## You Be the Judge Answer Key

| Scenario                                        | Our decision is in favor of:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | The constitutional principle(s)<br>that apply include:              |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Scenario #1</b><br>United States<br>v. Lopez | PETITIONER: United States<br>RESPONDENT: Lopez                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Commerce Clause<br>Federalism                                       |
|                                                 | <i>Is the 1990 Gun-Free School Zones Act unconstitutional because it exceeds the power of Congress?</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                     |
|                                                 | Yes. Having a gun in a school zone is not an<br>economic activity necessary for a connection to the<br>commerce clause. The Gun-Free School Zones Act<br>was written to stop "criminal action" not economic<br>action.                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                     |
|                                                 | Although Lopez won the case, he still did<br>something wrong that needed to be punished, just<br>not in a federal court.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                     |
| <b>Scenario #2</b><br>Gonzales<br>v. Raich      | PETITIONER:<br>Alberto R. Gonzales, Attorney General, et al.<br>RESPONDENT: Angel McClary Raich, et al.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 10th Amendment<br>Federalism<br>Supremacy Clause<br>Commerce Clause |
|                                                 | Does Congress have the power to stop the medical sale<br>and growth of marijuana where the state has deemed<br>it legal?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Commerce Chause                                                     |
|                                                 | Yes. The Court decided that the commerce clause<br>gave Congress the ability to stop the medical sale<br>and growth of marijuana even when the state has<br>passed a law that says otherwise. The Court argued<br>that state marijuana use affects supply and demand<br>in the national market, making regulation<br>necessary and fitting the commerce clause. This is<br>also a supremacy clause issue. A federal statute is<br>above a state law. |                                                                     |



## Our decision is in favor of: The constitutional principle(s) Scenario that apply include: **PETITIONER:** National Federation of **10th Amendment** Scenario #3 Independent Business, et al. Federalism National **RESPONDENT: Kathleen Sebelius, Secretary Commerce Clause** Federation of **Checks and Balances** of Health and Human Services, et al. Independent Business v. #1. Does Congress have power to require most Sebelius Americans to purchase health insurance and require a tax penalty if they do not?

#1 Yes. The penalty is a tax and Congress has the power to impose a tax if an individual does not have health insurance. This is a valid exercise of congressional authority. They also noted that the payment is not so severe as to cause major hardship.

#2. Can the U.S. Congress remove all federal funding for Medicaid if the states refuse to expand it?

#2. No. Congress does not have authority to threaten the states with complete loss of federal funding of Medicaid if the states refuse to comply with the expansion.



| Scenario                                             | Our decision is in favor of:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | The constitutional principle(s)<br>that apply include:                    |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scenario #4<br>United States<br>v. Nixon             | PETITIONER: United States<br>RESPONDENT: Richard M. Nixon, et al. Should the president have unlimited executive<br>privilege to safeguard information and without any<br>judicial review? No. The Court said that "neither separation of<br>powers, nor the generalized need for<br>confidentiality of high-level communications, can<br>sustain an absolute, unqualified, presidential<br>privilege." They recognized the need for<br>confidentiality in certain military or diplomatic<br>affairs, but gave preference to "the fundamental<br>demands of due process of law in the fair<br>administration of justice." Nixon was compelled to produce the tapes and<br>documents. He resigned shortly after the release of<br>the tapes. | Rule of Law<br>Judicial Review<br>Checks and Balances<br>Supremacy Clause |
| <b>Scenario #5</b><br>Clinton v. City<br>of New York | APPELLANT: Clinton<br>APPELLEE: City of New York<br>Should the president be able to selectively cancel<br>portions of bills before they are signed into law?<br>No. The Court said that legislation that passes both<br>houses of Congress must either be entirely<br>approved (signed) or rejected (vetoed) by the<br>president. By vetoing only selected portions of the<br>bills, the president was making law (or at a                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Article I<br>Checks and Balances<br>Judicial Review                       |

minimum, amending the law), which is the duty of Congress according to Article I of the Constitution.