Con Law-sec. 3-Sp.07-Harpaz Exam No	Raw Score	Final Grade
Question I (ban on marriage by illegal immigrand Due Process - fundamental vs. nonfund'l rt - rt tradition, fund'l to personal identity, precedent	to marry vs. marry illeg as applied to rt to mar	ry (illegal immig't)(8)
right of child to be born to a married couple; rig undue burden-ban on right is automatically an u	ndue burden since it pr	recludes marriage-(3)
strict scrut-comp'g int/narrowly tailored applied min rationality-legit int? punish lawbreakers?, r		
Equal Protection-classif-illegal immigrants vs o traits applied to facts-history,immutable,unrelated traits applied to facts-history, immutable, unrelated traits applied to facts-history applied to facts history applied to facts history applied to facts history.	ed to ability, stamp infe	erior,powerless(10)
strict scrut-suspect like race-use of classif narro intermediate scrutiny-quasi suspect like gender-	application to facts-im	p just/sub'l rel(4)
minimum scrut-rat'l rel to legit int-harm pol un Miscellaneous		(2)
Question II (ban on sale of horsemeat) (50 point	ts)	
Dormant Commerce Clause issuediscrimination - no discrim on face, but discrim		* *
protectionist motive?-protection of horses vs. prif discrim-legit purpose? any less discrim alt me		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
benefit vs burden-\$ loss to horsemeat industry v	s protection of horses-	more than slight?-(6)
valid federal law? Commerce Power-inspection,	packaging, labeling of	product sold in IC(4)
express preemption-as to inspection & labeling, express nonpreemption-if not inconsistent with	the act not preempted b	by express terms(3)
implied-conflict-compliance w/both is possible- conflict-Law 66 doesn't undermine fed purpose	1 •	
field preemp-preempts field of inspection and la Due Process- nonfund'l rt, min rationality - app	beling not whether me	at should be sold(4)
Equal Protection-horsemeat vs other meat and p Miscellaneous	oultry products, min ra	tt - apply to facts(3)(3)
Question III (Genetic Discrimination in Employ	ment Act) (50 points)	
States-10th Amendment-no claim based on argualong w/private employers-NLC overturned by	ment that burdens emp	•
state sov-like Printz-compelled to assist enforce state sov-not like Printz-only required to provid		
Employers-beyond power of Congress under Concomic or noneconomic activity-employment	ommerce Clause-catego	ory 3-local activity(4)
Could Congress rationally conclude local activi	ty in aggregate has sub	s eco effect on IC?(3)
application to facts-reg all employers w/ 5 or me part of a class of activities or comprehensive reg		
N & P Clause-is it necy to reg of IC itself, part of if Lopez-no jur elem, no findings on IC link, no		
Miscellaneous		(3)
Bonus Questions: 4. A (could not consider race) 7. B (sell processed glassex); 8 C (uphold - Sp		
1. D (sell processed glassex), o C (upiloid - S)	chang rower)BC	mus pomis (up to 3)