

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface	xi
Acknowledgments	xiii
About the Authors	xv
Editorial Notes	xvii

PART ONE REVIEW OF DISTRICT COURT DECISIONS

I. The Fundamentals: Constitutional Considerations, the Four Principal Standards of Review, and the Fact/Law Paradigm	3
A. Constitutional Considerations	3
B. The Standards Governing Review of Preserved Claims of Error, Plain Error and Exceptional Circumstances Review of Unpreserved Claims, and Review of Jurisdictional Issues	4
C. The Fact/Law Paradigm and Its Limitations ..	7
1. Hypothetical Examples: The “FMSS” Cases	9
2. Within the Paradigm: Specifically Defined Laws and Historical Facts	9
3. Still Within the Paradigm: Abstract Laws	10
4. The Limits of the Paradigm: Mixed Questions of Law and Fact	12
D. The Theory Informing the Paradigm: The Functional Approach	13

	Page
E. Discretionary Decisions: Mixed Questions of Law and Fact and the Abuse of Discretion Standard of Review	18
F. The Mixed Question in the Final “FMSS” Hypothetical	21
G. A Qualifying Comment on Review of Mixed Questions	21
II. Clearly Erroneous Review of Judicial Fact-Finding	23
III. De Novo Review of Conclusions of Law: A Sampling of Substantive Standards	29
A. Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Constitutional Standing in Civil Cases: The Unwaivable Article III Prerequisites to Federal Judicial Review	30
1. Subject Matter Jurisdiction	33
2. Article III Standing	42
B. Summary Judgment: Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56	53
C. Testing the Legal Sufficiency of the Evidence in Civil Jury Trials: Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50	61
D. Testing the Legal Sufficiency of Criminal Trial Evidence	67
1. Taking the Decision from a Jury: The <i>Jackson</i> Standard and Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 29	67
2. Reversing Guilty Verdicts in Bench Trials for Insufficient Evidence: <i>Jackson</i> Plus	74

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
IV. Review of Findings and Conclusions Supporting Rule 52 Judgments in Civil Bench Trials: Clearly Erroneous Review, <i>De Novo</i> Review, and the “Mixed Question” Conundrum	77
V. Decisions Committed to a District Judge’s Discretion: Giving Meaning to the Variable Abuse of Discretion Standard	83
A. General Principles	83
B. Identifying the Degree of Appellate Scrutiny Afforded Discretionary Decisions	86
1. Ascertaining the Bounds of Discretion Delegated by Congress	86
2. Enforcing Congressional Bounds on Discretion: The Law-Declaring Power of Reviewing Courts	89
3. Discerning the Limits on Largely Unbounded Discretion	90
VI. Preserving, Forfeiting, and Waiving Error: How a Party’s Actions Before the Trial Court Can Affect or Preclude Appellate Review	95
VII. The Harmless Error Doctrine: Limiting the Remedial Response to Preserved Legal, Factual, and Discretionary Error in Criminal and Civil Trials	101
A. Application of the Harmless Error Doctrine in Criminal Cases	102
1. The <i>Kotteakos</i> Decision: Harmlessness Review of Nonconstitutional Error	103
2. The <i>Chapman</i> Decision: Harmlessness Review of (Most) Constitutional Error	107
3. Structural Defects: When Does Constitutional Error Merit Automatic Reversal?	109

	Page
B. Application of the Harmless Error Doctrine in Civil Cases	112
1. The <i>Sanders</i> Standard: Putting the Burden on the Party Claiming Non-constitutional Error to Show Harm ..	112
2. The Inapplicability of the <i>Chapman</i> “Beyond a Reasonable Doubt” Standard to Constitutional Error and the Limited Availability of Automatic Reversal	117
VIII. Judicial Review of Unpreserved Claims and Arguments	119
A. The Four-Part Plain Error Test Governing Review of Unpreserved Error in Criminal Cases	119
B. Exceptional Circumstances and Plain Error Review: The Limited Situations in Which Appellate Review of Unpreserved Arguments is Available in Civil Cases	125
 PART TWO REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTION 	
IX. The Fundamentals: The Principal Standards of Review, Threshold Considerations, and Administrative Agencies Defined	135
A. An Introduction to the Principal Standards of Review and Threshold Considerations	135
B. What are Administrative Agencies?	136
X. The Interplay Between the APA and Agency Authorizing Statutes: Standards of Review and Causes of Action	139
A. Defining the Scope and Standards of Review ..	140
B. Defining a Cause of Action	143

