

Interim Stat Pack for October Term 2018

Index	
Opinions By Sitting.....	2
Circuit Scorecard.....	3-4
Merits Cases By Vote Split.....	5
Term Index.....	6
Makeup of the Merits Docket.....	7
Total Opinion Authorship.....	8
Opinions Authored By Each Justice...	9
Workload.....	10-11
Majority Opinion Authorship.....	12
Strength of Majority.....	13
Unanimity.....	14-15
Frequency in the Majority.....	16
5-4 Cases.....	17-18
Majority Opinion Distribution.....	19
Justice Agreement.....	20
Pace of Grants.....	21
Pace of Opinions.....	22
Oral Argument – Justices.....	23
Oral Argument – Advocates.....	25-25
Voting Alignment – All Cases.....	26-32

Summary of the Term	
Total Merits Opinions Released	50
+ Signed merits opinions after oral argument	44
+ Per Curiam merits opinions after oral argument	1
+ Summary reversals	5
Total Merits Opinions Expected	74
<hr/>	
+ Petitions granted and set for argument	72
+ Summary reversals	5
- Cases removed from argument calendar	2
- Cases dismissed after oral argument	1
Cases Set for Argument During OT19	24
<hr/>	

* You can find past Stat Packs here: <<https://www.scotusblog.com/reference/stat-pack/>>. A few matters regarding our methodology are worth mentioning at the outset. First, SCOTUSblog treats consolidated cases as a single case, as determined by the case with the lowest docket number (prior to the release of an opinion) or the case that is captioned with an opinion. To the extent that two cases are argued separately but later decided with only one opinion, we will remove one of the cases from this Stat Pack, except to include it in the Pace of Grants chart to maintain cross-conference comparisons. The most unusual way we manage these later-consolidated cases is to merge the oral-argument data for the two cases. We combine the questions asked by each justice in the separate oral argument proceedings into one “consolidated” session. Second, this Stat Pack frequently uses the term “merits opinions,” “merits docket” or “merits cases.” Those three terms are used interchangeably, and signify the set of cases decided “on the merits.” Those cases include signed opinions after oral argument (the bulk of all merits cases), most per curiam opinions released after oral argument, summary reversals (cases decided with per curiam opinions without briefing or oral argument, often to reverse a lower court), and cases decided by an equally divided (4-4) court. Cases that are dismissed as improvidently granted are not included in our tally of merits cases.

Opinions By Sitting

	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	Decided	Argued				
Roberts	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	JGR	4				
Thomas	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	CT	8				
Ginsburg	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	RBG	5				
Breyer	1	1	1	2	-	-	1	SGB	6				
Alito	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	SAA	2				
Sotomayor	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	SMS	5				
Kagan	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	EK	5				
Gorsuch	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	NMG	4				
Kavanaugh	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	BMK	5				
Per Curiam	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	Per Cur.	1				
	Decided: 8 Remain: 1	Decided: 11 Remain: 1	Decided: 8 Remain: 2	Decided: 9 Remain: 2	Decided: 3 Remain: 3	Decided: 2 Remain: 7	Decided: 4 Remain: 8	Decided	45				
								Argued	69				
<i>Weyerhaeuser</i>	JGR	<i>Schein</i>	BMK	<i>Apple</i>	BMK	<i>Merck</i>	SGB	<i>Return Mail</i>	SMS	<i>Bethune</i>		<i>Brunetti</i>	
<i>Mt. Lemmon</i>	RBG	<i>Lamps Plus</i>	JGR	<i>Nieves</i>	JGR	<i>Obduskey</i>	SGB	<i>Mission Prd.</i>	EK	<i>Smith</i>	SMS	<i>Emulex*</i>	
<i>Gundy</i>		<i>Cougar Den</i>	SGB	<i>Nutraceutical</i>	SMS	<i>Herrera</i>	SMS	<i>Manhattan</i>		<i>Cochise</i>	CT	<i>Parker</i>	CT
<i>Madison</i>	EK	<i>Garza</i>	SMS	<i>Murphy</i>		<i>Fourth Est.</i>	RBG	<i>Haymond</i>		<i>Flowers</i>		<i>Kaestner Tr.</i>	
<i>Knick*</i>		<i>Frank</i>	PC	<i>Timbs</i>	RBG	<i>Hyatt</i>	CT	<i>Mont</i>	CT	<i>PDR</i>		<i>Davis</i>	
<i>New Prime</i>	NMG	<i>Jam</i>	JGR	<i>Dawson</i>	NMG	<i>Thacker</i>	EK	<i>Am. Legion</i>		<i>Dutra</i>		<i>McDonough</i>	
<i>Stokeling</i>	CT	<i>Sturgeon</i>	EK	<i>Lorenzo</i>	SGB	<i>Rimini</i>	BMK			<i>Rucho</i>		<i>Food Mrkt.</i>	
<i>Stitt</i>	SGB	<i>Va. Uranium</i>		<i>Biestek</i>	EK	<i>Home Depot</i>	CT			<i>Benisek</i>		<i>Fort Bend</i>	RBG
<i>Preap</i>	SAA	<i>Bucklew</i>	NMG	<i>Helsinn</i>	CT	<i>Allina</i>	NMG			<i>Kisor</i>		<i>Commerce</i>	
<i>Air & Liquid</i>	BMK	<i>BNSF Railway</i>	RBG	<i>Gamble</i>		<i>Knick</i>						<i>Mitchell</i>	
		<i>Harrison</i>	SAA			<i>Tenn. Wine</i>						<i>Rehaif</i>	
		<i>Culbertson</i>	CT									<i>Quarles</i>	BMK
												<i>Taggart</i>	SGB

*After oral argument in *Knick v. Township of Scott, Pennsylvania* on October 3, 2018, the Supreme Court ordered new briefing and heard reargument on January 16, 2019. After oral argument on April 15, 2019, the court dismissed *Emulex Corp. v. Varjabedian* as improvidently granted. The total of 69 arguments counts *Knick* only once and does not count *Emulex*.

Circuit Scorecard

October Term 2018							
	Number	Percent	Decided	Aff'd	Rev'd	Aff'd %	Rev'd %
CA1	2	3%	2	1	1	50%	50%
CA2	6	7%	1	0	1	0%	100%
CA3	3	4%	2	1	1	50%	50%
CA4	5	5%	1	1	0	100%	0%
CA5	4	5%	3	1	2	33.33%	66.67%
CA6	7	9%	6	3	3	50%	50%
CA7	1	1%	1	0	1	0%	100%
CA8	4	5%	3	1	2	33.33%	66.67%
CA9	15	19%	13	2	11	16.67%	84.62%
CA10	3	4%	1	1	0	100%	0%
CA11	7	9%	5	3	2	60%	40%
CA DC	3	4%	3	2	1	66.67%	33.33%
CA Fed	5	5%	2	1	1	50%	50%
State	11	14%	8	1	7	12.5%	87.5%
Dist. Court	3	4%	0	0	0	-	-
Original	0	0%	-	-	-	-	-
	75	100%	51	18	33	35.29%	64.71%

October Term 2019		
	Number	Percent
CA1	0	0%
CA2	3	12%
CA3	2	8%
CA4	2	8%
CA5	2	8%
CA6	3	12%
CA7	0	0%
CA8	0	0%
CA9	3	12%
CA10	0	0%
CA11	2	8%
CA DC	0	0%
CA Fed	2	8%
State	6	24%
Dist. Court	-	-
Original	-	-
	25	100%

* For the circuit scorecards only, we treat certain consolidated cases as separate decisions rather than as one. For consolidated cases that stemmed from different lower court decisions, such as the cases consolidated as *United States v. Stitt*, we counted the cases separately on this table to most accurately reflect the Supreme Court's treatment of the precedents below. For cases that were consolidated in the court below, such as the two petitions from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit in *The American Legion v. American Humanist Association* and *Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission v. AHA*, we count the Supreme Court's decision only once. Throughout the rest of the Stat Pack consolidated cases are uniformly treated as a single case.

