#### Stat Pack for October Term 2014

#### Index

Opinions by Sitting	2
Circuit Scorecards	3-4
Merits Cases by Vote Split	5
Make-Up of the Merits Docket	6
Term Index	7
Total Opinion Authorship	8
Total Opinions Over Time	9
Opinions Authored by Each Justice	10
Workload	11-14
Summary Reversals	15
Merits Opinions	16
Majority Opinion Authorship	17
Strength of the Majority	18
Unanimity	19-20
Frequency in the Majority	21
5-to-4 Cases	22-23
5-to-4 Case Majorities	24-25
Majority Opinion Distribution by Senior Justices	26-27
Justice Agreement - Tables	28-30
Justice Agreement - Highs and Lows	31
Time Between Cert. Grant and Oral Argument	32
Time Between Oral Argument and Opinion	33
Pace of Grants	34
Pace of Opinions	35
Grants Per Conference	36
Opinions Per Week	37
Oral Argument - Justices	38
Oral Argument - Advocates	39-40
Voting Alignment - All Cases	41-49
Voting Alignment - 5-4 Cases	50-52

#### Summary of the Term

<b>Total Merits Opinions Released</b>	74
+ Signed opinions after oral argument	66
+ Summary reversals	8

Fotal Merits Opinions Expected	74
+ Petitions granted and set for argument	69
+ Summary reversals	8
- Cases dismissed before oral argument	-2
- Cases consolidated for decision	-1

Cases Set for Argument During OT15	26	
------------------------------------	----	--

\* You can find past Stat Packs here: <<u>http://www.scotusblog.com/reference/stat-pack/></u>. A few matters regarding our methodology are worth mentioning at the outset. First, SCOTUSblog treats consolidated cases as a single case, as determined by the case with the lowest docket number (prior to the release of an opinion) or the case that is captioned with an opinion. To the extent that two cases are argued separately but later decided with only one opinion, we will remove one of the cases from this Stat Pack, except to include it in the Pace of Grants chart to maintain cross-conference comparisons. The most unusual way we manage these later-consolidated cases is to merge the oral argument data for the two cases. We combine the questions asked by each Justice in the separate oral argument proceedings into one "consolidated" session. Second, this Stat Pack frequently uses the term "merits opinions," "merits docket," or "merits cases." Those three terms are used interchangeably, and signify the set of cases decided "on the merits." Those cases include signed opinions after oral argument (the bulk of all merits cases), most per curiam opinions released after oral arguments, summary reversals (cases decided with per curiam opinions after the certiorari stage), and cases decided by an equally divided (4-4) Court. Cases that are dismissed as improvidently granted are not included in our tally of merits cases.

Suggested Citation: Kedar S. Bhatia, Stat Pack for October Term 2014, SCOTUSBLOG (June 30, 2015), http://sblog.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/SCOTUSblog\_Stat\_Pack\_OT14.pdf.

# **Opinions by Sitting**

Roberts	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		JGR	7				
Scalia	1		1		2		1		2		1		1		AS	9				
Kennedy	1		1		1		1		-		1		1		AMK	6				
Thomas	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		СТ	7				
Ginsburg	1		1		1		2		1		1		-		RBG	7				
Breyer	1		1		1		1		1		1		2		1		1		SGB	8
Alito	) 1		1		1		1		2		1		1		SAA	8				
Sotomayor	1		1		2		1		1		1		-		SMS	7				
Kagan	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		EK	7				
	October		Novembe	er	Decembe	r	January	7	Februar	у	Marcl	1	April		Decided	67				
	Decided: 9   Rem	ain: o	Decided: 9   Rem	ain: o	Decided: 12   Rem	ain: o	Decided: 10   Ren	nain: o	Decided: 11   Ren	nain: o	Decided: 9   Re	main: o	Decided: 7   Rei	main: o	Argued	67				
	Heien	JGR	Omnicare	EK	Elonis	JGR	Oneok	SGB	Coleman	SGB	Sheehan	SAA	Johnson	AS						
	Holt	SAA	Zivotofsky	AMK	Mortgage Banker	SMS	Reed	CT	Din	AS	Confed. Vets	SGB	Obergefell	AMK						
	Dart Cherokee	RBG	Jesinoski	AS	Whitfield	AS	Mach Mining	EK	Tibble	SGB	BoA	CT	McFadden	CT						
	Integrity Staffing	CT	MacLean	JGR	B&B Hardware	SAA	KBR	SAA	Henderson	EK	EPA	AS	Kingsley	SGB						
	Warger	SMS	Yates	RBG	Hana	SMS	Mellouli	RBG	Abercrombie	AS	Brumfield	SMS	Horne	JGR						
	Dental Examiners	AMK	T-Mobile	SMS	Young	SGB	Wellness	SMS	Baker Botts LLP	CT	Commil	AMK	Reyes Mata	EK						
	Kansas	EK	M&G Polymers	CT	American Railroads	AMK	Williams-Yulee	JGR	AZ Legis.	RBG	Kimble	EK	Glossip	SAA						
	Jennings	AS	Wynne	SAA	Direct Marketing	CT	Armstrong	AS	Clark	SAA	Bullard	JGR								
	Teva	SGB	AL Black Caucus	SGB	Gelboim	RBG	Inclusive Comm.	AMK	Patel	SMS	Viegelahn	RBG								
					CSX Transp.	AS	Rodriguez	RBG	Davis	SAA										
					Wong	EK			Burwell	JGR										
					June															

### **Circuit Scorecard**

#### October Term 2014

	Number	Percent	Decided	Aff'd	Rev'd	Aff'd %	Rev'd %
CA1	1	1%	1	1	0	100%	0%
CA2	1	1%	1	0	1	0%	100%
CA3	3	4%	3	0	3	0%	100%
CA4	6	8%	6	3	3	50%	50%
CA5	8	11%	8	2	6	25%	75%
CA6	5	7%	5	1	4	20%	80%
CA7	3	4%	3	0	3	0%	100%
CA8	8	11%	8	1	7	13%	88%
CA9	16	21%	16	6	10	38%	63%
CA10	4	5%	4	1	3	25%	75%
CA11	5	7%	5	0	5	0%	100%
CA DC	4	5%	4	1	3	25%	75%
CA Fed	3	4%	3	1	2	33%	67%
State	5	7%	5	3	2	60%	40%
Dist. Court	2	3%	2	1	1	50%	50%
Original	1	1%	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	75	100%	75	21	53	28%	72%

#### October Term 2015

	Number	Percent
CA1	-	-
CA2	3	12%
CA3	-	-
CA4	2	8%
CA5	3	12%
CA6	-	-
CA7	-	-
<b>CA8</b>	2	8%
CA9	3	12%
CA10	1	4%
CA11	2	8%
CA DC	2	8%
CA Fed	1	4%
State	6	23%
Dist. Court	1	4%
Original	-	-
	26	100%

<sup>\*</sup> For the circuit scorecards only, we treated certain consolidated cases as separate decisions rather than as one. For consolidated cases that stemmed from different lower court decisions, such as *United States v. Wong* and *United States v. June*, we counted the two cases separately on this table to most accurately reflect the Supreme Court's treatment of the precedents below. For cases that were consolidated in the court below, such as the pair of petitions from a three-judge panel consolidated in *Alabama Black Legislative Caucus v. Alabama*, we counted the Supreme Court's decision only once. Throughout the rest of the Stat Pack consolidated cases are uniformly treated as a single case.

### **Circuit Scorecard**

	Roberts	Scalia	Kennedy	Thomas	Ginsburg	Breyer	Alito	Sotomayor	Kagan	Total Votes	Overall Decisions
CA1	1 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	1 - 0	9 - 0	1 - 0
CA2	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 9	0 - 1
CA3	0 - 3	0 - 3	0 - 3	1 - 2	0 - 3	0 - 3	0 - 3	0 - 3	0-3	1 - 26	0 - 3
CA4	3 - 3	2 - 4	4 - 2	2 - 4	3 - 3	3 - 3	1 - 5	3 - 3	3 - 3	24 - 30	3 - 3
CA5	3 - 5	3 - 5	4 - 4	4 - 4	1-7	1-7	4 - 4	2 - 6	1-7	23 - 49	2 - 6
CA6	2 - 3	2 - 3	1 - 4	2 - 3	1 - 4	1-4	2 - 3	1 - 4	1 - 4	13 - 32	1 - 4
CA7	2 - 1	2 - 1	0 - 3	2 - 1	0 - 3	0 - 3	1 - 2	0 - 3	0 - 3	7 - 20	0 - 3
CA8	1-7	2 - 6	2 - 6	5 - 3	1 - 7	1 - 7	5 - 3	1 - 7	1 - 7	19 - 53	1 - 7
CA9	1 - 14	3 - 12	6 - 9	2 - 13	9 - 6	8 - 6	2 - 13	9 - 6	10 - 5	50 - 93	6 - 10
CA10	1 - 3	2 - 2	2 - 2	3 - 1	0 - 4	0 - 4	1 - 3	0 - 4	1 - 3	10 - 26	1 - 3
CA11	1 - 4	1 - 4	1 - 4	3 - 2	2 - 3	0 - 5	0 - 5	0 - 5	1 - 4	9 - 36	0 - 5
CA DC	0 - 4	0 - 4	1 - 3	1 - 3	2 - 2	2 - 2	0 - 4	2 - 2	2 - 2	10 - 26	1 - 3
CA Fed.	2 - 1	2 - 1	0 - 3	2 - 1	1-2	1 - 1	2 - 1	0 - 3	1 - 2	11 - 15	1 - 2
State Ct.	3 - 2	1 - 4	2 - 3	1 - 4	2 - 3	3 - 2	2 - 3	2 - 3	2 - 3	18 - 27	3 - 2
Dist. Court	1 - 1	1 - 1	1 - 1	1 - 1	1 - 1	1 - 1	1 - 1	1 - 1	1 - 1	9 - 9	1 - 1
Original	1 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 0	0 - 1	1-0	1 - 0	0 - 1	1 - 0	1 - 0	6 - 3	1-0
	22 - 52	22 - 52	26 - 48	30 - 44	25 - 49	23 - 49	22 - 52	23 - 51	26 - 48	219 - 454	22 - 53

This chart features affirmance and reversal rates for each circuit and each Justice. The first number is the number of times a particular Justice voted to affirm a decision of the court below and the second number is the number of times that Justice voted to vacate or reverse the decision below.

McFadden v. United States

Ohio v. Clark

9-0 30 (41%)	8-1 5 (7%)	7-2 9 (12%)	6-3 11 (15%)				5-4 19 (26	%)	
Lopez v. Smith (PC)	Heien v. North Carolina	Teva v. Sandoz	Jennings v. Stephens		Dart	Cherok	ee v. Ow	ens	
Johnson v. City of Shelby (PC)	Elonis v. U.S.	Christeson v. Roper (PC)	T-Mobile South v. Rosw	rell	Yate	s v. U.S.			
Carroll v. Carman (PC)	EEOC v. Abercrombie	DHS v. MacLean	Kansas v. Nebraska		AL F	Black Car	ucus v. A	labama	
Glebe v. Frost (PC)	Reyes Mata v. Lynch	Alabama v. CSX Transp.	Dental Examiners v. FT	С	Arm	strong v	. Except	ional Ch	ild
Integrity Staffing v. Busk	Johnson v. U.S.	B&B Hardware v. Hargins	Young v. UPS		U.S.	v. Wong	5		
Warger v. Shauers		Oneok v. Learjet	Rodriguez v. U.S.		Will	iams-Yu	lee v. Flo	orida Ba	ſ
Jesinoski v. Countrywide		San Francisco v. Sheehan (6-2)	Wellness Int'l v. Sharif		Com	ptroller	v. Wynn	e	
Whitfield v. U.S.		Commil v. Cisco (6-2)	Zivotofsky v. Kerry		Kerr	y v. Din			
Holt v. Hobbs		Mellouli v. Lynch	Baker Botts LLP v. ASAI	RCO	Wall	ker v. So	ns of Co	nfed. Ve	ts
Gelboim v. BoA			Kimble v. Marvel		Davi	is v. Ayal	la		
Hana Financial v. Hana Bank			King v. Burwell		Brui	nfield v.	Cain		
M&G Polymers v. Tackett					Hor	ne v. Dej	pt. of Ag	riculture	:
Direct Marketing v. Brohl					King	sley v. H	Iendrick	son	
DOT v. American Railroads					Los	Angeles	v. Patel		
Perez v. Mortgage Bankers					TX I	Housing	v. Inclus	sive Com	m.
Omnicare v. Laborers Pension Fund					Obe	rgefell v.	Hodges		
Grady v. North Carolina (PC)					Mich	nigan v. 1	EPA		
Woods v. Donald (PC)					AZ I	egis. v. A	AZ Redis	stricting	
Mach Mining v. EEOC					Glos	sip v. Gi	OSS		
Bullard v. Blue Hills									
Harris v. Viegelahn									
Tibble v. Edison									
Coleman v. Tollefson									
Henderson v. U.S.		Not Included Above				Past 7	Terms		
Kellogg Brown & Root v. Carter	Public Employees v. IndyMac	Dismissed	Before Argument		9-0	8-1	7-2	6-3	5-4
BoA v. Caulkett	Chen v. Baltimore	Dismissed	Before Argument	ОТо9	46%	10%	15%	11%	18%
Taylor v. Barkes (PC)	United States v. June	Decided with United States v. Wo	ng After Argument	<b>OT10</b>	48%	13%	15%	5%	20%
Reed v. Gilbert		1	_	OT11	44%	11%	8%	17%	20%

### Merits Cases by Vote Split

\* We treat cases with eight or fewer votes as if they were decided by the full Court. For example, we treat *Commil v. Cisco*, which had only eight Justices voting, as a 7-2 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.

