## Merits Cases by Vote Split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9-0</th>
<th>8-1</th>
<th>7-2</th>
<th>6-3</th>
<th>5-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 (42%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>11 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>15 (23%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kernan v. Cuero (PC)  
Dunn v. Madison (PC)  
Hamer v. Neighborhood Housing  
In re United States (PC)  
D.C. v. Wesby  
NAM v. DOD  
CNH v. Reese (PC)  
Montana v. Wyoming (PC) (8-o)  
Digital Realty v. Somers  
Rubin v. Iran (8-o)  
Merit v. FTI  
U.S. Bank v. Lakeridge  
Texas v. New Mexico  
Cyan v. Beaver  
Ayestas v. Davis  
Hall v. Hall  
U.S. v. Sanchez-Gomez  
Byrd v. U.S.  
Dahda v. U.S. (8-o)  
Lagos v. U.S.  
Koons v. U.S.  
Lamar v. Appling  
Azar v. Garza (PC)  
China Agritech v. Resh  
Animal Sci. Prods v. Hebei  
Gill v. Whitford  
Benisek v. Lamone (PC)  

Collins v. Virginia  
Sween v. Melin  
Lozman v. Riviera Beach  
Pereira v. Sessions  
Marinello v. U.S.  
Kisela v. Hughes (PC)  
Oil States v. Greene's  
Murphy v. NCAA  
Upper Skagit v. Landgren  
Masterpiece v. Co. Comm'n  
MN Voter's Alliance v. Mansky  
Rosales-Mireles v. U.S.  
Lucia v. S.E.C.  
WesternGeco v. ION  
Ortiz v. U.S.  
Tharpe v. Sellers (PC)  
Class v. U.S.  
Patchak v. Zinke  
Wilson v. Sellers  
McCoy v. Louisiana  
Hughes v. U.S.  
Chavez-Meza v. U.S. (5-3)  
Artis v. D.C.  
Murphy v. Smith  
Jennings v. Rodriguez (5-3)  
Encino Motorcars v. Navarro  
Sessions v. Dimaya  
Jesner v. Arab Bank  
SAS Inst. v. Iancu  
Epic v. Lewis  
Husted v. Randolph Inst.  
South Dakota v. Wayfair  
Wisconsin Central v. U.S.  
Carpenter v. U.S.  
Currier v. Virginia  
Ohio v. AmEx  
Abbott v. Perez

### Past Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9-0</th>
<th>8-1</th>
<th>7-2</th>
<th>6-3</th>
<th>5-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OT10</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT11</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT12</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT13</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT14</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT15</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT16</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We treat cases with eight or fewer votes as if they were decided by the full court. For 8-0, 7-1, and 6-2 decisions, we simply assume that the recused justice would have joined the majority. In cases that are decided 5-3, we look 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.

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

***For per curium opinions, we assume that all justices who do not publicly dissent voted with the majority.