

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

No. 06-06-260 AUG 17 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

Kimberly J. Goodin,
Petitioner,

v.

United States Postal Inspection Service.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Eighth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Mark D. Kelly
KLEMP & STANTON, P.L.L.P.
400 Exchange Building
26 East Exchange St.
St. Paul, MN 55101

Pamela S. Karlan
Jeffrey L. Fisher
STANFORD LAW SCHOOL
SUPREME COURT
LITIGATION CLINIC
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305

August 17, 2006

Amy Howe
(Counsel of Record)
Kevin K. Russell
HOWE & RUSSELL, P.C.
4607 Asbury Pl. NW
Washington, DC 20016
(202) 237-7543

Thomas C. Goldstein
AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER
& FELD LLP
1333 New Hampshire
Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

260

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the Contract Disputes Act of 1978, 41 U.S.C. 601 et seq., impliedly repeals the independent grant of jurisdiction in statutes providing that governmental entities may sue or be sued in federal district court.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

No. 06-261 AUG 18 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

JO ANN FULTON,

Petitioner,

v.

BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY,
WYOMING STATE BAR,

Respondent.

**On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The Supreme Court Of Wyoming**

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

CHARLES M. ARON
(*Counsel of Record*)
GALEN B. WOELK

Attorneys for Petitioner

ARON AND HENNIG, LLP
1472 North 5th Street, Suite 201
Laramie, Wyoming 82072
(307) 721-5760

261

i

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. In acting by default on an amended complaint, is a state court's suspension of an attorney void as a denial of due process where the court never obtained Rule 15 jurisdiction after the attorney had answered the original complaint?
2. Is an attorney deprived of her right to substantive and procedural due process when a state court violates its own jurisdictional and notice requirements in suspending the attorney from practice?

Supreme Court U.S.

No. _____ 06-262 APR 13 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

IN RE:
SUSPENSION OF ATTORNEY
JO ANN FULTON

Jo Ann Fulton,

Petitioner,

**On Petition For Writ Of Mandamus
To The United States District Court
For The District Of Wyoming**

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

CHARLES M. ARON
(*Counsel of Record*)
GALEN B. WOELK

Attorneys for Petitioner

ARON AND HENNIG, LLP
1472 North 5th Street, Suite 201
Laramie, Wyoming 82072
(307) 721-5760

262

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Does a federal district court lack jurisdiction to review an attorney's due process challenge of a state court suspension before imposing reciprocal discipline on that attorney in federal district court?
2. In imposing reciprocal discipline, can a federal district court suspend an attorney from practice in its court for an offense referenced but never charged by the state court, and on which no hearing was conducted and no opportunity afforded to contest inaccurate information?

Supreme Court U.S.
FILED

No. 06-263 JUN 23 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Rachel Haas, Carol Haas, and Richard Haas
Petitioners,

v.

Quest Recovery Services, Inc. and State of Ohio
Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

W. Craig Bashein, Esq.*
BASHEIN & BASHEIN CO.,
L.P.A.
3500 Terminal Tower
50 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44113
(216) 771-3239

Paul W. Flowers, Esq.
PAUL W. FLOWERS CO.,
L.P.A.
3500 Terminal Tower
50 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44113
(216) 344-9393

Attorneys for Petitioners

*Counsel of Record

263

QUESTION PRESENTED

1. Should the Sixth Circuit have followed the holdings of the Ninth and Eleventh Circuits which had recognized that Congress had completely abrogated Eleventh Amendment Immunity by adopting Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and allowing States to be held liable for failing to comply with handicap accessibility requirements?
2. Is absolute judicial immunity applicable to sentencing orders that result in an individual suffering disparate treatment in violation of the Constitution and/or statutory law while in confinement?

20
Supreme Court, U.S.

06-265-0000

No. OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

HENRY A. MAGYARI,
DRAFTSMAN FIRST CLASS,
UNITED STATES NAVY,
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent.

*On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RICHARD A. VICZOREK
Captain, USMC
Counsel of Record

RICHARD H. MCWILLIAMS
Lieutenant, JAGC, USNR

Navy-Marine Corps Appellate Review Activity
716 Sicard St., S.E., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20374-5047
202/685-7295

265

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether hearsay statements authored by laboratory technicians or personnel otherwise involved in the analysis of blood, breath, or urine are testimonial pursuant to *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36 (2004).

Supreme Court, U.S.

06-266 2006

No. OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

ERIC SERRANO, *CHANHASSEN VILLAGER*,
SOUTHWEST SUBURBAN PUBLISHING, AND
RED WING PUBLISHING COMPANY,

Petitioners,

v.

