## **Merits Cases by Vote Split**

9-0	8-1	<b>7-2</b>	6-3	5-4
38 (64%)	2 (3%)	6 (10%)	5 (8%)	8 (14%)
Stanton v. Sims (PC)	Brandt v. U.S.	Chadbourne v. Troice	Fernandez v. California	McCutcheon v. FEC
Burt v. Titlow	Argentina v. NML Capital (7-1)	BG Group v. Argentina	Kaley v. U.S.	Navarette v. California
Ford v. U.S. (PC)		Rosemond v. U.S.	Lawson v. FMR	Paroline v. U.S.
U.S. v. Woods		Schuette v. Coalition to Defend (6-2)	White v. Woodall	Town of Greece v. Galloway
Atlantic Marine v. U.S. Dist. Ct.		EPA v. EME Homer City (6-2)	Petrella v. MGM	Hall v. Florida
Sprint v. Jacobs		CTS v. Waldberger		Michigan v. Bay Mills
Kansas v. Cheever				Scialabba v. de Osorio
Heimeshoff v. Hartford Life Ins.				Abramski v. U.S.
Daimler AG v. Bauman				
Mississippi v. AU Optronics				

Lozano v. Alvarez
Lexmark Int'l v. Static Control
U.S. v. Quality Stores (8-0)
U.S. v. Castleman
Northwest v. Ginsberg
Octane Fitness v. Icon Health
Highmark v. Allcare
Robers v. U.S.
Tolan v. Cotton (PC)
Wood v. Moss
Plumhoff v. Rickard
Martinez v. Illinois (PC)
Bond v. United States
Nautilus v. Biosig
Limelight v. Akamai
Exec. Benefits v. Arkison
POM v. Coca-Cola (8-o)
Clark v. Rameker
SBA List v. Driehaus
* TAT

Ray Haluch Gravel v. Central Pension Medtronic v. Mirowski Ventures

Burrage v. U.S.

Sandifer v. U.S. Steel Corp. Air Wisconsin v. Hoeper Hinton v. Alabama (PC) Walden v. Fiore U.S. v. Apel Law v. Siegel

Not Included Above						
Cline v. Okla. Coalition	Dismissed as Improvidently Granted	Before Arguments				
Unite Here v. Mulhall	Dismissed as Improvidently Granted	After Arguments				
Madigan v. Levin	Dismissed	After Arguments				
Mt. Holly v. Mt. Holly Gardens	Dismissed	Before Arguments				
U.S. Forest Serv. v. Pac. Rivers Council	Dismissed	Before Arguments				
UBS v. Union de Empleados de Muelles	Dismissed	Before Arguments				
Burnside v. Walters	Vacated and Remanded	Before Arguments				

Past Terms							
	9-0	8-1	7-2	6-3	5-4		
ОТо8	33%	5%	16%	16%	29%		
ОТо9	46%	10%	15%	11%	18%		
OT10	48%	13%	15%	5%	20%		
OT11	44%	11%	8%	17%	20%		
OT12	49%	5%	9%	8%	29%		
Avg.	44%	9%	13%	11%	23%		

<sup>\*</sup> We treat cases with eight or fewer votes as if they were decided by the full Court. For example, we treat *United States v. Quality Stores*, which had only eight Justices voting, as a 9-0 case throughout much of this Stat Pack. For 8-0, 7-1, and 6-2 decisions, we simply assume that the recused Justice would have joined the majority. In cases that are decided 5-3, we would look at each case individually to decide whether it was more likely that the recused Justice would join the majority or the dissent. Our assumption that nine Justices voted in each case applies only to figures that treat each case as a whole, like the chart above, and not to figures that focus on the behavior of individual Justices, like our Justice Agreement charts. We have done our best to note where we assume a full Court and where we count only actual votes.

<sup>\*\*</sup> For cases that are decided by a 5-4 vote, we provide information about whether the majority was comprised of the most common conservative block (Roberts, Scalia, Kennedy, Thomas, and Alito), the most common liberal block (Kennedy, Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan), or a more uncommon alignment. A conservative lineup is marked with a red square, a liberal lineup is marked with a blue square, and all others are marked with a yellow square.