235. PLIVA Inc. v. Mensing, 564 U.S. ____, No. 09–993 (2011).

Louisiana statute which provides for liability where a manufacturer has a duty to warn of a products is preempted by federal labeling requirements, despite the fact that the manufacturer of a generic drug could have sought assistance from the Food and Drug Administration to convince manufacturers of the brand-name equivalent drug to change their labeling, allowing the generic manufacturer to follow suit.

Justices concurring: Thomas, Roberts, C.J., Scalia, Alito Justice concurring in all but Part III-B-2: Kennedy Justices dissenting: Sotomayor, Ginsburg, Breyer, Kagan

236. National Meat Ass'n v. Harris, 565 U.S. ____, No. 10–224, slip op. (2012).

California state statute dictating what slaughterhouses must do with pigs that cannot walk preempted by provision of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) expressly preempting state requirements that are in addition to, or different than, those made under the FMIA, where FMIA is more permissive.

237. Kurns v. Railroad Friction Products Corp., 565 U.S. ____, No. 10–879, slip op. (2012).

Pennsylvania state-law tort claim by the estate of maintenance engineer alleging defective design of locomotive components and failure to warn of attendant dangers held preempted by the Locomotive Inspection Act, where purpose of the Act was found to be regulation of locomotive equipment generally and not limited to regulation of activities of locomotive operators or use of locomotives while engaged in transportation.

Justices concurring: Thomas, Roberts, C.J., Scalia, Kennedy, Alito, Kagan Justices dissenting in part: Sotomayor, Ginsburg, Breyer

238. Arizona v. United States, 567 U.S. ____, No. 11–182, slip op. (2012).

Arizona state penalties for violating federal alien registration requirements held preempted by federal law that occupied the field; state sanctions against unauthorized aliens seeking employment or working held preempted by comprehensive system of federal employer sanctions that eschewed employee sanctions; state authority for police arrests of individuals believed to be deportable on criminal grounds held preempted as upsetting careful policy balance struck by Congress; state policy of checking immigration status of individuals stopped by police during ordinary course of state law enforcement activities held not to be preempted on its face because federal law contemplated and facilitated status checks.

Justices concurring: Kennedy, Roberts, C.J., Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor Justices dissenting in part: Scalia, Thomas, Alito