-Mobile South v. City of Roswell, GA*
Ohio v. Clark
Eric Schnapper (2): *AL Legis. Black Caucus v. AL*
U.S. v. Wong
John Elwood (2): *Elonis v. U.S.*
Kellogg Brown & Root Services v. U.S.

[OT 2013: 49 mooted/63 arguments/91%
P.Clement (4); S.Waxman (4); J.Bursch (3); K.Russell (3); J.Fisher (2);
N.Katyal (2); E.Schnapper (2)]

[OT 2012: 51 mooted/67 arguments/81%
J.Fisher (4); P.Clement (3); D.Frederick (3); T.Goldstein (3); J.Bursch (2);
G.Garre (2); N.Katyal (2); S.Waxman (2)]

[OT 2011: 53 mooted/59 arguments/87%
P.Clement (5); J.Neiman (2); S.Waxman (2)]

[OT 2010: 66 mooted/65 arguments/91%: 1 moot of 2 counsel w/ divided arg.]

Former US SGs: 2: Neal Katyal (2) and Seth Waxman (4)
 [OT 2013: 4: Clement, Garre, Katyal, and Waxman]
 [OT 2012: 4: Clement, Garre, Katyal, and Waxman]
 [OT 2011: 3: Clement, Dellinger, and Waxman]
 [OT 2010: 2: Clement and Waxman]

State/City Reps: 10 States/1 City/11 moots:
 NC: R.Montgomery: *Hein v. N.C.*
 AR: D.Curran: *Holt v. Hobbs*
 NE: D.Cookson: *Kansas v. Nebraska & Colorado*
 MD: W.Brockman: *Comptroller v. Wynne*
 AL: A.Brasher: *AL Dept. of Revenue v. CSX Transp.*
 CO: D.Domenico: *Direct Marketing Assoc. v. Brohl*
 ID: C.Withroe: *Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Ctr.*
 CA: R.Urbanski: *Chappell v. Ayala*
 S.F.: C.Van Aken: *City & County of S.F. v. Sheehan*
 MI: A.Lindstrom: *Michigan v. EPA*
 OK: P.Wyrick: *Glossip v. Gross*
 [OT 2013: 4 States/1 City/7 Moots: AR-city; IL; MA; MI-3; OH]
 [OT 2012: 6 States/2 Cities/10 moots: AR; FL; MD; MI; OH; TX; Arl., TX; L.A., CA]
 [OT 2011: 7 States/8 moots: CA; AZ; AL (2x); MI; NH; IL; AR]
 [OT 2010: 7 States/8 moots – AL; CA; NY; OH; OR (2x); SC; WY]

Criminal Def/Habeas Pet: 10 counsel/11 arguments
 R.Schaffer (Shaffer Firm): *Jennings v. Stephens*
 J.Badalamenti (FD, FL): *Yates v. U.S.*
 K.Menendez (FD, MN): *Johnson v. U.S. I*
 K.Menendez (FD, MN): *Johnson v. U.S. II*
 J.Elwood (Vinson): *Elonis v. U.S.*
 J.Carpenter (FD, NC): *Whitfield v. U.S.*
 S.O'Connor (FD, NE): *Rodriguez v. U.S.*
 D.Ortiz (U.VA): *Henderson v. U.S.*
 J.Fisher (Stanford): *Ohio v. Clark*
 M.DeSanctis (Jenner): *Brumfield v. Cain*
 K.Russell (G&R): *McFadden v. U.S.*
 [OT 2013: 15 counsel/16 arguments]
 [OT 2012: 18 counsel/19 arguments]
 [OT 2011: 7 counsel]
 [OT 2010: 10 counsel]

Law Professors: 6 professors from 6 law schools mooted for 8 arguments

U. of WA: E.Schnapper: *AL Legis. Black Caucus v. AL U.S. v. Wong*

NYU: R.Pildes: *AL Democratic Conf. v. AL*

Stanford: J.Fisher: *T-Mobile South v. City of Roswell, GA Ohio v. Clark*

U. of MI: S.Bagenstos: *Young v. UPS*

U. of VA: D.Ortiz: *Henderson v. U.S.*

U. of PA: J.Feldman: *Bullard v. Blue Hills Bank*

[OT 2013: 6 professors/5 law schools/8 arguments]

[OT 2012: 7 professors/6 law schools/10 arguments]

[OT 2011: 6 professors]

[OT 2010: 8 professors]

Non-Profit Orgs: 2 organizations/2 arguments

Alliance Def. Freedom: D.Cortman: *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*

GLAD: M.Bonauto: *Obergefell/Bourke/Tanco/DeBoer*

[OT 2013: 4 organizations/4 arguments]

[OT 2012: 4 organizations/6 arguments]

[OT 2011: 4 organizations]

[OT 2010: 4 organizations]

Solo Practitioners: 0

[OT 2013: 2]

[OT 2012: 5]

[OT 2011: 1]

[OT 2010: 5]

Boutiques: 7 firms/8 attorneys/10 arguments (< 75 attys)

Daniel & Beshara/2 attys: M.Daniel: *TX DHCA v. Inclusive Communities*

Geo. Brothers Kincaid/11: R.J.George: *Walker v. TX Sons of Confed. Vets.*

Goldstein & Russell/4: T.Goldstein: *Omnicare v. Laborer's Dist Mach Mining v. EEOC City of L.A. v. Patel*

