


# Introduction to Legal Research on Fastcase

2016

## Getting started — Logging in



# What's in the Fastcase Database?

## Scope of Coverage

### Law Libraries

Fastcase puts the whole national law library on your desktop, with online access to cases, statutes, regulations, court rules, and bar publications, right at your fingertips.

[Collapse All](#) | [Expand All](#)

#### Federal Libraries

- U.S. Supreme Court | 1 U.S. 1 – Current
- All Federal Circuit Courts | 1 F.2d 1 – Current
  - U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit
  - U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
  - U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit
  - U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit
  - U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit
  - U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
  - U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit
  - U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

- Primary Law:
  - Cases
  - Statutes
  - Regulations
  - Court Rules
  - Constitutions
- HeinOnline Partnership
- Not sure? Check our Scope of Coverage page:
  - [fastcase.com/coverage](http://fastcase.com/coverage)

## My Research Home

**search case name OR citation (1 Cranch 137)**

Quick Caselaw Search [switch to advanced caselaw search](#)

marbury v. madison

☒ All Jurisdictions


You have 43 new alerts.

| Start a New Search                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Last 10 Searches                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Help Options                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Advanced Caselaw Search</li> <li>➤ Search Statutes</li> <li>➤ Search Regulations</li> <li>➤ Search Constitutions</li> <li>➤ Search Court Rules</li> <li>➤ Search Attorney General Opinions</li> <li>➤ Search HeinOnline Law Reviews</li> <li>➤ Search Disciplinary Orders</li> </ul> | <div style="margin-bottom: 5px;">marbury v. madison</div> <div style="margin-bottom: 5px;">hobby lobby</div> <div style="margin-bottom: 5px;">cantan*</div> <div style="margin-bottom: 5px;">1 USC 201</div> <div style="margin-bottom: 5px;">34-S-194</div> <div style="margin-bottom: 5px;">63 NJ Super 369</div> <div style="margin-bottom: 5px;">(((attorney or attorneys) /6 (fee or fees)) /7 (acceptable or appropriate or allow*)) /9 (low or reduced)</div> <div style="margin-bottom: 5px;">(((attorney or attorneys) /6 (fee or fees)) /7 (acceptable or appropriate or allow*))</div> <div style="margin-bottom: 5px;">(((attorney or attorneys) /6 (fee or fees)) /7 (reduced or low)</div> <div style="margin-bottom: 5px;">(attorney or attorneys) /6 (fee or fees)</div> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ User Guide</li> <li>➤ FAQs</li> <li>➤ Tutorials</li> <li>➤ Live Chat</li> <li>➤ E-mail Support</li> <li>➤ Resources</li> </ul> |



## Print, download, or email cases

These options are available at the top of each Fastcase document in the grey toolbar.



Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 2 L. Ed. 60, 1 Cranch 137 (1803)

5 U.S. 137  
2 L. Ed. 60  
1 Cranch 137

William **MARBURY**  
v.  
James **MADISON**, Secretary of State of the United States.  
Supreme Court of the United States  
February, 1803

## Printing options

- Fastcase allows you to download, save, and print an unlimited amount of primary law documents.
- You can change the number of columns and file format (Microsoft Word or PDF).

**Print Document**

Document selected: **Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 2 L. Ed. 60, 1 Cranch 137 (1803)**

Highlight search terms: ☐ Yes ☒ No

Number of columns:

Format:

[Print/Save](#) [Cancel](#)

## Save Your Favorite Documents

My Library

Recent Documents Favorite Documents

**Favorites**

- Who Owns the Law?**
  - Nash v. Lathrop, 142 Mass. 29, 6 N.E. 559 (Mass., 1886)
  - Henry Wheaton and Robert Donaldson, Appellants v. Richard Peters and John Grigg, 33 U.S. 591, 8 Pet. 591, 8 L.Ed. 1 (1834)
  - Matthew Bender & Co., Inc. v. West Pub. Co., 158 F.3d 693 (C.A.2 (N.Y.), 1998)
- Warrantless Searches**
  - United States v. Wurie (1st Cir., 2013)
  - Bel-Ray Co., Inc. v. Chemrite Ltd., 181 F.3d 435 (3rd Cir., 1999)
  - Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, 83 S.Ct. 792, 9 L.Ed.2d 799 (1963)
- Fourth Amendment**
  - State v. Smith, 124 Ohio St.3d 163, 2009 Ohio 6426, 920 N.E.2d 949 (Ohio, 2009)
  - 415 ILCS 5/22.2 Hazardous waste; fees; liability. (Illinois Compiled Statutes (2014 Edition))