** The circuit scorecard does not include *Emulex v. Varjabedian*, which was dismissed as improvidently granted.

Circuit Scorecard

This chart features affirmance and reversal rates for each circuit and each justice. The first number is the number of times a particular justice voted to affirm a decision of the court below and the second number is the number of times that justice voted to vacate or reverse the decision below.

	Roberts	Thomas	Ginsburg	Breyer	Alito	Sotomayor	Kagan	Gorsuch	Kavanaugh	Total Votes	Overall Decisions
CA1	1-1	1-1	1-1	1-1	1-1	1-1	1-1	2-0	0-1	9-8	1-1
CA2	0-1	1-0	0-1	0-1	0-1	0-1	0-1	0-1	0-1	1-8	0-1
CA3	1-1	0-2	1-1	1-1	0-2	1-1	1-1	0-2	1-1	6-12	1-1
CA4	0-1	1-0	1-0	1-0	0-1	1-0	1-0	0-1	0-1	5-4	1-0
CA5	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-1	9-17	1-2
CA6	3-3	3-3	2-4	2-4	3-3	1-5	2-4	1-5	3-3	20-34	3-3
CA7	0-1	0-1	1-0	0-1	0-1	1-0	0-1	0-1	0-1	2-7	0-1
CA8	1-1	2-0	0-2	0-2	1-1	0-2	0-2	2-0	1-1	7-11	1-1
CA9	1-12	2-11	5-8	4-9	1-12	5-8	4-9	2-11	1-11	25-91	2-11
CA10	1-0	1-0	1-0	1-0	1-0	1-0	1-0	1-0	1-0	9-0	1-0
CA11	2-3	3-2	2-3	3-2	3-2	2-3	2-3	3-2	3-2	23-22	3-2
CA DC	2-1	1-2	2-1	2-1	2-1	2-1	2-1	1-2	0-0	14-10	2-0
CA Fed	1-1	1-1	2-0	2-0	1-1	1-1	2-0	1-1	1-1	12-6	1-1
State	1-7	4-4	2-6	2-6	4-4	2-6	2-6	4-4	1-6	22-49	1-7
Dist. Court											
Original											

Merits Cases By Vote Split

9-0 25 (50%)	8-1 5 (10%)	7-2 3 (6%)	6-3 6 (12%)	5-4 11 (22%)	
<i>Mt. Lemmon</i> (8-0)	<i>Jam</i> (7-1)	<i>BNSF Railway</i>	<i>Garza</i>	<i>Stokeling</i>	Yellow
<i>Weyerhaeuser</i> (8-0)	<i>Frank</i> (PC)	<i>Lorenzo</i> (6-2)	<i>Moore</i> (PC)	<i>Madison</i> (5-3)	Blue
<i>Stitt</i>	<i>Harrison</i>	<i>Box</i> (PC)	<i>Air & Liquid</i>	<i>Preap</i>	Red
<i>Emmons</i> (PC)	<i>Allina</i> (7-1)		<i>Biestek</i>	<i>Lamps Plus</i>	Red
<i>Hill</i> (PC)	<i>Mission Prd.</i>		<i>Nieves</i>	<i>Bucklew</i>	Red
<i>Culbertson</i>			<i>Return Mail</i>	<i>Apple</i>	Blue
<i>Schein</i>				<i>Cougar Den</i>	Blue
<i>New Prime</i> (8-0)				<i>Herrera</i>	Blue
<i>Helsinn</i>				<i>Hyatt</i>	Red
<i>Timbs</i>				<i>Home Depot</i>	Blue
<i>Dawson</i>				<i>Mont</i>	Blue
<i>Rizo</i> (PC)					
<i>Nutraceutical</i>					
<i>Fourth Est.</i>					
<i>Rimini</i>					
<i>Sturgeon</i>					
<i>Merck</i>					
<i>Thacker</i>					
<i>Smith</i>					
<i>Cochise</i>					
<i>Fort Bend</i>					
<i>Obduskey</i>					
<i>Taggart</i>					
<i>Quarles</i>					
<i>Parker</i>					

Past Terms					
	9-0	8-1	7-2	6-3	5-4
OT10	46%	12%	15%	5%	20%
OT11	45%	11%	8%	17%	20%
OT12	49%	5%	9%	8%	29%
OT13	66%	3%	10%	8%	14%
OT14	41%	7%	12%	15%	26%
OT15	48%	11%	20%	11%	5%
OT16	59%	9%	17%	4%	10%
OT17	39%	8%	15%	10%	26%
Avg.	49%	8%	13%	10%	19%

* 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 nonparticipating 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 nonparticipating 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, Thomas, Alito, Gorsuch and Kavanaugh), the most liberal bloc (Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor and Kagan) along with any of the more conservative justices, 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.

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

Term Index


This chart includes a summary of the cases for the term including (1) majority opinion author, (2) vote, (3) days between argument and opinion, (4) judgment, and (5) court below. For each sitting, the chart provides the number of majority opinions written by each justice and the average number of days between argument and opinion for that justice's majority opinions.

