

THIRD EDITION

THE DEATH PENALTY

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES, COMMENTARIES,
AND CASE BRIEFS

SCOTT VOLLUM // ROLANDO V. DEL CARMEN
DURANT FRANTZEN // CLAUDIA SAN MIGUEL
KELLY CHEESEMAN

The Death Penalty

Constitutional Issues, Commentaries, and Case Briefs

Third Edition

Scott Vollum

University of Minnesota, Duluth

Rolando V. del Carmen

Sam Houston State University

Durant Frantzen

Texas A&M University, San Antonio

Claudia San Miguel

Texas A&M International University

Kelly Cheeseman

Messiah College



AMSTERDAM • BOSTON • HEIDELBERG • LONDON
NEW YORK • OXFORD • PARIS • SAN DIEGO
SAN FRANCISCO • SINGAPORE • SYDNEY • TOKYO

Anderson Publishing is an imprint of Elsevier



Acquiring Editor: Pam Chester
Editorial Project Manager: Ellen S. Boyne
Project Manager: Priya Kumaraguruparan
Designer: Russell Purdy

Anderson Publishing is an imprint of Elsevier
225 Wyman Street, Waltham, MA 02451, USA

Third Edition: Copyright © 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
Second Edition: Copyright © 2008, 2005 Matthew Bender & Company Inc., a member of the
LexisNexis Group Newark, NJ

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. Details on how to seek permission, further information about the Publisher's permissions policies and our arrangements with organizations such as the Copyright Clearance Center and the Copyright Licensing Agency, can be found at our website: www.elsevier.com/permissions.

This book and the individual contributions contained in it are protected under copyright by the Publisher (other than as may be noted herein).

Notices

Knowledge and best practice in this field are constantly changing. As new research and experience broaden our understanding, changes in research methods or professional practices, may become necessary. Practitioners and researchers must always rely on their own experience and knowledge in evaluating and using any information or methods described herein. In using such information or methods they should be mindful of their own safety and the safety of others, including parties for whom they have a professional responsibility.

To the fullest extent of the law, neither the Publisher nor the authors, contributors, or editors, assume any liability for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions, or ideas contained in the material herein.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The death penalty / Scott Vollum, Rolando V. del Carmen, Durant Frantzen, Claudia San Miguel, Kelly Cheeseman.—Third edition. p. cm.

1. Capital punishment—United States. I. Vollum, Scott, 1970- author. II. Del Carmen, Rolando V. author. III. Frantzen, Durant, author.

KF9227.C2D4117 2014

345.73'0773—dc23

2014001186

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-4557-7633-7

For information on all Anderson publications visit our website at
<http://store.elsevier.com>

Printed and bound in the United States of America

15 16 17 18 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1



Working together
to grow libraries in
developing countries

www.elsevier.com • www.bookaid.org

Preface to the Third Edition

Much has changed in the legal world of the death penalty since this book was first conceived in 2003. Over this span of 10 years there have been more than 500 executions and 1,175 new death sentences. During this period the United States hit and surpassed the 1,000-execution post-*Furman* milestone (1,347 executions as of October 1, 2013). But during that same time, the rates of death sentences and executions have declined precipitously. Six states have abolished the death penalty—five since the last edition of this book—and several others are considering doing so. There also have been 42 exonerations of individuals on death row who were found to be innocent, including six due to DNA testing.

By all measures, the popularity and use of the death penalty is on the decline. Increasing awareness of the flaws and failures of the death penalty system, as well as increasing concerns about the financial costs of the death penalty, seem to have played a role in this decline, as has the now virtually universal availability of true life sentences. That being said, we still remain one of the most prolific nations in terms of executions and the only Western nation to carry out executions at all. Furthermore, though it seems to be occurring in only a shrinking minority of jurisdictions, the death penalty continues in earnest in some states and localities. Texas surpassed 500 executions this year; states such as North Carolina, which has had no executions since 2006, are taking measures to revitalize and expand the death penalty and speed up executions. The death penalty remains a criminal sanction that presents us with many contradictions and controversies and increasingly evokes ambivalence among lawmakers and the public alike.

Violence in the United States has also declined significantly over the last decade, though it may be hard to tell given that we are presented with increasingly stark images of violence on a seemingly daily basis. Highly publicized cases of extreme and mass violence seem to have proliferated in the last few years, often drawing attention as capital or potentially capital cases. Just in the last two years, there has been a terrorist bombing at the Boston Marathon as well as twelve mass shootings, including a particularly horrific massacre of young children in a grade school in Newtown, Connecticut. Though many of these violent acts end with the offender's suicide, in cases in which the offenders live, such as the man who opened fire in a Colorado theater killing 12 people and injuring another 58, or one of the men who set off the bombs in Boston, the death penalty enters the public consciousness almost immediately. Both of these cases are still in progress at the time of this writing, so it is unknown whether they will result in death sentences. But there is no denying that cases such as these challenge us to think very hard about violence and killing and, by extension, the death penalty. When we are faced with horrors such as these, it is easy to understand why the death penalty persists. It is also easy to understand why the death penalty often evokes great emotion and conflict in our society.

