



Joshua Matz *Petition of the Day*

Posted Fri, April 27th, 2012 9:19 am

## Friday round-up

Wednesday's oral argument in *Arizona v. United States* – the federal challenge to S.B. 1070, Arizona's immigration law – remains the main subject of Court-related news. The [Wall Street Journal](#) (subscription required) and [Reason Magazine](#) have coverage, while the [Christian Science Monitor](#) focuses on reactions to the argument in Arizona. At [ACSblog](#), Omar Jadwat lists “three things you should know” about the oral argument; Andrew Cohen ups the ante by offering “five takeaways” in [The Atlantic](#); Michael Dorf of [Dorf on Law](#) takes the road less traveled and provides “a few offbeat observations” (three of them, since we're counting). Jacques Billeaud of the [Associated Press](#) discusses some of the possible implications of the Court's decision. And at [NPR](#), Nina Totenberg describes her participation in an “insurrection” when the Supreme Court police caused confusion outside the Court after the oral argument by requiring reporters to show identification to enter the press area.

Commentators continue to weigh in as well. The editorial board of the [Christian Science Monitor](#) reviews the oral argument and expresses hope that “perhaps by the end of 2012, the nation will finally come closer to resolving the core dilemma in th[e] debate” over immigration enforcement: “How much enforcement is preferred, and who can do it?” At [The Daily Beast](#), Terry Greene Sterling discusses the oral argument, while in an op-ed for the [New York Daily News](#), Tamar Jacoby criticizes Arizona's policy of “attrition through enforcement” and urges the Justices to remember the “the larger issues at stake.” Finally, at [ACSblog](#), Gabriel Chin and Marc Miller counter predictions that the Court will uphold Section 2 of S.B. 1070, which requires police officers to verify the immigration status of anyone whom they stop or detain when there is reasonable suspicion to believe that the person is in the United States illegally, by painting a “more nuanced picture” of the argument.

Briefly:

- The [Library of Congress](#) reports that the papers of the late Justice Byron White are now open for research.
- At [Reuters](#), Joan Biskupic reports that “the collective impatience [for a ruling in the health care cases] is fueling a mini-industry of rumors, wagers and speculation not seen since the *Bush v. Gore* case of 2000, when a presidential election hung in the balance.”
- At the [Volokh Conspiracy](#), Randy Barnett reports on an event honoring Justice Ginsburg yesterday at the Georgetown Supreme Court Institute.
- Charles Babington of the [Associated Press](#) discusses the Court's new role “at the heart of presidential politics.”
- The [Sixth Circuit Appellate Blog](#) covers Justice Kagan's appearance at the Sixth Circuit Judicial Conference.

- Ilya Shapiro and Carl DeNigris of [CATO@Liberty](#) contend that in this week's decision in [United States v. Home Concrete & Supply, LLC](#), the Court “scored a blow for American taxpayers.”