October										November										December									
1	<i>Weyerhaeuser</i>	JGR	8-0	57d	R	CA5	JGR	1	57d	<i>Schein</i>	BMK	9-0	71d	R	CA5	JGR	2	148d	<i>Apple</i>	BMK	5-4	168d	A	CA9	JGR	1	183d		
2	<i>Mt. Lemmon</i>	RBG	8-0	36d	A	CA9	CT	1	98d	<i>Lamps Plus</i>	JGR	5-4	177d	R	CA9	CT	1	62d	<i>Nieves</i>	JGR	6-3	183d	R	CA9	CT	1	52d		
3	<i>Gundy</i>					CA2	RBG	1	36d	<i>Cougar Den</i>	SGB	5-4	140d	A	ST	RBG	1	118d	<i>Nutraceutical</i>	SMS	9-0	91d	R	CA9	RBG	1	84d		
4	<i>Madison</i>	EK	5-3	148d	R	ST	SGB	1	62d	<i>Garza</i>	SMS	6-3	120d	R	ST	SGB	1	140d	<i>Murphy</i>					CA10	SGB	1	114d		
5	<i>Knick</i>					CA3	SAA	1	160d	<i>Frank</i>	PC	8-1	140d	R	CA9	SAA	1	139d	<i>Timbs</i>	RBG	9-0	84d	R	ST	SAA	0			
6	<i>New Prime</i>	NMG	8-0	104d	A	CA1	SMS	0		<i>Jam</i>	JGR	7-1	119d	R	CADC	SMS	1	120d	<i>Dawson</i>	NMG	9-0	79d	R	ST	SMS	1	91d		
7	<i>Stokeling</i>	CT	5-4	98d	A	CA11	EK	1	148d	<i>Sturgeon</i>	EK	9-0	141d	R	CA9	EK	1	141d	<i>Lorenzo</i>	SGB	6-2	114d	A	CADC	EK	1	118d		
8	<i>Stitt</i>	SGB	9-0	62d	R	CA6	NMG	1	104d	<i>Va. Uranium</i>					CA4	NMG	1	146d	<i>Biestek</i>	EK	6-3	118d	A	CA6	NMG	1	79d		
9	<i>Preap</i>	SAA	5-4	160d	R	CA9	BMK	1	160d	<i>Bucklew</i>	NMG	5-4	146d	A	CA8	BMK	1	71d	<i>Helsinn</i>	CT	9-0	52d	A	CAFC	BMK	0			
10	<i>Air & Liquid</i>	BMK	6-3	160d	A	CA3	Tot.	8		<i>BNSF Railway</i>	RBG	7-2	118d	R	CA8	PC	1	140d	<i>Gamble</i>					CA11	Tot.	8			
11							Expect	9		<i>Harrison</i>	SAA	8-1	139d	R	CA2	Tot.	11								Expect	10			
12							Avg.		95d	<i>Culbertson</i>	CT	9-0	62d	R	CA11	Expect	12								Avg.		103d		
																Avg.		125d											
January										February										March									
1	<i>Merck</i>	SGB	9-0	133d	R	CA3	JGR	0		<i>Return Mail</i>	SMS	6-3	110d	R	CAFC	JGR			<i>Bethune</i>					USDC	JGR				
2	<i>Obduskey</i>	SGB	9-0	72d	A	CA10	CT	2	129d	<i>Mission Prd.</i>	EK	8-1	89d	R	CA1	CT	1	97d	<i>Smith</i>	SMS	9-0	71d	R	CA6	CT	1	55d		
3	<i>Herrera</i>	SMS	5-4	132d	R	ST	RBG	1	55d	<i>Manhattan</i>					CA2	RBG			<i>Cochise</i>	CT	9-0	55d	A	CA11	RBG				
4	<i>Fourth Est.</i>	RBG	9-0	55d	A	CA11	SGB	2	103d	<i>Haymond</i>					CA10	SGB			<i>Flowers</i>					ST	SGB				
5	<i>Hyatt</i>	CT	5-4	124d	R	ST	SAA	0		<i>Mont</i>	CT	5-4	97d	A	CA6	SAA			<i>PDR</i>					CA4	SAA				
6	<i>Thacker</i>	EK	9-0	105d	R	CA11	SMS	1	132d	<i>Am. Legion</i>					CA4	SMS	1	110d	<i>Dutra</i>					CA9	SMS	1	71d		
7	<i>Rimini</i>	BMK	9-0	49d	R	CA9	EK	1	105d							EK	1	89d	<i>Rucho</i>					USDC	EK				
8	<i>Home Depot</i>	CT	5-4	133d	A	CA4	NMG	1	139d							NMG			<i>Benisek</i>					USDC	NMG				
9	<i>Allina</i>	NMG	7-1	139d	A	CADC	BMK	1	49d							BMK			<i>Kisor</i>					CAFC	BMK				
10	<i>Knick</i>					CA3	Tot.	9								Tot.	3								Tot.	2			
11	<i>Tenn. Wine</i>					CA6	Expect	11								Expect	6								Expect	9			
12							Avg.		102d							Avg.		99d							Avg.		63d		
April										Summary Reversal										Total									
1	<i>Brunetti</i>					CAFC	JGR			<i>Emmons</i>	PC	9-0	n/a	R	CA9				JGR	4	134d			Dismissed after argument	1				
2	<i>Emulex</i>					CA9	CT	1	55d	<i>Hill</i>	PC	9-0	n/a	R	CA6				CT	8	85d								
3	<i>Parker</i>	CT	9-0	55d		CA9	RBG	1	42d	<i>Moore</i>	PC	6-3	n/a	R	ST				RBG	5	67d								
4	<i>Kaestner Tr.</i>					ST	SGB	1	40d	<i>Rizo</i>	PC	9-0	n/a	R	CA9				SGB	6	94d								
5	<i>Davis</i>					CA5	SAA			<i>Box</i>	PC	7-2	n/a	R	CA7				SAA	2	150d								
6	<i>McDonough</i>					CA2	SMS												SMS	5	105d								
7	<i>Food Mrkt.</i>					CA8	EK												EK	5	120d								
8	<i>Fort Bend</i>	RBG	9-0	42d	A	CA5	NMG												NMG	4	117d								
9	<i>Commerce</i>					CA2	BMK	1	47d										BMK	5	99d								
10	<i>Mitchell</i>					ST	Tot.	4											PC	6									
11	<i>Rehaif</i>					CA11	Expect	13											Cases disposed	51									
12	<i>Quarles</i>	BMK	9-0	47d		CA6	Avg.		46d										Expected	79									
13	<i>Taggart</i>	SGB	9-0	40d	R	CA9													Percent Decided	64.6%									
																			Average time	103d									


Makeup of the Merits Docket

The following charts depict different characteristics of the cases that were released with merits opinions. These charts include information about cases disposed of with signed opinions, summary reversals or affirmances by an equally divided court.


Court Below




Jurisdiction



Docket



Nature




* Technically, all paid and in forma pauperis cases have been on the same docket since 1971, with paid cases beginning each year with case number 1, and IFP cases beginning at number 5001. Original cases remain on a separate docket and follow a separate numbering convention. For more information on the dockets, see Eugene Gressman et al., "Supreme Court Practice" 55-56 (9th ed. 2007).

Total Opinion Authorship

The number of opinions five pages or longer is included in parentheses and represented by the thicker bars in the chart below.

	Total Opinions	Majority Opinions	Concurring Opinions	Dissenting Opinions
Roberts	6 (5)	4 (4)	1 (0)	1 (1)
Thomas	20 (15)	8 (8)	8 (4)	4 (3)
Ginsburg	9 (6)	5 (5)	1 (0)	3 (1)
Breyer	13 (13)	6 (6)	0 (0)	7 (7)
Alito	7 (6)	2 (2)	1 (1)	4 (3)
Sotomayor	14 (10)	5 (5)	3 (2)	6 (4)
Kagan	6 (6)	5 (5)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Gorsuch	12 (10)	4 (4)	2 (1)	6 (5)
Kavanaugh	8 (5)	5 (5)	2 (0)	1 (1)
Per Curiam	6 (5)	6 (5)	- (-)	- (-)