K.Russell: *McFadden v. U.S.*

Lewin & Lewin/2: A.Lewin: *Zivotofsky v. Kerry*

Robbins Russell/29: M.Madden: *Harris v. Viegelahn*

The Schaffer Firm/3: R.Schaffer: *Jennings v. Stephens*

Thierman Law Firm/3: M.Thierman: *Integrity Staffing v. Busk*

[OT 2013: 9 firms/12 attorneys/17 arguments]

[OT 2012: 14 firms/20 arguments]

[OT 2011: 13 firms]

[OT 2010: 12 firms]

**Large Firms: 20 firms/28 attorneys/34 arguments
(100+ attys)**

Alston & Bird:	N.Berreth:	<i>Dart Cherokee Basin Op. Co. v. Owens</i>
Baker Botts:	A.Streett:	<i>Baker Botts v. Asarco</i>
Faegre Baker Daniels:	J.Laramore:	<i>Mellouli v. Holder</i>
Gibson Dunn:	T.Dupree:	<i>DOT v. Assoc. of American Railroads</i>
Goodwin Procter:	W.Jay:	<i>B&B Hardware v. Hargis Industries</i>
Hogan Lovells:	N.Katyal:	<i>DHS v. MacLean</i> <i>Oneok v. Learjet</i>
Jenner & Block:	C.Steege:	<i>Wellness International Network v. Sharif</i>
	M.DeSanctis:	<i>Brumfield v. Cain</i>
Jones Day:	H.Mooppan:	<i>NC Bd. of Med. Examiners v. FTC</i>
	S.Dvoretzky:	<i>EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores</i>
	M.Carvin:	<i>King v. Burwell</i>
Kirkland & Ellis:	M.McConnell:	<i>Horne v. Dept. of Agriculture</i>
Mayer Brown:	P.Hughes:	<i>Hana Financial v. Hana Bank</i>
	A.Pincus:	<i>Williams-Yulee v. The Florida Bar</i>
Merchant & Gould:	W.Ward:	<i>Kingsley v. Hendrickson</i>
Morgan Lewis:	Allyson Ho:	<i>M&G Polymers v. Tackett</i> <i>Perez/Nickols v. Mortgage Bankers Assoc.</i>
O'Melveny & Myers:	J.Hacker:	<i>Tibble v. Edison International</i>
Orrick:	J.Rosenkranz:	<i>U.S. v. June</i>
Quinn Emanuel:	S.Birnbaum:	<i>Warger v. Shauers</i>
Ropes & Gray:	Hallward-Dr.:	<i>Obergefell/Bourke/Tanco/DeBoer</i>
Sidley Austin:	C.Phillips:	<i>Teva Pharmaceuticals v. Sandoz</i>
	M.Haddad:	<i>Kerry v. Dinn</i>
Vinson & Elkins:	J.Elwood:	<i>Elonis v. U.S.</i> <i>Kellogg Brown & Root Services v. U.S.</i>
Williams & Connolly:	Shanmugam:	<i>Coleman-Bey v. Tollefson</i>
WilmerHale:	S.Waxman:	<i>Jesinoski v. Countrywide Home Loans</i> <i>Gelboim v. Bank of America</i> <i>AZ State Legis. v. AZ Indept. Redist. Comm.</i> <i>Commil USA v. Cisco Systems</i> <i>Bank of America v. Caulkett</i>
	D.Spinelli:	<i>Bank of America v. Caulkett</i>
	T.Saunders:	<i>Kimble v. Marvel Enterprises</i>
	M.Fleming:	<i>Mata v. Holder</i>

[OT 2013: 22 firms/25 attorneys/29 arguments]

[OT 2012: 18 firms/22 arguments]

[OT 2011: 19 firms]

[OT 2010: 15 firms]

SCI Moot Courts:

For the second time in its 15-year history, SCI mooted counsel in every case heard by the Supreme Court in OT 2014, providing 69 moot courts to a total of 60 advocates. Two hundred thirty-two (232) volunteer “Justices” filled 340 seats behind the bench – averaging out to the ideal 5-member panel for each moot court. More than half of the 60 advocates we mooted – 32 counsel, or 52% – were preparing for their first Supreme Court argument. At the other end of the experience spectrum, we assisted two former Solicitors General of the United States, Seth Waxman and Neal Katyal, to prepare for a total of six arguments. We mooted advocates from two non-profit organizations; 27 different law firms (8 advocates affiliated with 7 small or “boutique” firms (under 30 attorneys) prepared for 10 arguments; and 28 advocates affiliated with 20 large firms (over 100 attorneys) prepared for 32 arguments); and six law schools (six professors prepared for eight arguments). We also mooted ten counsel representing a criminal defendant or habeas petitioner for 11 arguments, and counsel representing 11 states or municipalities (Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Maryland, Michigan, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and San Francisco) for 11 arguments. As in past years, advocates representing petitioners (43, or 64% of moots) outnumbered those representing respondents (26, or 38% of moots).