The death penalty remains a hotly debated topic in the United States and a potent public policy in certain locations. In much of the United States, the public continues to support it and, in some cases, demand it. However, it also continues to be a lightning rod of sorts, drawing attention to many of the problems and controversies within criminal justice. Issues of cost, public safety, deterrence, retribution, justice, wrongful conviction, rehabilitation, redemption, race, and discrimination are illuminated through the magnifying glass that is the death penalty. As such, we believe that an understanding and analysis of the legal and constitutional issues surrounding the death penalty serve the broader objective of better understanding the criminal justice system. It is our hope that, throughout this book,

we have served this objective and that we have provided insight into the often complex and confusing world of the U.S. Supreme Court and its death penalty jurisprudence.

In this revised third edition, we have again maintained the overall structure and much of the content from the prior two editions. But there is also much that is new and improved. We present eight new case briefs and discuss many more new cases throughout the book, recalibrating our commentary on the major constitutional issues in line with the ever-evolving jurisprudence. We also added to the coverage of important peripheral legal and social issues, such as racial disparities in the criminal justice system, life sentences for juveniles, public opinion, wrongful convictions, and state trends in abolition of the death penalty.

Over the last five years, Supreme Court activity in terms of death penalty cases did not take on the same pace or volume that it had in previous decades. However, the legal developments, issues, and challenges—many of which have stemmed from prior Supreme Court decisions—have flourished and will likely continue to spur further involvement by the Court for the foreseeable future.

Scott Vollum, Ph.D.

Duluth, MN

October 1, 2013

The case briefs added in the third edition are:

Chapter 4: The Mentally Impaired and the Death Penalty

Bobby v. Bies (2009): Reassessment of mental retardation for the determination of eligibility for the death penalty.

Ryan v. Gonzales/Tibbals v. Carter (2013): Competence to assist counsel during appellate processes.

Chapter 7: The Right to Effective Assistance of Counsel and the Death Penalty

Wood v. Allen (2010): Counsel's failure to present evidence of mental retardation in capital mitigation.

Maples v. Thomas (2012): Counsel's failure to meet a filing deadline and "cause" to excuse a consequent procedural default.

Chapter 8: Due Process and the Death Penalty

Cone v. Bell (2009): Procedural default of habeas corpus claim following a lack of proper review by a state court; application of the *Brady* rule when evidence was suppressed.

Connick v. Thompson (2011): Section 1983 lawsuit based on wrongful conviction and establishing liability of state agents.

Chapter 10: Appeals, Habeas Corpus, and the Death Penalty

Stewart v. Martinez-Villareal (1998): The AEDPA's successive petition restriction and the filing of successive habeas corpus petitions when previous petitions were dismissed as premature.

Skinner v. Switzer (2011): The use of Section 1983 lawsuits to compel DNA testing in claims of actual innocence.

Preface to the Second Edition

The death penalty, in the context of the United States Constitution and the Supreme Court, is constantly evolving. In this, the second edition of *The Death Penalty: Constitutional Issues, Commentaries, and Case Briefs*, we try to reflect this evolution by presenting the most recent Supreme Court cases and the issues inherent in them that have occurred in the years since we published the first edition of this book. As I write this preface, we have just come off the longest hiatus in executions since the death penalty was reinstated following the Supreme Court decision in *Gregg v. Georgia*. This informal moratorium resulted from the Court's decision to consider the constitutionality of the execution method of lethal injection. The case was *Baze v. Rees*, one of the most recent among the new cases analyzed and discussed in this book, and the Court held that lethal injection is a constitutionally permissible method of execution. The first execution since September 25, 2007, was carried out on May 6, 2008, when William Earl Lynd was executed in Georgia by lethal injection at 7:51 P.M. As I write this, Mark Schwab is scheduled to be executed by lethal injection in Florida for the rape and murder of an 11-year-old boy; it will be the tenth execution of the year. There are more than 20 executions scheduled to take place over the coming months.

Over the last several years executions have slowed, but the Supreme Court's consideration of constitutional issues pertaining to them certainly has not. During the four years since the first edition of this book was published, the Supreme Court has made significant decisions about, among other things, racial disparity in capital jury selection, mental impairment as a mitigating factor in capital sentencing, standards of effectiveness of legal representation for capital defendants, jury instructions pertaining to aggravating and mitigating evidence, evidence of actual innocence in habeas corpus petitions, and, most recently, the constitutionality of lethal injection as a method of execution and the constitutionality of the death penalty in cases of the rape of a child when the victim is not murdered. The makeup of the Court has also changed in the years since this book was first published. Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist has been succeeded by new Chief Justice John G. Roberts, and Justice Sandra Day O'Connor has been succeeded by Justice Samuel Anthony Alito Jr. Justice Alito's first death penalty opinion was in *Holmes v. South Carolina* (briefed in Chapter 8), and Chief Justice Roberts has written several opinions in death penalty cases and penned the plurality opinion in *Baze v. Rees* (briefed in Chapter 11).