Opinions Authored By Each Justice

		Roberts	Thomas	Ginsburg	Breyer	Alito	Sotomayor	Kagan	Gorsuch	Kavanaugh	PC	
Majority Opinions	1	<i>Weyerhaeuser</i>	<i>Stokeling</i>	<i>Mt. Lemmon</i>	<i>Stitt</i>	<i>Preap</i>	<i>Garza</i>	<i>Madison</i>	<i>New Prime</i>	<i>Schein</i>	<i>Emmons</i>	50
	2	<i>Jam</i>	<i>Culbertson</i>	<i>Timbs</i>	<i>Lorenzo</i>	<i>Harrison</i>	<i>Nutraceutical</i>	<i>Sturgeon</i>	<i>Dawson</i>	<i>Rimini</i>	<i>Hill</i>	
	3	<i>Lamps Plus</i>	<i>Helsinn</i>	<i>BNSF Railway</i>	<i>Cougar Den</i>		<i>Herrera</i>	<i>Biestek</i>	<i>Bucklew</i>	<i>Air & Liquid</i>	<i>Moore</i>	
	4	<i>Nieves</i>	<i>Hyatt</i>	<i>Fourth Est.</i>	<i>Obduskey</i>		<i>Smith</i>	<i>Thacker</i>	<i>Allina</i>	<i>Apple</i>	<i>Rizo</i>	
	5		<i>Home Depot</i>	<i>Fort Bend</i>	<i>Merck</i>		<i>Return Mail</i>	<i>Mission Prd.</i>		<i>Quarles</i>	<i>Frank</i>	
	6		<i>Mont</i>		<i>Taggart</i>						<i>Box</i>	
	7		<i>Conchise</i>									
	8		<i>Parker</i>									
	9											
	10											
	11											
	12											
	13											
	14											
	15											
Concurring Opinions	1	<i>Moore</i>	<i>Timbs</i>	<i>New Prime</i>		<i>Merck</i>	<i>Sturgeon</i>		<i>Timbs</i>	<i>Nielsen</i>		18
	2		<i>Preap</i>				<i>Obduskey</i>		<i>Cougar Den</i>	<i>Bucklew</i>		
	3		<i>Lamps Plus</i>				<i>Mission Prd.</i>					
	4		<i>Bucklew</i>									
	5		<i>Nieves</i>									
	6		<i>Merck</i>									
	7		<i>Box</i>									
	8		<i>Quarles</i>									
	9											
	10											
	11											
	12											
	13											
	14											
	15											
Dissenting Opinions	1	<i>Cougar Den</i>	<i>Garza</i>	<i>Lamps Plus</i>	<i>Jam</i>	<i>Madison</i>	<i>Stokeling</i>	<i>Lamps Plus</i>	<i>BNSF Railway</i>	<i>Cougar Den</i>		33
	2		<i>Frank</i>	<i>Nieves</i>	<i>Preap</i>	<i>Moore</i>	<i>Lamps Plus</i>		<i>Air & Liquid</i>			
	3		<i>Lorenzo</i>	<i>Box</i>	<i>Lamps Plus</i>	<i>Herrera</i>	<i>Bucklew</i>		<i>Apple</i>			
	4		<i>Harrison</i>		<i>Bucklew</i>	<i>Home Depot</i>	<i>Biestek</i>		<i>Biestek</i>			
	5				<i>Hyatt</i>		<i>Nieves</i>		<i>Nieves</i>			
	6				<i>Allina</i>		<i>Mont</i>		<i>Mission Prd.</i>			
	7				<i>Return Mail</i>							
	8											
	9											
	10											
	11											
	12											
	13											
	14											
	15											
Total		6	20	9	13	7	14	6	12	8	6	101

*Plurality opinions, like the one by Justice Breyer in *Washington State Department of Licensing v. Cougar Den Inc.*, are treated as majority opinions throughout the Stat Pack.

Workload – Opinions Released Each Week

The chart below demonstrates how many opinions were released by each justice during each opinion week.

		October			November			December			January			February			March			April			May			June				Total
		#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#4	
JGR	Majority						1								1					1									4	
	Concurring																								1				0	
	Dissenting																	1											1	
	Total						1								1		1				1								5	
CT	Majority									1	1	1										2		1	1	1			8	
	Concurring													1			1			1	1			1	2			7		
	Dissenting														1		1	2										4		
	Total									1	1	1			1	1		2	2	1	1		2	1	3	1	1	19		
RBG	Majority					1								1		2												4		
	Concurring										1																	1		
	Dissenting																				1				2			3		
	Total					1					1				1	2					1				2			8		
SGB	Majority								1							2	1						1					5		
	Concurring																											0		
	Dissenting																					1				1	1	7		
	Total								1							1	3	1		1	1		1	1		1	1	12		
SAA	Majority															1	1											2		
	Concurring																									1		1		
	Dissenting																									1	1	3		
	Total																1	1								2	1	6		
SMS	Majority														2								1	1			1	5		
	Concurring																1	1					1					3		
	Dissenting										1									2	1				1	1		5		
	Total										1					2	1	1		2	1			2	2	1		13		
EK	Majority														1			1	1			1						5		
	Concurring																											0		
	Dissenting																									1		1		
	Total														1			1	1		1	1			1			6		
NMG	Majority										1																	4		
	Concurring																										1	2		
	Dissenting																			1	1		1	1	1			6		
	Total										1									1	1		1	1	1			12		
BMK	Majority										1					1	1											5		
	Concurring																										1	2		
	Dissenting																											1		
	Total										1					1	3					1					1	8		

Workload – Slip Pages Released Each Week

		October			November			December			January			February			March			April			May			June				Total	
		#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#4		
JGR	Majority						15								16						13									60	
	Concurring																														
	Dissenting																	10												10	
	Total						15								16		10					13								70	
CT	Majority									9	13	9										27		11	13	15				97	
	Concurring													13			6			2	2			6	24		2			55	
	Dissenting														18		3	20												41	
	Total									9	13	9		13	18		9	20		2	2		27	6	35	13	17			193	
RBG	Majority				7									9		26														53	
	Concurring										2																			2	
	Dissenting																					5			4					9	
	Total				7						2			9		26						5			4		11			64	
SGB	Majority							9									32	13							17		11	18		100	
	Concurring																													0	
	Dissenting														17		17				18	9		13			18			92	
	Total							9						17		49	13		18	9		13	17			29	18			192	
SAA	Majority																26	17												43	
	Concurring																							6						6	
	Dissenting																							19	26					58	
	Total																	26	17					25	26					107	
SMS	Majority														24									22	16					62	
	Concurring																3	12						2				8		25	
	Dissenting										13										8	3			14	14				52	
	Total										13				24		3	12			8	3		24	30	14	8			139	
EK	Majority														18			30	11			11		17						87	
	Concurring																													0	
	Dissenting																										14			14	
	Total														18			30	11		14	11		17						101	
NMG	Majority										15			8							31						17			71	
	Concurring																													12	
	Dissenting																		9	9			9		11	2	9			49	
	Total										15			9		9	20			40			11	2	9	17				132	
BMK	Majority										8						12	11						14				10			55
	Concurring																													5	
	Dissenting																													6	
	Total										8						12	20						14				10			66

Majority Opinion Authorship

Majority Opinions Authored

	Total	9-0	8-1	7-2	6-3	5-4	Average Majority
Roberts	4	1	1	-	1	1	7
Thomas	8	4	-	-	-	4	7
Ginsburg	5	4	-	1	-	-	8.6
Breyer	6	4	-	1	-	1	8
Alito	2	-	1	-	-	1	6.5
Sotomayor	5	2	-	-	2	1	7
Kagan	5	2	1	-	1	1	7.4
Gorsuch	4	2	1	-	-	1	7.75
Kavanaugh	5	3	-	-	1	1	7.6
	44	22	4	2	5	11	7.5