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

8%

8%

10%

29%

14%

20%

9%

10%

11%

**OT12** 

**OT13** 

Avg.

49%

66%

51%

5%

3%

8%

## Make-Up of the Merits Docket

The following charts depict different characteristics of the cases that were released with merits opinions or are expected to be disposed of with a merits opinion. These charts include information about cases disposed of with signed opinions, summary reversals, or those that were affirmed by an equally divided Court.



\* Technically, all paid and *in forma pauperis* cases have been on the same docket since 1971, with paid cases beginning each year with case number 1, and IFP cases beginning at number 5001. Accordingly, the first paid case of this Term was numbered 13-1 and the first IFP case was numbered 13-5001. Original cases remain on a separate docket and follow a separate numbering convention. For more information on the dockets, see EUGENE GRESSMAN ET AL., SUPREME COURT PRACTICE 55–56 (9th ed. 2007).

### **Term Index**

This chart includes a summary of the cases for the Term including (1) majority opinion author, (2) vote, (3) days between argument and opinion, (4) judgment, and (5) court below. For each sitting, the chart provides the number of majority opinions written by each Justice and the average number of days between argument and opinion for that Justice's majority opinions.

	October									November									December								
1	Heien	JGR	8-1	70d	Α	ST	JGR	1	70d	Omnicare	EK	9-0	141d	R	CA6	JGR	1	78d	Elonis	JGR	8-1	182d	R	CA3	JGR	1	182d
2	Holt	SAA	9-0	105d	R	CA8	AS	1	91d	Zivotofsky	AMK	6-3	217d	Α	CADC	AS	1	70d	Mortgage Banke	SMS	9-0	98d	R	CADC	AS	2	64d
3	Dart Cherokee	RBG	5-4	69d	R	CA10	AMK	1	134d	Jesinoski	AS	9-0	70d	R	CA8	AMK	1	217d	Whitfield	AS	9-0	42d	Α	CA4	AMK	1	91d
4	Integrity Staffing	СТ	9-0	62d	R	CA9	СТ	1	62d	MacLean	JGR	7-2	78d	Α	CAFC	СТ	1	77d	B&B Hardware	SAA	7-2	112d	R	CA8	СТ	1	85d
5	Warger	SMS	9-0	62d	Α	CA8	RBG	1	69d	Yates	RBG	5-4	112d	R	CA11	RBG	1	112d	Hana	SMS	9-0	49d	A	CA9	RBG	1	43d
6	<b>Dental Examiners</b>	AMK	6-3	134d	Α	CA4	SGB	1	97d	T-Mobile	SMS	6-3	65d	R	CA11	SGB	1	133d	Young	SGB	6-3	112d	R	CA4	SGB	1	112d
7	Kansas	EK	6-3	133d	Α	Orig	SAA	1	105d	M&G Polymers	СТ	9-0	77d	R	CA6	SAA	1	187d	American Railro	AMK	9-0	91d	R	CADC	SAA	1	112d
8	Jennings	AS	6-3	91d	R	CA5	SMS	1	62d	Wynne	SAA	5-4	187d	Α	ST	SMS	1	65d	Direct Marketin	СТ	9-0	85d	R	CA10	SMS	2	74d
9	Teva	SGB	7-2	97d	R	CAFC	EK	1	133d	AL Black Caucus	SGB	5-4	133d	R	USDC	EK	1	141d	Gelboim	RBG	9-0	43d	R	CA2	EK	1	133d
10							Total	9								Total	9		CSX Transp.	AS	7-2	85d	R	CA11	Total	12	
11							Expect.	9								Expect.	9		Wong	EK	5-4	133d	Α	CA9	Expect.	12	
12							Avg.	-	91d							Avg.		120d	June			00-	Α	CA9	Avg.		94d
	January						: •			February									March					- /			
1	Oneok	SGB	7-9	ood	Δ	CAO	JGR	1	000	Coleman	SGB	0-0	84d	Δ	CA6	JGR	1	112d	Sheehan	SAA	6-2	56d	R	CAO	JGR	1	22d
1	Reed	СТ	0-0	157d	R	CAO	AS	1	70d	Din	AS	5-4	112d	R	CAO	AS	2	104d	Confed Vets	SGB	5-4	87d	R	CAE	AS	1	06d
2	Mach Mining	EK	9-0	106d	R	CA7	AMK	1	155d	Tibble	SGR	5-4 0-0	82d	R		AMK	2	1040	BoA	СТ	5-4 0-0	60d	R		AMK	1	56d
3	KRD	SAA	9-0	100u	P		CT	1	155u	Henderson	FK	9-0	803u	P		CT	1	1100	FDA	10	9-0 5-4	090	P			1	60d
4	Mellouli	RRC	9-0 7-0	133u	P		RBC	1	15/u	Abarcrombia		9-0 8_1	030	P		RBC	1	110u	Brumfield	SWS	5-4	900 80d	P		RBC	1	47d
5	Wollnoss	SWS	/-2 6-2	130u	P	CAO CA7	SCR	2	00d	Raker Botte III		6-2	110d		CAE	SCR	1	R4d	Commil	AMK	5-4 6-2	500	P	CAEC	SCB	1	4/u 87d
0	Williams Vuloo	ICP	0-3	132u		CA/	SGD	1	100d	AZ Logic	DPC	0-3	1100	л л	USDC	SGD	2	109d	Kimblo	EV	6.0	Sod	к л		SGD	1	-6d
7	Armstrong	JGK	5-4	990 50d	A D	51	SAA	1	1330	AZ Legis.	KDG CAA	5-4	1090	A D	OSDC	SAA	2	1000	Rulland	LCD	0-3	ogu	A		SAA	1	500
8	Arilistrong Inducive Comm	AS	5-4	700	K A	CA9	EV	1	1320	Datal	SAA	9-0	1000	K A	51	I SIMIS	1	Rod	Dullaru Viegolehn	DBC	9-0	330	A D			1	000
9	De deitere en	AMK	5-4	1550	A	CA5	EK	1	1060	Pater	SIMIS	5-4	1110	A	CA9	EK	1	830	viegelann	KDG	9-0	4 <sup>-</sup> /u	ĸ	CA5	EK	1	830
10	Koariguez	KBG	6-3	900	к	CA8	Frencet	10		Davis	SAA	5-4	1070	ĸ	CA9	Frencest	11								Total	9	
11							Expect.	10		Burwell	JGK	6-3	1130	A	CA4	Expect.	11								Expect.	9	(-1
12	. •1						Avg.	_	1180			-				Avg.		1020	m · 1						Avg.		67 <b>a</b>
	April		~	. 1	-	<u> </u>				Summary Re	evers	al			<u>a</u> .				Total	1			~				
1	Johnson	AS	8-1	67d	R	CA8	JGR	1	54d	Lopez	PC	9-0	-	R	CA9				Roberts	7	90	1	Case	es Disn	nissed	1	
2	Obergefell	AMK	5-4	66d	R	CA6	AS	1	67d	Johnson	PC	9-0	-	R	CA5				Scalia	9	81	1	Ane	or Oral .	Aig.		
3	McFadden	СТ	9-0	57d	R	CA4	AMK	1	66d	Carroll	PC	9-0	-	R	CA3				Kennedy	6	120	d					
4	Kingsley	SGB	5-4	55d	R	CA7	CT	1	57d	Glebe	PC	9-0	-	R	CA9				Thomas	7	88	d					
5	Horne	JGR	5-4	54d	R	CA9	RBG	0		Grady	PC	9-0	-	R	ST				Ginsburg	7	88	d					
6	Reyes Mata	EK	8-1	47d	R	CA5	SGB	1	55d	Donald	PC	9-0	-	R	CA6				Breyer	8	94	b					
7	Glossip	SAA	5-4	61d	Α	CA10	SAA	1	61d	Taylor	PC	9-0	-	R	CA3				Alito	8	109	b					
8							SMS	0		Christesen	PC	7-2	-	R	CA8				Sotomayor	7	85	b					
9							EK	1	47d										Kagan	7	104	b					
10							Total	7											Summary Rev.	8							
11							Expect.	7											Cases Disposed	75							
12							Avg.		58d										Expected	75							
13																			Percent Decided	100%	6						
14																			Average Time	95d							

# **Total Opinion Authorship**

	Total Opinions	Majority Opinions	Concurring Opinions	Dissenting Opinions
Roberts	<b>14</b> (12)	7 (7)	2 (0)	<b>5</b> (5)
Scalia	<b>28</b> (23)	9 (9)	4 (3)	15 (11)
Kennedy	<b>13</b> (9)	<b>6</b> (6)	4 (2)	3 (1)
Thomas	<b>37</b> (27)	7 (7)	<b>11</b> (6)	<b>19</b> (14)
Ginsburg	<b>13</b> (9)	7 (7)	<b>5</b> (1)	<b>1</b> (1)
Breyer	<b>16</b> (14)	8 (8)	4 (2)	<b>4</b> (4)
Alito	<b>30</b> (20)	8 (8)	<b>9</b> (4)	13 (8)
Sotomayor	<b>16</b> (12)	7 (7)	<b>3</b> (0)	<b>6</b> (5)
Kagan	<b>11</b> (10)	7 (7)	<b>2</b> (1)	<b>2</b> (2)
Per Curiam	<b>8</b> (7)	8 (7)	- (-)	- (-)
	<b>186</b> (142)	74 (73)	44 (19)	<b>68</b> (51)

The number of opinions five pages or longer is included in parentheses and represented by a red line in the chart below.



