Con Law Sp 2010 Harpaz	Exam No	Raw Score	Final Grade

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)			
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)			
MPE-city operating bridge-market partic, but monopoly so may be deprived of defense(6)			
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)			
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)			
Occupation of Field-did Congress intend to fully occupy field, what field?(3)			
EP-nature of classification, resident vs nonresident, apply test(3)			
DP-nature of rt, rt to travel?, apply test to facts(3)(
Miscellaneous (3)			

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) 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) standard of review-minimum rationality-health or morality, related to------(4) strict scrutiny-comp'g int?, least restrictive alt?, ban phthalates, educ program-----(5) absolute ban so amounts to an undue burden and so less strict test does not apply------(2) Com Clause-as to DD- feds argue category 1 or 2 so fed'l power is plenary/DD argues 3-(2) As to EE, gov argues category 3-eco activity - comprehensive regulatory scheme - Raich(3) 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) 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)