Some comments from appreciative moot court participants this Term:

Advocates:

“I want to thank you for all your hospitality. It was great meeting you and I think the program you are running is a great one.” – Oct. 3, 2014

“Now that the argument is done I want to thank you again. It was wonderful to see some of the students at Georgetown who went to the argument to see the end result.” – Oct. 9, 2014
- Sheila Birnbaum, Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, counsel for respondent in *Warger v. Shauers*

“Thanks so much for your assistance in *Holt v. Hobbs*. I think the argument went very well, and we made the most out of a very challenging case. Your program is first rate, and I appreciate your efforts so much.” – Oct. 14, 2014
- David Curran, Office of the Attorney General of Arkansas, counsel for respondents in *Holt v. Hobbs*

“The moot proved to be invaluable. Thanks again to all.” – Oct. 16, 2014
- Randy Schaffer, The Schaffer Firm, counsel for petitioner in *Jennings v. Stephens*

“I wanted to extend a belated thank you for arranging and participating in the moot two weeks ago. I thought the questions were extremely helpful. During the argument, several of the questions we heard during the Georgetown moot were heard again. That's always helpful to have heard the questions (or a form of the questions) ahead of time. Please convey our thanks to everyone involved in this moot.” - Nov. 11, 2014

“On behalf of Mr. Yates, the *Yates* team, and the entire Middle District of Florida, Federal Defender's Office, we would like to extend our sincerest gratitude and appreciation to you for your support on Mr. Yates' case. The decision, as it turns out, was a close one, and undoubtedly your support helped carry the five votes at the end of the day. We cannot express how valuable we found your moot to be and how much we gained from that experience.” –

Feb. 24, 2014

- Craig Crawford, Office of the Federal Defender, co-counsel for petitioner in *Yates v. U.S.*

“Thank you many times over for your assistance and support of our cause. The Georgetown moot helped greatly, and I considered it most beneficial. We ended up changing our opening after the moot, mostly due to the valuable feedback we got! We are indebted to you and Georgetown Law for the help we received. A heartfelt THANK YOU from me and the entire team on *Yates!*” – Nov. 21, 2014

- Donna Lee Elm, Federal Defender, co-counsel for petitioner in *Yates v. U.S.*

“Thanks again for hosting the moot court. The clients who accompanied me today had never been to one of your moots and they were all stunned by how thoughtful and well prepared the panel was. I told them this was par for the course – that the Georgetown moots are the best! So thank you again. It was very helpful and I am really grateful for all the time that you and the panelists put into it.” – Dec. 1, 2014

- Tom Dupree, Gibson Dunn, counsel for respondent in *Dept. of Transportation v. Association of American Railroads*

“Thank you for hosting us and putting together such a helpful panel. They did a very good job helping me prepare for a challenging argument.” – Dec. 10, 2014

- Dan Domenico, Solicitor General of Colorado, counsel for respondent in *Direct Marketing Association v. Brohl*

“Thank you very much for mooting me at the Georgetown Law Center in preparation for my argument in *Alabama Department of Revenue v. CSX*. I think the argument went about as well as it could have, given the issues in the case. I really appreciate the amount of time and effort that you put into the case. Please let me know if we can ever work together in the future.” – Dec. 11, 2014

- Andrew L. Brasher, Solicitor General of Alabama, counsel for petitioner in *AL Dept. of Revenue v. CSX*

“Thank you very much for the moot court yesterday and the time you put into it. It was very, very helpful to get your take on the issues and perspectives on the potential questions. I have always heard such wonderful things about the moot courts that are run at Georgetown and how helpful they are for preparation and got a lot of great ideas yesterday about how to get to the meat of the matter more quickly. Thank you again.” – Jan. 9, 2015

- Cathy Steege, Jenner & Block, counsel for petitioner in *Wellness International Network v. Sharif*

"I just wanted to thank you for all of your hard work in setting up and hosting the moot. It is an invaluable service and helped tremendously." - Jan. 14, 2015

- Dave Cortman, Alliance Defending Freedom, counsel for petitioner in *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*, AZ

"Thanks for all the work you put in to set up my 1/9 moot. The panel was terrific and gave some great advice that really improved my performance. What a wonderful, confidence-building asset is a moot court at Georgetown." – Jan. 20, 2015

- Jon Laramore, Faegre Baker Daniels, counsel for petitioner in *Mellouli v. Holder*

"I can't thank you enough not only for the moots, but also for your encouragement. I'm pleased to report that we won the first case you mooted." – Jan. 26, 2015

- Allyson Ho, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, counsel for petitioner in *M&G Polymers v. Tackett*

"I wanted to write to thank you for hosting the moot at GU last month for my argument in *Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Center*. It was, to put it mildly, a wonderful experience and a tremendous help to my preparation. Your program is a great service to Supreme Court advocates and the Court itself. Thank you so much!" – Feb. 4, 2015

- Carl Withroe, Office of the Attorney General of Idaho, counsel for petitioner in *Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Center*

"As I told my team after the moot, I think that may have convinced a whole generation of Georgetown students that they want to do something other than practice law! Thanks as always for putting together a great panel." – Feb. 19, 2015

"Just wanted to thank you again for your help with the moot in the *Coleman* case, which I argued yesterday. The transcript is attached below. . . . you'll see the results of your input at various points in my argument – for which I am grateful." – Feb. 24, 2015

- Kannon Shanmugam, Williams & Connolly, counsel for petitioner in *Coleman-Bey v. Tollefson*

"That was incredibly helpful. Many, many thanks for arranging it and participating in it." – Feb. 20, 2015

- Shay Dvoretzky, Jones Day, counsel for respondent in *EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores*

"Thanks so much for arranging the mooting last week. It really helped. In fact, one justice asked a version of the ancillary jurisdiction question for which, without the mooting, I would have been very underprepared." – Feb. 26, 2015

- Dan Ortiz, University of Virginia School of Law, counsel for petitioner in *Henderson v. U.S.*

"I just wanted to thank you again for today's moot and for all of the time you put into the program. I realize that it's what you do in every case. But from my perspective, this case is SO important to me and to the entire team that has been working with [our client] for so long. I can't tell you how much it means to me that you and all of the panelists put in the time to help us as much as you have." - Mar. 25, 2015

"I just wanted to thank you . . . so much for your invaluable assistance in helping me and the

team prepare for Monday's argument. We literally reframed the structure of our presentation based on what we had discussed with you, and it seemed to resonate with several of the judges that we desperately need. It was an experience I'll never forget . . . Thanks again."