Term	Majority Opinions	Concurring Opinions	Dissenting Opinions	Total Opinions
ОТоо	85	49	61	195
ОТо1	81	46	62	189
OT02	80	56	54	190
ОТоз	79	55	57	191
ОТ04	81	61	63	205
ОТо5	82	39	56	177
ОТоб	73	46	57	176
ОТо7	69	43	59	171
ОТо8	79	46	71	196
ОТо9	86	65	51	202
OT10	82	49	47	178
OT11	76	37	48	161
OT12	78	39	52	169
OT13	73	41	32	146
OT14	74	44	68	186
Average	79	48	56	182

# **Total Opinions Over Time**





# **Opinions Authored by Each Justice**

		Roberts	Scalia	Kennedy	Thomas	Ginsburg	Breyer	Alito	Sotomayor	Kagan	Per	
Majority Opinions	1 2 3 4 5 6	Heien MacLean Williams-Yulee Bullard Elonis Horne	Jesinoski Whitfield Jennings CSX Transp. Armstrong Abercrombie	Dental Examiners American Railroad Commil Zivotofsky Inclusive Comm. Obergefell	Integrity Staffing M&G Polymers Direct Marketing BoA Baker Botts LLP Reed	Dart Cherokee Gelboim Yates Rodriguez Viegelahn Mellouli	Teva Young AL Black Caucus Oneok Tibble Coleman	Holt B&B Hardware Wynne Sheehan KBR Clark	Warger T-Mobile Hana Mortgage Bankers Wellness Brumfield	M&G Polymers Omnicare Wong Mach Mining Henderson Reyes Mata	Lopez Johnson Carroll Glebe Christeson Grady	74
	7 8 9 10	Burwell	Din Johnson EPA		McFadden	AZ Legis.	Confed. Vets Kingsley	Davis Glossip	Patel	Kimble	Donald Taylor	
Concurring Opinions	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	M&G Polymers McFadden	Mortgage Banker Omnicare Clark Glossip	Direct Marketing Din Davis Johnson	American Railroad Mortgage Bankers Omnicare Oneok Zivotofsky Clark Davis Horne Johnson EPA Glossip	Holt M&G Polymers Direct Marketing B&B Hardware Williams-Yulee	Armstrong Williams-Yulee Zivotofsky Reed	T-Mobile Yates American Railroad Mortgage Bankers Young Wellness Elonis Abercrombie Reed	Integrity Staffing Holt Baker Botts LLP	Heien Reed		44
Dissenting Opinions	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	T-Mobile Wellness Zivotofsky Obergefell AZ Legis.	Dart Cherokee M&G Polymers Young AL Black Caucus Oneok Williams-Yulee Wynne Sheehan Commil Zivotofsky Kingsley Patel Burwell Obergefell AZ Legis.	Young Rodriguez Williams-Yulee	Dart Cherokee Jennings T-Mobile Teva M&G Polymers CSX Transp. B&B Hardware AL Black Caucus Rodriguez Wynne Wellness Elonis Abercrombie Mellouli Reyes Mata Brumfield Inclusive Comm. Obergefell AZ Legis.	Wynne	Din Baker Botts LLP Horne Glossip	Christeson Dental Examiners Rodriguez Wong Williams-Yulee Confed. Vets Brumfield Kingsley Patel Kimble Inclusive Comm. Johnson Obergefell	Heien MacLean Armstrong Davis Horne Glossip	Yates EPA	9	68
Total		14	28	13	37	13	16	30	16	11	8	186

# **Workload - Opinions Released Each Week** The chart below demonstrates how many opinions were released by each Justice during each opinion week.

		0	ctob	er	No	ovem	ber	De	cem	ber	Ja	nua	ry	Fe	brua	ary	N	Iarc	h		Apri	1		May	7		Ju	ne		
		#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#4	Total
	Majority									1		1		-							1	1			1		-	2		7
JGR	Discenting										1			1										1		1	1	1	1	2
	Total									1	1	1		1							1	1		1	1	1	1	3	1	5 14
		-																										0		
	Majority										3				1			1							1		1	1	1	9
AS	Concurring									1				1		1	1			1	1		0	1		1	1	4	1	4
_	Total									1	2			1	1	1	2	1		1	1		2	1	1	1	2	4	2	15 28
	Total									-	5			-	-	-	J	-		-	-		_	-	-	-	-	<u>J</u>	5	20
	Majority													1		1								1		1		2		6
AMK	Concurring														1												2	1		4
	Dissenting													1	1	1	1			1	1			1		1	0	0		3
	10tai													1	1	1	1			1	1			1		1	2	3		13
	Majority								1				1		1										1		3			7
СТ	Concurring															2	1			1						1	2	2	2	11
	Dissenting	ļ			ļ					1	2	1		1	1		2			1			1	1	3		2	2	1	19
	Total								1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	3			2			1	1	4	1	7	4	3	37
	Majority									1		1		1						1			1		1				1	7
RRG	Concurring											1	1		1		1				1									5
<b>KD</b> U	Dissenting																						1							1
	Total									1		2	1	1	1		1			1	1		2		1				1	13
	Majority											1					2			1			2				1	1		8
SCR	Concurring																	1			1					1	1			4
SOD	Dissenting																										2	1	1	4
	Total											1					2	1		1	1		2			1	4	2	1	16
	Majority											1					1						2	1			2		1	8
GAA	Concurring										1			1		2	1							1	2		1			9
SAA	Dissenting											1		1						2	1						2	6		13
	Total										1	2		2		2	2			2	1		2	2	2		5	6	1	30
	Majority								1	_	1	1	_			1								1			1	1		7
OMO	Concurring								1		_	1															1		l	3
SIMS	Dissenting									1		1						1									1	1	1	6
	Total								2	1	1	3				1		1						1			3	2	1	16
	Majority	-			<u> </u>			<b></b>						1			1			1	1		1				1	1		7
	Concurring									1				1			1			1	1		1				1	1		2
EK	Dissenting													1															1	2
	Total							İ		1				2			1			1	1		1				2	1	1	11

# Workload - Opinions Outstanding At Any Given Time

		0	ctob	er	No	veml	ber	Dee	ceml	ber	Ja	nua	ry	Fel	brua	ıry	N	[arc]	h	A	pril	L	l	May			Ju	ne		
		#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#4	Total
	Majority		1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2		7
ICP	Concurring			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1							1	1	1	1	1	1	1			2
JOK	Dissenting					1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	5
	Total		1	2	2	4	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	5	4	6	6	6	7	7	9	9	8	8	7	6	5	4	1	14
	3.6.																													
	Concurring			1	1	2	2	2	3	4	4	1	2	2	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	1	9
AS	Disconting		1	9	2	1	-	-	2	2	-	2			2	3	2	L Q	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	4
	Total		1	2	2	5	<u>с</u> 8	2 8	11	12	0 11	0	11	11	12	15	14	12	12	12	14	15	15	12	12	11	10	<u> </u>	2	28
	10001		1	3	3	0	0	0	11	12	11	9	11	11	12	10	14	13	13	10	-14	191	13	10	12	11	10		<u> </u>	20
	Majority			1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2		6
	Concurring									1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1		4
AWIN	Dissenting								1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	1									3
	Total			1	1	2	2	2	3	5	5	5	8	8	8	8	7	6	7	7	8	7	7	7	6	6	5	3		13
	3.6.4.	<b>I</b>							-			-			0	0														
	Majority		1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4		7
<b>CT</b>	Disconting		1	4	4	2	2	2	3	4	4	5	10	10	10	10	10	5 Q	5	5	5	10	10	/	/ 8	/	5	4	2	11
	Total		2	<u>4</u> 5	4	4	11	11	14	16	15	17	18	17	18	10	17	16	17	17	18	21	21	20	10	15	14	7	2	27
	1000		-	<u> </u>	5	/	11		-4	10	10	1/	10	1/	10	19	1/	10	1/	1/	10			20	19	-10	-4	/	3	3/
	Majority		1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	7
DRC	Concurring		1	1	1	1	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1									5
KDU	Dissenting						1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1							1
	Total		2	2	2	3	5	5	6	8	7	8	8	7	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	4	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	13
	Majority			1	1	1	0		0	0	0	4	0	0	-	-	_	4	4	4	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	1		0
	Concurring			1	1	1	2	2	3	3 1	3 1	4	3	3	5	5	5	4	4	4	ა ა	4	4	2	2	2	2	1		0
SGB	Dissenting					1	1	-	1	1	-	-	4	4	- + 2	+ 2	- + 2	2	2	2	2 2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	4
	Total			1	1	2	3	3	4	4	4	6	7	7	11	11	11	10	9	9	8	10	10	8	8	8	7	3	1	16
							0	0					/	,					/								,			
	Majority		1	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	4	3	3	3	1	1	8
SAA	Concurring					1	2	2	5	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	1			9
	Dissenting			1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	5	5	4	5	5	6	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	6		13
	Total		1	2	2	3	5	5	9	11	11	13	15	15	14	17	15	15	17	17	17	18	18	16	14	12	12	7	1	30
	Majority		1	1	1	1	2	2	4	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	9	2	0	2	2	0	9	2	0	2	1	— – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –	7
	Concurring		2	2	2	2	2	2	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	1		/ 3
SMS	Dissenting		- 1	-	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	6
	Total		4	4	4	5	6	6	8	6	5	5	3	3	4	6	5	5	5	5	5	7	7	7	6	6	6	3	1	16
																						/								
	Majority			1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	Ţ	7
EK	Concurring		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			2
	Dissenting					1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
	Total		1	2	2	4	4	4	4	5	4	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	2	1	11

# Workload - Slip Pages Released Each Week

		00	ctobe	er	No	vem	ber	De	cem	ber	Ja	nua	ry	Fe	brua	ary	N	larc	h		Apri	1		May	•		Ju	ne		
		#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#4	Total
	Majority									13		16									22	12			17			39		119
JGR	Concurring													1																1
JOK	Dissenting										8													20		7		29	27	91
	Total									13	8	16		1							22	12		20	17	7		68	27	211
	Majonity							1			00				10		1	11							-		15	15	15	05
	Concurring										22				10	F	7	11							/		15	15	15	95
AS	Dissenting									8				1		Э	11			10	19		19	2		20	4	50	6	-3 194
	Total									8	22			1	10	5	18	11		10	12		12	3	7	20	10	65	28	252
	Total									U				1	10	5	10			10	10			5	/	20	9	<u> </u>	20	-J-
	Majority													18		12								14		30		52		126
	Concurring														4												11	1		16
AWIN	Dissenting																3			1	6									10
	Total													18	4	12	3			1	6			14		30	11	53		152
										_																				
	Majority								9				14		13										7		41			84
СТ	Concurring															50	3			2						31	4	20	15	125
	Dissenting									2	11	16		19	11		27			12			4	19	38		30	30	4	223
	Total								9	2	11	16	14	19	24	50	30			14			4	19	45	31	75	50	19	432
	Majority									14		10		20						0			11		1/1				25	112
	Concurring											1	2	20	2		1			9	5		11		14				- 55	113
RBG	Dissenting											-	_		-		-				J		10							10
	Total									14		11	2	20	2		1			9	5		30		14				35	143
																					0		0-						00	- 10
	Majority											16					47		_	16			17				18	14		128
SCR	Concurring																	5			1					1	5			12
300	Dissenting																										19	7	41	67
	Total											16					47	5		16	1		17			1	42	21	41	207
	Majorit	<u> </u>						1				16								<u> </u>			4 -	10					00	166
	Concurring										0	16		4		14	22						45	13	15		41		29	100
SAA	Disconting										2	0		4		14	10			16	0			2	15		18	78		49
	Total										0	3		13		14	00			10	2		4 -	15	15		61	70	- 00	130
	10101										2	19		1/		14	32			10	2		45	15	15		01	/0	- 29	345
	Majority								13		14	8				14								20			19	18		106
CMC	Concurring								3			3															1			7
21/12	Dissenting									10		5															15	13	31	74
	Total								16	10	14	16				14								20			35	31	31	187
	Majority													28			21			18	14		8				8	18	1	115
EK	Concurring									3																	7			10
	Dissenting													19									-					_	25	44
	Total									3				47			21			18	14		8				15	18	25	169