Although the structure and much of the content in this second edition remains the same as in the original edition, there is much that is new and revised. There are 17 new cases briefed and many more new cases discussed throughout the book. The added case briefs are:

Chapter 3: Racial Discrimination and the Death Penalty

Miller El v. Dretke (2005): Racially disparate questioning in jury selection

Snyder v. Louisiana (2008): Exclusion of prospective black jurors without racially neutral explanations

Chapter 4: The Mentally Impaired and the Death Penalty

Singleton v. Norris (2003): Forcefully medicating an inmate for competency in order to be executed

Tennard v. Dretke (2004): Mental retardation as mitigating factor when unrelated to crime

Panetti v. Quarterman (2007): Mental competency to be executed

Chapter 6: Juries, Jurors, and the Death Penalty

Uttecht v. Brown (2007): Trial court judge's role in death qualification

Chapter 7: The Right to Effective Assistance of Counsel and the Death Penalty

Rompilla v. Beard (2005): Counsel's failure to make a reasonable effort to contest evidence supporting a death sentence

Schriro v. Landrigan (2007): Defendant's interference with counsel's strategy and the presentation of mitigating evidence

Chapter 8: Due Process and the Death Penalty

Deck v. Missouri (2005): Shackling of a capital defendant during sentencing phase of trial

Holmes v. South Carolina (2006): Introduction of third-party guilt evidence

Chapter 9: Aggravating and Mitigating Factors in Death Penalty Cases

Kansas v. Marsh (2006): Death sentence when aggravating and mitigating factors are equal in weight

Brewer v. Quarterman (2007): Statutory restrictions on jury instructions regarding the consideration of mitigating factors

Chapter 10: Appeals, Habeas Corpus, and the Death Penalty

Nelson v. Campbell (2004): Right to bring a lawsuit challenging the method of execution

House v. Bell (2007): Habeas corpus appeals on the grounds of actual innocence

Lawrence v. Florida (2007): Suspension of AEDPA's statute of limitations while awaiting habeas corpus decision

Chapter 11: Evolving Standards of Decency and the Eighth Amendment's Ban on Cruel and Unusual Punishment

Baze v. Rees (2008): Constitutionality of lethal injection as a method of execution

Kennedy v. Louisiana (2008): Constitutionality of the death penalty for nonhomicide cases of sexual assault against a child

Only one case brief has been removed (the 2003 case of *Miller-El v. Cockrell* has been replaced by the more recent 2005 case of *Miller-El v. Dretke*). Discussion surrounding past cases and the rich history and lineage of Supreme Court decisions in capital cases has been preserved but has been supplemented by numerous new decisions and updated information on the many related death penalty issues. In the end, we believe that the second edition of this book significantly strengthens and bolsters what was already a valuable and unique book and offers the reader the most comprehensive and up-to-date collection and consideration of constitutional issues and Supreme Court decisions pertaining to the death penalty.

Scott Vollum, Ph.D.
Harrisonburg, Virginia
July 1, 2008

Preface and Introduction to the First Edition

Death as a form of punishment was used in the United States even before the American colonies became a republic. For a long time, the death penalty was—and still is—an option available to the state when dealing with serious offenders, and the public accepted it as such without many legal or political challenges. In recent times, however, issues have arisen concerning the constitutionality and wisdom of this ultimate sanction. This has spawned numerous court cases, decided over several decades, that have sought to declare this form of punishment unconstitutional, or that attempted to refine and polish some of its features. These cases and what they say are the focus of this book.

Constitutionality and the wisdom of imposing the death penalty are two separate issues, although they tend to be treated as one in some quarters. Constitutionality is an issue addressed and resolved by the courts, while the wisdom of imposing it is a political question to be resolved by political decision-makers who represent the public. This book focuses on the constitutionality issue. Whether the death penalty is wise or desirable as a form of punishment is for political entities to eventually determine and resolve.

Numerous books and articles have been written on the death penalty. This book seeks to add a legal dimension to existing literature by bringing together all the major cases decided by the United States Supreme Court on the death penalty. The first case decided by the Court on the death penalty was *Wilkerson v. Utah* in 1878. The cut-off date for the cases briefed in this book was July 1, 2013. A total of 72 cases are briefed here. As in any project in which choices are involved, subjectivity played a role in determining which cases from among the many decided by the Court are sufficiently important to justify inclusion among the briefed cases. That determination, including the “Top Ten Most Significant Death Penalty Cases,” was made by the authors based on their familiarity over the years with death penalty cases.

THE BOOK'S PURPOSE AND AUDIENCE

This text is written to fill a need for a book that gathers and synthesizes all the legal issues related to the death penalty, bringing together both fundamental presentation and discussion of these issues with short case briefs of key Supreme Court cases. There is no such book available to the general public at present, except perhaps those used in law schools and in full case form. It classifies the death penalty cases according to legal issues, provides a commentary on the various subtopics, and then presents legal materials in an easy-to-digest and understandable form. The main audiences of the book are undergraduates and criminal justice practitioners. The book should also prove useful, however, for anyone who has an interest in the legal issues surrounding the death penalty.

THE BOOK'S CONTENT

The book consists of 12 chapters, subclassified into four parts.

Part I (Chapters 1 and 2) introduces the history of the death penalty and then discusses the foundation cases of *Furman v. Georgia* and *Gregg v. Georgia*.

Part II (Chapters 3, 4, and 5) focuses on constitutional issues and specific groups. These groups are those discriminated against because of race, mental impairment, or due to their having committed serious crimes at a young age. These offenders are treated differently by the Court.

Part III (Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11) constitutes the major thrust of the book. It addresses constitutional issues such as the role of juries and jurors, the right to effective assistance of counsel, the right to due process, aggravating and mitigating circumstances, appeals, habeas corpus, and the concept of evolving standards of decency.

