Con Law-Harpaz-Sp 2013	Exam #	Raw Score	Final Grade
QI (Excessive Unemploymer P & I Cl-res v. nonres? But Flesh & blood Indivs-9 pls Rt essential to interst harmon this situation as rt to private Stand of rev-sub'l reason for Degree of discrim-100% di jobs, plus evid unskilled res No market participant excep Dorm Com-discrim ag OOS Strict test-legit reason/no le Eco protect'ism-eco well-but finondiscrim - Pike balance Market partic exc-state buil EP-res v. nonres?, res not su DP-nonfund'l rt, rat'l basis, Miscellaneous	nonres from nonrest can sue, but not corp ony-gov't employmt employmt-working or dif in treatmt-nonres scrim ag res of NR st s workers not nonres ption	s (on behalf of employment of private employment of private contractors source of evil (encates-less discrim altereste problem	oyees?)(3) It yes - Camden case treated ors(4) ough evid?)(4) s?-study showed 50% of(5) (1) I contractors-(4) of other states(4) orks (White)(4) (jobs for res)(3) (3)
QII (transgender parent child DP-rt to custody of bio child Precedent-CC-parent custod History and tradition-CC-hickid; TT- no tradition of parentral to personal identity S/R-if fund-strict scrutiny (Undue burden test? Loss of Apply strict scrutiny-CC an Apply minimum rationality EP-Classif-gender?M/W wl Classif?-transgender indivs Suspect?-transgender perso stigmatize/immutable-centre S/R-strict/intermediate/min CC applies the various stan Miscellaneous	d born during marrial dy-Troxel, Michael Fastory of maternal custors arent who has undergout to retain custody compg int, least restrictions an undue of TT-best int of child — CC (no legit reaso ho change gender vs. vs. other males & fens-apply criteria-hist alto identity?imum rationality-stat dards(4)/TT applies to	ge-fund'l rt or nonful; TT-trad'l family-Netody over young chione gender reassign of child; rt to gende ictive alt); if nonfundurdendren?/other alternation) and TT (best into M/W who don't (Mmales-still a gender ory/unrelated to abilities the elements of the che various standards	Michael H(4) ildren, right to parent bio ment(4) r identity(3) d-rat'l basis(2) ves?(2) ves?(5) of children)-(3) /W in both)(3) classif?(3) ity/pol powerlessness(7) e tests used-(2) s(4)(8)
QIII (National Domestic Vi Com Cl - Feds argue Categ AA argues Cat 3-reg'd loca Eco vs. noneco activity? Fe If eco, could Congress ratio what is reg'd local activity? If noneco-Feds & AA apply State autonomy—Feds-state Stone-info used for reg pur Spending power-feds argue since a reg not conditional s State argues doesn't satisfy Miscellaneous	ory 1 or 2 (DVOs tra l activity-DV or pres ds argue eco (compres onally conclude local de DV or registration-Ity de Lopez factors-jur el only required to prov poses to enforce crim not using spending prespending; enforcemt- Dole Test/Coercive-	veling in or affecting ence of DVO (wk, sehensive scheme); A activity in aggregate Feds & AA apply sultement-findings-link vide info not reg behalaw ag DVOs	g int com)-(5) chool, live)(5) A noneco-(6) e has subl eco effect on IC- ol effect test(6) to IC(9) avior(4) so coercion doesn't matter rant \$(5) n at head(3)