# Workload - Slip Pages Outstanding At Any Given Time

		0	ctob	er	No	vem	ber	De	cem	ber	J٤	nua	ıry	Fe	brua	ary	N	/larc	h		Apri	1		May	7		Ju	ne		
		#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#4	Total
	Majority		13	13	13	29	29	29	46	46	33	33	39	39	39	60	60	60	72	72	72	68	56	56	56	39	39	39		119
ICD	Concurring			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1																1
JOK	Dissenting					7	15	15	15	15	15	27	27	27	27	54	54	54	54	54	83	83	83	83	63	63	56	56	27	91
	Total		13	14	14	37	45	45	62	62	49	61	67	67	66	114	114	114	126	126	155	151	139	139	119	102	95	95	27	211
																				-										
	Majority			12	12	17	17	17	22	32	32	10	21	21	43	33	33	48	37	37	52	52	52	52	52	45	45	30	15	95
AS	Concurring		-			7	7	7	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	16	11	4	4	4	4	11	11	11	11	11	11	7	7	23
	Dissenting		8	9	9	29	37	37	48	48	40	50	63	63	62	104	104	97	100	100	99	91	91	79	76	76	56	56	6	134
	Total		8	21	21	53	61	61	82	92	84	72	96	96	117	153	148	149	141	141	155	154	154	142	139	132	112	93	28	252
	Majority			18	18	18	48	48	48	60	60	60	84	84	66	66	<b>F</b> 4	<b>E</b> 4	68	68	06	06	06	06	80	80	50	50		196
	Concurring			10	10	40	40	40	40	4	4	4	4	4	10	11	54 11	54 11	11	11	12	12	12	12	12	12	54 12	54 1		120
	Dissenting								2	7	7	7	10	10	10	10	10	7	7	7	6							-		10
	Total			18	18	48	48	48	51	67	67	67	08	08	86	87	75	72	86	86	114	108	108	108	04	04	64	53		152
	1000			10	10	- <sup>-</sup>		- <del>1</del> 0	<u>J</u> -	07	0/	0/	90	90	00	0/	/0	/-	00	00		100	100	100	27	1 27	~7	00		-0-
	Majority		9	9	9	9	23	23	23	27	27	44	44	30	43	30	30	37	37	37	48	48	48	48	48	41	41			84
СТ	Concurring					34	34	34	57	84	84	86	86	86	86	90	40	42	42	42	59	70	70	70	70	70	39	35	15	125
	Dissenting		2	47	47	47	65	65	98	109	107	124	132	132	123	116	116	89	116	116	122	125	125	121	102	64	64	34	4	223
	Total		11	56	56	90	122	122	178	220	218	254	262	248	252	236	186	168	195	195	229	243	243	239	220	175	144	69	19	432
	Majority		14	14	14	34	34	34	34	44	30	44	43	43	23	58	58	58	69	69	60	60	60	49	49	35	35	35	35	113
RBG	Concurring		1	1	1	1	3	3	4	6	6	6	10	8	8	6	6	5	5	5	5									11
	Dissenting						19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19							19
	Iotal		15	15	15	35	56	50	57	69	55	69	72	70	50	83	83	82	93	93	84	79	79	49	49	35	35	35	35	143
	Maiority			16	16	16	30	30	63	63	63	70	63	63	80	80	80	51	51	51	35	40	40	32	32	32	32	14		128
COD	Concurring			10	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	12	12	12	12	12	12	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	5	-7		12
SGB	Dissenting														19	19	19	19	19	19	19	67	67	67	67	67	67	48	41	67
	Total			16	16	17	40	40	64	64	64	85	75	75	111	111	111	82	77	77	61	122	122	105	105	105	104	62	41	207
						/						- 0	/0	/0					//	. , ,				- 0	- 0	- 0				- /
	Majority		16	16	16	16	44	44	66	66	66	79	63	63	63	104	104	99	99	99	99	128	128	83	70	70	70	29	29	166
SAA	Concurring					4	6	6	27	39	39	41	41	41	43	43	29	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	17	2	2			49
SAA	Dissenting			13	13	13	13	13	13	25	25	25	66	66	53	58	58	75	84	84	97	96	96	96	96	96	96	78		130
	Total		16	29	29	33	63	63	106	130	130	145	170	170	159	205	191	193	202	202	215	243	243	198	183	168	168	107	29	345
	3.6.4		10	10	1.0	10			10	26	(	10	~ /		~ (	- 0		~ 0					I		~-		~-	-0		10(
	Concurring		13	13	13	13	27	27	49	36	30	42	34	34	34	52	38	38	57	57	57	57	57	57	37	37	37	18		106
SMS	Disconting		10	10	10	15	15	15	15	3	3	3			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		01	7
	Total		10	10	10	15	15	15	15	15	5	5	0.4	0.1	05	49	15	15	15	15	15	59	59	59	59	59	59	44	31	197
	10141		29	29	29	- 34	40	40	/0	54	44	50	34	34	35	00	54	54	/3	/3	/3	117	117	117	97	97	9/	02	31	107
	Majority			28	28	49	49	49	49	67	67	81	81	81	61	61	61	40	58	58	40	34	34	26	26	26	26	18		115
DIZ.	Concurring		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3		7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7			10
EK	Dissenting		-	-	Ū	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19				25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	44
	Total		3	31	31	71	71	71	71	89	86	107	107	107	68	68	68	72	90	90	72	66	66	58	58	58	58	43	25	169
	•	-																												

Term	Signed Opinions After Oral Argument	Summary Reversals	Total
ОТоо	79	6	85
<b>OT01</b>	76	5	81
OT02	73	7	80
ОТоз	74	5	79
ОТ04	76	4	80
ОТо5	71	11	82
ОТоб	68	4	72
ОТо7	69	2	71
ОТо8	75	4	79
ОТо9	72	14	86
OT10	77	5	82
OT11	65	11	76
OT12	73	5	78
OT13	67	6	73
OT14	66	8	74
Average	72	6	79

# **Summary Reversals**



## **Merits Opinions**

This chart places the number of merits opinions from OT14 into historical perspective. The Court released seventy-four merits opinions, including sixtysix signed opinions, which is a dramatic decline from only a few decades ago. Except for the data from OT14, the data in this chart is drawn from the Supreme Court's annual Journals, which have included useful statistics since the 1930s. This chart displays the number of cases disposed of by signed opinion and, unlike most of the tables and graphs in our Stat Pack, counts cases consolidated as separate decisions. The chart runs from October Term 1932 to October Term 2014.



# **Majority Opinion Authorship**

	Total	9-0	8-1	7 <b>-2</b>	6-3	5-4	Average Strength of the Majority*
Roberts	7	1	2	1	1	2	6.9
Scalia	9	2	2	1	1	3	6.9
Kennedy	6	1	-	1	2	2	6.3
Thomas	7	6	-	-	1	-	8.6
Ginsburg	7	2	-	1	1	3	6.6
Breyer	8	2	-	2	1	3	6.6
Alito	8	3	-	2	-	3	7.0
Sotomayor	7	3	-	-	2	2	7.0
Kagan	7	3	1	-	2	1	7.4
	66	23	5	8	11	19	7.1

#### Majority Opinions Authored

#### Authorship as a Percentage of Similar Opinions

	9-0	8-1	7-2	6-3	5-4
Roberts	4%	40%	13%	9%	11%
Scalia	9%	40%	13%	9%	16%
Kennedy	4%	-	13%	18%	11%
Thomas	26%	-	-	9%	-
Ginsburg	9%	-	13%	9%	16%
Breyer	9%	-	25%	9%	16%
Alito	13%	-	25%	-	16%
Sotomayor	13%	-	-	18%	11%
Kagan	13%	20%	-	18%	5%
	100% (23)	100% (5)	100% (8)	100% (11)	100% (19)

### Percentage of Majority Opinions Decided with Unanimous Judgment



#### **Days Between Argument and Opinion**

Majority Opinion Author	Days
Scalia	81d
Sotomayor	85d
Thomas	88d
Ginsburg	88d
Roberts	90d
Breyer	94d
Kagan	104d
Alito	109d
Kennedy	120d
	95d

Argument Sitting	Decided	9-0	8-1	7-2	6-3	5-4	Average Strength of the Majority	Number of Opinions Per Case
October	9	3	1	1	3	1	7.2	2.4
November	9	3	-	1	2	3	6.8	3.0
December	11	6	1	2	1	1	7.3	2.5
January	10	3	-	2	2	3	6.8	3.1
February	11	4	1	-	2	4	6.9	2.5
March	9	3	-	2	1	3	6.9	1.9
April	7	1	2	-	-	4	6.4	3.1
Summary Reversal	8	7	-	1	-	-	8.8	1.5
	74	30	5	9	11	19	7.1	2.5

# Strength of the Majority

# Cases Affirmed by an Equally Divided Court

Term	Total
ОТо5	-
ОТоб	-
ОТо7	2
ОТо8	-
ОТо9	-
OT10	2
OT11	-
OT12	-
OT13	-
OT14	-
Average	0.44

#### Recusals

Justice	Total
Breyer	2
Roberts	-
Scalia	-
Kennedy	-
Thomas	-
Ginsburg	-
Alito	-
Sotomayor	-
Kagan	-
	2

#### **Solo Dissents**

Justice	Total (OT14)	Average* (OT06-OT13)
Thomas	3	1.8
Alito	1	0.5
Sotomayor	1	0.8
Roberts	-	0.0
Scalia	-	0.9
Kennedy	-	0.1
Ginsburg	-	1.1
Breyer	-	0.4
Kagan	-	0.0
	5	6.4

### Unanimity

To take a closer look at unanimity at the Court, we created three distinct measures of unanimity. The measures of unanimity are defined as follows:

**Measure #1**: When all Justices simply voted for the same judgment -i.e., whether to affirm or reverse the judgment below. This is the broadest measure of unanimity because it allows for Justices to write separate opinions - and sometimes even conflicting ones - as long as each Justice voted to affirm or reverse the decision below.

Measure #2: When all Justices joined some part of the same majority opinion, but one or more Justices (1) wrote separately to state an individual position or (2) did not join the majority opinion in full.

**Measure #3**: When all Justices join a single majority opinion in full, and without any Justices writing separate concurring opinions. This is the narrowest measure of unanimity because it requires that the Justices agree in full and without any written reservations or additions.

	Measure #3	All Justices In Total Agreement	19	25%
	Measure #2	All Justices Join The Majority Opinion	5	7%
	Measure #1	All Justices Vote For the Same Judgment	6	8%
	Total		30	40%

Divided	Justices Disagree On Whether To Affirm, Reverse, Or Vacate The Decision Below	45	60%
---------	--	----	-----

\* Note that Measure #2 incorporates the cases captured in Measure #1, just as Measure #3 captures those cases included in Measures #1 and #2. For more information on our measures of unanimity, see Kedar S. Bhatia, *A Few Notes On Unanimity*, SCOTUSBLOG (July 10, 2014 10:40 AM), http://www.scotusblog.com/2014/07/a-few-notes-on-unanimity/.

## Unanimity

To take a closer look at unanimity at the Court, we created three distinct measures of unanimity. The measures of unanimity are defined as follows:

**Measure #1**: Where all Justices simply voted for the same judgment, *i.e.*, whether to affirm or reverse the judgment below. This is the broadest measure of unanimity because it allows for Justices to write separate opinions — and sometimes even conflicting ones — as long as each Justices voted to affirm or reverse the decision below.

**Measure #2**: Where all Justices joined some part of the same majority opinion, but one or more Justices (1) wrote separately to state their individual positions or (2) did not join the majority opinion in full.

**Measure #3**: Where all Justices join a single majority opinion in full, and without any Justices writing separate concurring opinions. This is the narrowest measure of unanimity because it requires that the Justices agree in full and without any written reservations or additions.



## Frequency in the Majority

The following charts measure how frequently each Justice has voted with the majority during October Term 2014. The charts include summary reversals but do not include cases that were dismissed.