- Michael DeSanctis, Jenner & Block, counsel for petitioner in *Brumfield v. Cain*

"Thanks, again, for everything. The moot was fantastic, and many of the panelists' questions turned up, in one form or another, during the argument last week." - April 6, 2015

- Matt Madden, Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck, Untereiner & Sauber, counsel for petitioner in *Harris v. Viegelahn*

Panelists:

"I actually pulled an all-nighter on an unrelated assignment, but didn't want to miss this. THANKS for all the great work you do to make arguments better. Have a GREAT Term!!"

- Amar Sarwal, Association of Corporate Counsel, Oct. 2014

"It is an interesting case and was fun to be a part of such an esteemed panel."

- Scott Attaway, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, Oct. 2014

"It was great fun. I think I enjoyed being on that panel more than any panel I've been on, and I've been on a lot of them. And if you're a Western water junky, as I think most everyone there was, this argument was a treat."

- Hope Babcock, Georgetown University Law Center, Oct. 2014

"Please read the oral argument [transcript] if you want to see vindication of doing moot courts. [The advocate] last week and today were totally different people."

- Alan Morrison, George Washington University Law School, Nov. 2014

"Lots of fun as usual. Would be happy to do it again in the future."

- Daniel Volchok, WilmerHale, Nov. 2014

"It's always a pleasure participating, and I'm already looking forward to the next one!"

- Peter Karanjia, Davis Wright Tremaine, Nov. 2014

"Thank you so much for including me. I thought it was very stimulating."

- Adam Sloane, Mayer Brown, Dec. 2014

"This was tons of fun--what a neat case."

- Sarah Harris, Arnold & Porter, Dec. 2014

"Thanks for inviting me. It was a very enjoyable moot."

- Miriam Nemetz, Mayer Brown, Dec. 2015

“It is always a pleasure to serve in your process, which helps the advocates, helps the Court, and ultimately helps our system of justice.”

- John Cooney, Venable, Dec. 2014

“It is a fantastic program and you run it well.”

- Andrew McBride, Wiley Rein, Feb. 2015

“Always happy to help. You run the best moot court shop in town. I just wish the S Ct would grant more of my cases so I could be on other side of the bench!”

- Chris Landau, Kirkland & Ellis, March 2015

Attendance at SCI Moot Courts:

Attendance at SCI moot courts by students and guests remains robust. The number of observers at each SCI moot court combined totaled 1,580 this Term. We maintained our collaboration with the Legal Research and Writing (LRW) faculty to ensure that every first-year J.D. student – including those enrolled in the evening division – had the opportunity to observe the argument preparation of a Supreme Court advocate. An SCI director provided case materials (briefs and opinions) with suggested reading assignments, and visited each LRW class before the class attended a moot court. During LRW class visits, students learned about oral argument preparation, and the factual and legal background of the assigned case. At the conclusion of each moot court (time permitting), students had an opportunity to ask questions of the mooted advocate. Over the course of the year, advocates responded to students’ questions about their professional background or experience; methods of preparing for oral argument; the history of the particular case; their litigation strategy; the legal issues at stake; and Supreme Court advocacy generally. On occasion, trial counsel, a client, or a member of the Office of the Solicitor General observing the moot in preparation to argue for the United States as *amicus curiae*, joined in the post-moot exchanges with students. To accommodate the schedules of first-year students in our evening division, and with the cooperation of LRW Prof. Jeffrey Shulman and Constitutional Law Prof. Marty Lederman, we held an evening moot court (6:00-8:00 pm) in *Arizona State Legislature v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission* (Election Clause challenge to delegation by state referendum of federal congressional redistricting authority from state legislature to independent commission).

The SCI also coordinated with other professors to include moot courts as part of related course curricula. Prof. Tanina Rostain accompanied students in her Evidence class to the moot in *Warger v. Shauers* (whether Fed.R.Evid. 606(b) prohibits testimony about statements during deliberations showing juror dishonesty during voir dire to support motion for a new trial). Students in Prof. Lederman’s Law and Religion Seminar, along with Prof. Sue Bloch’s Supreme Court Seminar and Constitutional Law I class, attended the moot court in *Holt v. Hobbs* (claim under Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act by Arkansas inmate seeking exception to prison grooming policy to grow a short beard, in accord with Muslim beliefs). Prof. Bloch’s students also attended the moot in *Zivotofsky v. Kerry* (constitutional authority of

Congress to enable U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem to require the State Department to designate “Israel” as their birthplace on U.S. passports).