## Public link — share with anyone

Authority Check: These results: 3/21 Entire database: 3/21

Highlight: all search terms

Find: previous term [P], next term [N]

Navigate to the: previous case, next case

Jump to the: most relevant paragraph [M]

Print/Save

Add to My Print Queue

Add to My Favorites

Email

Public Link

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 2 L. Ed. 60, 1 Cranch 137 (1803)

8 U.S. 137  
2 L. Ed. 60  
1 Cranch 137

William **MARBURY**  
v.  
James **MADISON**, Secretary of State of the United States.  
Supreme Court of the United States  
February, 1803

MARSHALL  
[1 Cranch 138]

The supreme court of the U. States has not power to issue a mandamus to a secretary of state of the U. States, it being an exercise of original jurisdiction not warranted have not power to give original jurisdiction to the supreme court in other cases than those described in the constitution. An act of congress repugnant to the constitution of the U. States are bound to take notice of the constitution. A commission is not necessary to the appointment of an officer by the executive-Semb. A commissioner appointment.

Delivery is not necessary to the validity of letters patent. The President cannot authorize a secretary of state to omit the performance

[1 Cranch 139]

➤ You can share Primary Law documents with anyone, even if they do not have access to Fastcase.

➤ Just click Public Link to open a new Public tab. Share the web address with friends, colleagues, and clients.

## Advanced Caselaw Search

- Go to Search > Search Cases from the black toolbar along the top of the screen to access the Advanced Caselaw Search page.
- Many more options are available:
  - Change the search mode
  - Change your jurisdiction
  - Adjust your date range.

The screenshot shows the 'Advanced Caselaw Search' page. A red box highlights the 'Search Type' section at the top, which includes radio buttons for 'Keyword Search (Boolean)', 'Natural Language', and 'Citation Lookup'. A green box highlights the 'Select Jurisdictions' section, which lists various court levels and jurisdictions. A blue box highlights the 'Search Options' section, which includes date range selectors for 'Start Date' and 'End Date'. The 'Results' section on the right shows settings for 'Maximum results', 'Results per page', and 'Sort by'.

## Different types of searches

- Citation Lookup; Natural Language; and Keyword (Boolean)

This screenshot focuses on the 'Advanced Caselaw Search' page, specifically the 'Search Type' section. An orange box highlights the radio buttons for 'Keyword Search (Boolean)', 'Natural Language', and 'Citation Lookup'. The 'Keyword Search (Boolean)' option is currently selected. Below the search type section is a large text input field and a 'Show Search Tips' checkbox.

## Mix and match jurisdictions

Individual Jurisdictions...

- ☒ U.S. Supreme Court and U.S. Courts of Appeal
- ☒ U.S. District Courts
- ☒ U.S. Bankruptcy Courts
- ☒ State Supreme and Appeals Courts

|                                               |                                        |                                         |                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alabama              | <input type="checkbox"/> Illinois      | <input type="checkbox"/> Montana        | <input type="checkbox"/> Rhode Island   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alaska               | <input type="checkbox"/> Indiana       | <input type="checkbox"/> Nebraska       | <input type="checkbox"/> South Carolina |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arizona              | <input type="checkbox"/> Iowa          | <input type="checkbox"/> Nevada         | <input type="checkbox"/> South Dakota   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arkansas             | <input type="checkbox"/> Kansas        | <input type="checkbox"/> New Hampshire  | <input type="checkbox"/> Tennessee      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California           | <input type="checkbox"/> Kentucky      | <input type="checkbox"/> New Jersey     | <input type="checkbox"/> Texas          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Colorado             | <input type="checkbox"/> Louisiana     | <input type="checkbox"/> New Mexico     | <input type="checkbox"/> Utah           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Connecticut          | <input type="checkbox"/> Maine         | <input type="checkbox"/> New York       | <input type="checkbox"/> Vermont        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Delaware             | <input type="checkbox"/> Maryland      | <input type="checkbox"/> North Carolina | <input type="checkbox"/> Virginia       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> District of Columbia | <input type="checkbox"/> Massachusetts | <input type="checkbox"/> North Dakota   | <input type="checkbox"/> Washington     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Florida              | <input type="checkbox"/> Michigan      | <input type="checkbox"/> Ohio           | <input type="checkbox"/> West Virginia  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Georgia              | <input type="checkbox"/> Minnesota     | <input type="checkbox"/> Oklahoma       | <input type="checkbox"/> Wisconsin      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hawaii               | <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippi   | <input type="checkbox"/> Oregon         | <input type="checkbox"/> Wyoming        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Idaho                | <input type="checkbox"/> Missouri      | <input type="checkbox"/> Pennsylvania   | <input type="checkbox"/> Guam           |

