1. Text 958: Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), was a landmark decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in which the Court ruled that the Constitution of the United States generally protected a right to have an abortion. The decision struck down many abortion laws, and caused an ongoing abortion debate in the United States about whether, or to what extent, abortion should be legal, who should decide the legality of abortion, and what the role of moral and religious views in the political sphere should be. The decision also shaped debate concerning which methods the Supreme Court should use in constitutional adjudication. The Supreme Court overruled Roe in 2022, ending the constitutional right to abortion.  
   The case was brought by Norma McCorvey—under the legal pseudonym "Jane Roe"—who, in 1969, became pregnant with her third child. McCorvey wanted an abortion but lived in Texas, where abortion was illegal except when necessary to save the mother's life. Her lawyers, Sarah Weddington and Linda Coffee, filed a lawsuit on her behalf in U.S. federal court against her local district attorney, Henry Wade, alleging that Texas's abortion laws were unconstitutional. A special three-judge court of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas heard the case and ruled in her favor. The parties appealed this ruling to the Supreme Court. In January 1973, the Supreme Court issued a 7–2 decision in McCorvey's favor holding that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides a fundamental "right to privacy", which protects a pregnant woman's right to an abortion. It also held that the right to abortion is not absolute and must be balanced against the government's interests in protecting women's health and prenatal life. It resolved these competing interests by announcing a pregnancy trimester timetable to govern all abortion regulations in the United States. The Court also classified the right to abortion as "fundamental", which required courts to evaluate challenged abortion laws under the "strict scrutiny" standard, the most stringent level of judicial review in the United States.   
   The Supreme Court's decision in Roe was among the most controversial in U.S. history. In addition to the dissent, Roe was criticized by some in the legal community, including some who thought that Roe reached the correct result but went about it the wrong way, and some called the decision a form of judicial activism. Others argued that Roe did not go far enough, as it was placed within the framework of civil rights rather than the broader human rights. The decision also radically reconfigured the voting coalitions of the Republican and Democratic parties in the following decades. Anti-abortion politicians and activists sought for decades to restrict abortion or overrule the decision; polls into the 21st century showed that a plurality and a majority, especially into the late 2010s to early 2020s, opposed overruling Roe. Despite criticism of the decision, the Supreme Court reaffirmed Roe's central holding in its 1992 decision, Planned Parenthood v. Casey. Casey overruled Roe's trimester framework and abandoned its "strict scrutiny" standard in favor of an "undue burden" test.  
   In June 2022, the Supreme Court overruled Roe and Casey in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization on the grounds that the substantive right to abortion was not "deeply rooted in this Nation's history or tradition", nor considered a right when the Due Process Clause was ratified in 1868, and was unknown in U.S. law until Roe.
2. Text 1174: Mitchell v. Donovan, 398 U.S. 427 (1970), was a United States Supreme Court case.
3. Text 1429: United States v. Johnson, 383 U.S. 169 (1966), is a United States Supreme Court case.
4. Text 159: Bellotti v. Baird, 443 U.S. 622 (1979), is a United States Supreme Court case that ruled 8-1 that teenagers do not have to secure parental consent to obtain an abortion.  
   The Court elaborated on its parental consent decision of 1976. It implies that states may be able to require a pregnant, unmarried minor to obtain parental consent to an abortion if the state law provides an alternative procedure to parental approval, such as letting the minor seek a state judge's approval instead. The plurality opinion declined to extend the full right to minors to seek and obtain an abortion, which was granted to adult women in Roe v. Wade. The Court rejected the extension to minors by placing emphasis on the especially vulnerable nature of children, their "inability to make critical decisions in an informed and mature manner; and the importance of the parental role in child rearing." Ironically, the plurality opinion allows a judge to determine that a pregnant minor is unable to make critical decisions regarding a fetus and must instead become a parent—thereby forcing the minor to make critical decisions regarding another child.  
   Consent must be obtained from the parent(s) for a minor to have a nonemergency abortion and the parent(s) must know about the judicial proceedings, unless no parent(s) are available. If the judge decides the minor is mature and making an informed and capable decision, he can still deny the abortion based on his own decision.  
   Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr., joined by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, Justice Potter Stewart, and Justice William Rehnquist argued there are three reasons why children aren't like adults: the vulnerability of children, the lack of critical decision making, and reliance on parents guidance for their children upbringing.  
   Justice John P. Stevens, joined by Justice William J. Brennan Jr., Justice Thurgood Marshall, and Justice Harry Blackmun, concluded that the Massachusetts statute was unconstitutional because first it allows for the court to deny the abortion despite the courts decision on the minor's maturity. Second, consent was required in every case without giving the minor an option to an independent case to prove she was mature, leading to an 'absolute third-party veto'.  
   If a state requires a pregnant minor to obtain consent of one or both parents, another alternative option must be available for the minor to receive the abortion. The alternative process has four requirements: (1) the minor is permitted to demonstrate her maturity and informed decision making on having the abortion without parental consent, (2) if the minor does not prove maturity, she has the ability to convince the judge that the abortion would be the best decision for her (3) the minor must remain anonymous, and (4) the process must be expedited to ensure the abortion will be possible to obtain.  
   Justice Rehnquist concurred on stare decisis grounds while continuing to oppose the constitutional right to an abortion.
5. Text 1211: Abel v. United States, 362 U.S. 217 (1960), was a United States Supreme Court case.
6. Text 1298: Eisenstadt v. Baird, 405 U.S. 438 (1972), was a landmark decision of the U.S. Supreme Court that established the right of unmarried people to possess contraception on the same basis as married couples.  
   The Court struck down a Massachusetts law prohibiting the distribution of contraceptives to unmarried people for the purpose of preventing pregnancy, ruling that it violated the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution. The decision effectively legalized (heterosexual) premarital sex in the United States.
7. Text 922: United States v. Johnson, 457 U.S. 537 (1982), was a United States Supreme Court case.
8. Text 689: United States v. Johnson, 390 U.S. 563 (1968), was a United States Supreme Court case.
9. Text 1110: Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar, 421 U.S. 773 (1975), was a U.S. Supreme Court decision. It stated that lawyers engage in "trade or commerce" and hence ended the legal profession's exemption from antitrust laws.
10. Text 341: Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), was a landmark decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in which the Court ruled that the Constitution of the United States protects the liberty of married couples to use contraceptives without government restriction. The case involved a Connecticut "Little Comstock Act" that prohibited any person from using "any drug, medicinal article or instrument for the purpose of preventing conception". The court held that the statute was unconstitutional, and that its effect was "to deny disadvantaged citizens ... access to medical assistance and up-to-date information in respect to proper methods of birth control." By a vote of 7–2, the Supreme Court invalidated the law on the grounds that it violated the "right to marital privacy", establishing the basis for the right to privacy with respect to intimate practices. This and other cases view the right to privacy as "protected from governmental intrusion".  
    Although the U.S. Bill of Rights does not explicitly mention "privacy", Justice William O. Douglas wrote for the majority, "Would we allow the police to search the sacred precincts of marital bedrooms for telltale signs of the use of contraceptives? The very idea is repulsive to the notions of privacy surrounding the marriage relationship." Justice Arthur Goldberg wrote a concurring opinion in which he used the Ninth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution in support of the ruling. Justice John Marshall Harlan II wrote a concurring opinion arguing that privacy is protected by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, while Justice Byron White argued that Connecticut's law failed the rational basis standard.
11. Text 1239: Planned Parenthood v. Casey, 505 U.S. 833 (1992), was a landmark decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in which the Court upheld the right to have an abortion as established by the "essential holding" of Roe v. Wade (1973) and issued as its "key judgment" the restoration of the undue burden standard when evaluating state-imposed restrictions on that right. Both the essential holding of Roe and the key judgment of Casey were overturned by the Supreme Court in 2022, with its landmark decision in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization.  
    The case arose from a challenge to five provisions of the Pennsylvania Abortion Control Act of 1982; among the provisions were requirements for a waiting period, spousal notice, and (for minors) parental consent prior to undergoing an abortion procedure. In a plurality opinion jointly written by associate justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Anthony Kennedy, and David Souter, the Supreme Court upheld the "essential holding" of Roe, which was that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution protected a woman's right to have an abortion prior to fetal viability.  
