1. Text 385: Lopez v. Gonzales, 549 U.S. 47 (2006), held that an "aggravated felony" includes only conduct punishable as a felony under the federal Controlled Substances Act, regardless of whether state law classifies such conduct as a felony or a misdemeanor. Under federal law, there are two main consequences of having a prior conviction for an "aggravated felony." One is that, if the convicted person is an alien, he will be deported. The other is that, with respect to certain federal crimes, a prior conviction for an aggravated felony provides a sentencing enhancement. In this case, Lopez had been convicted of conduct that was a felony under South Dakota law but was a misdemeanor under federal law. Accordingly, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that this conviction could not serve as a basis for deporting him.
2. Text 1429: United States v. Johnson, 383 U.S. 169 (1966), is a United States Supreme Court case.
3. 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.
4. Text 1296: 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett, 556 U.S. 247 (2009), is a United States labor law case decided by the United States Supreme Court on the rights of unionized workers to sue their employer for age discrimination. In this 2009 decision, the Court decided that whenever a union contract "clearly and unmistakably" requires that all age discrimination claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) be decided through arbitration, then employees subject to that contract cannot have those claims heard in court.  
   Pyett's lawyers, in addition to arguing that a union could not legally bargain away an employee's right to pursue an ADEA claim in court, also argued that "the facts… [show that the union] Local32BJ… has not done so in this case." However, because these arguments had not been raised in the lower courts, the Supreme Court chose not to consider them and decided that the Collective Bargaining Agreement in this case did mandate that the employees' ADEA claims had to be resolved through arbitration.  
   Prior to the Supreme Court's decision in 14 Penn Plaza v. Pyett, employees who were covered under union contracts, often referred to as bargaining unit members, had been able to raise any claims of civil rights violations by their employer in court. This had been the case regardless of the language which was stated in their union contract, a document often referred to as a collective bargaining agreement, or CBA.
5. Text 4: United States v. Wunderlich, 342 U.S. 98 (1951), was a case decided before the United States Supreme Court.
6. Text 6: Boddie v. Connecticut, 401 U.S. 371 (1971), was a case before the United States Supreme Court.
7. 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.
8. Text 32: Braunfeld v. Brown, 366 U.S. 599 (1961), was a landmark case on the issue of religious and economic liberty decided by the United States Supreme Court. In a 6–3 decision, the Court held that a Pennsylvania blue law forbidding the sale of various retail products on Sunday was not an unconstitutional interference with religion as described in the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.
9. Text 53: United States v. Nixon, 418 U.S. 683 (1974), was a landmark decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in which the Court unanimously ordered President Richard Nixon to deliver tape recordings and other subpoenaed materials related to the Watergate scandal to a federal district court. Decided on July 24, 1974, the ruling was important to the late stages of the Watergate scandal, amidst an ongoing process to impeach Richard Nixon. United States v. Nixon is considered a crucial precedent limiting the power of any U.S. president to claim executive privilege.  
   Chief Justice Warren E. Burger wrote the opinion for a unanimous court, joined by Justices William O. Douglas, William J. Brennan, Potter Stewart, Byron White, Thurgood Marshall, Harry Blackmun and Lewis F. Powell. Burger, Blackmun, and Powell were appointed to the Court by Nixon during his first term. Associate Justice William Rehnquist recused himself as he had previously served in the Nixon administration as an Assistant Attorney General.
10. Text 61: Nixon v. United States, 506 U.S. 224 (1993), was a United States Supreme Court decision that determined that a question of whether the Senate had properly tried an impeachment was political in nature and could not be resolved in the courts if there was no applicable judicial standard.
11. Text 71: Adderley v. Florida, 385 U.S. 39 (1966), was a United States Supreme Court case regarding whether arrests for protesting in front of a jail were constitutional.
12. Text 94: Gillette v. United States, 401 U.S. 437 (1971), is a decision from the Supreme Court of the United States, adding constraints on the terms of conscientious objection resulting from draftees in the Selective Service.
13. Text 99: Califano v. Webster, 430 U.S. 313 (1977), was a case before the United States Supreme Court that was decided per curiam.
14. Text 116: Smith v. Texas, 550 U.S. 297 (2007), was a United States Supreme Court case about a challenge to a Texas death penalty court procedure. Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote the opinion of the Court, holding 5-4 that the Texas procedure was improper. Justice Samuel Alito wrote a dissent.
15. Text 131: Roth v. United States, 354 U.S. 476 (1957), along with its companion case Alberts v. California, was a landmark decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which redefined the constitutional test for determining what constitutes obscene material unprotected by the First Amendment. The Court, in an opinion by Justice William J. Brennan Jr. created a test to determine what constituted obscene material: Whether the average person, applying contemporary community standards would find that the material appeals to a prurient interest in sex, and whether the material was utterly without redeeming social value. Although the Court upheld Roth’s conviction and allowed some obscenity prosecutions, it drastically loosened obscenity laws. The decision dissatisfied both social conservatives who thought that it had gone too far in tolerating sexual imagery, and liberals who felt that it infringed on the rights of consenting adults.  
    The decision was superseded by Miller v. California which removed the "utterly without redeeming social value" test, and replaced it with without "serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value". In that case, Justice Brennan dissented, repudiating his previous position in Roth, arguing that states could not ban the sale, advertisement, or distribution of obscene materials to consenting adults.
16. Text 139: Hernandez v. Texas, 347 U.S. 475 (1954), was a landmark case, "the first and only Mexican-American civil-rights case heard and decided by the United States Supreme Court during the post-World War II period." In a unanimous ruling, the court held that Mexican Americans and all other nationality groups in the United States have equal protection under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. The ruling was written by Chief Justice Earl Warren. This was the first case in which Mexican-American lawyers had appeared before the Supreme Court.
17. Text 143: Paul v. Davis, 424 U.S. 693 (1976), is a United States Supreme Court case in which a sharply divided Court held that the plaintiff, whom the local police chief had named an "active shoplifter," suffered no deprivation of liberty resulting from injury to his reputation. In the case, the court broke from precedents and restricted the definition of the constitutional right to privacy "to matters relating to 'marriage procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education".
18. Text 153: United States v. Seeger, 380 U.S. 163 (1965), was a case in which the United States Supreme Court ruled that the exemption from the military draft for conscientious objectors could be reserved not only for those professing conformity with the moral directives of a supreme being but also for those whose views on war derived from a "sincere and meaningful belief which occupies in the life of its possessor a place parallel to that filled by the God of those" who had routinely gotten the exemption.   
    The Court reasoned that "both morals and sound policy require that the state should not violate the conscience of the individual" and that "liberty of conscience has a moral and social value which makes it worthy of preservation at the hands of the state." Additionally, that if this principle is violated to preserve the "life" of the state that it puts into question whether the state will lose its "life" as a result.   
    The case resolved, on diverse but related grounds, three cases, each involving conviction for failure to accept induction into the armed forces on the part of someone who sought conscientious-objector status without "belong[ing] to an orthodox religious sect". The accused, whose cases were otherwise unrelated, were Arno Sascha Jakobson, Forest Britt Peter, and Daniel Andrew Seeger; it was Seeger's case that gave its name to the multi-case decision. Archibald Cox, then Solicitor General, argued for the United States in every case.
19. Text 157: Ginsberg v. New York, 390 U.S. 629 (1968), was a United States Supreme Court case in which the Court ruled that material that is not obscene may nonetheless be harmful for children, and its marketing may be regulated.
20. 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.