Part IV (Chapter 12) addresses the current death penalty issues and trends in the United States, including the flaws in its administration of which awareness and acknowledgment seem to be growing rapidly. The trends of declining use of the death penalty are discussed, asking what they might foretell about where things are headed in regard to this controversial criminal sanction. We end with a consideration of this possible future of the death penalty in the United States.

FORMAT

Every chapter starts with commentaries on the general case law on a subtopic, followed by a chart of the cases briefed in the chapter, and then the case briefs. The case brief approach to the study of law is deemed more effective for undergraduates and field practitioners who do not have the time or the inclination to go into a prolonged reading of United States Supreme Court cases. A case brief acquaints the reader with the case by summarizing its facts, issues, reasons, and holding. This is done in the interest of brevity, but hopefully not at the expense of accuracy.

A WORD ON LEGAL REFERENCING AND ACCESS TO ORIGINAL CASES

Every case briefed in this book contains a case citation. For those who may need some guidance in understanding case citations, the legal citation used in this book is similar to those used in law books and articles. To illustrate, let us use the following citation: *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153 (1976). *Gregg v. Georgia* is the case title, 428 refers to the volume where the case starts, U.S. means the United States Reports (the official government publisher of United States Supreme Court cases), 153 refers to the page where the case starts, and 1976 refers to the year the case was decided.

Anyone who wants to read the case of *Gregg v. Georgia* as originally printed may therefore go to any law library, pull out Volume 428 of the United States Reports, then go to page 153, where the case starts. Some Supreme Court decisions are short, while others are very long.

The original decisions of the United States Supreme Court in these cases are readily available on the Internet. To find these cases, go to the Supreme Court's Website at www.supremecourtus.gov and click on "Opinions," then the year of the decision. If more research is desired on a case, perform an Internet search, then choose the U.S. Supreme Court decision from the many results. There will likely be many entries on that case, including the decisions of the lower courts that were appealed and commentaries on the case. Make sure the case is the U.S. Supreme Court decision and not that of the trial court, the court of appeals, or of a state supreme court.

About the Authors

Scott Vollum is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology-Anthropology at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, where he primarily teaches classes on violence, the death penalty, restorative justice, criminological theory, and research methods. He conducts research and writes on a variety of topics related to the death penalty, including attitudes about the death penalty and experiences of those impacted by it (e.g., condemned death row inmates, co-victims of capital murder, and death row exonerates). He also conducts research on and writes about moral disengagement, restorative justice, violence against animals, and crime and justice in popular culture.

Rolando V. del Carmen retired in May 2011 as Distinguished Professor of Criminal Justice (Law) in the College of Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University. He has authored numerous books and articles in various areas of law related to criminal justice. His book, *Criminal Procedure: Law and Practice*, has been translated into Japanese, Korean, and Chinese and is used extensively in the United States and some Asian countries. He has won all three major awards given by the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. He has taught numerous graduate and undergraduate classes in law and has been a mentor and friend to many of his students.

Durant Frantzen is Associate Professor of Criminology in the College of Arts and Sciences at Texas A&M University, San Antonio. His research focuses on offender reentry and recidivism, domestic violence policy, and the death penalty. He teaches courses on forensic psychology, statistics, victimology, and comparative systems in criminal justice.

Claudia San Miguel is an Associate Professor of Criminal Justice within the Department of Public Affairs and Social Research at Texas A&M International University in Laredo, Texas. Her research focuses on the trafficking of women and children, dating violence, domestic violence, and various policing issues. She recently traveled to England, Poland, Sweden, Austria, and Spain to help form collaborative relationships with their antitrafficking task forces. She has also taught courses for the Department of State in Roswell, New Mexico, on global human trafficking at the International Law Enforcement Academy.

Kelly Cheeseman Dial was Associate Professor and Chair of the Criminal Justice Program at Messiah College in Grantham, Pennsylvania. Until her untimely death during the production of this book, her research interests included female offenders, prison deviance, correctional officer stress and job satisfaction, institutional corrections, the death penalty, ethics, and sexually deviant behavior.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank their families, friends, colleagues, and students. The work required to bring this book to fruition quite simply would not have been possible if not for their support and encouragement. We also express gratitude to the staff at Elsevier Publishing, particularly Pam Chester and Ellen Boyne. Pam was an early advocate for the publication of this revised edition and worked with the authors through the early stages of its development. Ellen guided us and provided valuable feedback and assistance through the writing and revision process. We greatly appreciate their insight, guidance, and assistance, without which the third edition of this book would not have happened.

Online Resources

Thank you for selecting Anderson Publishing's *The Death Penalty: Constitutional Issues, Commentaries, and Case Briefs*, Third Edition. To complement the learning experience, we have provided online tools to accompany this edition.

Please consult your local sales representative with any additional questions. You may also email the Academic Sales Team at textbook@elsevier.com.

Qualified adopters and instructors can access valuable material for free by registering at <http://textbooks.elsevier.com/web/manuals.aspx?isbn=9781455776337>.

Students and other readers can access additional resources at <http://store.elsevier.com/product.jsp?&isbn=9781455776337>.

Table of Cases

Note: Page number followed by *b* indicates boxes, *t* indicates tables, and *np* indicates footnotes.

