



## Tuesday round-up

Yesterday the Court released two decisions in argued cases – [Arizona v. United States](#) and a consolidated opinion in [Miller v. Alabama](#) and [Jackson v. Hobbs](#) – and summarily reversed the decision of the Montana Supreme Court in [American Tradition Partnership, Inc. v. Bullock](#). Kali provides early coverage of these decisions in an evening round-up [here](#).

In the *Arizona* case, both the state and the federal government have claimed victory after the Court struck down three of the four provisions of Arizona’s controversial immigration law, S.B. 1070, but allowed the fourth – the so-called “show me your papers” provision – to go into effect. The [Financial Times](#) has general coverage, as do the [Houston Chronicle](#), Warren Richey of the [Christian Science Monitor](#), Mark Barabak of the [Los Angeles Times](#), and Cesar Hernandez of the [crImmigration](#) blog, while other coverage focuses on reactions from the Arizona police (Associated Press via [Google News](#)) and other parts of the country, including California ([Modesto Bee](#)), Maryland ([CBS](#)), Texas ([KDAF-TV](#)), and Alabama ([WNCN-TV](#)).

Commentary on the decision comes from (former SCOTUSblogger) Ben Winograd in the [Christian Science Monitor](#), Adam Winkler of [The Daily Beast](#), Walter Dellinger at [Slate](#), Eugene Robinson of the Washington Post (via the [Sacramento Bee](#)), Mike Dorf of [Dorf on Law](#), and David Cole for [The Nation](#). In other commentary, the editorial board of the [Arizona Republic](#) and Ilya Shapiro of [Cato@Liberty](#) urge Congress to step in and remedy the immigration issue.

In [Miller v. Alabama](#) and [Jackson v. Hobbs](#), the Court held that the Eighth Amendment prohibits mandatory sentences of life in prison without the possibility of parole for juvenile homicide offenders. Lyle Denniston covered the case for [this blog](#), with other coverage from David Savage of the [Los Angeles Times](#), Chuck Lindell of the [Austin Statesman](#), Mike Sacks of the [Huffington Post](#), Warren Richey of the [Christian Science Monitor](#), Nannette Miranda of [ABC News](#), and Carrie Johnson of [NPR](#). In commentary on the case, Emily Bazelon of [Slate](#) calls the decision a “fairly small but still significant step in expanding the definition of cruel and unusual punishment,” while Kent Scheidegger of [Crime and Consequences](#) counters that the Court’s logic is “one more reason for the next Congress to remove sentencing-phase claims from federal habeas altogether.”

And finally, the Court issued a summary reversal in [American Tradition Partnership, Inc. v. Bullock](#), holding that “there can be no serious doubt” that [Citizens United v. FEC](#) renders the Montana campaign finance law at issue – which prohibited corporations from spending money on elections in the state – unconstitutional. Jess Bravin covered the decision for the [Wall Street Journal](#). Dahlia Lithwick, writing for [Slate](#), observes that “one of the most interesting lessons here is that the sense of lingering public outrage over *Citizens United*—deserved or not—influenced the court not one little bit on this issue.” Rick Hasen of [Election Law Blog](#) argues that “taking the case would have been an opportunity for the majority of Supreme Court justices to make things worse,” while at [Balkinization](#), Marvin Ammori analyzes the reasoning behind the Court’s decision. And at [Cato@Liberty](#), John Samples highlights the decision as a reminder that “if one justice in the *Citizens United* majority leaves the Court, and President Obama selects his replacement, *Citizens United* will almost immediately be overturned.”

Briefly:

- At [Balkinization](#), Jack Balkin speculates on the possible authors of this Term’s three remaining opinions: [First American Financial Corp. v. Edwards](#), [United States v. Alvarez](#), and the Affordable Care Act litigation.
- Orin Kerr of the [Volokh Conspiracy](#) observes that Chief Justice Roberts cited to legal scholarship in yesterday’s *Miller* decision.
- Patience Haggin of [Time](#) discusses why the opinion for the Affordable Care Act litigation has not yet been released.