Select All Clear All

Search >>


- Select Individual Jurisdictions to search within one particular state, district, circuit etc.
- Or mix and match in any combination.

## Operators for keyword searches

| Operator | Example                     | Description                                                                                                            |
|----------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| AND, &   | libel AND damages           | Results must contain both "libel" and "damages"                                                                        |
| OR       | premarital OR prenuptial    | Results must contain either "premarital" or "prenuptial"                                                               |
| NOT      | negligence NOT criminal     | Results must contain "negligence" but must not contain the word "criminal"                                             |
| w/3, /3  | custody w/15 interrogation  | Results must contain "custody" within 15 words of "interrogation." Select a number to limit the distance between words |
| *, !     | testif*                     | Results must contain some variation of the stem "testif" such as testified, testifying, etc.                           |
| ?        | mari?uana                   | Results must contain a m-a-r-i-__-u-a-n-a with one letter being substituted for the question mark                      |
| " "      | "estate tax"                | Results must contain the exact phrase: estate tax                                                                      |
| ( )      | (confront OR cross-examine) | Altering the order of operations (more later)                                                                          |

## AND — libel AND damages


---



Only returns cases at the intersection  
— ones containing both the words libel  
and damages.

## OR — prenuptial OR premarital


---



Returns all cases around the perimeter  
of the two words — either those using  
the word prenuptial or the word  
premarital.



## NOT — negligence NOT criminal




## Proximity or within — w/# or /#

**custody /5 interrogation** — return cases where **custody** appears within 5 words of **interrogation**

### Sample matches:


|                                                                     |                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| in-custody <b>interrogation</b> of a suspect . . . .                | (w/1 matches.) |
| unless in-custody <u>police</u> <b>interrogation</b> is . . . .     | (w/2 matches.) |
| <b>interrogation</b> <u>while in</u> custody may give . . . .       | (w/3 matches.) |
| when in custody <u>for purposes of</u> <b>interrogation</b> . . . . | (w/4 matches.) |

## Root expander (\*, !)



Return all cases beginning with the letters prosecut — **important:** for a Boolean search, Fastcase doesn't return past-tense, future tense, gerunds, etc.

## Single letter wildcard — ?



rec??ved — return all cases with either spelling (correct or wrong) of received

## “Quotation marks”

---

**“notice of appeal” — returns only cases with the exact phrase notice of appeal**

### Sample matches:

Defendant timely filed her **notice of appeal** with . . . .


One must file **notice of appeal** with the prothonotary . . . .

### Not in search results:

Defendant erroneously filed two **notices of appeal** with . . . .

## Parentheses — ()


---



Consider the following search:  
**car OR vehicle AND getaway**

## car OR vehicle AND getaway


What Fastcase actually sees:  
**(vehicle AND getaway) OR car**



## Subtle but important distinction


**Correct:**

**(car OR vehicle) AND getaway**



**Incorrect:**

**car OR (vehicle AND getaway)**



**fastcase**

Start Search Results Document Print My Library Options Help

### Advanced Caselaw Search

Search Type: ☒ Keyword Search (Boolean) ☐ Natural Language ☐ Citation Lookup

Search: "sixth amendment" & confront\*

☐ Show Search Tips Search >>

**Select Jurisdictions**

☒ All Jurisdictions  
☐ All Federal Appellate  
☐ All State  
☐ All District Courts  
☐ All Bankruptcy Courts

☐ Individual Jurisdictions...

**Recently Searched Jurisdictions**

☐ NC  
☐ NJ  
☐ IL  
☐ MO  
☐ Fed. 5th Cir.