David Simmons’ Employment Discrimination class observed the moot court in *Young v. United Parcel Service* (whether the federal Pregnancy Discrimination Act requires an employer to provide light duty assignments to employees with pregnancy-related medical restrictions). LLM students studying State and Local Taxation with Prof. Tatarowicz were invited to a trio of tax moots: *Comptroller of the Treasury of MD v. Wynne* (whether dormant Commerce Clause requires a state to allow a deduction to residents for taxes paid to other states); *Alabama Dept. of Revenue v. CSX Transportation* (whether Alabama’s exemption of sales tax on diesel fuel sold by trucking and water transport companies discriminates against railroads, in violation of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulation Reform Act); and *Direct Marketing Co. v. Brohl* (whether Tax Injunction Act bars suit by out-of-state retailers challenging Colorado’s record-keeping and notification requirements on purchases by state residents). Profs. Gornstein and McLeod included their Criminal Justice students in the moot court in *City of Los Angeles v. Patel* (Fourth Amendment challenge to city ordinance requiring hotel operators to allow police inspection of hotel registries without a warrant or opportunity for pre-compliance judicial review).

As might be expected, both faculty and students expressed tremendous interest in attending the two moot courts for petitioners’ counsel in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, *Tanco v. Haslam*, *Bourke v. Beshear*, and *DeBoer v. Snyder*, in which the Court will decide whether the Fourteenth Amendment requires States to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples, and to recognize such marriages performed elsewhere. Students in the following classes were invited to these moots, at their professors’ request: Gender and Sexuality: Law and Theory, taught by Profs. Nan Hunter and Naomi Mezey; Sexual Orientation and the Law: Selected Topics in Civil Rights, taught by Profs. Alex Wagner and Matt Nosanchuk; Constitutional Law II, taught by Prof. Brad Snyder; and Family Law I and Family Law Seminar: Children of LGBT Parents, both taught by Prof. Nancy Polikoff.

With counsel’s consent, several moot courts were held in venues larger than SCI’s moot courtroom to meet student and faculty demand. The moot courts in *Holt v. Hobbs*, *Warger v. Shauers*, and *City of Los Angeles v. Patel*, were held in large lecture halls in McDonough Hall. Hart Auditorium served as the venue for the moots in *Elonis v. U.S.*, *Omnicare v. Laborers’ District Council* (whether subjective intent to deceive is essential to violate federal securities law’s prohibition against false or misleading statements in a prospectus), and the marriage equality moot courts.

SCI moot courts were integral to the curricula of two seminars and a practicum offered during the 2013-14 academic year. In the fall semester, Prof. Bloch’s Supreme Court Seminar students attended the moot courts in *Holt v. Hobbs* and *Zivotofsky v. Kerry*. During the spring semester, students in Prof. Don Ayer’s Supreme Court Litigation Seminar attended the moots in *King v. Burwell* (challenge to tax subsidies for health care purchased on federal exchanges under the Affordable Care Act); *Ohio v. Clark* (Confrontation Clause challenge to young child’s out-of-court responses to teacher’s inquiries about suspected abuse); *Michigan v. EPA* (whether

Clean Air Act requires EPA to consider costs in promulgating emissions regulations); and the marriage equality moot courts. In addition, each student in Prof. Steve Goldblatt's Appellate Litigation Clinic attended at least three SCI moots, of his or her choosing, during the year.

The SCI Judicial Clerkship practicum, taught by Prof. Bernstein, offered eight J.D. students the opportunity to serve as "law clerks" to professors who volunteered to serve as "Justices" on an SCI moot panel. Each student/clerk read the lower court opinions and all briefs in his assigned case; led a class discussion of the case; wrote a bench memo synthesizing the critical facts, pertinent legal framework, contentions of the parties and *amici curiae*, and pivotal Supreme Court authority; met with his or her assigned professor/Justice to discuss the case in preparation for the moot court; observed the moot court and oral argument; and prepared a post-mortem analysis comparing the moot court to the oral argument. The following professors/Justices worked with a practicum law clerk this Term: Profs. Cole, Gornstein, Gottesman, Lederman, McLeod, McMahon, Shulman, and Vladeck.

On occasion, students enrolled elsewhere were invited to observe SCI moot courts, by prior arrangement with their professors. Harvard Law students taking a Supreme Court seminar with Prof. Kevin Russell observed the moot court of Tom Goldstein, Prof. Russell's law partner, in *Mach Mining v. EEOC* (whether EEOC's pre-suit conciliation efforts are subject to judicial review). Prof. Lisa McElroy, of Drexel University Earle Mack School of Law, served on the panel mooting respondent's counsel in *Ohio v. Clark*, which her students attended.

Finally, prospective, accepted, and newly enrolled Georgetown Law students, and parents who attended the inaugural Parents' Weekend, were introduced to the SCI's moot court program via mock moot courts. Profs. Mike Gottesman, David Vladeck, and Irv Gornstein acted as "mock" moot court advocates to argue both sides of *Elonis v. United States* (First Amendment challenge to prosecution of internet speech as a "direct threat"), before panels of faculty Justices that included Dean Bill Treanor and Profs. Mike Seidman, Julie Ross, Marty Lederman, Irv Gornstein, Paul Butler, Julie O'Sullivan, and Dori Bernstein. Prof. Goldblatt and Roy Englert, head of the Supreme Court practice at Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck, Untereiner and Sauber LLP, assumed the role of counsel for the private petitioner and the United States, respectively, in *Zivotofsky v. Kerry*, to introduce SCI's moot court program to foreign LLM students; Profs. David Cole, Marty Lederman, David Stewart, and Dori Bernstein served as panelists.