Percentage of Majority Opinions Decided with Unanimous Judgment

Ginsburg	80%
Breyer	66.67%
Kavanaugh	60%
Thomas	50%
Gorsuch	50%
Sotomayor	40%
Kagan	40%
Roberts	25%
Alito	0%

Authorship as a Percentage of Similar Opinions

	9-0	8-1	7-2	6-3	5-4
Roberts	5%	25%		20%	9%
Thomas	18%				36%
Ginsburg	18%		50%		
Breyer	18%		50%		9%
Alito		25%			9%
Sotomayor	9%			40%	9%
Kagan	9%	25%		20%	9%
Gorsuch	9%	25%			9%
Kavanaugh	14%			20%	9%

Average Days Between Argument and Opinion

Alito	150d
Roberts	134d
Kagan	120d
Gorsuch	117d
Sotomayor	105d
Kavanaugh	99d
Breyer	94d
Thomas	85d
Ginsburg	67d

Strength of the Majority

Argument Sitting	Decided	9-0	8-1	7-2	6-3	5-4	Average Majority
October	8	4			1	3	7.13
November	11	3	3	1	1	3	7.18
December	8	4		1	2	1	7.5
January	9	5	1			3	7.56
February	3		1		1	1	6.33
March	2	2					9
April	4	4					9
Summary Reversal	5	3		1	1		8

Number of Opinions Per Case
1.88
2.63
2.25
1.78
2.33
1
1.25
1.8

Recusals

Justice	Total
Kavanaugh	7

Solo Dissents

Justice	Total (OT18)	Average* (OT05-OT17)
Breyer	2	.28
Thomas	2	2.1
Gorsuch	1	.5
Alito	-	.62
Sotomayor	-	.89
Kagan	-	0
Roberts	-	0
Kavanaugh	-	0

* Averages consider only the terms during which a justice served on the court. Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Kagan have never filed a lone dissenting vote.

Unanimity

To take a closer look at unanimity at the court, we created three distinct measures of unanimity. The measures of unanimity are defined as follows:

Measure #1: When all justices simply voted for the same judgment – i.e., whether to affirm or reverse the judgment below. This is the broadest measure of unanimity because it allows for justices to write separate opinions – and sometimes even conflicting ones – as long as each justice voted to affirm or reverse the decision below.

Measure #2: When all justices joined some part of the same majority opinion, but one or more justices (1) wrote separately to state an individual position or (2) did not join the majority opinion in full.

Measure #3: When all justices joined a single majority opinion in full, without any justices writing separate concurring opinions. This is the narrowest measure of unanimity because it requires that the justices agree in full and without any written reservations or additions.

	Measure #3	<i>All Justices in Total Agreement</i>	19	38%
	Measure #2	<i>All Justices Join the Majority Opinion</i>	23	46%
	Measure #1	<i>All Justices Vote For the Same Judgment</i>	25	50%
Divided		<i>Justices Disagree On Whether To Affirm, Reverse, Or Vacate The Decision Below</i>	25	50%

* Note that Measure #2 incorporates the cases captured in Measure #1, just as Measure #3 captures those cases included in Measures #1 and #2. For more information on our measures of unanimity, see Kedar S. Bhatia, A Few Notes On Unanimity, SCOTUSblog (July 10, 2014 10:40 AM), <<http://www.scotusblog.com/2014/07/a-few-notes-on-unanimity/>>.


Unanimity

To take a closer look at unanimity at the court, we created three distinct measures of unanimity. The measures of unanimity are defined as follows:

Measure #1: When all justices simply voted for the same judgment – i.e., whether to affirm or reverse the judgment below. This is the broadest measure of unanimity because it allows for justices to write separate opinions – and sometimes even conflicting ones – as long as each justice voted to affirm or reverse the decision below.

Measure #2: When all justices joined some part of the same majority opinion, but one or more justices (1) wrote separately to state an individual position or (2) did not join the majority opinion in full.

Measure #3: When all justices joined a single majority opinion in full, without any justices writing separate concurring opinions. This is the narrowest measure of unanimity because it requires that the justices agree in full and without any written reservations or additions.



Frequency in the Majority

The following charts measure how frequently each justice has voted with the majority during October Term 2018. The charts include summary reversals but do not include cases that were dismissed.

All Cases										
Justice	Votes	Frequency in Majority		OT17	OT16	OT15	OT14	OT13	OT12	OT11
Roberts	50	45	90%	93%	93%	92%	80%	92%	86%	92%
Thomas	50	39	78%	81%	82%	72%	61%	88%	79%	86%
Ginsburg	50	41	82%	73%	85%	88%	86%	85%	79%	70%
Breyer	50	42	84%	73%	90%	94%	92%	88%	83%	76%
Alito	50	42	84%	79%	86%	84%	72%	88%	79%	83%
Sotomayor	50	41	82%	68%	90%	83%	89%	82%	79%	80%
Kagan	50	43	86%	74%	93%	95%	85%	92%	81%	82%
Gorsuch	50	38	76%	85%	82%	-	-	-	-	-
Kavanaugh	43	40	93%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Divided Cases										
Justice	Votes	Frequency in Majority		OT17	OT16	OT15	OT14	OT13	OT12	OT11
Roberts	25	20	80%	89%	83%	84%	66%	76%	73%	86%
Thomas	25	14	56%	69%	57%	49%	34%	64%	60%	74%
Ginsburg	25	16	64%	56%	63%	78%	77%	56%	60%	45%
Breyer	25	17	68%	56%	77%	89%	86%	64%	67%	57%
Alito	25	17	68%	67%	67%	70%	52%	63%	59%	69%
Sotomayor	25	16	64%	49%	76%	68%	82%	46%	59%	64%
Kagan	25	18	72%	59%	83%	91%	75%	75%	63%	67%
Gorsuch	25	13	52%	75%	63%	-	-	-	-	-
Kavanaugh	21	18	86%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

5-4 Cases

Alignment of the Majority

Majority	11	Cases
Roberts, Thomas, Alito, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh	4	<i>Preap, Lamps Plus, Bucklew, Hyatt</i>
Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan, Gorsuch	2	<i>Cougar Den, Herrera</i>
Roberts, Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan	1	<i>Madison</i>
Roberts, Thomas, Ginsburg, Alito, Kavanaugh	1	<i>Mont</i>
Thomas, Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan	1	<i>Home Depot</i>
Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan, Kavanaugh	1	<i>Apple</i>
Thomas, Breyer, Alito, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh	1	<i>Stokeling</i>

Term	Number of 5-4 Opinions	Percentage of Total Opinions	Percentage of 5-4 Split Ideological *	Conservative Victory * (Percentage of Ideological)	Conservative Victory (Percentage of All 5-4)	Number of Different Alignments
OT05	11	12%	73%	53%	45%	7
OT06	24	33%	79%	68%	54%	6
OT07	12	17%	67%	50%	33%	6
OT08	23	29%	70%	69%	48%	7
OT09	16	19%	69%	73%	50%	7
OT10	16	20%	88%	71%	63%	4
OT11	15	20%	67%	50%	33%	7
OT12	23	29%	70%	63%	43%	7
OT13	10	14%	60%	67%	40%	7
OT14	19	26%	68%	38%	26%	7
OT15	4	5%	100%	25%	25%	2
OT16	7	10%	86%	33%	29%	3
OT17	19	26%	74%	100%	74%	5
OT18	11	22%	82%	44%	36%	7
Average	15	20%	75%	57%	43%	6

* For the purposes of this chart, a “Conservative Victory” occurs whenever the majority consists of Chief Justice Roberts and Justices Thomas, Alito, Gorsuch and Kavanaugh. A “Liberal Victory” occurs whenever the majority consists of Justices Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan and one conservative. An ideological split occurs with either of these two types of victories.