### Search Options

**Date**

Start Date: January Before 1925  
End Date: December 2014

**Results**

Maximum results: Unlimited  
Results per page: 20  
Sort by: Relevance

**Authority Check**

☒ Show Number of Citations in Search Results  
☒ Show Number of Citations in Entire Database

## Sorting search results

**fastcase** Fastcase Home | Contact Info | Help and Support | Logout

Start Search Results Document Print My Library Options Help Welcome, Josh Auerbach

Results Interactive Timeline

Jurisdiction: All Jurisdictions 1 to 20 of 46,813 results Search Within Add Item Print List of Results Print/Save Documents in Queue

**Favorite:** Fastcase has identified 3 additional decisions that may be relevant to your research topic, but do not contain one or more of your search terms. View Results

| Relevance | Case                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Decision Date    | Authority Check                     | These Results                       | Entire Database                     |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 100%      | 1. <a href="#">Williams v. Rhode, 132 S.Ct. 2221 (U.S., 2012)</a><br>...of the Confrontation Clause. See ante, at 2225. There is no textual justification, however, for limiting the confrontation right to statements made after the accused's identity became known. To be sure, the Sixth Amendment right to confrontation attaches "[i]n criminal prosecutions," at which time the accused has been identified and apprehended. But the text of the Confrontation Clause does not constrain the time at which one becomes a "witness." Indeed, we have previously held that a defendant...                                                                                                                                                              | June 18, 2012    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 72%       | 2. <a href="#">California v. Green, 399 U.S. 149, 90 S.Ct. 1930, 26 L.Ed.2d 489 (U.S., 1970)</a><br>...of the Sixth Amendment Confrontation Clause. Commentators have been prone to slide too easily from confrontation to cross-examination. Against this amorphous backdrop I reach two conclusions. First, the Confrontation Clause of the Sixth Amendment reaches no farther than to require the prosecution to produce and available witness whose declarations it seeks to use in a criminal trial. Second, even were this conclusion deemed untenable as a matter of Sixth Amendment law, it is surely agreeable...                                                                                                                                  | June 23, 1970    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 69%       | 3. <a href="#">Mayfield v. Craig, 497 U.S. 836, 110 S.Ct. 3157, 111 L.Ed.2d 866 (U.S., 1990)</a><br>...of the Sixth Amendment's guarantee of the right to jury trial." The Court makes the impossible plausible by recharacterizing the Confrontation Clause, so that confrontation (redesignated "face-to-face confrontation") becomes only one of many "elements of confrontation" ante, at 846. The reasoning is as follows: "The Confrontation Clause guarantees not only what it explicitly provides for—"face-to-face" confrontation but also implied and collateral rights such as cross-examination, oath, and...                                                                                                                                   | June 27, 1990    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 69%       | 4. <a href="#">U.S. v. Booker, 125 S.Ct. 738, 160 L.Ed.2d 821, 543 U.S. 220, 2005 WL 50106 (U.S., 2005)</a><br>...violating the Sixth Amendment. Because the Guidelines as written possess the virtue of combining a mandatory determination of sentencing ranges and discretionary decisions within those ranges, they allow ample latitude for judicial factfinding that does not even arguably raise any Sixth Amendment issue. The principal basis for the Court's chosen remedy is its assumption that Congress did not contemplate that the Sixth Amendment would be violated by depriving the defendant of the right to a jury trial.                                                                                                                | January 12, 2005 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 69%       | 5. <a href="#">State v. Beauchamp, 333 Wn.2d 1, 796 N.W.2d 780, 2011 WL 277 (Wn., 2011)</a><br>Beauchamp's Sixth Amendment right to confront witnesses nor his corresponding right under the Wisconsin Constitution. 9 As the court of appeals noted, "the Sixth Amendment's guarantee of the confrontation right does not apply where an exception to the confrontation right was recognized at the time of the founding." 10 Beauchamp concedes that the dying declaration exception was an established hearsay exception at common law. The Crawford Court acknowledged the dying declaration hearsay...                                                                                                                                                 | May 3, 2011      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 65%       | 6. <a href="#">Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts, 557 U.S. 305, 129 S.Ct. 2527, 174 L.Ed.2d 314, 77 U.S.W.4574, 9 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 7994, 2009 Daily Journal D.A.R. 3063, 21 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S. 990 (U.S., 2009)</a><br>...violated his Sixth Amendment right to be confronted with the witnesses against him. The Appellate Court of Massachusetts rejected the claim, affirmance order, 69 Mass App. 1114, 870 N.E.2d 675, 2007 WL 2189152, *4, n. 3 (July 31, 2007), relying on the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court's decision in Commonwealth v. Verde, 444 Mass. 279, 253-285, 827 N.E.2d 701, 705-706 (2005), which held that the authors of certificates of forensic analysis are not subject to confrontation under the Sixth Amendment... | June 25, 2009    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Suggested Results**