A

Abdul-Kabir v. Quarterman, 127 S. Ct. 1654 (2007), 119*np*, 119, 173–174, 174*np*, 228*np*, 228, 237*np*, 237, 249, 250
Adams v. Texas, 448 U.S. 38 (1980), 139*np*, 139
Alabama v. Miller, 183 L. Ed. 2d 407 (2012), 118–119, 119*np*
Andres v. United States, 333 U.S. 740 (1948), 294*np*, 294
Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), 58*np*, 58, 129*np*, 129, 132*np*, 132–133, 133*np*, 152, 152*np*
Arave v. Creech, 507 U.S. 463 (1993), 230*np*, 230, 245*np*, 245
Atkins v. Virginia, 536 U.S. 304 (2002), 76–80, 76*np*, 77*np*, 79*np*, 81, 86–87, 88, 88*np*, 92–95, 93*np*, 97, 97*b*, 102, 105, 108, 108*np*, 111–113, 111*np*, 112*np*, 114, 114*np*, 116, 116*np*, 119*np*, 119, 127, 293, 308*np*, 308, 309, 316, 317, 318
Ayers v. Belmontes, 549 U.S. 7 (2006), 236*np*, 236

B

Banks v. Dretke, 540 U.S. 668 (2004), 332–334, 333*np*, 333*b*
Barclay v. Florida, 463 U.S. 939 (1983), 229*np*, 229
Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S. 880 (1983), 233, 233*np*, 238*np*, 238, 239–240, 243–244, 243*b*
Batson v. Kentucky, 476 U.S. 79 (1986), 59, 59*np*, 61–63, 61*np*, 63*np*, 65, 65*b*, 66, 69–70, 69*np*, 71*np*, 71
Baze v. Rees, 553 U.S. 35 (2008), 5*np*, 16–17, 19, 19*np*, 21, 22*np*, 22, 295*np*, 295–297, 299–300, 310, 311, 314*b*
Beck v. Alabama, 447 U.S. 625 (1980), 135, 135*np*, 142–143, 144*b*
Bell v. Cone, 535 U.S. 685 (2002), 157, 157*np*, 169*np*, 169, 170*np*, 170, 176–177, 181*b*, 203–204, 207–208, 216*b*
Bell v. Ohio, 438 U.S. 637 (1978), 234*np*, 234
Blair v. Armontrout, 916 F.2d 1310 (8th Cir. 1990), 54*np*, 54
Blystone v. Pennsylvania, 494 U.S. 299 (1990), 229*np*, 229
Bobby v. Bies, 556 U.S. 825 (2009), 78*np*, 78–79, 92–93, 93*np*
Bobby v. Van Hook, 130 S. Ct. 13, 15 (2009), 165*np*, 165, 166*np*, 166
Booth v. Maryland, 482 U.S. 496 (1987), 231*np*, 231, 247
Bradshaw v. Richey, 546 U.S. 74 (2005), 302*np*, 302–303
Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 87 (1963), 202*np*, 202–203, 218
Branch v. Texas (1972), 30
Brewer v. Landrigan, 131 S.Ct. 445 (2010), 297*np*, 297–298
Brewer v. Quarterman, 550 U.S. 233 (2007), 119*np*, 119, 228, 228*np*, 237*np*, 237, 239–240, 249*b*, 297*np*, 297
Brookhart v. Janis, 384 U.S. 1 (1966), 172*np*, 172
Brown v. State, 568 S.E.2d 62 (Ga. App. 2002), 70*np*, 70–71, 139–140, 139*np*, 142–143, 152*b*
Buchanan v. Angelone, 522 U.S. 269 (1998), 230–231, 231*np*, 236*np*, 236
Buchanan v. Kentucky, 483 U.S. 402 (1987), 201*np*, 201–202
Burger v. Kemp, 483 U.S. 776 (1987), 163*np*, 163
Burton v. Stewart, 127 S. Ct. 793 (2007), 263*np*, 263, 291

C

California v. Ramos, 463 U.S. 992 (1983), 47, 55*np*, 68–69, 136*np*, 136–138, 197*np*, 197
Coker v. Georgia, 433 U.S. 584 (1977), 117*np*, 117, 125, 301*np*, 301
Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722 (1991), 159*np*, 159–160
Collins v. Lockhart (1985), 179
Cone v. Bell, 556 U.S. 449 (2009), 203–204, 203*np*, 204*np*, 207–208, 216*b*

Connick v. Thompson, 131, 563, U.S. Ct. 1350 (2011), 194, 204np, 204, 207–208, 217b, 332–334
Crampton v. Ohio, 402 U.S. 183 (1971), 12np, 12–13
Cullen v. Pinholster, 131 S.Ct. 1388 (2011), 118–119, 119np, 165np, 165, 167np, 167

D

Darden v. Wainwright, 477 U.S. 168 (1986), 163np, 163, 181
Deck v. Missouri, 544 U.S. 622 (2005), 198, 198np, 207–208, 213b
Delo v. Lashley, 507 U.S. 272 (1993), 236np, 236
Dendy v. Wilson, 142 Tex. 460, 464 (1944), 107np, 107–108
Dobbs v. Zant, 963 F.2d at 1407 (1991), 56–57, 57np
Duncan v. Louisiana, 391 U.S. 145 (1968), 129np, 129, 131–132, 132np

