

## Introduction to the 2025-2 Edition

We are pleased to provide you with the 2025-2 Edition for *Federal Civil Rights Acts 3d*. *Federal Civil Rights Acts 3d* is a comprehensive treatment of current civil rights law, by Rodney A. Smolla, President of the Vermont Law and Graduate School.

New features and recent developments in this 2025-2 Edition include:

- In *United States v. Skrametti*, the Supreme Court, in a 6-3 decision written by Chief Justice Roberts for the Court, the Court upheld the Tennessee law restricting sex transition treatments for minors. See § 1:46.
- In *Food & Drug Administration v. Wages & White Lion Investments, L.L.C.*, in a unanimous opinion written by Justice Alito, the Supreme Court held that actions by the Food and Drug Administration to regulate the sale of e-cigarettes, were not arbitrary and capricious. See § 1:56.
- The Supreme Court elaborated on the principles governing free exercise in *Catholic Charities Bureau, Inc. v. Wisconsin Labor & Industrial Review Commission*. At issue was a Wisconsin tax regime that operated to disqualify the Catholic Charities Bureau from certain tax advantages under Wisconsin law. The Wisconsin Supreme Court denied the tax break to the Catholic Charities Bureau, Inc., and four of the entities that it operated, on the grounds that the Catholic Charities were not “operated primarily for religious purposes” because they neither engage in proselytization nor serve only Catholics in their charitable work. The United States Supreme Court reversed the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, holding that its exclusion violated the First Amendment. See § 5:23.
- The Supreme Court held in *A.J.T. v. Osseo Area Schools, Independent School District No. 279* that neither the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 nor the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 required children with disabilities to satisfy a heightened “bad faith or gross misjudgment” standard when seeking relief for discrimination relating to their education, bringing such education cases into harmony with the general standards applicable in ADA or Section 504 claims. See § 12:20.

- In *Barnes v. Felix*, in a unanimous opinion written by Justice Kagan, the Supreme Court dealt with when a police officer's use of deadly force violates the Fourth Amendment. The Court in *Barnes* rejected the so-called "moment-of-threat rule," under which a court looks only to the circumstances existing at the precise time an officer perceived the threat inducing the officer to shoot. The Court held that to assess whether an officer acted reasonably in using force, a court must consider all the relevant circumstances, including facts and events leading up to the climactic moment. *See* § 14:50.