$\qquad$ Raw Score $\qquad$ Final Grade $\qquad$
Question I (Channing River Bridge Resident Discount) (56 points)
P \& I-prelim hurdles-discrim ag nonres, flesh \& blood, rt essential to interstate harmony(4)
Test-MM applies-sub'l reason for dif in treatmt, degree of discrim related to sub'l obj---(4) $\qquad$
Test-city applies-sub'l reason for dif in treatmt, degree of discrim related to sub'l obj-----(4)
DCC-discrim on face, legit purpose?/no less discrim alts? less discount, volume discount(6)___
DCC- Pike balancing test-burden-extra toll costs vs. benefits-\$ for operation of bridge---(4) $\qquad$
MPE-city operating bridge-market partic, but monopoly so may be deprived of defense--(6) $\qquad$
Preemption - valid fed'l law?, commerce power, category 1 - reg of channel of IC?-------(3)
State autonomy arg by city-forcing it to adopt or administer fed program? But Condon---(4) $\qquad$
Express Preemption-states can't discriminate-but terms access and discrim not defined---(4)


Conflict - Impossible to Comply w/both; conflict in purpose, what is purpose of fed law-(5) $\qquad$
Occupation of Field-did Congress intend to fully occupy field, what field?-----------------(3)
EP-nature of classification, resident vs nonresident, apply test---
DP-nature of rt, rt to travel?, apply test to facts-------------------------------------------------------(3)
Miscellaneous
Question II (Federal Ban on Sexual Devices) (Due Process \& Commerce Clause) (56 points)
Due Process - nature of the right? Is it fundamental or nonfundamental?-------------------(2) $\qquad$
Argue fund'l rt - history/tradition, precedent (Griswold, Lawrence), personal identity-----(6)
Argue nonfund'l rt-no history/tradition, no cases, not central to personal identity----------(6)

DD vs EE - DD sales are eco so perhaps she can only assert eco rt, but EE has personal rt(2)
$\qquad$ standard of review-minimum rationality-health or morality, related to-----------------------(4)
strict scrutiny-comp'g int?, least restrictive alt?, ban phthalates, educ program------------(5) $\square$
absolute ban so amounts to an undue burden and so less strict test does not apply---------(2) $\qquad$
Com Clause-as to DD- feds argue category 1 or 2 so fed'l power is plenary/DD argues 3-(2) $\qquad$
As to EE, gov argues category 3-eco activity - comprehensive regulatory scheme - Raich(3) $\qquad$
if eco-could congress rationally conclude reg'd activity has subl eco effect on interst com(4)
EE argues noneconomic activity-focus on possession aspect of statute-like Lopez---------(3)
If Lopez factors - findings-no findings linking reg'd activity to interstate com, not nec'y-(2) $\qquad$
jur'l element-FBSD has jur'l elements, but are they sufficient to limit reach of statute?---(5)
Link between reg'd activity and interstate commerce - attenuated or sufficiently direct?- (4)
Necessary and Proper Clause to regulate possession as Scalia argued in Raich--------------(3)
Miscellaneous
(3)

Question III (segregation of homosexual prisoners) (Equal Protection) (32 points)
Classif-LL argues homosexuals vs. heterosexuals-------------------------------------------------(1)
State-homosexuals vs those not identified as homosexuals, homosexuals in both groups-(3) $\qquad$
Nature of Class-traits of suspect cl-history, unalterable, not ability, inferior, pol power---(3) $\qquad$
LL-Suspect Cl-apply traits-history, unalterable, not ability, inferior, under-represented---(6)
State-not Susp Cl-like Clebourne-not a class, range of sexual orientations, recent laws---(4) $\square$
Standards of Review - Minimum Scrutiny - applied by State \& LL-rational basis?--------(4) $\qquad$
Intermediate/Strict Scrutiny-applied by LL (if know violence by cellmate - alts available)(4)
Intermed/Str Scrut-applied by PP(comp'g int/narrow-1 prison/only in IC,tried alt means)(4)
Miscellaneous
(3)