E

Eberheart v. Georgia, 433 U.S. 917 (1977), 301np, 301
Eddings v. Oklahoma, 455 U.S. 104 (1982), 195, 195np, 207–208, 210b, 235np, 235, 246
Enmund v. Florida, 458 U.S. 782 (1982), 302np, 302, 313, 314, 316
Estelle v. Smith, 451 U.S. 454 (1981), 194, 194np, 200np, 200, 201–202, 207–208, 209b, 210
Estelle v. Williams (1976), 198–199, 214
Ex parte Royall, 117 U.S. 241 (1886), 256np, 256, 257, 259, 273np, 273

F

Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 846 (1994), 314–315, 315np
Felker v. Turpin, 518 U.S. 651 (1996), 262, 262np, 276–277, 284b
Fierro v. Gomez, 77 F.3d 301 (9th Cir. 1996), 295np, 295
Florida v. Nixon, 543 U.S. 175 (2004), 172, 172np, 176–177, 183b
Ford v. Wainwright, 477 U.S. 399 (1986), 88–89, 88np, 89np, 90np, 90, 92np, 92–95, 95b, 105, 125, 262–263, 263np, 283
Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972), 6–7, 6np, 20, 21np, 21–22, 29, 30–33, 34, 36, 38, 38b, 39, 40–41, 44np, 44–45, 63np, 63, 73, 194np, 194–195, 209, 222np, 222, 293np, 293–294, 300np, 300, 301, 303–305, 304np, 317, 323np, 323, 324–325, 324np, 325np, 329np, 329, 330–331, 330np, 333np, 334–336, 334np, 338np

G

Gardner v. Florida, 430 U.S. 349 (1977), 149, 195–196, 195np, 206, 207–208, 208b
Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335 (1963), 155np, 155, 156, 161np, 161
Godfrey v. Georgia, 446 U.S. 420 (1980), 229–230, 230np, 245np, 245
Gonzalez v. Thaler, 132 S. Ct. 641 (2012), 264np, 264, 267, 273–274, 291
Graham v. Florida, 176 L. Ed. 2d 825 (2010), 119np, 119
Gray v. Netherland, 519 U.S. 1301 (1996), 196, 196np, 207–208, 211b
Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153 (1976), 1, 1np, 2, 12np, 12–13, 20, 29, 33–37, 38, 39b, 40–41, 98, 130–131, 134, 134np, 135, 137–138, 140np, 140, 142, 221–228, 221np, 229np, 229, 230–231, 237np, 237, 241, 242, 242np, 243np, 243, 245np, 245, 258np, 258, 290, 293np, 293–294, 300–301, 300np, 303np, 303, 321, 321np, 325np, 325–326, 329, 329np

H

Harbison v. Bell, 556 U.S. 180 (2009), 162np, 162
Harrington v. Richter, 131 S. Ct. 770 (2011), 264np, 264–265
Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), 289
Herrera v. Collins, 506 U.S. 390 (1993), 256np, 262np, 268, 268np, 274np, 274–275, 276–277, 281b
Hill v. McDonough, 126 S. Ct. 1189 (2006), 270np, 270, 271–272, 275, 286, 291, 295np, 295, 297

Hill v. McDonough, 126 S. Ct. 2096 (2006), 295*np*, 295, 297
Hitchcock v. Dugger, 481 U.S. 393 (1987), 234*np*, 234
Holbrook v. Flynn (1986), 198–199, 214
Holland v. Florida, 130 S. Ct. 2549 (2010), 17–18, 18*np*, 159*np*, 159, 161, 266*np*, 266, 274, 291
Holland v. Florida, 560 U.S. 2549 (2010), 158*np*, 158–159
Holmes v. South Carolina, 547 U.S. 319 (2006), 194, 194*np*, 197*np*, 197, 207–208, 215*b*
Hopkins v. Reeves, 524 U.S. 88 (1998), 135*np*, 135–136
Hopper v. Evans, 456 U.S. 605 (1982), 135*np*, 135–136
House v. Bell, 547 U.S. 518 (2007), 268–269, 268*np*, 276–277, 287*b*
Huffman v. State, 450 S.W.2d 858 (Tex. Crim. App. 1970), 60–61, 61*np*

I

Illinois v. Allen (1970), 198–199, 214
In re Kemmler, 136 U.S. 436 (1890), 8*np*, 8–10, 23, 24*b*, 27, 294*np*, 294

J

Jackson v. Georgia (1972), 28, 30
Jefferson v. Upton, 130 S. Ct. 2217 (2010), 166*np*, 166, 168*np*, 168
Johnson v. Texas, 509 U.S. 350 (1993), 236*np*, 236
Johnson v. Williams, 133 S. Ct. 1088 (2013), 264*np*, 264–265
Johnston v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458 (1938), 173*np*, 173
Jurek v. Texas, 428 U.S. 262 (1976), 134*np*, 134, 136–138, 137*np*, 300*np*, 300

K

Kansas v. Cheever, 295 Kan. 229 (2012), 194*np*, 194, 201*np*, 201–202
Kansas v. Marsh, 548 U.S. 163 (2006), 228, 228*np*, 239–240, 248*b*
Kelly v. California, 555 U.S. 1020, 19024, 1026 (2008), 231–232, 232*np*
Kelly v. South Carolina, 534 U.S. 246 (2002), 137*np*, 137–138
Kennedy v. Louisiana, 554 U.S. 407 (2008), 119*np*, 119, 301–302, 301*np*, 311, 316*b*
Kotteakos v. United States, 323 U.S. 750 (1946), 255*np*, 255
Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 419 (1995), 203*np*, 203