TOM WORKMAN,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Mark R. Anfinson

Counsel of Record

Lake Calhoun Professional Building

3109 Hennepin Avenue South

Minneapolis, MN 55408

(612) 827-5611

John M. Baker and Robin M. Wolpert

Greene Espel PLLP

200 South Sixth Street, Suite 1200

Minneapolis, MN 55402

(612) 373-0830

Counsel for Petitioners

266

QUESTION PRESENTED

Do the costs of defense incurred in resisting Respondent's libel lawsuit threaten to deprive Petitioners (a small newspaper and its editor) of free speech rights guaranteed by the First Amendment, and if they do, then is an especially vigorous application required of established legal principles designed to protect these rights, including those directing that statements that are incapable of a defamatory meaning, or that are substantially true, cannot support a libel action?

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

06-267 AUG 21 2006

No. OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

GOVERNMENT OF TURKMENISTAN,

Petitioner,

v.

BRIDAS S.A.P.I.C., BRIDAS ENERGY INTERNATIONAL, LTD.,
INTERCONTINENTAL OIL & GAS VENTURES, LTD., AND
BRIDAS CORP.,

Respondents.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to
the United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

WILLIAM H. KNULL, III
TIMOTHY J. TYLER
JEREMY GASTON
LEE B. KOVARSKY
*Mayer, Brown, Rowe &
Maw LLP*
700 Louisiana Street
Houston, TX 77002
(713) 238-3000

JEFFREY W. SARLES
Counsel of Record
*Mayer, Brown, Rowe &
Maw LLP*
71 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 782-0600

Attorneys for Petitioner

267

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

In *First National City Bank v. Banco Para El Comercio Exterior de Cuba*, 462 U.S. 611, 626-627 (1983) ("*Bancec*"), this Court held that "duly created instrumentalities of a foreign state are to be accorded a presumption of independent status." The Court also recognized an exception to that presumption in cases of "injustice." The Court found that exception applicable in *Bancec* to prevent a foreign state from reaping "the benefits of our courts while avoiding the obligations of international law." *Id.* at 633-634. In this case, the Fifth Circuit extended the *Bancec* "injustice" exception by imposing on the Government of Turkmenistan an arbitration agreement executed solely by its instrumentality with respondents. Accordingly, although the Government had never agreed to arbitrate, the Fifth Circuit upheld a hotly disputed \$445 million arbitral award in favor of respondents against the Government. The questions presented are as follows:

1. Whether, in conflict with other courts of appeals, the Fifth Circuit improperly expanded the scope of the "injustice" exception to the *Bancec* presumption of independence.
2. Whether, contrary to *Anderson v. City of Bessemer City*, 470 U.S. 564 (1985), the Fifth Circuit improperly resolved a disputed fact issue not addressed by the district court by finding that the Government deprived respondents of the ability to enforce an arbitral award against its instrumentality.
3. Whether the arbitral damages award should be vacated for manifest disregard of the law where the arbitrators' use of an interest rate designated for short-term loans to discount 25 years of uncertain profits inflated damages by \$200 million.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

No. ——— 06-268 AUG 21 2006

In the OFFICE OF THE CLERK
Supreme Court of the United States

PORT AUTHORITY
OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY,
Petitioner,

v.

DANIELLE STANGL
And YVETTE KOERNER,
Respondents.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United
States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

CHRISTOPHER J. HESS
Counsel of Record
PORT AUTHORITY OF
ALLEGHENY COUNTY
345 SIXTH AVENUE
PITTSBURGH, PA 15222
(412) 566-5248
(412) 237-6498 FAX

LISA M. PASSARELLO
JAIME S. TUIE
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL &
ROONEY, P.C.
301 GRANT STREET, 20TH FL.
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219
(412) 562-8800
(412) 562-1041 FAX

Counsel for Petitioner

Becker Gallagher Legal Publishing, Inc. 800.890.5001

268

i

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Whether the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit erred in denying sovereign immunity under the Eleventh Amendment to a government transit agency that is recognized as a state agency under state law and where a majority of its funding is provided by the State?

Supreme Court of Illinois

No. _____ 06-269 AUG 31 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

UNITED DISPOSAL OF BRADLEY, INC.
and MUNICIPAL TRUST & SAVINGS BANK
AS TRUSTEE UNDER TRUST 0799,

Petitioners,

vs.

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD and
ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,

Respondents.

**On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The State of Illinois, Appellate Court,
Third District**

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JENNIFER J. SACKETT POHLENZ
QUERREY & HARROW, LTD.
175 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 1600
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 540-7540 Fax: (312) 540-0578

*Attorney for Petitioners
United Disposal of Bradley, Inc. and
Municipal Trust & Savings Bank
as Trustee under Trust 0799*

269

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Whether a permit restriction based on geographic origins of waste, limiting a business to the boundaries of a particular municipality is void under the Commerce Clause.

Whether there is an exception to the Commerce Clause strict scrutiny test for geographically based restrictions on articles of commerce when the state imposes the geographical restriction in a permit, rather than by law, ordinance or regulation.

Whether there is an exception to due process for appeals from administrative agencies, such that on an administrative agency should be given deference, more so than courts, in interpreting and applying the U.S. Constitution, and be reviewed under a deferential manifest weight rather than *de novo* standard.