5-4 Cases

Membership in a 5-4 Majority

Justice	Cases Decided	Frequency in Majority	OT17	OT16	OT15	OT14	OT13	OT12	OT11	OT10	
Kavanaugh	10	7	70%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Thomas	11	7	64%	79%	43%	25%	37%	50%	65%	67%	75%
Gorsuch	11	7	64%	84%	67%	-	-	-	-	-	
Roberts	11	6	55%	89%	29%	25%	53%	70%	61%	67%	63%
Breyer	11	6	55%	21%	71%	75%	74%	50%	48%	47%	31%
Alito	11	6	55%	79%	29%	25%	47%	60%	57%	60%	63%
Ginsburg	11	5	45%	26%	71%	75%	63%	40%	43%	33%	38%
Sotomayor	11	5	45%	21%	71%	75%	68%	30%	39%	47%	38%
Kagan	11	5	45%	17%	71%	50%	53%	50%	43%	40%	38%

5-4 Majority Opinion Authorship *

Justice	Cases Decided	Frequency in the Majority	Opinions Authored	Frequency as Author	OT17	OT16	OT15	OT14	OT13	OT12	OT11	OT10
Thomas	11	7	4	57%	20%	33%	0%	0%	20%	13%	0%	33%
Sotomayor	11	5	1	20%	0%	0%	0%	15%	0%	22%	29%	17%
Kagan	11	5	1	20%	33%	20%	0%	10%	60%	10%	17%	0%
Roberts	11	6	1	17%	12%	0%	0%	20%	14%	14%	10%	30%
Breyer	11	6	1	17%	25%	20%	33%	21%	0%	18%	43%	20%
Alito	11	6	1	17%	27%	0%	100%	33%	33%	46%	33%	0%
Gorsuch	11	7	1	14%	31%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kavanaugh	10	7	1	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ginsburg	11	5	0	0%	20%	20%	0%	25%	0%	10%	0%	33%

* These percentages consider how often a justice writes the majority opinion when that justice is in the majority.

Majority Opinion Distribution

For each case decided with a merits opinion, the author of the majority opinion is selected by the most senior justice who votes with the majority. For example, in *Herrera v. Wyoming*, a 5-4 decision in which Justices Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan and Gorsuch voted in the majority, Justice Ginsburg (the most senior justice in the majority) assigned authorship duties to Justice Sotomayor (the author of the majority opinion). The tables below demonstrate how the five most senior justices on the court assigned majority opinions during OT18 when they had the chance. For unanimous cases we have showed only statistics for Chief Justice Roberts because he is always the most senior justice in the majority for unanimous opinions.

Unanimous Cases

	Roberts	Thomas	Ginsburg	Breyer	Alito	Sotomayor	Kagan	Gorsuch	Kavanaugh
Roberts (22)	1	4	4	4	0	2	2	2	3

5-4 Cases

	Roberts	Thomas	Ginsburg	Breyer	Alito	Sotomayor	Kagan	Gorsuch	Kavanaugh
Roberts (6)	1	2	0	0	1		1	1	0
	Thomas (2)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Ginsburg (3)	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
			Breyer (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0
				Alito (0)	0	0	0	0	0


Justice Agreement (All Cases)

	Thomas	Ginsburg	Breyer	Alito	Sotomayor	Kagan	Gorsuch	Kavanaugh	Total
Roberts	31 62%	34 68%	35 70%	44 88%	32 64%	38 76%	34 68%	37 86%	50
	38 76%	37 74%	36 72%	45 90%	36 72%	39 78%	36 72%	41 95%	
	40 80%	38 76%	37 74%	45 90%	38 76%	40 80%	37 74%	41 95%	
	10 20%	12 24%	13 26%	5 10%	12 24%	10 20%	13 26%	2 5%	
Thomas	25 50%	26 52%	35 70%	23 46%	27 54%	35 70%	27 63%	50	
	29 58%	30 60%	43 86%	28 56%	31 62%	40 80%	33 77%		
	30 60%	31 62%	45 90%	30 60%	32 64%	41 82%	35 81%		
	20 40%	19 38%	5 10%	20 40%	18 36%	9 18%	8 19%		
Ginsburg	38 76%	30 60%	38 76%	42 84%	29 58%	29 67%	50		
	42 84%	32 64%	43 86%	45 90%	32 64%	30 70%			
	43 86%	33 66%	48 98%	46 92%	33 66%	31 72%			
	7 14%	17 34%	2 2%	4 8%	17 34%	12 28%			
Breyer	33 66%	37 74%	45 90%	30 60%	33 77%	50			
	33 66%	42 84%	47 94%	31 62%	33 77%				
	34 68%	43 86%	47 94%	32 64%	34 79%				
	16 32%	7 14%	3 6%	18 36%	9 21%				
Alito	28 56%	34 68%	38 76%	36 84%	50				
	31 62%	34 68%	41 82%	39 91%					
	33 66%	35 70%	42 84%	39 91%					
	17 34%	15 30%	8 16%	4 9%					
Sotomayor	40 80%	28 56%	26 61%	50					
	45 90%	32 64%	29 67%						
	46 92%	35 70%	31 72%						
	4 8%	15 30%	12 28%						
Kagan	31 62%	31 72%	50						
	32 64%	32 74%							
	33 66%	33 77%							
	17 34%	9 23%							
Gorsuch	28 65%	50							
	31 72%								
	32 74%								
	11 26%								
Kavanaugh		43							

Key
Fully Agree
Agree in Full or Part
Agree in Full, Part, or Judgment Only
Disagree in Judgment

Pace of Grants


The following chart plots the pace at which the court fills its merits docket for a given term. Each date marker represents the conference within a given sitting. For instance, Feb #3 is the third February conference, which, during OT18, took place on March 1, 2019. Categorizing grants by their conference within a given sitting ensures more accurate cross-term comparisons.



* The Minimum Distribution Pace presented in this chart reflects the number of petitions that must be granted to fill the court's docket for oral argument while giving the litigants in each case a complete or near-complete briefing schedule. The pace also reflects the number of petitions raised at each conference and other factors affecting the certiorari process.

Pace of Opinions

The following chart plots the pace at which the court releases merits opinions throughout the term, beginning in October and ending in June. This chart includes both opinions released after full briefing and summary reversals. Here, as in the Pace of Grants chart, cases are categorized by their release within a given sitting, rather than by calendar month. For example, the opinions for Feb #3 of OT18 were actually released on March 4, 2019.