# Filtering results

fastcase

Start Search Results Document Print My Library Options Help

Results Interactive Timeline

1 to 20 of 46,813 results

Search Within Add Alert Print List of Results Print/Save Documents in Queue

Jurisdiction:

- All Jurisdictions
- U.S. Supreme Court
- Federal 1st Circuit
- Federal 2nd Circuit
- Federal 3rd Circuit
- Federal 4th Circuit
- Federal 5th Circuit
- Federal 6th Circuit
- Federal 7th Circuit
- Federal 8th Circuit
- Federal 9th Circuit
- Federal 10th Circuit
- Federal 11th Circuit
- Federal Circuit
- Federal D.C. Circuit
- Bankruptcy Appellate Panel of the First Circuit
- Bankruptcy Appellate Panel of the Ninth Circuit
- U.S. Court of Federal Claims
- United States Tax Court
- U.S. Court of International Trade

69%

3. [Maryland v. Craig](#), 497 U.S. 836, 110 S.Ct. 3157, 111 L.Ed.2d 666 (U.S., 1990)

...of the **Sixth Amendment's** guarantee of the right to jury trial." The Court makes the impossible plausible by recharacterizing the **Confrontation Clause** argument, or that the issue should be assessed as a matter of plain error in light of the way it has been raised. Had a **confrontation** argument been raised before the State concluded its case, inquiry could have been made as to which **analyst** or **analysts** defendant wanted produced. Even at this stage...

# Search within

fastcase

Start Search Results Document Print My Library Options Help

Results Interactive Timeline

1 to 20 of 27,492 results

Search Within Add Alert Print List of Results Print/Save Documents in Queue

| Relevance | Case                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Decision Date      | Authority Check |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 100%      | 1. <a href="#">Mendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts</a> , 557 U.S. 305, 129 S.Ct. 2527, 174 L.Ed.2d 314, 77 U.S.W.4574, 9 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 7594, 2009 Daily Journal D.A.R. 9363, 21 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S.990 (U.S., 2009) | June 25, 2009      | 1,223 1,038     |
| 62%       | 2. <a href="#">Derr v. State</a> (Md. App., 2011)                                                                                                                                                                      | September 29, 2011 | 0 0             |
| 62%       | 3. <a href="#">Conners v. State</a> , 92 So. 3d 676 (Miss., 2012)                                                                                                                                                      | July 19, 2012      | 12 20           |
| 59%       | 4. <a href="#">Bullock v. New Mexico</a> , 131 S.Ct. 2705, 180 L.Ed.2d 610 (U.S., 2011)                                                                                                                                | June 23, 2011      | 257 261         |
| 57%       | 5. <a href="#">Williams v. Binos</a> , 132 S.Ct. 2221 (U.S., 2012)                                                                                                                                                     | June 18, 2012      | 148 208         |
| 55%       | 6. <a href="#">State v. Michaels</a> (N.J., 2014)                                                                                                                                                                      | August 6, 2014     | 0 0             |

Authority Check: These Results Entire Database

Suggested Results

Authority Check Report

Generated on December 9, 2014

State v. Beauchamp, 333 Wis.2d 1, 796 N.W.2d 780, 2011 WI 27 (Wis., 2011)

view document

Print Report

Jurisdiction:

All Jurisdictions

Authority Check is an automated system that identifies later-citing cases, but it is not a citator, and does not include editorial information telling you whether your case is still good law.

Interactive Timeline

Vertical Axis: Court level

State v. Beauchamp, 333 Wis.2d 1...

