

Merits Cases by Vote Split

9-0 38 (49%)	8-1 4 (5%)	7-2 7 (9%)	6-3 6 (8%)	5-4 23 (29%)**
Lefemine v. Wideman (PC)	Evans v. Michigan	Lozman v. Riviera Beach	Bailey v. U.S.	Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l
U.S. v. Bormes	Decker v. NW Env'tl Def. Center (7-1)	U.S. v. Chaidez	Henderson v. U.S.	Florida v. Jardines
Nitro-Lift v. Howard (PC)	Descamps v. U.S.	Marx v. General Revenue	Amgen v. Conn. Retirement Plans	Comcast v. Behrend
Ark. Game & Fish Comm'n v. U.S. (8-0)	Fisher v. Univ. of Texas (7-1)	Moncrieffe v. Holder	Kirtsaeng v. Wiley & Sons	Genesis v. Symczyk
Kloeckner v. Solis		Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council	Wos v. E.M.A.	US Airways v. McCutchen
Ryan v. Gonzales		AID v. Alliance for Open Soc. (6-2)	Arlington v. FCC	Missouri v. McNeely
L.A. County Flood Dist. v. NRDC		U.S. v. Kebodeaux		McQuiggin v. Perkins
Already v. Nike				Trevino v. Thaler
Smith v. U.S.				Maryland v. King
Sebelius v. Auburn Regional				Peugh v. U.S.
Chafin v. Chafin				Maracich v. Spears
FTC v. Phoebe Putney				Alleyne v. U.S.
Florida v. Harris				FTC v. Actavis (5-3)
Gunn v. Minton				Salinas v. Texas
Johnson v. Williams				Am. Express v. Italian Colors (5-3)
Gabelli v. SEC				UT Southwestern v. Nassar
Levin v. U.S.				Vance v. Ball State Univ.
Std. Fire Ins. v. Knowles				Mutual Pharm. v. Bartlett
Millbrook v. U.S.				Shelby County v. Holder
Marshall v. Rodgers (PC)				Koontz v. St. Johns Water Mgmt.
Kiobel v. Royal Dutch				Adoptive Couple v. Baby Girl
McBurney v. Young				Hollingsworth v. Perry
Dan's City Used Cars v. Pelkey				United States v. Windsor
Bullock v. BankChampaign				
Bowman v. Monsanto				
PPL Corp. v. CIR				
Metrish v. Lancaster				
Sebelius v. Cloer				
Hillman v. Maretta				
Nevada v. Jackson (PC)				
Horne v. Dept. of Agriculture				
Oxford Health Plans v. Sutter				
Ass'n for Molec. Pathology v. Myriad				
U.S. v. Davila				
Tarrant v. Herrmann				
Am. Trucking Ass'n v. Los Angeles				
Ryan v. Schad (PC)				
Sekhar v. U.S.				

Not Included Above	
<i>Tibbals v. Carter</i>	Decided with <i>Ryan v. Gonzales</i>
<i>Boyer v. Louisiana</i>	Dismissed as Improvidently Granted

Past Terms					
	9-0	8-1	7-2	6-3	5-4
OT08	33%	5%	16%	16%	29%
OT09	46%	10%	15%	11%	18%
OT10	48%	13%	15%	5%	20%
OT11	44%	11%	8%	17%	20%
Avg.	43%	10%	14%	12%	22%

* We treat cases with eight or fewer votes as if they were decided by the full Court. For example, we treated *Arkansas Game & Fish Commission v. United States*, which had only eight Justices voting, as a 9-0 case throughout much of this Stat Pack. For 8-0, 7-1, and 6-2 decisions, we categorically assume that the recused Justice would have joined the majority. In cases that were decided 5-3, we looked at each case individually to decide whether it was more likely that the recused Justice would join the majority or the dissent. Our assumption that nine Justices voted in each case applies only to figures that treat each case as a whole, like the chart above, and not to figures that focus on the behavior of individual Justices, like our Justice Agreement charts, *infra*. We have done our best to note where we assume a full Court and where we count only actual votes.

** For cases that are decided by a 5-4 vote, we provide information about whether the majority was comprised of the most common conservative block (Roberts, Scalia, Kennedy, Thomas, and Alito), the most common liberal block (Kennedy, Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan), or a more uncommon alignment. A conservative lineup is marked with a red square, a liberal lineup is marked with a blue square, and all others are marked with a yellow square.