Justice	Votes	Freq	uency in Majority	OT13	OT12	<b>OT11</b>	<b>OT10</b>	ОТо9	ОТо8	ОТо7
Breyer	72	66	92%	88%	83%	76%	79%	78%	75%	79%
Sotomayor	74	66	89%	82%	79%	80%	81%	84%	-	-
Kennedy	74	65	88%	92%	91%	93%	94%	91%	92%	86%
Ginsburg	74	64	86%	85%	79%	70%	74%	80%	70%	75%
Kagan	74	63	85%	92%	81%	82%	81%	-	-	-
Roberts	74	59	80%	92%	86%	92%	91%	91%	81%	90%
Alito	74	53	72%	88%	79%	83%	86%	87%	81%	82%
Scalia	74	51	69%	90%	78%	82%	86%	87%	84%	81%
Thomas	74	45	61%	88%	79%	86%	88%	83%	81%	75%

#### All Cases

#### **Divided Cases**

Justice	Votes	Free	uency in Majority	OT13	OT12	<b>OT11</b>	OT10	ОТо9	ОТо8	ОТо7
Breyer	42	36	86%	64%	67%	57%	60%	58%	62%	68%
Sotomayor	44	36	82%	46%	59%	64%	64%	69%	-	-
Kennedy	44	35	80%	84%	83%	88%	88%	83%	89%	79%
Ginsburg	44	34	77%	56%	60%	45%	50%	63%	55%	65%
Kagan	44	33	75%	75%	63%	67%	67%	-	-	-
Roberts	44	29	66%	76%	73%	86%	83%	83%	72%	73%
Alito	44	23	52%	63%	59%	69%	74%	76%	72%	75%
Scalia	44	21	48%	72%	58%	67%	74%	76%	76%	65%
Thomas	44	15	34%	64%	60%	74%	76%	67%	72%	85%

# 5-4 Cases

#### Alignment of the Majority

Majority	19	Cases
Kennedy, Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan	8	Alabama Black Caucus, Wong, Brumfield, Kingsley, Patel, Inclusive Comm., Obergefell, Arizona Legislature
Roberts, Scalia, Kennedy, Thomas, Alito	5	Din, Ayala, Horne, Michigan, Glossip
Roberts, Ginsburg, Breyer, Alito, Sotomayor	2	Dart Cherokee, Yates
Roberts, Scalia, Thomas, Breyer, Alito	1	Armstrong
Roberts, Kennedy, Alito, Breyer, Sotomayor	1	Wynne
Roberts, Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan	1	Williams-Yulee
Thomas, Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan	1	Walker

Term	Number of 5-4 Opinions	Percentage of Total Opinions	Percentage of 5-4 Split Ideological	Conservative Victory* (Percentage of Ideological)	Conservative Victory (Percentage of All 5-4)	Number of Different Alignments
ОТо5	11	12%	73%	63%	45%	7
ОТоб	24	33%	79%	68%	54%	6
ОТо7	12	17%	67%	50%	33%	6
ОТо8	23	29%	70%	69%	48%	7
ОТо9	16	19%	69%	73%	50%	7
OT10	16	20%	88%	71%	63%	4
OT11	15	20%	67%	50%	33%	7
OT12	23	29%	35%	63%	43%	7
OT13	10	14%	60%	67%	40%	7
OT14	19	26%	68%	38%	26%	7
Average	17	22%	67%	61%	44%	7

\* For the purposes of this chart, a "Conservative Win" occurs whenever the majority consists of Chief Justice Roberts and Justices Scalia, Kennedy, Thomas, and O'Connor or Alito.

### 5-4 Cases

Justice	Cases Decided	Freq	uency in Majority	OT13	OT12	<b>OT11</b>	OT10	ОТо9	ОТо8	ОТо7
Kennedy	19	14	74%	100%	87%	80%	88%	69%	78%	67%
Breyer	19	14	74%	50%	48%	47%	31%	38%	39%	45%
Sotomayor	19	13	68%	30%	39%	47%	38%	43%	-	-
Ginsburg	19	12	63%	40%	43%	33%	38%	25%	52%	50%
Roberts	19	10	53%	70%	61%	67%	63%	56%	48%	58%
Kagan	19	10	53%	50%	43%	40%	38%	-	-	-
Alito	19	9	47%	60%	57%	60%	63%	63%	52%	50%
Thomas	19	7	37%	50%	65%	67%	75%	69%	65%	67%
Scalia	19	6	32%	50%	60%	60%	69%	69%	70%	58%

#### Membership in a Five-to-Four Majority

#### **Five-to-Four Majority Opinion Authorship**

These percentages consider how often a Justice authors the majority opinion when that Justice is in the majority.\*

Justice	Cases Decided	Frequency in the Majority	Opinions Authored	Frequency as Author	OT13	OT12	<b>OT11</b>	OT10	ОТо9	ОТо8	ОТо7
Scalia	19	6	3	50%	0%	23%	0%	9%	18%	33%	29%
Alito	19	9	3	33%	33%	46%	33%	0%	40%	8%	17%
Ginsburg	19	12	3	25%	0%	10%	о%	33%	50%	27%	о%
Breyer	19	14	3	21%	0%	18%	43%	20%	25%	0%	40%
Roberts	19	10	2	20%	14%	14%	10%	30%	22%	18%	14%
Sotomayor	19	13	2	15%	0%	22%	29%	17%	0%	-	-
Kennedy	19	14	2	14%	30%	20%	33%	21%	22%	28%	50%
Kagan	19	10	1	10%	60%	10%	17%	0%	-	-	-
Thomas	19	7	0	0%	20%	13%	о%	33%	9%	13%	13%

\* Percentages represent the number of majority opinions authored divided by the number of times a Justice was in the majority for a *signed* opinion.





\*The conservative line includes the combination of Kennedy, Rehnquist/Roberts, O'Connor/Alito, Scalia, and Thomas; the liberal line counts the combination of Kennedy, Stevens/Kagan, Souter/Sotomayor, Ginsburg, and Breyer. All other alignments of five-Justice majorities are grouped into the "other" category.

### 5-4 Case Majorities

#### **Majority Opinion Distribution by Senior Justices - OT14**

For each case decided with a merits opinion, the author of the majority opinion is selected by the most senior Justice who votes with the majority. For example, in *United States v. Wong*, a 5-4 decision in which Justices Kennedy, Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan voted in the majority, Justice Kennedy (the most senior Justice in the majority) assigned authorship duties to Justice Kagan (the author of the majority opinion). The tables below demonstrate how the five most senior Justices on the Court assigned majority opinions during OT14 when they had the chance. For unanimous cases we have showed only statistics for Chief Justice Roberts because he is always the most senior Justice in the majority for unanimous opinions.

**Unanimous** Cases

	Roberts Scalia		Scalia Kennedy			The	Thomas Ginsbur			Bre	eyer	A	lito	Soto	mayor	or Kagan		
Roberts* (23)	1	4%	2	9%	1	4%	6	26%	2	9%	2	9%	3	13%	3	13%	3	13%

#### **Divided Cases**

	Roberts Scalia		Kennedy	Thomas	Ginsburg	Breyer	Alito	Sotomayor	Kagan
Roberts (28)	6 21%	7 25%	1 4%	1 4%	4 14%	2 7%	5 18%	0 0%	2 7%
	Scalia (2)	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 50%	1 50%
		Kennedy (12)	4 <b>33%</b>	0 0%	1 <b>8%</b>	3 <b>25%</b>	0 0%	3 25%	1 8%
			Thomas (1)	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
				Ginsburg (0)	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

\* The only instance in which the Chief Justice would not be the most senior Justice in the majority of a unanimous decision is when he is recused. He was not recused in any unanimous decisions during OT14.

#### **Majority Opinion Distribution by Senior Justice - OT10 through OT14**

Like the tables on the previous page, the tables below show how each of the most senior Justices assigned majority opinion authorship duties when they were, in fact, the most senior Justice in the majority. Unlike the tables above, however, the information on this page covers OT10-OT14.

	Rob	Roberts Scalia		alia	Kennedy Thomas			mas	Ginsburg Breyer			Alito		Sotomayor		Kagan		
Roberts* (113)	11	10%	16	14%	6	5%	16	14%	18	16%	9	8%	10	9%	11	10%	16	14%

**Divided Cases** 

#### **Unanimous Cases**

	Rob	oerts	Sca	alia	Ken	nedy	Tho	mas	Gins	burg	Bre	eyer	Al	ito	Sotor	nayor	Ka	gan
Roberts (124)	19	15%	15	12%	18	15%	13	10%	10	8%	12	10%	20	16%	8	6%	9	7%
	Scalia (8)		3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3	38%	1	13%
			Kenne	dy (28)	10	36%	0	0%	2	7%	8	29%	0	0%	5	18%	3	11%
					Thom	as (3)	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
							Ginsb	urg (0)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

<sup>\*</sup> Chief Justice Roberts was recused in two unanimous cases during the past four Terms. Justice Scalia assigned one of those opinions, *Microsoft v. i4i Limited Partnership*, to Justice Sotomayor and the other, *Credit Suisse (USA) v. Simmonds*, to himself.

	Sca	alia	Ken	nedy	The	omas	Gin	sburg	Bre	eyer	A	lito	Soto	mayor	Ka	gan	Total
	53	72%	44	59%	34	46%	41	55%	44	61%	48	65%	42	<b>5</b> 7%	42	<b>5</b> 7%	
Roberts	59	80%	49	66%	47	64%	49	66%	51	71%	52	70%	50	68%	47	64%	
	62	84%	52	70%	52	70%	51	69%	52	72%	60	81%	51	69%	48	65%	74
	12	16%	22	30%	22	30%	23	31%	20	28%	14	19%	23	31%	26	35%	
			40	54%	42	57%	35	47%	37	51%	40	54%	33	45%	40	54%	
	Scalia		46	62%	53	72%	41	55%	42	58%	49	66%	40	54%	45	61%	
			52	70%	58	78%	43	58%	45	63%	58	78%	43	58%	48	65%	'/4
			22	30%	16	22%	31	42%	27	38%	16	22%	31	42%	26	35%	
					29	39%	48	65%	53	74%	41	55%	55	74%	53	72%	1
		ŀ	Kenned	ly	41	55%	55	74%	56	78%	49	66%	60	81%	59	80%	
					48	65%	57	77%	57	79%	52	70%	61	82%	60	81%	'/4
					26	35%	17	23%	15	21%	22	30%	13	18%	14	19%	
							25	34%	26	36%	39	53%	23	31%	25	34%	
				]	Гһота	IS	34	46%	31	43%	53	72%	31	42%	33	45%	
							41	55%	37	51%	60	81%	37	50%	40	54%	'/4
							33	45%	35	49%	14	19%	37	50%	34	46%	
									61	85%	29	39%	59	80%	61	82%	
						G	linsbu	rg	67	93%	38	51%	65	88%	68	92%	
									68	94%	43	58%	68	92%	69	93%	74
									4	6%	31	42%	6	8%	5	7%	
											32	44%	62	86%	61	85%	
	К	ey							Breye	r	41	57%	66	92%	68	94%	
	Fully	Agree									45	63%	68	94%	68	94%	/2
A	gree in F	ull or Pa	art								27	38%	4	6%	4	6%	
Agree in F	ull, Part,	or Judg	gment C	nly									31	42%	31	42%	
Dis	sagree in	Judgm	ent								Alito		41	55%	39	53%	
					-								45	61%	42	57%	74
													29	39%	32	43%	
															62	84%	
												Se	otoma	yor	65	88%	
															67	01%	74

# Justice Agreement - All Cases

9%

7

	Sc	alia	Ken	nedy	The	omas	Gins	sburg	Br	eyer	A	lito	Soto	mayor	Ka	gan	Total
	27	61%	18	41%	9	20%	17	39%	19	45%	22	50%	19	43%	16	36%	
Roberts	33	75%	20	45%	22	50%	22	50%	23	55%	23	52%	21	48%	19	43%	
	32	73%	22	50%	22	50%	21	48%	22	52%	30	68%	21	48%	18	41%	44
	12	27%	22	50%	22	50%	23	52%	20	48%	14	32%	23	52%	26	59%	
			16	36%	16	36%	11	25%	14	33%	15	34%	12	27%	16	36%	
	Sc	alia	19	43%	27	61%	14	32%	16	38%	22	50%	13	30%	19	43%	
			22	50%	28	64%	13	30%	15	36%	28	64%	13	30%	18	41%	44
			22	50%	16	36%	31	70%	27	64%	16	36%	31	70%	26	59%	
					6	14%	24	55%	26	62%	15	34%	29	66%	28	64%	
			Ken	nedy	15	34%	27	61%	27	64%	19	43%	30	68%	30	68%	
					18	41%	27	61%	27	64%	22	50%	31	70%	30	<b>68%</b>	44
					26	59%	17	39%	15	36%	22	50%	13	30%	14	32%	
							4	9%	3	7%	15	34%	2	5%	3	7%	
					The	omas	9	20%	6	14%	27	61%	5	11%	8	18%	
							11	25%	7	17%	30	68%	7	16%	10	23%	44
							33	75%	35	83%	14	32%	37	84%	34	77%	
									35	83%	6	14%	34	77%	36	82%	
							Gins	sburg	38	90%	10	23%	37	84%	39	89%	44
									38	90%	13	30%	38	86%	39	89%	44
									4	10%	31	70%	6	14%	5	11%	
											8	19%	35	83%	35	83%	
	K	ey							Bre	eyer	12	29%	37	88%	38	90%	12
	Fully	Agree									15	36%	38	90%	38	90%	4-
Ag	gree in F	Full or Pa	rt								27	64%	4	10%	4	10%	
Agree in Fu	ıll, Part	, or Judg	ment C	Only									8	18%	6	14%	
Dis	agree in	ı Judgmo	ent								A	lito	11	25%	10	23%	11
													15	34%	12	27%	44
													29	66%	32	73%	
															36	82%	
													Soto	mayor	36	82%	
															37	84%	44