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
C. A Note About the Distinct Roles of District and Appellate Courts	145
XI. Threshold Jurisdictional and Prudential Limits on Judicial Review	147
A. Waiver of Sovereign Immunity	149
B. Subject Matter Jurisdiction	151
C. Article III Standing	158
D. Mootness	165
E. The Overlapping Doctrines of Finality, Ripeness, Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies, and Issue Waiver	169
1. The Finality Doctrine	169
2. The Ripeness Doctrine	175
3. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies ..	180
4. Issue Waiver	183
XII. The Parameters of Judicial Review of Agency Actions	187
A. Challenges to Final Actions Having the Force of Law: The Presumption of Reviewability and Its Exceptions	188
1. Statutory Preclusion of Judicial Review ..	190
2. Actions Committed to Agency Discretion by Law	194
B. Challenges to Informal, Non-Final Actions Lacking the Force of Law: The Presumptive Non-Reviewability of Policy Statements and Interpretive Rules	196
1. Policy Statements and Interpretive Rules: What They Are and Why They Are (Generally) Not Reviewable	196

	Page
2. The Tests for Determining When a Purported Policy Statement or Interpretive Rule Is a Final, Substantive Action to Which the Presumption of Reviewability Applies	199
XIII. The Zone-of-Interests Inquiry: Is the Complainant Within the Class of Plaintiffs Authorized to Invoke the Cause of Action Asserted?	205
XIV. The Deference Due an Agency’s Construction of Its Authorizing Statute	211
A. The <i>Chevron</i> Framework	211
B. <i>Chevron</i> Step One: Has Congress Directly Spoken to the Precise Question?	216
C. <i>Chevron</i> Step Two: Judicial Deference to Agency Lawmaking Choices that Are Within the Scope of an Agency’s Congressionally Delegated Authority	221
1. An Agency Must Act Pursuant to Congressionally Delegated Authority	223
2. An Agency Must Act with the Force of Law	224
3. Judicial Assessments of Agency Constructions of Authorizing Statutes to Determine Reasonableness	226
4. An Agency May Permissibly Change its Construction of an Authorizing Statute ...	230
5. Agency Interpretations Resting on Implied Delegations of Authority	231
D. The <i>Chevron</i> “Carve Outs”	237
1. Situations in Which an Agency Has Failed to Act with the Force of Law	238
2. Situations Involving “Major Questions”—An Evolving Doctrine?	238

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
3. Situations in Which an Agency Fails to Use Its Delegated Authority	244
4. No <i>Chevron</i> Deference Is Due to an Agency's Litigation Position	246
5. Situations in Which an Agency Does Not Have Sole Responsibility for Administering a Statute	247
E. <i>Skidmore</i> Deference: The Power to Persuade ..	248
XV. The Deference Due an Agency's Interpretation of Its Own Regulations: <i>Auer</i> and <i>Seminole Rock</i>	253
XVI. The Requirement of Reasoned Decisionmaking: Arbitrary and Capricious Review	259
A. The <i>State Farm</i> Framework	259
B. The Importance of the Agency Record	265
XVII. Factual Determinations Made in On-the-Record Proceedings: Substantial Evidence Review	269
XVIII. Comparing and Contrasting the Principal Standards of Review	273
A. The Interplay of <i>Chevron</i> Step Two and Arbitrary and Capricious Review	273
B. The Substantial Evidence Test and Arbitrary and Capricious Review	278
XIX. The Requirement of Fair Notice	281

Table of Cases

Index