Cited Cases

Citation Summary

Total number of times this case has been cited: 8

Cited by federal appellate cases: 0

Cited by state cases: 8

Cited by district court cases: 0

Cited by bankruptcy court cases: 0

Decision date of most recent cite: May 27, 2014

Citing Law Reviews

Issue 2 - (Wenler 2012): Evading Confrontation: From One Amorphous Standard to Another 35 Seattle U. L. Rev. 473 (2011-2012) (Seattle University Law Review)

the states that recognize dying declarations as an exception to the Sixth Amendment confrontation right. Clay, 926 N.Y.S.2d at 609 (approving dying declarations as a Confrontation Clause exception, and listing various state court decisions reaching the same result); State v. Beau- champ, 796 N.W.2d 780, 782-85 (Wis. 2011) (approving dying declarations as a Confrontation Clause exception that was "deeply rooted in the common law"); see also Orenstein, supra note 316, at 1441 ("With few exceptions, courts post-Crawford have held that dying declarations, even when they are...

All Citing Cases

1 to 8 of 8 results

1. State v. Hales (Md. App., 2014)

May 27, 2014

Crawford did not upend the traditional view that dying declarations serve as an exception both to the common law hearsay rule and the constitutional right of a defendant to confront his accusers. State v. Beauchamp, 796 N.W.2d 780, 784-85 (Wis. 2011) ("Those principles compel the conclusion that allowing this hearsay exception comports with the protections of the Confrontation Clause"). Contra United States v. Mayhew, 380 F. Supp. 2d 961, 964-65 (S.D. Ohio 2005) (Mayhew admitted the dying declaration but rationalized the exemption from the Confrontation Clause as an instance of...

2. State v. Richmond (Wis. App., 2013)

November 19, 2013

did not seek a Machner hearing. We decline to consider the merits of Richmond's ineffective assistance claims because he failed to raise them at the trial court. See Huebner, 235 Wis. 2d 486, ¶10. State v. Beauchamp, 2011 WI 27, ¶39 n.32, 333 Wis. 2d 1, 796 N.W.2d 780 ("A Machner hearing is 'a prerequisite to a claim of ineffective representation on appeal to preserve the testimony of trial counsel.') (citation omitted). By the Court.—Judgment affirmed. This opinion will not be published. See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.23(1)(b)5. Notes: 1. All references...

3. Grondie v. State (Miss. App., 2013)

August 27, 2013

...not merely in existence but was centuries old by that point, the logic of Giles cannot support the conclusion that the hearsay exception afforded for dying declarations offends the constitution. State v. Beauchamp, 796 N.W.2d 780, 792-93 (Wis. 2011). See also Commonwealth v. Nesbitt, 892 N.E.2d 299, 251 (Mass. 2008) ("Considering the Supreme Court's guidance on the issue, we are reluctant to expand that right beyond the historical parameters indicated in Crawford." (quoting People v. Gilmore, 828 N.E.2d 293, 302 (Ill. App. Ct. 2005))); People v. Clay, 88 A.D.3d 14, 26-27 (N.Y. App. Div. ...

4. State v. Felton, 2012 WI App. 114, 344 Wis. 2d 483, 824 N.W.2d 871 (Wis. App., 2012)

September 18, 2012

...bound by decisions of the United States Supreme Court interpreting federal law, not those of the lower federal courts. State v. Webster, 114 Wis.2d 418, 426 n. 4, 338 N.W.2d 474, 478 n. 4 (1983). State v. Beauchamp, 2010 WI App. 42, ¶ 17, 324 Wis.2d 162, 177-178, 781 N.W.2d 254, 261 ("On federal questions, Wisconsin courts are bound only by the decisions of the United States Supreme Court"), aff'd 2011 WI 27, 333 Wis.2d 1, 796 N.W.2d 780. In any event, Felton does not contend that the magistrate judge's decision affects his appeal. 4. A...

5. People v. Clay (N.Y. App. Div., 2011)

June 28, 2011

PETER B. SKELOS, J.P., THOMAS A. DICKERSON, RANDALL T. ENG, PLUMMER E. LOTT, J.J., APPEAL by the defendant from a judgment of the Supreme Court, (Deborah Dowling, J.), rendered November 21, 2007, in Kings County, convicting him of murder in the second degree, upon a jury verdict, and imposing sentence... Lynn W. L. Fahey, New York, N.Y. (Denise A. Corsi of counsel), for appellant... Charles J. Hynes, District Attorney, Brooklyn, N.Y. (Leonard Joblove, Howard B. Goodman, and Melissa J...

## Bad Law Bot

Authority Check

Negative treatment indicated

Highlight [all search terms]

Find previous term [P] next term [N]

Navigate to the previous case, next case

Jump to the most relevant paragraph [M]

Print/Save

Add to My Print Queue

Add to My Favorites

Email

Public Link

U.S. v. Johnson, 196 F.Supp.2d 795 (N.D. Iowa, 2002)

196 F.Supp.2d 795

UNITED STATES of America, Plaintiff,

v.