L

Landrigan v. Schriro, 441 F.3d at 647 (9th Cir. 2006), 172–173, 173*np*
Lawrence v. Florida, 549 U.S. 327 (2007), 265–266, 265*np*, 266*np*, 276–277, 288*b*
Lewis v. Jeffers, 497 U.S. 764 (1990), 230, 230*np*, 239–240, 244*b*
Lockett v. Ohio, 438 U.S. 586 (1978), 98, 195*np*, 195, 234, 234*np*, 235, 239–240, 242*b*
Lockhart v. Fretwell, 506 U.S. 364 (1993), 176–177, 179*b*
Lockhart v. McCree, 476 U.S. 162 (1986), 139, 139*np*, 140*np*, 140, 142–143, 144, 144*np*, 145*b*, 148*np*, 148
Louisiana ex rel. Francis v. Resweber, 329 U.S. 459 (1947), 10–11, 10*np*, 20, 22*np*, 22, 23, 26*b*, 27, 286, 299*np*, 299, 314*np*, 314–315

M

Magwood v. Patterson, 130 S. Ct. 2788 (2010), 263–264, 264*np*, 275
Maples v. Thomas, 181 L. Ed. 2d 807 (2012), 118–119, 119*np*, 160*np*, 160, 174–175, 175*np*
Maples v. Thomas, 565 U.S. ____ (2012), 158–159, 158*np*, 176–177, 189*b*
Maples v. Thomas, 122 Yale L.J. 1328 (2013), 158*np*, 158–159
Martel v. Clair, 565 U.S. ____ (2012), 158*np*, 158–159

Martinez v. Ryan, 566 U.S. ____ (2012), 158np, 158–161, 160np
McCleskey v. Kemp, 481 U.S. 279 (1987), 43–46, 44np, 45np, 46np, 63–64, 63np, 64np, 65, 67b, 73
McCleskey v. Zant, 499 U.S. 467 (1991), 44–45, 45np, 259np, 259–260, 267–269, 268np, 273, 273np, 276–277, 279b, 285, 314–315, 315np
McGautha v. California, 402 U.S. 183 (1971), 12np, 12–13, 222np, 222
McKoy v. North Carolina, 494 U.S. 433 (1990), 234, 234np, 239–240, 245b
McMann v. Richardson, 397 U.S. 759 (1970), 156np, 156
McQuiggin v. Perkins, 133 S. Ct. 1924 (2013), 269np, 269–270, 274–275
Medellin v. Texas, 552 U.S. 491 (2008), 308np, 308
Mexico v. United States of America, International Court of Justice (March 31, 2004), 306–308, 308np
Mickens v. Taylor, 535 U.S. 172 (2002), 170–171, 170np, 171np, 176–177, 180b
Miller-El v. Dretke, 545 U.S. 231 (2005), 51–54, 53np, 54np, 60np, 60–61, 61np, 64np, 64, 65, 69b, 71
Miller v. Alabama, 183 L. Ed. 2d 407 (2012), 17np, 17, 119np, 119
Miller v. North Carolina, 583 F.2d 701 (4th Cir. 1978), 54np, 54
Mills v. Maryland, 486 U.S. 367 (1988), 142–143, 146b, 234np, 234, 239–240, 245–246, 246np
Minnesota v. McRae, 494 N.W.2d 252 (1992), 61np, 61–62, 70–71, 71np
Morgan v. Illinois, 504 U.S. 719 (1992), 139, 139np, 142–143, 147b
Moulton v. State, 199 Ala. 411 (1917), 54np, 54
Murray v. Carrier, 477 U.S. 478 (1986), 281np, 281

N

Nelson v. Campbell, 541 U.S. 637 (2004), 270, 270np, 271–272, 271np, 272np, 275, 276–277, 285b, 291
Netherland v. Gray, 519 U.S. 1301 (1996), 196np, 196

O

Oregon v. Guzek, 546 U.S. 517 (2006), 235np, 235

P

Pace v. DiGuglielmo, 544 U.S. 408, 418 (2005), 159np, 159
Panetti v. Quarterman, 448 F.3d 815 (2007), 77–78, 78np, 92np, 92–93, 93np, 94–95, 101b
Parker v. Dugger, 498 U.S. 308 (1991), 234np, 234
Patton v. Mississippi, 332 U.S. 463 (1947), 12np, 12, 20
Patton v. Mississippi, 498 U.S. 308 (1991), 234np, 234
Payne v. Tennessee, 501 U.S. 808 (1991), 231, 231np, 232np, 238np, 238, 239–240, 246b
Penry v. Lynaugh, 492 U.S. 302 (1989), 76, 76np, 77, 92np, 92–93, 94–95, 96b, 97–98, 98np, 105, 111–112, 112np, 235np, 235
Perry v. Lockhart, 871 F.2d 1384 (1989), 179
Porter v. McCollum, 130 S. Ct. 447 (2009), 166np, 166
Powell v. Alabama, 287 U.S. 45 (1932), 12np, 12, 20, 21np, 21–22, 155np, 155
Presnell v. Georgia, 439 U.S. 14 (1978), 229, 229np, 239–240, 241b, 243, 243np
Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U.S. 242 (1976), 134np, 134, 300np, 300
Pulley v. Harris, 465 U.S. 37 (1984), 303, 303np, 311, 312b
Purkett v. Elem, 514 U.S. 765 (1995), 59np, 59, 63–64, 64np, 66np, 66