Oral Argument - Justices

For our purposes, the number of “questions” per argument is simply the number of times a given justice’s name appears in the argument transcript in capital letters. To account for the chief justice’s administrative comments – such as his call for an advocate to begin – his tally for each case has been uniformly reduced by three “questions.”

Average Number of Questions Per Argument

	Average
Sotomayor	23.8
Breyer	18.1
Kavanaugh	15.1
Kagan	14.9
Gorsuch	14.2
Roberts	13.3
Alito	13.1
Ginsburg	8.1
Thomas	0.0

Frequency as the Top Questioner or as a Top 3 Questioner

	Freq. Top 1	Freq. Top 3
Sotomayor	46%	78%
Breyer	16%	52%
Gorsuch	16%	41%
Kavanaugh	13%	37%
Roberts	6%	29%
Kagan	6%	42%
Ginsburg	5%	10%
Alito	4%	35%
Thomas	0%	0%

Cases With Most Total Justice Questions

	Questions
<i>Commerce</i>	219
<i>Am. Legion</i>	212
<i>PDR Network</i>	199
<i>Kaestner Tr.</i>	174
<i>Rehaif</i>	166
<i>Manhattan</i>	163
<i>Cougar Den</i>	161
<i>Davis</i>	153
<i>Murphy</i>	153
<i>Gamble</i>	152

Most Active Arguments

	Argument	Number of Questions (% of all questions)
Roberts	<i>Dawson</i>	33 (23%)
Thomas	<i>Flowers</i>	3 (2%)
Ginsburg	<i>Fort Bend</i>	34 (37%)
Breyer	<i>Halleck</i>	50 (31%)
Alito	<i>Benisek</i>	34 (23%)
Sotomayor	<i>Commerce</i>	58 (26%)
Kagan	<i>Am. Legion</i>	38 (18%)
Gorsuch	<i>Rehaif</i>	43 (26%)
Kavanaugh	<i>Emulex</i>	42 (30%)

Frequency as the First Questioner

	Frequency	
Ginsburg	24/ 60	40%
Sotomayor	27/ 70	39%
Roberts	9/ 70	13%
Alito	5/ 70	7%
Kagan	3/ 70	4%
Breyer	1/ 70	1%
Gorsuch	1/ 70	1%
Thomas	0/ 70	0%
Kavanaugh	0/ 62	0%

Oral Argument - Advocates

Overview

	OT12	OT13	OT14	OT15	OT16	OT17	OT18
Number of Different Advocates	120	121	112	117	100	113	122
Number of Total Appearances	193	185	178	186	158	163	178

Appearances by Advocates Who...	OT12	OT13	OT14	OT15	OT16	OT17	OT18
...Are from the Office of the Solicitor General	64 (33%)	61 (33%)	56 (31%)	59 (32%)	48 (30%)	48 (29%)	50 (28%)
...Have experience in the Office of the Solicitor General	Not Available	85 (47%)	78 (46%)	84 (71%)	73 (48%)	71 (65%)	86 (48%)
...Have argued at least twice during the Term	104 (54%)	96 (52%)	104 (58%)	109 (59%)	94 (59%)	77 (47%)	87 (49%)
...Are “expert” Supreme Court litigators*	137 (71%)	131 (71%)	116 (66%)	136 (74%)	115 (74%)	89 (56%)	123 (69%)
...Are based in Washington, D.C.**	125 (65%)	119 (64%)	101 (57%)	122 (66%)	97 (61%)	97 (60%)	109 (61%)
...Are female	33 (17%)	28 (15%)	34 (19%)	32 (18%)	33 (21%)	19 (12%)	30 (17%)
...Are female and not from the Office of the Solicitor General***	17 (13%)	11 (9%)	17 (14%)	13 (10%)	15 (14%)	10 (9%)	21 (12%)

Most Popular Advocate Origins

State	Total
Washington, D.C.	109
California	12
New York	10
Texas	8

Most Popular Supreme Court Clerkships

Clerkship	Appearances	Advocates
Antonin Scalia	26	11
John G. Roberts	15	9
Stephen Breyer	10	7
Ruth Bader Ginsburg	7	4

Most Popular Law Schools

Law School	Appearances	Advocates
Harvard	34	24
Yale	32	18
Chicago	15	7
Stanford	9	5
Michigan	8	5

* We adopt Richard Lazarus' definition of an “expert” Supreme Court litigator: one who has argued five or more times before the Supreme Court or works in an office where lawyers have collectively argued more than 10 times. See Richard J. Lazarus, “Advocacy Matters Before and Within the Supreme Court: Transforming the Court by Transforming the Bar,” 97 Geo. L.J. 1487, 1490 n.17 (2008).

** An advocate’s “origin” is simply the state of origin listed for that lawyer on the court’s monthly hearing lists. If attorneys from the Office of the Solicitor General are omitted, lawyers based in Washington, D.C., appeared 59 times during OT18.

*** The percentage figures for this category omit all advocates from the Office of the Solicitor General. They demonstrate the percentage of female advocates from positions other than those within the Office of the Solicitor General as a percentage of all men or women arguing from positions other than those within the Office of the Solicitor General.

Oral Argument - Advocates

Advocates Who Have Argued Two or More Cases During OT18

Name	Appearances		Position	Law School	Supreme Court Clerkship	U.S. Solicitor General Experience	Gender
	OT18	All Time					
David C. Frederick	5	55	Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick PLLC	Texas	Byron White	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Jeffrey B. Wall	5	21	Principal Deputy Solicitor General	Chicago	Clarence Thomas	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Noel J. Francisco	5	11	Solicitor General	Chicago	Antonin Scalia	Solicitor General	Male
Paul D. Clement	4	96	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	Harvard	Antonin Scalia	Solicitor General	Male
Edwin S. Kneeder	4	142	Deputy Solicitor General	Virginia	None	Deputy Solicitor General	Male
Kannon K. Shanmugam	4	27	Williams & Connolly LLP*	Harvard	Antonin Scalia	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Malcolm L. Stewart	4	83	Deputy Solicitor General	Yale	Harry Blackmun	Deputy Solicitor General	Male
Daniel L. Geysler	4	8	Geysler PC	Harvard	None	None	Male
Shay Dvoretzky	3	10	Jones Day LLP	Yale	Antonin Scalia	None	Male
Eric J. Feigin	3	21	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Stanford	Stephen Breyer	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Jeffrey L. Fisher	3	38	Stanford Supreme Court Clinic	Michigan	John Paul Stevens	None	Male
Allon Kedem	3	11	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Yale	Elena Kagan	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Zachary D. Tripp	3	11	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Columbia	Ruth Bader Ginsburg	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Anthony A. Yang	3	29	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Yale	None	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Jonathan C. Bond	3	4	Assistant to the Solicitor General	George Washington	Antonin Scalia	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Lisa S. Blatt	2	37	Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP*	Texas	None	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Female
Theodore J. Boutrous Jr.	2	4	Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	San Diego	None	None	Male
Paul W. Hughes	2	5	Mayer Brown LLP*	Yale	None	None	Male
Neal K. Katyal	2	39	Hogan Lovells LLP	Yale	Stephen Breyer	Acting Solicitor General	Male
Rachel P. Kovner	2	13	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Stanford	Antonin Scalia	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Female
Ann O'Connell Adams	2	21	Assistant to the Solicitor General*	George Washington	William Rehnquist	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Female
Carter G. Phillips	2	87	Sidley Austin LLP	Northwestern	Warren Burger	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Andrew J. Pincus	2	29	Mayer Brown LLP	Columbia	None	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Seth P. Waxman	2	82	WilmerHale LLP	Yale	None	Solicitor General	Male
Michael B. Kimberly	2	5	Mayer Brown LLP*	Yale	None	None	Male
Christopher G. Michel	2	3	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Yale	John G. Roberts	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Erica L. Ross	2	3	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Stanford	Elena Kagan	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Female
Jonathan Ellis	2	3	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Pennsylvania	John G. Roberts	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Michael R. Huston	2	3	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Michigan	John G. Roberts	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Morgan Ratner	2	3	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Harvard	John G. Roberts	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Female
Toby J. Heytens	2	9	Solicitor General of Virginia	Virginia	Ruth Bader Ginsburg	Assistant to the Solicitor General	Male
Total: 30							