# Justice Agreement - Non-Unanimous Cases

16%

7

	Scalia Kennedy		nedy	The	Thomas Ginsburg		Br	eyer	er Alito		Sotomayor		Ka	Kagan			
	11	58%	5	26%	4	21%	2	11%	3	16%	13	68%	4	21%	1	5%	
Roberts	15	79%	6	32%	14	74%	4	21%	6	32%	13	68%	4	21%	2	11%	10
	15	79%	7	37%	14	74%	3	16%	5	26%	18	95%	4	21%	1	5%	19
	4	21%	12	63%	5	26%	16	84%	14	74%	1	5%	15	79%	18	95%	
			5	26%	9	47%	0	0%	0	0%	8	42%	0	0%	2	11%	
	Sc	calia	7	37%	18	95%	2	11%	2	11%	12	63%	0	0%	4	21%	10
			9	47%	18	95%	1	5%	1	5%	16	84%	0	0%	3	16%	19
			10	53%	1	5%	18	95%	18	95%	3	16%	19	100%	16	84%	
					1	5%	9	47%	9	47%	6	32%	10	53%	11	58%	
			Ken	nedy	6	32%	10	53%	10	53%	7	37%	10	53%	12	63%	10
					8	<b>42%</b>	9	47%	9	47%	8	42%	10	53%	11	58%	19
					11	58%	10	53%	10	53%	11	58%	9	47%	8	42%	
							1	5%	1	5%	3	16%	1	5%	2	11%	
					The	omas	2	11%	3	16%	12	63%	1	5%	4	21%	10
							2	11%	2	11%	15	79%	1	5%	4	21%	19
							17	89%	17	89%	4	21%	18	95%	15	79%	
									16	84%	1	5%	15	79%	15	79%	
							Gin	sburg	17	89%	2	11%	17	89%	17	89%	
								_	17	89%	2	11%	18	95%	17	89%	19
									2	11%	17	89%	1	5%	2	11%	
											2	11%	15	79%	13	68%	
	К	Key							Br	eyer	4	21%	17	89%	15	79%	
	Fully	Agree								•	4	21%	18	95%	15	79%	19
Ag	gree in I	Full or Pa	ırt								15	79%	1	5%	4	21%	
Agree in Fu	ull, Part	t, or Judg	ment C	Only									2	11%	0	0%	
Dis	sagree i	n Judem	ent	2							A	lito	2	11%	1	5%	
													3	16%	0	0%	19
													16	84%	19	100%	
														- 1. 0	15	70%	
													Soto	mavor	15	79%	
													~~~	<b>~</b> , <b>~</b> 1	16	84%	19

# Justice Agreement - 5-4 Cases

16%

3

### Justice Agreement - Highs and Lows

The following tables list the Justice pairs with the highest and lowest agreement rates based on our three metrics for Justice agreement - *i.e.*, all cases, non-unanimous cases, and 5-4 cases only - when Justices agree in full, part, or judgment only. Non-unanimous cases are those in which at least one Justice dissented; cases that produced only a majority opinion and one or more concurring opinions are not included in that measure.

		Highest Agreemer	nt		Lowest Agreemer	nt
	1	Ginsburg - Breyer	94.4%	1	Thomas - Sotomayor	50.0%
	2	Breyer - Sotomayor	94.4%	2	Thomas - Breyer	51.4%
	3	Breyer - Kagan	94.4%	3	Thomas - Kagan	54.1%
	4	Ginsburg - Kagan	93.2%	4	Thomas - Ginsburg	55.4%
	5	Ginsburg - Sotomayor	91.9%	5	Alito - Kagan	56.8%
All Cases	6	Sotomayor - Kagan	90.5%	6	Scalia - Ginsburg	58.1%
	7	Roberts - Scalia	83.8%	7	Scalia - Sotomayor	58.1%
	8	Kennedy - Sotomayor	82.4%	8	Ginsburg - Alito	58.1%
	9	Roberts - Alito	81.1%	9	Alito - Sotomayor	60.8%
	10	Kennedy - Kagan	81.1%	10	Scalia - Breyer	62.5%
			04		<b>m</b> ] 0.1	
	1	Ginsburg - Breyer	90.5%	1	Thomas - Sotomayor	15.9%
	2	Breyer - Sotomayor	90.5%	2	Thomas - Breyer	16.7%
	3	Breyer - Kagan	90.5%	3	Thomas - Kagan	22.7%
	4	Ginsburg - Kagan	88.6%	4	Thomas - Ginsburg	25.0%
Divided	5	Ginsburg - Sotomayor	86.4%	5	Alito - Kagan	27.3%
Cases	6	Sotomayor - Kagan	84.1%	6	Scalia - Ginsburg	29.5%
	7	Roberts - Scalia	72.7%	7	Scalia - Sotomayor	29.5%
	8	Kennedy - Sotomayor	70.5%	8	Ginsburg - Alito	29.5%
	9	Roberts - Alito	68.2%	9	Alito - Sotomayor	34.1%
	10	Kennedy - Kagan	68.2%	10	Scalia - Breyer	35.7%
	1	Roberts - Alito	04.7%	1	Scalia - Sotomavor	0.0%
	2	Scalia - Thomas	94.7%	2	Alito - Kagan	0.0%
	2	Ginsburg - Sotomayor	94.7%	2	Roberts - Kagan	5.3%
	1	Brever - Sotomayor	94.7%		Scalia - Ginsburg	5.3%
	т 5	Ginshurg - Brever	80.5%	5	Scalia - Brever	5.3%
5-4 Cases	6	Ginsburg - Kagan	80.5%	6	Thomas - Sotomayor	5.2%
	7	Scalia - Alito	84.2%	7	Thomas - Ginsburg	10.5%
	8	Sotomayor - Kagan	84.2%	8	Thomas - Brever	10.5%
	0	Roberts - Scalia	78.0%	0	Ginsburg - Alito	10.5%
	10	Thomas - Alito	78.9%	10	Roberts - Ginsburg	15.8%

### Time Between Cert. Grant And Oral Argument

The following charts address the number of days between when the Court grants certiorari (or otherwise decides that a case should be argued), and when it hears oral argument in a given case. The typical briefing schedule outlined in the Court's rules allows for 112 days between argument and opinion. The Court typically seeks to avoid compressing the briefing schedule.

Argued	Avg. Days
October	196d
November	189d
December	162d
January	162d
February	140d
March	115d
April	137d
Overall	158d

Average	158d
Median	160d

Shortest	Obergefell	95d
Longest	Johnson	364d

#### Averages

ОТоз	172d
ОТо4	167d
ОТо5	165d
ОТоб	131d
ОТо7	134d
ОТо8	167d
ОТо9	168d
OT10	153d
OT11	160d
OT12	141d
OT13	158d

	Rank		Days	Granted	Argued
	1	Obergefell v. Hodges	95d	Jan 16, 2015	Apr 21, 2015
	2	Glossip v. Gross	96d	Jan 23, 2015	Apr 29, 2015
	2	McFadden v. United States	96d	Jan 16, 2015	Apr 22, 2015
	4	Kingsley v. Hendrickson	102d	Jan 16, 2015	Apr 28, 2015
le e este est	5	Reyes Mata v. Lynch	103d	Jan 16, 2015	Apr 29, 2015
onortest	5	Horne v. Dept. of Agriculture	103d	Jan 16, 2015	Apr 29, 2015
	7	Walker v. Sons of Confed. Vets	108d	Dec 5, 2014	Mar 23, 2015
	8	Kimble v. Marvel	109d	Dec 12, 2014	Mar 31, 2015
	9	Harris v. Viegelahn	110d	Dec 12, 2014	Apr 1, 2015
	9	Bullard v. Blue Hills	110d	Dec 12, 2014	Apr 1, 2015

	Rank		Days	Granted	Argued
	1	Johnson v. U.S.	364d	Apr 21, 2014	Apr 20, 2015
	2	Omnicare v. Laborers Pension Fund	245d	Mar 3, 2014	Nov 3, 2014
	3	Dental Examiners v. FTC	225d	Mar 3, 2014	Oct 14, 2014
	4	Integrity Staffing v. Busk	219d	Mar 3, 2014	Oct 8, 2014
Longoot	4	Warger v. Shauers	219d	Mar 3, 2014	Oct 8, 2014
Longest	6	Holt v. Hobbs	218d	Mar 3, 2014	Oct 7, 2014
	7	Jennings v. Stephens	205d	Mar 24, 2014	Oct 15, 2014
	8	Teva v. Sandoz	198d	Mar 31, 2014	Oct 15, 2014
	8	Mellouli v. Lynch	198d	Jun 30, 2014	Jan 14, 2015
	10	Mach Mining v. EEOC	197d	Jun 30, 2014	Jan 13, 2015

	Less than 100 days	100-124	125-149	150-174	175-199	200-224	225-249	More than 250
OT14	3	16	10	18	13	4	2	1

\* In cases that are on appeal to the Supreme Court, rather than on petition for writ of certiorari, the Court will rule on a statement of jurisdiction rather than on a cert. petition. Our charts treat those cases identically to those decided on cert. petitions, and the "Grant Date" indicates when the Court noted probable jurisdiction or postponed the determination of jurisdiction.

## Time Between Oral Argument and Opinion

The following charts address the time it takes for the Court to release opinions following oral argument. The Court has thus far released sixty-six signed opinions after argument during October Term 2014.

Argued	Avg.	Total	Remain
October	91d	9	-
November	120d	9	-
December	94d	12	-
January	118d	10	-
February	102d	11	-
March	67d	9	-
April	58d	7	-
Overall	95d	67	0

Average	95d
Median	91d

Shortest	Bullard	33d
Longest	Zivotofsky	217d

#### Averages

ОТоз	82d
ОТ04	91d
ОТо5	79d
ОТоб	96d
ОТо7	94d
ОТо8	94d
ОТо9	109d
OT10	106d
OT11	97d
OT12	95d
OT13	95d

	Rank			Author	Vote	Argued	Decided
	1	Bullard v. Blue Hills	33d	Roberts	9-0	Apr 1, 2015	May 4, 2015
	2	Whitfield v. U.S.	42d	Scalia	9-0	Dec 2, 2014	Jan 13, 2015
	3	Gelboim v. BoA	43d	Ginsburg	9-0	Dec 9, 2014	Jan 21, 2015
	4	Reyes Mata v. Lynch	47d	Kagan	8-1	Apr 29, 2015	Jun 15, 2015
howtoot	4	Harris v. Viegelahn	47d	Ginsburg	9-0	Apr 1, 2015	May 18, 2015
onortest	6	Hana Financial v. Hana Bank	49d	Sotomayor	9-0	Dec 3, 2014	Jan 21, 2015
	7	Horne v. Dept. of Agriculture	54d	Roberts	5-4	Apr 29, 2015	Jun 22, 2015
	8	Kingsley v. Hendrickson	55d	Breyer	5-4	Apr 28, 2015	Jun 22, 2015
	9	Commil v. Cisco	56d	Kennedy	6-2	Mar 31, 2015	May 26, 2015
	9	San Francisco v. Sheehan	56d	Alito	6-2	Mar 23, 2015	May 18, 2015

	Rank			Author	Vote	Argued	Decided
	1	Zivotofsky v. Kerry	217d	Kennedy	6-3	Nov 3, 2014	Jun 8, 2015
	2	Comptroller v. Wynne	187d	Alito	5-4	Nov 12, 2014	May 18, 2015
	3	Elonis v. U.S.	182d	Roberts	8-1	Dec 1, 2014	Jun 1, 2015
	4	Reed v. Gilbert	157d	Thomas	9-0	Jan 12, 2015	Jun 18, 2015
Longost	5	TX Housing v. Inclusive Comm.	155d	Kennedy	5-4	Jan 21, 2015	Jun 25, 2015
Longest	6	Omnicare v. Laborers Pension Fu	141d	Kagan	9-0	Nov 3, 2014	Mar 24, 2015
	7	Mellouli v. Lynch	138d	Ginsburg	7-2	Jan 14, 2015	Jun 1, 2015
	8	Dental Examiners v. FTC	134d	Kennedy	6-3	Oct 14, 2014	Feb 25, 2015
	9	AL Black Caucus v. Alabama	133d	Breyer	5-4	Nov 12, 2014	Mar 25, 2015
	9	U.S. v. Wong	133d	Kagan	5-4	Dec 10, 2014	Apr 22, 2015

	Less than 30 days	30-59	60-89	90-119	120-149	150-179	180-209	210-239	More than 240
<b>OT11</b>	2	5	19	24	8	6	1	0	0
OT12	1	15	21	20	8	4	2	1	1
OT13	1	17	20	13	7	5	4	0	0
<b>OT14</b>	0	11	21	21	8	2	2	1	0

	9-0	8-1	7-2	6-3	5-4
OT14	82d	92d	90d	116d	100d

### **Pace of Grants**



\* The Minimum Distribution Pace presented in this chart reflects the number of petitions that must be granted to fill the Court's docket for oral argument while giving the litigants in each case a complete or near-complete briefing schedule. The pace also reflects the number of petitions raised at each conference and other factors affecting the certiorari process.