SCI Programming:

The SCI sponsored a variety of programs during the past year, including panel discussions previewing cases to be argued during OT 2014 for the Supreme Court press, students, and alumni; a debate on *King v. Burwell*; and our end-of-term reception honoring five "SCI alumni" who have been recently elevated to the federal appellate bench: Judge Richard Taranto, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; Judges Sri Srinivasan, Patricia Millett, and Nina Pillard, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; and Judge Pamela Harris, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Judges Taranto, Srinivasan, and Millett all served as members of

SCI's Advisory Board of Supreme Court practitioners. Judge Pillard was Faculty Director of SCI, and Judge Harris served as Executive Director of SCI. All five judges were active participants in SCI's moot court program prior to their judicial appointments. We also hosted delegations of visiting attorneys and jurists from Argentina, China, Nigeria, Russia, and the U.K. A fuller description of all SCI programs offered this year appears below:

1. September 23, 2014, 8:30 – 11:00 am: **SCI Annual Term Preview Press Briefing.** Panel discussion of upcoming Supreme Court Term, moderated by SCI Executive Director Irv Gornstein; panelists were Hashim Mooppan, Jones Day; Erin Murphy, Bancroft PLLC; and Profs. Cole and Lederman. Discussion included a question-and-answer session with members of the Supreme Court press corps. The SCI OT 2014 Supreme Court Preview, a report summarizing all merits cases pending before the start of OT 2013, was distributed.
2. September 18, 2014, 11:30 am – 1:00 pm: **OT 2014 Term Preview and Pizza Lunch.** Panel discussion of highlights in the upcoming Supreme Court Term, moderated by SCI Exec. Dir. Irv Gornstein; panelists were Profs. Gottesman, Lederman, and Bernstein. This event included pizza lunch and was designed to generate interest among students in attending SCI moot courts.
3. October 10, 2014, 9:30 am: **Pegasus Scholars Visit.** Two attorney-scholars visiting from the U.K. were briefed by SCI Dir. Bernstein on the moot court program and attended the moot court of counsel for petitioner in *Jennings v. Stephens* (whether habeas petitioner may advance alternate grounds for affirmance on state's appeal under AEDPA). Visit was coordinated with Cindy Dennis of the American Inns of Court.
4. October 17, 2014, 4:30-6:00 pm: **Supreme Court Term Preview for Georgetown Law Alumni.** Panel discussion for GULC alumni of significant cases pending before the Supreme Court in OT 2012, featuring panelists SCI Dirs. Goldblatt, Gornstein, and Bernstein.
5. October 24, 2014, 2:30-4:00 pm: **Visiting Delegation of Chinese Attorneys.** SCI Dir. Bernstein met with a group of Chinese diplomats, accompanied by Amy Saltzman of the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations, and explained the role and decision-making process of the U.S. Supreme Court, discussed some recent prominent cases before the Court, and described oral argument preparation in the SCI moot court program.
6. October 27, 2014, 2:00-4:00 pm: **Visiting Delegation of Argentinian Judges.** Prof. Charles Abernathy and SCI Dir. Bernstein met with a group of judges visiting from Argentina, who were briefed on the U.S. judicial system, and the SCI moot court program for Supreme Court advocates. Coordinated with Elia Bendavid, Office of International Judicial Relations at the Federal Judicial Center.

7. January 28, 2015, 4:00-6:00 pm: **Supreme Court Term Preview, Part 2.** Panel discussion of cases set for argument during the second half of the Supreme Court Term, OT 2014, moderated by Amy Howe (SCOTUSblog), with panelists Kannon Shanmugam, Williams & Connolly; Melissa Arbus Sherry, Latham & Watkins; Tejinder Singh, Goldstein & Russell; and Jeff Wall, Sullivan & Cromwell. Hosted in partnership with Georgetown Law chapters of the ACLU and Federalist Society.
8. February 2, 2014, 10:00-11:00 am: **Visiting Delegation of Russian Human Rights Lawyers.** SCI Dir. Bernstein briefed a group of human rights lawyers from Moscow's Institute for Law and Public Policy on the SCI moot court program and oral argument preparation for Supreme Court advocates.
9. February 11, 2015, 4:00-6:00 pm: **King v. Burwell: The Affordable Care Act in the Supreme Court – Round 2.** A debate addressing the pending challenge to tax subsidies for health care purchased on federal exchanges under the Affordable Care Act, featuring Michael Cannon, Director of Health Policy Studies, Cato Institute, and Tejinder Singh, Goldstein & Russell, moderated by SCI Exec. Dir. Gornstein.
10. March 30-31, 2015: **Visiting Delegation of UK Judicial Assistants.** SCI Dir. Bernstein and Appellate Litigation Clinic Fellow Ruthanne Deutsch met on March 30 with a group of judicial assistants (equivalent to U.S. Supreme Court law clerks), accompanied by Judge Thomas Ambro, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, to brief them on Supreme Court oral arguments they would observe on March 30 and 31; the judicial assistants returned on March 31 for a discussion of Supreme Court advocacy with Judge Ambro and Profs. Goldblatt and Sherman Cohn. Visit was coordinated with Cindy Dennis of the American Inns of Court.
11. May 4, 2015, 2:30-3:30 pm: **Visiting Delegation of Nigerian Judges.** SCI Dir. Bernstein met with a group of Judges visiting from Nigeria, explained the role and decision-making process of the U.S. Supreme Court, discussed some recent prominent cases before the Court, and described oral argument preparation in the SCI moot court program. Coordinated with Elia Bendavid, Office of International Judicial Relations at the Federal Judicial Center.
12. May 20, 2015, 4:00-6:00 pm: **End-of-Term Reception Honoring Judges Richard Taranto, Sri Srinivasan, Patricia Millett, Nina Pillard, and Pamela Harris.** The SCI's annual celebration marks the completion of Supreme Court arguments for the current Term, thanks those who volunteered as moot court Justices and participated in other SCI programs, and recognizes honorees who have contributed significantly to the work of the Supreme Court. This year, we honored five recently appointed federal appellate judges; all were formerly Supreme Court practitioners and active participants in SCI leadership. Dean Bill Treanor opened the program with welcoming remarks, and Paul Clement, Bancroft PLLC, spoke in tribute to the honorees and presented each with a commemorative gift.