*Since their last oral arguments so far this term, these attorneys have moved to new positions.









































































Voting Alignment – All Cases

Cases are sorted by date of decision. Dissenting justices are shaded in gray and the author of the majority opinion is highlighted in red.

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kavanaugh	Roberts	Gorsuch	Alito	Thomas
<i>Mount Lemmon Fire District v. Guido</i>	November 6, 2018	8-0	Ginsburg									
<i>Weyerhaeuser v. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</i>	November 27, 2018	8-0	Roberts									
<i>United States v. Stitt</i>	December 10, 2018	9-0	Ginsburg									
<i>Escondido v. Emmons</i>	January 7, 2019	9-0	Per Curiam									
<i>Shoop v. Hill</i>	January 7, 2018	9-0	Per Curiam									
<i>Culbertson v. Berryhill</i>	January 8, 2018	9-0	Thomas									
<i>Henry Schein v. Archer and White Sales</i>	January 8, 2018	9-0	Kavanaugh									
<i>Stokeling v. United States</i>	January 15, 2019	5-4	Thomas									









































































Voting Alignment – All Cases

(continued)

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kavanaugh	Roberts	Gorsuch	Alito	Thomas
<i>New Prime v. Oliveira</i>	January 15, 2019	8-0	Roberts									
<i>Helsinn Healthcare v. Teva Pharmaceuticals</i>	January 25, 2019	9-0	Thomas									
<i>Moore v. Texas</i>	February 19, 2019	6-3	Per Curiam									
<i>Timbs v. Indiana</i>	February 20, 2019	9-0	Ginsburg									
<i>Dawson v. Steager</i>	February 20, 2019	9-0	Gorsuch									
<i>Yovino v. Rizo</i>	February 25, 2019	9-0	Per Curiam									
<i>Nutraceutical v. Lambert</i>	February 26, 2019	9-0	Sotomayor									
<i>Jam v. International Finance Corp.</i>	February 27, 2019	7-1	Roberts									









































































Voting Alignment – All Cases

(continued)

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kavanaugh	Roberts	Gorsuch	Alito	Thomas
<i>Garza v. Idaho</i>	February 27, 2019	6-3	Sotomayor									
<i>Madison v. Alabama</i>	February 27, 2019	5-3	Kagan									
<i>Fourth Estate Public Benefit Corp. v. Wall-Street.com</i>	March 4, 2019	9-0	Ginsburg									
<i>BNSF Railway v. Loos</i>	March 4, 2019	7-2	Ginsburg									
<i>Rimini Street Inc. v. Oracle USA Inc.</i>	March 4, 2019	9-0	Kavanaugh									
<i>Washington Department of Licensing v. Cougar Den</i>	March 19, 2019	5-4	Breyer									
<i>Nielsen v. Preap</i>	March 19, 2019	5-4	Alito									
<i>Air & Liquid Systems v. Devries</i>	March 19, 2019	6-3	Kavanaugh									









































































Voting Alignment – All Cases

(continued)

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kavanaugh	Roberts	Gorsuch	Alito	Thomas
<i>Obduskey v. McCarthy & Holthus LLP</i>	March 20, 2019	9-0	Breyer									
<i>Frank v. Gaos</i>	March 20, 2019	8-1	Per Curiam									
<i>Sudan v. Harrison</i>	March 26, 2019	8-1	Alito									
<i>Sturgeon v. Frost</i>	March 26, 2019	9-0	Kagan									
<i>Lorenzo v. Securities Exchange Commission</i>	March 27, 2019	6-2	Breyer									
<i>Biestek v. Berryhill</i>	April 1, 2019	6-3	Kagan									
<i>Bucklew v. Precythe</i>	April 1, 2019	5-4	Gorsuch									
<i>Lamps Plus v. Varela</i>	April 24, 2019	5-4	Roberts									









































































Voting Alignment – All Cases

(continued)

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kavanaugh	Roberts	Gorsuch	Alito	Thomas
<i>Thacker v. Tennessee Valley Authority</i>	April 29, 2019	9-0	Kagan									
<i>California Franchise Tax Board v. Hyatt</i>	May 15, 2019	5-4	Thomas									
<i>Cochise Consultancy v. United States ex rel. Hunt</i>	May 15, 2019	9-0	Thomas									
<i>Apple v. Pepper</i>	May 15, 2019	5-4	Kavanaugh									
<i>Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Albrecht</i>	May 20, 2019	9-0	Breyer									
<i>Herrera v. Wyoming</i>	May 20, 2019	5-4	Sotomayor									
<i>Mission Product Holdings Inc. v. Tempnology, LLC</i>	May 20, 2019	8-1	Kagan									
<i>Nieves v. Bartlett</i>	May 28, 2019	6-3	Roberts									










Voting Alignment – All Cases

(continued)

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kavanaugh	Roberts	Gorsuch	Alito	Thomas
<i>Home Depot U.S.A. Inc. v. Jackson</i>	May 28, 2019	5-4	Thomas									
<i>Smith v. Berryhill</i>	May 28, 2019	9-0	Sotomayor									
<i>Box v. Planned Parenthood of Indiana and Kentucky</i>	May 28, 2019	7-2	Per Curiam									
<i>Mont v. United States</i>	June 3, 2019	5-4	Thomas									
<i>Fort Bend County, Texas v. Davis</i>	June 3, 2019	9-0	Ginsburg									
<i>Taggart v. Lorenzen</i>	June 3, 2019	9-0	Breyer									
<i>Azar v. Allina Health Services</i>	June 3, 2019	7-1	Gorsuch									
<i>Mount Lemmon Fire District v. Guido</i>	June 10, 2019	9-0	Thomas									

Voting Alignment – All Cases

(continued)

Case Name	Decided	Vote	Author	Sotomayor	Ginsburg	Kagan	Breyer	Kavanaugh	Roberts	Gorsuch	Alito	Thomas
<i>Return Mail Inc. v. United States Postal Service</i>	June 10, 2019	6-3	Sotomayor									
<i>Quarles v. United States</i>	June 10, 2019	9-0	Kavanaugh	