## **Pace of Opinions**



	ОТо4	ОТо5	ОТоб	ОТо7	ОТо8	ОТо9	OT10	OT11	OT12	OT13	ОТ14	OT15	Ave (OT OT	rage '04- 14)	Range (OT04- OT14)	Calendar Weeks Covered	Grants Per Weeks Covered (OT04-OT14)
Feb #1	10	3	4	2	8	9	3	7	6	4	0	1	5.1		0 - 10	4	1.3
Feb #2	2	4	0	3	3	1	1	0	0	2	5	2	1.9	7.9	0 - 5	1	1.9
Feb #3	0	2	1	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	1	1	0.9		0-3	1	0.9
March #1	2	0	0	0	8	0	4	2	2	3	1	2	2.0		0 - 8	2	1.0
March #2	3	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	2	1	3	1.4	4.5	0-3	1	1.4
March #3	2	1	1	0	2	1	0	2	2	1	1	0	1.2		0 - 2	1	1.2
April #1	1	3	3	0	2	3	4	1	1	2	3	0	2.1		0 - 4	2	1.0
April #2	1	5	0	1	2	3	2	0	0	1	2	2	1.5	4.9	0 - 5	1	1.5
April #3	0	2	1	1	0	4	0	2	1	1	2	1	1.3		0 - 4	1	1.3
May #1	0	2	4	0	1	4	1	1	0	1	1	1	1.4		0-4	2	0.7
May #2	3	1	0	3	0	1	5	1	1	5	1	3	1.9	4.5	0 - 5	1	1.9
May #3	1	1	1	4	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	1.3		0-4	1	1.3
June #1	1	1	4	1	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	3	1.3		0-4	1	1.3
June #2	3	1	1	3	3	4	4	4	2	1	2	2	2.5	15.2	1 - 4	1	2.5
June #3	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	4	1	4	3	1	2.5	10.2	1 - 4	1	2.5
Final June	9	7	5	5	9	7	7	13	10	12	13	4	8.8		5 - 13	1	8.8
Oct #1	8	11	9	17	10	11	13	7	9	8	12		10.5		7 - 17	13	0.8
Oct #2	7	3	2	0	1	5	7	2	7	2	0		3.3	15.5	0-7	2	1.6
Oct #3	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	4	1	2	3		1.7		1-4	1	1.7
Nov #1	2	4	4	2	2	3	5	1	4	1	0		2.5		0 - 5	2	1.3
Nov #2	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	5	1	0	4		1.5	6.1	0 - 5	1	1.5
Nov #3	0	2	0	1	5	1	2	3	4	2	2		2.0		0 - 5	1	2.0
Dec #1	1	3	0	3	2	3	3	4	3	4	2		2.5		0-4	1	2.5
Dec #2	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	2	1	3		2.0	8.2	1 - 3	2	1.0
Dec #3	4	2	5	6	2	3	3	5	5	2	3		3.6		2 - 6	1	3.6
Jan #1	9	6	7	6	4	1	5	1	3	8	0		4.5		0-9	4	1.1
Jan #2	2	1	4	4	6	5	0	0	6	3	6		3.4	9.2	0 - 6	1	3.4
Jan #3	0	1	7	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	1		1.3		0-7	1	1.3
Total	75	75	72	73	79	81	79	76	76	77	73	26	76.3	76.0	72 - 81	52	

	ОТоб	ОТо7	ОТо8	ОТо9	OT10	OT11	OT12	OT13	OT14	Ave (OTo6	rage -OT13)	Range (OT06-OT13)
Oct #1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0		0 - 0
Oct #2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.4	0 - 1
Oct #3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.3		0 - 1
Nov #1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0.4		0 - 2
Nov #2	0	1	1	1	1	3	1	0	2	1.0	1.9	0 - 3
Nov #3	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0.5		0 - 1
Dec #1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	3	0	0.9		0-3
Dec #2	1	2	0	5	0	0	1	2	2	1.4	3.6	0 - 5
Dec #3	2	3	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	1.4		0-3
Jan #1	4	3	4	4	2	7	4	3	4	3.9		2 - 7
Jan #2	1	3	5	5	3	4	1	1	6	2.9	9.6	1 - 5
Jan #3	3	1	6	1	4	4	1	3	1	2.9		1 - 6
Feb #1	5	5	5	5	4	7	9	6	3	5.8		4 - 9
Feb #2	1	2	3	3	6	1	4	5	2	3.1	10.8	1 - 6
Feb #3	2	1	4	2	3	1	1	1	2	1.9		1 - 4
March #1	1	2	2	1	3	7	4	3	4	2.9		1-7
March #2	2	2	5	5	2	5	3	2	3	3.3	7.4	2 - 5
March #3	2	1	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	1.3		0 - 2
April #1	5	5	4	4	2	4	4	4	3	4.0		2 - 5
April #2	3	1	4	3	2	2	1	3	2	2.4	8.6	1 - 4
April #3	5	1	4	2	2	0	1	3	1	2.3		0 - 5
May #1	1	1	2	3	3	1	3	1	6	1.9		1 - 3
May #2	5	4	3	6	6	5	4	5	3	4.8	9.1	3 - 6
May #3	1	3	2	5	2	2	2	3	5	2.5		1 - 5
June #1	4	3	5	4	8	2	3	5	1	4.3		2 - 8
June #2	8	9	6	9	9	2	7	6	9	7.0		2 - 9
June #3	6	7	7	10	10	8	8	8	8	8.0	25.5	6 - 10
June #4	8	10	2	5	5	5	12	3	3	6.3		2 - 12
Total	72	70	79	86	82	75	78	73	73	76.9	76.9	70 - 86

# **Opinions Per Week**

## **Oral Argument - Justices**

For our purposes, the number of "questions" per argument is simply the number of times a given Justice's name appears in the argument transcript in capital letters. To account for the Chief Justice's administrative comments – such as his call for an advocate to begin – his tally for each case has been uniformly reduced by three "questions."

# Average Number of Questions

Per Argument	-
--------------	---

	Average
Scalia	22.0
Sotomayor	19.0
Breyer	17.5
Roberts	13.8
Kagan	12.7
Ginsburg	11.1
Kennedy	10.1
Alito	9.4
Thomas	0.0

#### **Most Active Arguments**

	Argument	Number of Questions (% of all Questions)
Roberts	Michigan v. EPA	36 (18%)
Scalia	Michigan v. EPA	51 (25%)
Kennedy	Los Angeles v. Patel	32 (16%)
Thomas	N/A	N/A
Ginsburg	Gelboim v. BoA	34 (17%)
Breyer	Bullard v. Blue Hills	41 (20%)
Alito	Obergefell v. Hodges	42 (21%)
Sotomayor	Obergefell v. Hodges	58 (29%)
Kagan	Obergefell v. Hodges	41 (20%)

#### Frequency as the Top Questioner or as a Top 3 Questioner

	Freq. Top 1	Freq. Top 3
Scalia	43%	62%
Sotomayor	26%	51%
Breyer	23%	42%
Ginsburg	4%	18%
Kagan	4%	13%
Roberts	3%	10%
Kennedy	3%	6%
Alito	1%	12%
Thomas	0%	0%

#### **Frequency as the First Questioner**

	Frequency								
Ginsburg	20	/68	29%						
Sotomayor	14	/68	21%						
Scalia	12	/68	18%						
Kennedy	11	/68	16%						
Roberts	5	/68	7%						
Kagan	4	/68	6%						
Alito	2	/68	3%						
Thomas	0	/68	0%						
Breyer	0	/66	0%						

#### **Oral Argument - Advocates**

#### Overview

	<b>OT10</b>	<b>OT11</b>	OT12	OT13	<b>OT14</b>
Number of different advocates	143	118	120	121	112
Number of total appearances	196	182	193	185	178

Appearances by Advocates Who	<b>OT10</b>	<b>OT11</b>	OT12	OT13	OT14
Are from the Office of the Solicitor	57	58	64	61	56
General	(29%)	(32%)	(33%)	(33%)	(31%)
Have experience in the Office of the Solicitor General	Not	Not	Not	85	78
	Available	Available	Available	(47%)	(46%)
Have argued at least twice during the Term	81	98	104	96	104
	(41%)	(54%)	(54%)	(52%)	(58%)
Are "expert" Supreme Court	Not	Not	137	131	116
litigators*	Available	Available	(71%)	(71%)	(66%)
Are based in	106	122	125	119	101
Washington, D.C.**	(54%)	(67%)	(65%)	(64%)	(57%)
Are female	33	27	33	28	34
	(17%)	(15%)	(17%)	(15%)	(19%)
Are female and not from the	19	14	17	11	17
Office of the Solicitor General***	(14%)	(11%)	(13%)	(9%)	(14%)

#### Most Popular Advocate Origins

State	Total
Washington, D.C.	101
Texas	12
California	10
Maryland	6
New York	5

#### Most Popular Supreme Court Clerkships

Clerkship	Appearances	Advocates
Antonin Scalia	18	8
William Brennan	12	5
Stephen Breyer	9	5
Ruth Bader Ginsburg	7	5
John Paul Stevens	7	2

#### **Most Popular Law Schools**

Law School	Appearances	Advocates
Harvard	36	21
Yale	27	15
Texas	10	8
Chicago	11	7
NYU	8	6

\* We adopt Richard Lazarus's definition of an "expert" Supreme Court litigator: one who has argued five or more times before the Supreme Court or works in an office where lawyers have collectively argued more than ten times. See Richard J. Lazarus, Advocacy Matters Before and Within the Supreme Court: Transforming the Court by Transforming the Bar, 97 GEO. L.J. 1487, 1490 n.17 (2008).

\*\* An advocate's "origin" is simply the state of origin listed for an advocate on the Court's monthly hearing lists. If attorneys from the Office of the Solicitor General are omitted, lawyers based in Washington, D.C., have appeared forty-five times during OT14.

\*\*\* The percentage figures for this category omit all advocates from the Office of the Solicitor General. As such, they demonstrate the percentage of female advocates from positions other than those within the Office of the Solicitor General as a percentage of all men or women arguing from positions other than those within the Office of the Solicitor General.