Angela JOHNSON, Defendant.

Nos. CR 00-3034-MWB, CR 01-3046-MWB.

United States District Court, N.D. Iowa, Central Division.

April 23, 2002.

Page 796

COPYRIGHT MATERIAL OMITTED

Page 797

COPYRIGHT MATERIAL OMITTED

Page 798

Alfred E. Willett, Terpstra, Epping & Willett, Cedar Rapids, IA, Dean A. Stowers, Rosenberg Law Firm, Des Moines, IA, Thomas P. Frenchs, Frenchs Law Office, Waterloo, IA, Patrick J. Bernigan, Watson & Dameron, LLP, Kansas City, MO, Philip A. MacTaggart, Federal Public Defender, Davenport, IA, Robert R. Rigg, Drake University Legal Clinic, Des Moines, IA, for Defendant.

Patrick J. Reinert, Charles J. Williams, U.S. Atty's Office, Northern District of Iowa, Cedar Rapids, IA, for U.S.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER REGARDING GOVERNMENT'S NOTICE OF INTENT TO USE

Bad Law Bot

what other courts have said about this case

When a court cites a case that has been overturned or reversed (even on other grounds), the Bluebook requires that the court indicate the negative history right there in the citation. Bad Law Bot reads through the citations in Fastcase, identifying this kind of negative "signal information" in citations. It then reports what other courts have said about this case when citing it, flagging negative history reported by the courts. The full list of citing cases is below. [More...](#)

U.S. v. Johnson, 403 F.Supp.2d 721 (N.D. Iowa, 2005)

December 16, 2005

Negative treatment indicated in a citation in this case

her seventeenth ground for judgment of acquittal or new trial, is that this court and the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals erred in allowing into evidence the testimony of jailhouse informant Robert McNeese and other fruits of his evidence. This ground revives issues extensively litigated pretrial. See United States v. Johnson, 196 F.Supp.2d 795 (N.D.Iowa 2002) (ruling on defendant's motion to suppress evidence from jailhouse informant as to indictment on non-capital offenses), rev'd, 338 F.3d 918 (8th Cir.2003), rev'd, 352 F.3d 339 (8th Cir.2004) (panel rehearing), cert. denied, \_\_\_ U.S. ...

U.S. v. Johnson, 354 F.Supp.2d 939 (N.D. Iowa, 2005)

January 3, 2005

Negative treatment indicated in a citation in this case

...in return for obtaining incriminating evidence about other prisoners. However, the court based its finding of agency prior to September 11, 2000, solely on the these grounds, because the record plainly did not support a finding of agency under the "bright line rule" stated in Moore. See United States v. Johnson, 196 F.Supp.2d 795, 863-871 (N.D.Iowa 2002), rev'd, 338 F.3d 918, and rev'd, 352 F.3d 339 (8th Cir.2003), cert. denied, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 126 S.Ct. 76, 160 L.Ed.2d 46 (2004). Second, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals...

U.S. v. Horken, 378 F.Supp.2d 928 (N.D. Iowa, 2004)

June 7, 2004


Negative treatment indicated in a citation in this case

...of this motion begins with a review of some additional factual background. 1. Additional factual background As this court explained in a ruling in the companion case against Angela Johnson, see United States v. Johnson, 196 F.Supp.2d 795 (N.D.Iowa 2002), rev'd, 338 F.3d 918 (8th Cir.2003), and rev'd, 352 F.3d 339 (8th Cir.2003), a jailhouse informant named Robert McNeese succeeded in obtaining a great deal of information from Johnson while both were incarcerated in the Benton County...

15



## Visual law



## Searching other materials

### Integrated Content

- Content is contained within Fastcase's database.
- The text is searchable within Fastcase.
- Searchable rules, etc. will be in **bold**

### Unintegrated Content

- Content is not integrated into Fastcase's database.
- The text is not searchable within Fastcase.
- Fastcase provides a hyperlink to a third party website where the content is available.