    The Court overturned the Roe trimester framework in favor of a viability analysis, thereby allowing states to implement abortion restrictions that apply during the first trimester of pregnancy. In its "key judgment," the Court overturned Roe's strict scrutiny standard of review of a state's abortion restrictions with the undue burden standard, under which abortion restrictions would be unconstitutional when they were enacted for "the purpose or effect of placing a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion of a nonviable fetus." Applying this new standard of review, the Court upheld four provisions of the Pennsylvania law, but invalidated the requirement of spousal notification. Four justices wrote or joined opinions arguing that Roe v. Wade should have been struck down, while two justices wrote opinions favoring the preservation of the higher standard of review for abortion restrictions.
12. Text 4: United States v. Wunderlich, 342 U.S. 98 (1951), was a case decided before the United States Supreme Court.
13. Text 20: Bellotti v. Baird, 428 U.S. 132 (1976), was a United States Supreme Court case in which the Court upheld a Massachusetts law requiring parental consent to a minor's abortion, under the provision that "if one or both of the [minor]'s parents refuse... consent, consent may be obtained by order of a judge... for good cause shown." The decision was unanimous, and the opinion of the Court was written by Harry Blackmun. The law in question "permits a minor capable of giving informed consent to obtain a court order allowing abortion without parental consultation, and further permits even a minor incapable of giving informed consent to obtain an abortion order without parental consultation where it is shown that abortion would be in her best interests."  
    The case was initially titled as Baird v. Quinn (Baird et al. v. Quinn et al.) since that proceedings commenced, Robert H. Quinn was the attorney general of Massachusetts. He was replaced in 1975 by Francis X. Bellotti.
14. Text 622: Bond v. Floyd, 385 U.S. 116 (1966), was a United States Supreme Court case.
15. Text 1216: Carey v. Population Services International, 431 U.S. 678 (1977), was a landmark decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in which the Court held that it was unconstitutional to prohibit anyone other than a licensed pharmacist to distribute nonprescription contraceptives to persons 16 years of age or over, to prohibit the distribution of nonprescription contraceptives by any adult to minors under 16 years of age, and to prohibit anyone, including licensed pharmacists, to advertise or display contraceptives.  
    The Court held that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution does not allow a state to intrude on an individual's decisions on matters of procreation which is protected as privacy rights.
16. Text 441: Stanley v. Georgia, 394 U.S. 557 (1969), was a landmark decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that helped to establish an implied "right to privacy" in U.S. law in the form of mere possession of obscene materials.  
    The home of Robert Eli Stanley, a suspected bookmaker, was searched by police with a federal warrant to seize betting paraphernalia. As they found none, they instead seized three reels of pornographic material from a desk drawer in an upstairs bedroom, and later charged Stanley with the possession of obscene materials, a crime under Georgia law. The conviction was upheld by the Supreme Court of Georgia.  
    In the Supreme Court of the United States, Justice Thurgood Marshall wrote the unanimous opinion that overturned the earlier decision and invalidated all state laws that forbade the private possession of materials judged obscene on the grounds of the First and Fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution. Justices Potter Stewart, William J. Brennan, and Byron White contributed a joint concurring opinion with a separate opinion having to do with the Fourth Amendment search and seizure provision. Justice Hugo Black also concurred expressing the view that all obscenity laws were unconstitutional.  
    The case also established an implied right to pornography, but not an absolute right. In Osborne v. Ohio (1990), the Supreme Court upheld a law which criminalized the possession of child pornography.
17. Text 1300: Hodgson v. Minnesota, 497 U.S. 417 (1990), was a United States Supreme Court abortion rights case that dealt with whether a state law may require notification of both parents before a minor can obtain an abortion. The law in question provided a judicial alternative.
18. Text 348: Douglas v. California, 372 U.S. 353 (1963), was a case before the United States Supreme Court.
19. Text 1099: Watson v. Employers Liability Assurance Corp., 348 U.S. 66 (1954), was a conflict of laws case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States.
20. Text 6: Boddie v. Connecticut, 401 U.S. 371 (1971), was a case before the United States Supreme Court.