



A CIVICS IN REAL LIFE SERIES **THE DOCKET**

Civics is all around us. The United States Supreme Court is the highest court in the land. Through its power of judicial review, its decisions have a lasting impact on "We the People". So what is the Court hearing this session and how might the justices rule? Let's help each other expand our civic literacy.

2025-2026 U.S. Supreme Court Cases UPDATES

In the closing days of the 2025-2026 Supreme Court term, the Justices delivered opinions in key cases from our CRL: The Docket Series. Below is a matrix highlighting the constitutional questions asked in these cases and how the Court ruled on these questions. Included are resources to explore the impact these decisions may have on society.

Case & Constitutional Question	Ruling & Impact
In Case v. Montana, the Court is being asked to address one question: May law enforcement enter a home without a search warrant based on less than probable cause that an emergency is occurring?	On January 14, 2026, the Justices unanimously decided that law enforcement may enter a home without a search warrant when they have an objectively reasonable basis for believing that an occupant is seriously injured or faces imminent serious injury. (Adapted from Oyez). View the SCOTUSblog post on the ruling and potential impact on future cases.
In Cox Communications, Inc. v. Sony Music Entertainment, the Court is being asked to address one question: Can an internet service provider be held liable, and found to have acted willfully, for copyright infringement just because it knew users were infringing and did not terminate their access?	On March 25, 2026, the Justices ruled that Cox Communications was not contributorily liable for its' copyright infringement. The Court held that because Cox neither encouraged users to infringe copyrights nor provided a service designed for infringement, it could not be held responsible for Sony Music Entertainment's copyrighted works being infringed upon. (Adapted from Oyez). View the SCOTUSblog post on the ruling and potential impact on future cases.
In Villarreal v. Texas, the Court is being asked to address one question: Does a trial court violate a defendant's Sixth Amendment right to counsel by preventing the defendant and his lawyer from discussing the defendant's testimony during an overnight break in the trial?	On February 25, 2025, the Justices ruled unanimously that a trial judge may prohibit a defendant's lawyer from coaching or influencing the defendants ongoing testimony during an overnight recess, as long as the lawyers are still allowed to discuss all other matters with their client. (Adapted from Oyez) View the SCOTUSblog post on the ruling and potential impact on future cases.
In Chatrie v. United States , the Court is being asked to address one question: Did the execution of the geofence warrant violate the Fourth Amendment?	On June 29, 2026, the Justices ruled 6–3 that police conduct a Fourth Amendment search when they obtain a person's cellphone location data through a geofence warrant. The Court held that individuals have a reasonable expectation of privacy in their historical cellphone location information, even when that data is stored by a third-party company such as Google, and sent the case back to the lower court to determine whether the warrant satisfied the Fourth Amendment's requirements for probable cause. (Adapted from Oyez). View the SCOTUSblog post on the ruling and potential impact on future cases.
There were multiple cases and constitutional questions involving the presidency and President Trump this term including: *Trump v. Slaughter *Trump v. Cook *Learning Resources Inc. v. Trump *Trump v. Barbara	~In Slaughter, the Court ruled 6–3 that the president may remove Federal Trade commissioners without needing to show cause. ~In Cook, the Court ruled 5–4 that President Trump could not immediately remove Federal Reserve Governor Lisa Cook from office. ~In Learning Resources Inc., the Court ruled 6–3 that the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) does not authorize the president to impose tariffs. ~In Barbara, the Court ruled 6–3 that the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees birthright citizenship to children born in the United States, regardless of whether their parents are unlawfully or temporarily present in the country.



**Lou Frey
Institute**