#### Advocates Who Have Appeared More than Once During OT14

D 1-	Nama	Арреа	rances	De stitte s	L. Calcal	Supreme Court	U.S. Solicitor General
капк	Name*	OT14	All-Time	Position	Law School	Clerkship	Experience
1	Donald B. Verrilli, Jr.	7	43	Solicitor General	Columbia	William Brennan	Yes
2	Edwin S. Kneedler	4	129	Deputy Solicitor General	Virginia	None	Yes
	Seth P. Waxman	4	73	WilmerHale LLP	Yale	None	Yes
	Thomas C. Goldstein	4	35	Goldstein & Russell PC	American	None	No
	Jeffrey L. Fisher	4	27	Stanford Supreme Court Clinic	Michigan	John Paul Stevens	No
6	Michael R. Dreeben	3	96	Deputy Solicitor General	Duke	None	Yes
	Paul D. Clement	3	77	Bancroft PLLC	Harvard	Antonin Scalia	Yes
	Malcolm L. Stewart	3	70	Deputy Solicitor General	Yale	Harry Blackmun	Yes
	Neal K. Katyal	3	24	Hogan Lovells LLP	Yale	Stephen Breyer	Yes
	Nicole A. Saharsky	3	23	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Minnesota	None	Yes
	Curtis E. Gannon	3	20	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Chicago	Antonin Scalia	Yes
	Anthony A. Yang	3	20	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Yale	None	Yes
	Kannon K. Shanmugam	3	17	Williams & Connolly LLP	Harvard	Antonin Scalia	Yes
	Ginger D. Anders	3	15	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Columbia	Ruth Bader Ginsburg	Yes
	Sarah E. Harrington	3	14	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Harvard	None	Yes
	Eric J. Feigin	3	12	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Stanford	Stephen Breyer	Yes
	Ann O'Connell	3	11	Assistant to the Solicitor General	George Washington	John Roberts	Yes
	Ian H. Gershengorn	3	8	Principal Deputy Solicitor General	Harvard	John Paul Stevens	Yes
	John F. Bash	3	6	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Harvard	Antonin Scalia	Yes
20	Carter G. Phillips	2	80	Sidley Austin LLP	Northwestern	Warren Burger	Yes
	David C. Frederick	2	44	Kellogg Huber PLLC	Texas	Byron White	Yes
	Eric Schnapper	2	21	University of Washington	Yale	None	No
	Douglas Hallward-Driemeier	2	16	Ropes & Gray LLP	Harvard	None	Yes
	William M. Jay	2	13	Goodwin Procter LLP	Harvard	Antonin Scalia	Yes
	E. Joshua Rosenkranz	2	10	Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP	Georgetown	William Brennan	No
	John P. Elwood	2	9	Vinson & Elkins LLP	Yale	Anthony Kennedy	Yes
	Elaine J. Goldenberg	2	6	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Harvard	None	Yes
	Stephen R. McAllister	2	6	Solicitor General of Kansas	Kansas	Clarence Thomas	No
	Jonathan D. Hacker	2	4	O'Melveney & Myers LLP	Michigan	None	No
	Brian H. Fletcher	2	3	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Harvard	Ruth Bader Ginsburg	Yes
	Rachel P. Kovner	2	3	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Stanford	Antonin Scalia	Yes
	Roman Martinez	2	3	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Yale	John Roberts	Yes
	Andrew L. Brasher	2	2	Solicitor General of Alabama	Harvard	None	No
	Allyson N. Ho	2	2	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	Chicago	Sandra Day O'Connor	No
	Scott A. Keller	2	2	Solicitor General of Texas	Texas	Anthony Kennedy	No
	Aaron D. Lindstrom	2	2	Solicitor General of Michigan	Chicago	None	No
	Katherine M. Menendez	2	2	Assistant Federal Defender	NYU	None	No
	Total: 37	26					

\* Yellow indicates that an advocate currently works in the Office of the Solicitor General. Blue indicates that an advocate has prior experience in the Office of the Solicitor General. For the purposes of this chart, we do not consider whether an advocate served as a Bristow Fellow.

# **Voting Alignment - All Cases**

Cases are sorted by date of decision. Dissenting Justices are shaded in gray and the author of the majority opinion is highlighted in red.

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Johnson v. City of Shelby	November 10, 2014	9-0	Per Curiam									
Carroll v. Carman	November 10, 2014	9-0	Per Curiam						<b>E</b>		3	
Glebe v. Frost	November 17, 2014	9-0	Per Curiam									
Integrity Staffing Solutions v. Busk	December 9, 2014	9-0	Thomas			6			<b>E</b>			
Warger v. Shauers	December 9, 2014	9-0	Sotomayor									
Heien v. North Carolina	December 15, 2014	8-1	Roberts			6						
Dart Cherokee Basin v. Owens	December 15, 2014	5-4	Ginsburg			Carlos Carlos		(See			3	
Jesinoski v. Countrywide Home Loans	January 13, 2015	9-0	Scalia									
Whitfield v. United States	January 13, 2015	9-0	Scalia								6	

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Jennings v. Stephens	January 14, 2015	6-3	Scalia			<b>S</b>				and the second		
T-Mobile South v. Roswell	January 14, 2015	6-3	Sotomayor			<b>E</b>						
Teva Pharmaceuticals USA Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.	January 20, 2015	7-2	Breyer			<b>I</b>			<b>S</b>		3	
Holt v. Hobbs	January 20, 2015	9-0	Alito			<b>E</b>			<b>S</b>		3	
Christeson v. Roper	January 20, 2015	7-2	Per Curiam			<b>E</b>					3	
Department of Homeland Security v. MacLean	January 21, 2015	7-2	Roberts			<b>O</b>						
Gelboim v. Bank of America Corporation	January 21, 2015	9-0	Ginsburg			<b>E</b>						
Hana Financial, Inc. v. Hana Bank	January 21, 2015	9-0	Sotomayor			<b>E</b>						
M&G Polymers USA v. Tackett	January 26, 2015	9-0	Thomas								3	

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
M&G Polymers USA v. Tackett	January 26, 2015	9-0	Thomas									
North Carolina Board of Dental Examiners v. Federal Trade Commission	February 25, 2015	6-3	Kennedy									
Yates v. United States	February 25, 2015	5-4	Ginsburg									
Direct Marketing Association v. Brohl	March 3, 2015	9-0	Thomas						<b>E</b>			
Alabama Department of Revenue v. CSX Transportation	March 4, 2015	7-2	Scalia			<b>E</b>						
Department of Transportation v. Association of American Railroads	March 9, 2015	9-0	Kennedy									
Perez v. Mortgage Bankers Association	March 9, 2015	9-0	Sotomayor									
B&B Hardware v. Hargins Industries	March 24, 2015	7-2	Alito									
Omnicare v. Laborers District Counsel Construction Industry Pension Fund	March 24, 2015	9-0	Kagan								3	

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Young v. United Parcel Service	March 25, 2015	6-3	Breyer									
Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama	March 25, 2015	5-4	Breyer									
Grady v. North Carolina	March 30, 2015	9-0	Per Curiam			<b>O</b>						
Woods v. Donald	March 30, 2015	9-0	Per Curiam			6						
Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Center	March 31, 2015	5-4	Scalia									
Rodriguez v. United States	April 21, 2015	6-3	Ginsburg			6						
Oneok v. Learjet	April 21, 2015	7-2	Breyer								3	
United States v. Wong	April 22, 2015	5-4	Kagan						<b>S</b>		3	(FR)
Williams-Yulee v. Florida Bar	April 29, 2015	5-4	Roberts								3	

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Mach Mining LLC v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	April 29, 2015	9-0	Kagan									
Bullard v. Blue Hills Bank	May 4, 2015	9-0	Roberts									
Harris v. Viegelahn	May 18, 2015	9-0	Ginsburg			<b>E</b>						
Tibble v. Edison International	May 18, 2015	9-0	Breyer			<b>E</b>			<b>E</b>			
Coleman v. Tollefson	May 18, 2015	9-0	Breyer			<b>E</b>						
Comptroller of Maryland v. Wynne	May 18, 2015	5-4	Alito									
San Francisco v. Sheehan	May 18, 2015	6-2	Alito			Carlos Carlos	Recused		<b>E</b>			
Henderson v. United States	May 18, 2015	9-0	Kagan									
Commil USA v. Cisco Systems	May 26, 2015	6-2	Kennedy			<b>I</b>	Recused					

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Kellogg Brown & Root v. United States ex rel. Carter	May 26, 2015	9-0	Alito									
Wellness International Network v. Sharif	May 26, 2015	6-3	Sotomayor									(Fa)
Elonis v. United States	June 1, 2015	8-1	Roberts									(RAD)
EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores	June 1, 2015	8-1	Scalia									Ra
Bank of America v. Caulkett	June 1, 2015	9-0	Thomas									
Mellouli v. Lynch	June 1, 2015	7-2	Ginsburg									(FR)
Taylor v. Barkes	June 1, 2015	9-0	Per Curiam									
Zivotofsky v. Kerry	June 8, 2015	6-3	Kennedy									
Kerry v. Din	June 15, 2015	5-4	Scalia		<u>S</u>							

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Baker Botts LLP v. ASARCO	June 15, 2015	6-3	Thomas			Charles and Charles	1 al					
Reyes Mata v. Lynch	June 15, 2015	8-1	Kagan									Car
Reed v. Town of Gilbert	June 18, 2015	9-0	Thomas						<b>B</b>			
McFadden v. United States	June 18, 2015	9-0	Thomas									
Walker v. Texas Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans, Inc.	June 18, 2015	5-4	Breyer									
Ohio v. Clark	June 18, 2015	9-0	Alito			<b>E</b>						
Davis v. Ayala	June 18, 2015	5-4	Alito				- Contraction of the second se					
Brumfield v. Cain	June 18, 2015	5-4	Sotomayor			<b>E</b>						
Horne v. Department of Agriculture	June 22, 2015	5-4	Roberts								3	

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Kingsley v. Hendrickson	June 22, 2015	5-4	Breyer			<b>E</b>						
Los Angeles v. Patel	June 22, 2015	5-4	Sotomayor			<b>E</b>						
Kimble v. Marvel Enterprises, Inc.	June 22, 2015	6-3	Kagan									
King v. Burwell	June 25, 2015	6-3	Roberts			<b>I</b>						
Texas Department of Housing & Commerce Affairs v. Inclusive Communities Project	June 25, 2015	5-4	Kennedy			<b>I</b>						
Johnson v. United States	June 26, 2015	8-1	Scalia			<b>I</b>					8	
Obergefell v. Hodges	June 26, 2015	5-4	Kennedy			<b>I</b>			C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C			
Michigan v. Environmental Protection Agency	June 29, 2015	5-4	Scalia						<b>E</b>			
Arizona State Legislature v. Arizona Independent Redistricting	June 29, 2015	5-4	Ginsburg						<b>B</b>			

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Glossip v. Gross	June 29, 2015	5-4	Alito			All and a second					

# Voting Alignment - 5-4 Cases

Cases are sorted by date of decision. Dissenting Justices are shaded in gray and the author of the majority opinion is highlighted in red.

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Dart Cherokee Basin v. Owens	December 15, 2014	5-4	Ginsburg									
Yates v. United States	February 25, 2015	5-4	Ginsburg									
Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama	March 25, 2015	5-4	Breyer		<b>X</b>				<b>B</b>		3	
Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Center	March 31, 2015	5-4	Scalia									
United States v. Wong	April 22, 2015	5-4	Kagan									
Williams-Yulee v. Florida Bar	April 29, 2015	5-4	Roberts									
Comptroller of Maryland v. Wynne	May 18, 2015	5-4	Alito									
Kerry v. Din	June 15, 2015	5-4	Scalia				- Jess					
Walker v. Texas Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans, Inc.	June 18, 2015	5-4	Breyer									

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Davis v. Ayala	June 18, 2015	5-4	Alito			Carlos Carlos	1					
Brumfield v. Cain	June 18, 2015	5-4	Sotomayor			<b>E</b>						
Horne v. Department of Agriculture	June 22, 2015	5-4	Roberts				The second secon					
Kingsley v. Hendrickson	June 22, 2015	5-4	Breyer									
Los Angeles v. Patel	June 22, 2015	5-4	Sotomayor									
Texas Department of Housing & Commerce Affairs v. Inclusive Communities Project	June 25, 2015	5-4	Kennedy			<b>E</b>						
Obergefell v. Hodges	June 26, 2015	5-4	Kennedy			<b>E</b>						
Michigan v. Environmental Protection Agency	June 29, 2015	5-4	Scalia									
Arizona State Legislature v. Arizona Independent Redistricting	June 29, 2015	5-4	Ginsburg						6			

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kennedy	Roberts	Alito	Scalia	Thomas
Glossip v. Gross	June 29, 2015	5-4	Alito			All and a second					