### Court Rules

#### Federal

[1st Circuit](#)  
[2nd Circuit](#)  
[3rd Circuit](#)  
[4th Circuit](#)  
[5th Circuit](#)  
[6th Circuit](#)  
[7th Circuit](#)  
[8th Circuit](#)  
[9th Circuit](#)  
[10th Circuit](#)  
[11th Circuit](#)  
[D.C. Circuit](#)  
[Federal Circuit](#)

← Integrated

← Unintegrated



# Searching statutes

fastcase

Start Search Results Document Print My Library Options Help

Search

Search Cases  
Search Statutes  
Search Regulations  
Search Constitutions  
Search Court Rules  
Search Attorney General Opinions  
Search Newspapers  
Search Federal Filings  
Search Legal Forms

Search Type: ☒ Keyword Search (Boolean) ☐ Natural Language ☐ Citation

Lookup

enforce or modify a spousal support agreement

☐ Show Search Tips

Select Statutes

Current Editions:

|                                               |                                        |                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> United States Code   | <input type="checkbox"/> Kansas        | <input type="checkbox"/> North Carolina       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alabama              | <input type="checkbox"/> Kentucky      | <input type="checkbox"/> North Dakota         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alaska               | <input type="checkbox"/> Louisiana     | <input type="checkbox"/> Ohio                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arizona              | <input type="checkbox"/> Maine         | <input type="checkbox"/> Oklahoma             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arkansas             | <input type="checkbox"/> Maryland      | <input type="checkbox"/> Oregon               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California           | <input type="checkbox"/> Massachusetts | <input type="checkbox"/> Pennsylvania         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Colorado             | <input type="checkbox"/> Michigan      | <input type="checkbox"/> Rhode Island         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Connecticut          | <input type="checkbox"/> Minnesota     | <input type="checkbox"/> South Carolina       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Delaware             | <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippi   | <input type="checkbox"/> South Dakota         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> District of Columbia | <input type="checkbox"/> Missouri      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tennessee |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Florida              | <input type="checkbox"/> Montana       | <input type="checkbox"/> Texas                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Georgia              | <input type="checkbox"/> Nebraska      | <input type="checkbox"/> Utah                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hawaii               | <input type="checkbox"/> Nevada        | <input type="checkbox"/> Vermont              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Idaho                | <input type="checkbox"/> New Hampshire | <input type="checkbox"/> Virginia             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Illinois             | <input type="checkbox"/> New Jersey    | <input type="checkbox"/> Washington           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Indiana              | <input type="checkbox"/> New Mexico    | <input type="checkbox"/> West Virginia        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Iowa                 | <input type="checkbox"/> New York      | <input type="checkbox"/> Wisconsin            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wyoming              |                                        |                                               |

Archived Editions

# Statute search results

Manipulate your results using the same sorting tools that are available for Caselaw searches.

fastcase

Start Search Results Document Print My Library Options Help

1 to 25 of 6,228 results

Relevance Title

100% 1. [Tenn. Code 36-5-101 Decree for support of children -- Modification -- Continuances -- Standing to petition -- Court costs and attorneys fees -- Means of collection -- Scientific parentage tests](#)

74% 2. [Tenn. Code 36-5-2211 Continuing, exclusive jurisdiction to modify spousal support order](#)

60% 3. [Tenn. Code 36-5-101 Enforcement of decrees for alimony and support](#)

45% 4. [Tenn. Code 36-5-101 Decree for support of spouse](#)

44% 5. [Tenn. Code 36-5-114 Federal's required state collection and disbursement unit for child and spousal support](#)

## View a Statute Section

- View your results along the left side. You can also see an Outline View (Table of Contents style) of the code here.
- A list of citing cases will display beneath the text of the statute in the Annotations section.

The screenshot shows the Westlaw database interface. On the left, a table of contents lists sections of the Tennessee Code. The main area displays the text of Tennessee Code 36-5-103, which relates to the enforcement of decrees for alimony and support. The bottom section, titled 'Annotations', lists citing cases, including *Sherrill v. Sherrill* and *Taylor v. Taylor*, with their respective decision dates and authority checkmarks.

## Ohio Attorneys . . .



## Customer Support



Available 8 am - 8 pm Eastern, Monday through Friday  
(excluding holidays)

### CALL

1-866-773-2782

### EMAIL

support@fastcase.com

### LIVE CHAT

Help → Live Help

CLE: 4 weeks. No need to email.

[www.fastcase.com](http://www.fastcase.com)

[Help & Training](#)

[Documentation & Downloads](#)