Q

Quoting Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722 (1991), 160np, 160

R

Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269, 272 (2005), 261np, 261–262, 262np
Richardson v. Marsh, 481 U.S. 200, (1987), 150

Rico v. Leftridge-Byrd, 340 F.3d 178 (3d Cir. 2003), 61–62, 62np, 70–71, 71np
Ring v. Arizona, 536 U.S. 584 (2002), 57np, 57, 129–131, 130np, 131np, 132–133, 132np, 133np, 140np, 140–141, 142–143, 151b
Roberts v. Louisiana, 428 U.S. 325 (1976), 34, 135np, 135, 221np, 221–222, 229np, 300np, 300
Roberts v. Louisiana, 431 U.S. 633 (1977), 221np, 221–222, 229, 229np
Robinson v. California, 370 U.S. 666 (1962), 2np, 2, 24, 34, 39
Rompilla v. Beard, 545 U.S. 374 (2005), 163–164, 163np, 164np, 176–177, 184b
Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551 (2005), 108, 108np, 113np, 113–118, 119, 119np, 121, 122, 123, 125b, 127, 308, 309, 316, 317, 318, 340
Rose v. Lundy, 455 U.S. 509 (1982), 259, 259np, 261np, 261–262, 273np, 273, 276–277, 277b
Ross v. Moffitt, 417 U.S. 600 (1974), 267np, 267
Ryan v. Gonzales, 133 S. Ct. 696 (2013), 17–18, 18np, 79np, 79, 92–93, 93np

S

Salinger v. Loisel, 265 U.S. 224 (1924), 257np, 257–258, 273np, 273, 290
Sanders v. United States, 373 U.S. 1 (1963), 258np, 258, 273, 273np, 279, 290
Sattazahn v. Pennsylvania, 537 U.S. 101 (2003), 199–200, 199np, 207–208, 212b
Sawyer v. Whitley, 505 U.S. 333 (1992), 257np, 268, 268np, 274–275, 276–277, 280b, 282, 291
Schlup v. Delo, 513 U.S. 298 (1995), 268–269, 269np, 287
Schriro v. Landrigan, 127 S. Ct. 1947 (2007), 172–173, 173np, 176–177, 186b
Schriro v. Summerlin, 542 U.S. 348 (2004), 132–133, 133np
Sears v. Upton, 130 S.Ct. 3259 (2010), 166np, 166, 168np, 168
Shafer v. South Carolina, 532 U.S. 36 (2001), 137np, 137
Simmons v. Roper, 112 S.W.3d 397 (2003), 112np, 112–113, 116np, 116, 117np, 117, 121t, 127, 133np
Simmons v. South Carolina, 512 U.S. 154 (1994), 137, 137np, 142–143, 148b
Singleton v. Norris, 319 F.3d 10184 (2003), 77–78, 77np, 90–93, 92np, 93np, 94–95, 99b
Skinner v. Switzer, 131 S. Ct. 1289 (2011), 272np, 272–273, 291
Skinner v. Switzer, 562 U.S. ____ (2011), 276–277, 289b
Skipper v. South Carolina, 476 U.S. 1 (1986), 153, 196np, 196–197, 235np, 235, 238np, 238
Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473 (2000), 263np, 263–264, 291
Smith v. Cain, 132 S.Ct. 627 (2012), 194, 202, 202np, 205np, 205
Smith v. Murray, 477 U.S. 527 (1986), 281np, 281, 282
Smith v. Spisak, 130 S. Ct. 676 (2010), 165np, 165, 167np, 167
Smith v. Texas, 543 U.S. 37 (2004), 236–237, 237np
Smith v. Texas, 550 U.S. 297 (2007), 119np, 119, 236–237, 237np
Snyder v. Louisiana, 552 U.S. 472 (2008), 55, 55np, 62np, 62–63, 65, 71b
South Carolina v. Gathers, 490 U.S. 805 (1989), 231np, 231, 247
Spaziano v. Florida, 468 U.S. 447 (1984), 131np, 131–132, 327np, 327
Spisak v. Hudson, 512 F.3d 852 (2008), 167np, 167
Stanford v. Kentucky, 492 U.S. 361 (1989), 108, 108np, 110np, 110–111, 116, 116np, 121t, 123, 124, 124b, 126–127
State v. Gay, 541 S.E.2d 541 (S.C. 2001), 197np, 197–198, 198np
State v. Marshall, 613 A.2d 1059 (N.J. 1992), 47np, 47–48
State v. Washington, 67 So. 930 (La. Sup. Ct. 1915), 54np, 54
Stewart v. Martinez-Villareal, 523 U.S. 637 (1998), 262–264, 263np, 273–274, 274np, 276–277, 283b, 291
Strauder v. West Virginia, 100 U.S. 303 (1880), 58np, 58, 66
Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), 156, 156np, 157, 176–177, 178b, 180, 184, 186, 187
Strickler v. Greene, 527 U.S. 263 (1999), 203np, 203
Swain v. Alabama, 380 U.S. 202 (1965), 59np, 60np, 60, 61–62, 66, 66np, 69np, 69–70

T

Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288 (1989), 132–133, 133np, 158np, 158, 179, 212, 261np, 261
Tennard v. Dretke, 542 U.S. 274 (2004), 45np, 78, 92–93, 93np, 94–95, 100b