OT 2014 SCI Moot Courts

(Party mooted in yellow; 1st-Time SCOTUS advocates in red; purple advocates are women)

October Sitting

Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co. v. *Owens*, 10/1/2014

Advocate: **Nowell Berreth**, Alston & Bird, Atlanta, GA

Observers: 0

Heien v. *North Carolina*, 10/1/2014

Advocate: **Robert Montgomery**, North Carolina Department of Justice, Raleigh, NC

Observers: 48

Warger v. *Shauers*, 10/2/2014

Advocate: Sheila Birnbaum, Quinn Emanuel, New York, NY

Observers: 89

Integrity Staffing v. *Busk*, 10/3/2014

Advocate: **Mark Thierman**, Thierman Law Firm, Reno, NV

Observers: 1

Holt v. *Hobbs*, 10/3/2014

Advocate: **David Curran**, Office of the Attorney General of Arkansas, Little Rock, AR

Observers: 131

Kansas v. *Nebraska and Colorado*, 10/9/2014

Advocate: **David Cookson**, Office of the Attorney General of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE

Observers: 11

North Carolina Board of Dental Examiners v. *Federal Trade Commission*, 10/9/2014

Advocate: **Hashim Mooppan**, Jones Day

Observers: 4

Jennings v. *Stephens*, 10/9/2014

Advocate: **Randolph Schaffer**, The Schaffer Firm, Houston, TX

Observers: 5

Teva Pharmaceuticals v. *Sandoz*, 10/10/2014

Advocate: Carter Phillips, Sidley Austin

Observers: 0

November Sitting

Department of Homeland Security v. MacLean, 10/29/2014

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 38

Zivotofsky v. Kerry, 10/30/2014

Advocate: Alyza Lewin, Lewin & Lewin

Observers: 50

Omnicare v. Laborers' District Council Construction Industry Pension Fund, 10/30/2014

Advocate: Tom Goldstein, Goldstein & Russell

Observers: 108

Yates v. United States, 10/31/2014

Advocate: John Badalamenti, Office of the Federal Defender, Tampa, FL

Observers: 10

Johnson v. United States I, 10/31/2014

Advocate: Kate Menendez, Office of the Federal Defender, Minneapolis, MN

Observers: 11

Jesinoski v. Countrywide Home Loans, 10/31/2014

Advocate: Seth Waxman, WilmerHale

Observers: 6

M&G Polymers USA v. Tackett, 11/5/2014

Advocate: Allyson Ho, Morgan Lewis & Bockius, Dallas, TX

Observers: 0

Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama, 11/5/2015

Alabama Democratic Conference v. Alabama, 11/5/2015

Advocate: Eric Schnapper (University of Washington Law School)

Advocate: Rick Pildes (NYU Law School)

Observers: 25

Comptroller of the Treasury of Maryland v. Wynne, 11/6/2014

Advocate: William Brockman, Office of the Attorney General of Maryland, Baltimore, MD

Observers: 18

T-Mobile South v. City of Roswell, Georgia, 11/7/2014

Advocate: Jeff Fisher, Stanford Law School, Stanford, CA

Observers: 61

December Sitting:

Perez v. Mortgage Bankers Association, 11/24/2014

Nickols v. Mortgage Bankers Association, 11/24/2014

Advocate: Allyson Ho, Morgan Lewis & Bockius, Dallas, TX

Observers: 6

Hana Financial v. Hana Bank, 11/24/2014

Advocate: Paul Hughes, Mayer Brown

Observers: 0

Elonis v. United States, 11/24/2014

Advocate: John Elwood, Vinson & Elkins

Observers: 70

Whitfield v. United States, 11/25/2014

Advocate: Josh Carpenter, Office of the Federal Defender, Asheville, NC

Observers: 4

B&B Hardware v. Hargis Industries, 11/25/2015

Advocate: Willy Jay, Goodwin Procter

Observers: 2

Young v. United Parcel Service, 11/25/2015

Advocate: Sam Bagenstos, University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor, MI

Observers: 33

Department of Transportation v. Association of American Railroads, 12/1/2014

Advocate: Tom Dupree, Gibson Dunn

Observers: 0

Alabama Department of Revenue v. CSX Transportation, 12/4/2014

Advocate: Andrew Brasher, Office of the Attorney General of Alabama, Montgomery, AL

Observers: 5

Direct Marketing Association v. Brohl, 12/5/2014

Advocate: Dan Domenico, Office of the Attorney General of Colorado, Denver, CO

Observers: 1

Gelboim v. Bank of America, 12/5/2014

Advocate: Seth Waxman, WilmerHale

Observers: 1

United States v. Wong, 12/8/2014

Advocate: Eric Schnapper, University of Washington Law School, Seattle, WA

Observers: 1

United States v. June, 12/8/2014

Advocate: Josh Rosenkranz, Orrick, New York, NY

Observers: 2

January Sitting:

Oneok v. Learjet, 1/8/2015

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 3

Kellogg Brown & Root Services v. United States, 1/8/2015

Advocate: John Elwood, Vinson & Elkins

Observers: 3

Wellness International Network v. Sharif, 1/8/2015

Advocate: Catherine Steege, Jenner & Block, Chicago, IL

Observers: 0

Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona, 1/9/2015

Advocate: David Cortman, Alliance Defending Freedom, Lawrenceville, GA

Observers: 0

Mellouli v. Holder, 1/9/2015

Advocate: Jon Laramore, Faegre Baker Daniels, Indianapolis, IN

Observers: 0

Mach Mining v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1/9/2015

Advocate: Tom Goldstein, Goldstein & Russell

Observers: 10

Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Center, 1/14/2015

Advocate: Carl Withroe, Office of the Attorney General of Idaho, Boise, ID

Observers: 0

Williams-Yulee v. The Florida Bar, 1/14/2015

Advocate: Andy Pincus, Mayer Brown

Observers: 7

Rodriguez v. *United States*, 1/15/2015

Advocate: **Shannon O'Connor**, Office of the Federal Defender, Omaha, NE

Observers: 60

TX Dept. of Housing and Community Affairs v. **The Inclusive Communities Project**, 1/16/2015

Advocate: **Michael Daniel**, Daniel & Beshara, Dallas, TX

Observers: 4

February Sitting:

Kerry v. **Dinn**, 2/18/2015

Advocate: Mark Haddad, Sidley Austin, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 4

Tibble v. **Edison International**, 2/18/2015

Advocate: Jonathan Hacker, O'Melveny & Myers

Observers: 0

Henderson v. *United States*, 2/19/2015

Advocate: Dan Ortiz, University of Virginia School of Law, Charlottesville, VA

Observers: 0

Coleman-Bey v. *Tollefson*, 2/19/2015

Advocate: Kannon Shanmugam, Williams & Connolly

Observers: 52

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. **Abercrombie & Fitch**, 2/20/2015

Advocate: Shay Dvoretzky, Jones Day

Observers: 47

Baker Botts v. *Asarco*, 2/20/2015

Advocate: Aaron Streett, Baker Botts, Houston, TX

Observers: 2

Arizona State Legislature v. **Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission**, 2/23/2015

Advocate: Seth Waxman, WilmerHale

Observers: 46

City of Los Angeles v. **Patel**, 2/25/2015

Advocate: Tom Goldstein, Goldstein & Russell

Observers: 123

King v. Burwell, 2/26/2015

Advocate: Mike Carvin, Jones Day

Observers: 36

Chappell v. Ayala, 2/27/2015

Advocate: Robin Urbanski, Office of the Attorney General of California, San Diego, CA

Observers: 4

Ohio v. Clark, 2/27/2015

Advocate: Jeff Fisher, Stanford Law School, Stanford, CA

Observers: 35

March Sitting:

City and County of San Francisco v. Sheehan, 3/18/2015

Advocate: Christine Van Aken, San Francisco City Attorney's Office, San Francisco, CA

Observers: 8

Walker v. Texas Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans, 3/19/2015

Advocate: Jim George, George Brothers Kincaid & Horton, Austin, TX

Observers: 61

Bank of America v. Caulkett, 3/20/2015

Advocate: Danielle Spinelli, WilmerHale

Observers: 0

Michigan v. Environmental Protection Agency, 3/20/2015

Advocate: Aaron Lindstrom, Michigan Department of Attorney General, Lansing, MI

Advocate: William Brownell, Hunton & Williams

Observers: 16

Brumfield v. Cain, 3/25/2015

Advocate: Michael DeSanctis, Jenner & Block

Observers: 21

Kimble v. Marvel Enterprises, 3/26/2015

Advocate: Tom Saunders, WilmerHale

Observers: 5

Harris v. Viegelahn, 3/27/2015

Advocate: Matt Madden, Robbins Russell

Observers: 0

Commil USA v. Cisco Systems, 3/27/2015

Advocate: Seth Waxman, WilmerHale

Observers: 2

Bullard v. Blue Hills Bank, 3/27/2015

Advocate: Jim Feldman, University of Pennsylvania Law School

Observers: 0

April Sitting:

Johnson v. United States II, 4/16/2015

Advocate: Kate Menendez, Office of the Federal Defender, Minneapolis, MN

Observers: 6

McFadden v. United States, 4/17/2015

Advocate: Kevin Russell, Goldstein & Russell

Observers: 1

Horne v. Department of Agriculture, 4/20/2015

Advocate: Michael McConnell, Kirkland & Ellis

Observers: 0

Kingsley v. Hendrickson, 4/22/2015

Advocate: Wendy Ward, Merchant & Gould, Madison, WI

Observers: 1

Mata v. Holder, 4/23/2015

Advocate: Mark Fleming, WilmerHale, Boston, MA

Observers: 2

DeBoer v. Snyder/Bourke v. Beshear, 4/24/2015

Advocate: Mary Bonauto, Gay & Lesbian Advocates & Defenders, Boston, MA

Observers: 199

Obergefell v. Hodges/Tanco v. Haslam/DeBoer v. Snyder, 4/24/2015

Advocate: Doug Hallward-Driemeier, Ropes & Gray

Observers: 75 (est.)

Glossip v. Gross, 4/27/2015

Advocate: Patrick Wyrick, Office of the Attorney General of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, OK

Observers: 1