
Friday round-up

An interview with retired Justice Stevens; the lack of retirement rumors this spring; more on AT&T v. Conception

At [The Atlantic](#), Bill Barnhart has interviewed retired Justice John Paul Stevens about, among other things, the Justice's choice to retire last year. Barnhart reports that Justice Stevens had secretly asked Justice Souter to tell him when it was time for him to step down. Justice Souter retired before Justice Stevens, in 2009, which contributed to Justice Steven's decision to leave the bench, "When he [Justice Souter] retired, I knew I didn't have any safety valve anymore." Tony Mauro at the [BLT](#) and Ashby Jones at the WSJ [Law Blog](#) both highlight notable sections of the interview.

At [The New Republic](#), Randall Kennedy makes "The Case for Early Retirement," suggesting that Justice Ginsburg (78) and Justice Breyer (72) should depart the Court while there is still time for their successors to be confirmed before the end of the current administration. Kennedy, who clerked for Justice Marshall, supports the case for early retirement by pointing to Justice Marshall's decision *not* to retire early – during a like-minded administration – warning that, "if Justice Ginsburg departs the Supreme Court with a Republican in the White House, it is probable that the female Thurgood Marshall will be replaced by a female Clarence Thomas." At [Reason](#), Damon Root comments on the proposal. Mark Sherman of the AP (via the [Mercury News](#)) notes that this spring has not heard "even a whimsical rumor of a departure," from the bench, in contrast to the last two years, when retirement announcements were made around this time. Sherman also notes that Justice Sotomayor received a visit at the Court from the renowned chef Alice Waters earlier this week.

The Court's decision in [AT&T v. Conception](#) (which Amanda covered in [yesterday's](#) round up) is still creating discussion at The New York Times [Bucks](#) blog, [Market Watch](#), [The Huffington Post](#), [Dorf on Law](#), [Cato @ Liberty](#), the [Sacramento Bee](#), and the [American Spectator](#). In a vote of five to four, the Court held that California must enforce class action bans in arbitration agreements.