Carp-Manning U.S. District Court Database

Principal Investigators:

Robert A. Carp, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
University of Houston

Kenneth L. Manning, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth

May 2016

ABOUT THE DATA

All the cases in this data set are taken from the *Federal Supplement*, the primary source of the publication for U.S. district court cases. The *Supplement* was first published in 1933 and continues to the present time. Consequently, this data covers an era spanning more than eighty years.

Produced by West Publishing (a division of Thomson Reuters Inc.) in Eagan, Minnesota, the *Supplement* is the primary source of published U.S. district court decisions. All types of cases are reported in the *Federal Supplement*. Opinions designated by the courts as "for publication" — those with full precedential value for which citation in court filings is permissible — are included in the *Supplement*. In practice this has meant that West Publishing tends to publish any decision that a sitting federal district submits. Though West is a private company, it does not have a legal monopoly over the court opinions it publishes. However, it has so dominated the industry in the U.S. that legal professionals uniformly cite the *Federal Supplement* for its published decisions. Given the large number and great diversity of cases published, as well as the universal acceptance of the *Supplement* as the primary source of district court decisions, it provides an extremely valuable data resource.

After reading each case in the *Federal Supplement*, it is first determined whether or not the case should be added to the data set. If the case contains a relevant and traditional liberal-conservative dimension, the case is included. For example, if the case deals with an issue of freedom of speech, a dispute between workers and their employer, or a challenge by a criminal defendant to his sentence, the case is included because social scientists have been able to identify a generally-accepted liberal-conservative dimension in such cases. For example, a ruling in favor of freedom of speech, a decision in favor of the workers, and a vote for the criminal defendant would be regarded as a "liberal" decision, whereas a decision for the other party would be coded as "conservative." This methodology is consistent with other judicial decision data sets on the U.S. Supreme Court and U.S. Courts of Appeals.

Prior to July 19, 1995, (i.e., Vols. # 1 through 789) the decisions of senior district judges were not coded. However, given the increasing numbers and impact on the senior judges, it was decided to include their decisions in the data base, and so from Series 1, Vols. 790 onward the rulings of these jurists are included.

If for any given case it was not possible to determine the clear-cut winner or loser, the case was not coded. Likewise, if Party A wins on two issues and Party B wins on two issues, the case was not coded because it is not clear who the primary victor was. There are two exceptions to this rule, however:

> 1. For criminal justice and habeas corpus cases, any victory for the petitioner is coded, and it is coded as "liberal." This is because there is so little variance in this dependent variable (with the State wining most of the time) that it seemed wise to code any victory for the criminal defendant.

> 2. For civil rights suits by prisoners against prison authorities, even relatively modest victories for the petitioner are coded (as "liberal"). Because the vast majority of these prisoner petitions are rejected, if one coded only those with overwhelming victories, there would be no variance in the dependent variable.

If a case does not contain a dimension that social scientists regard as either liberal or conservative, the case is not entered into the data set. For example, in cases dealing with patents, copyrights, or land condemnation hearings, it is often impossible to identify a traditional liberal-conservative dimension. Likewise, if a case involves a suit between two employers or between two labor unions, each seeking to represent a group of workers at a factory, it is often not possible to say which is the "liberal" side in such cases nor what the "conservative" position may be, and so such cases are not entered into the data set. We estimate that approximately half of the cases

that have appeared in the *Federal Supplement* have been
selected for analysis and included in the data set.

HISTORY

This data has been collected systematically for over forty-
three years. When Robert A. Carp first began doing
research in the realm of judicial politics in 1970, his
primary focus was on the U.S. District Courts. But much to
his dismay he realized that there was no data set available
to scholars which systematically recorded the published
decisions of federal district court judges. Virtually all
information about these judges' decision-making patterns
was anecdotal. It became his goal to remedy this
deficiency by beginning to systematically code all the
relevant published decisions of the federal district judges
that have appeared in the *Federal Supplement* since such
publications began in 1933.

Kenneth L. Manning began working with Carp on the project
in 1994. Carp and Manning have amassed to date over
110,000 cases that contains relevant information about the
cases themselves and about the judges who decided them.
The data covers the judicial cohorts of some nineteen
Presidents from Theodore Roosevelt to Barack Obama. The
first cases in the data set were decided in 1927 and the
most recent in 2012. Over 2000 volumes of the *Federal
Supplement* have been read and coded, and there are
approximately 1400 pages in each volume of the *Supplement*.
In effect, nearly three million pages of federal trial
court decisions have been read and categorized in this
database. The data has been compiled without grant
support.

We are very grateful to the following scholars for their
varied contributions to the collection of this data in the
early stages of the project: Russell Wheeler, a Fellow at
the Brookings Institution; Ronald Stidham, Professor
Emeritus at Appalachian State University; and C. K.
Rowland, Professor Emeritus at the University of Kansas.

JUDGE – Judge Number
This is a unique five digit identification number assigned
to each U.S. district court judge who has published an
opinion in the *Federal Supplement* that was coded for the
purposes of this data base. The first two digits in the
JUDGE variable represent the federal circuit in which the
judge presides. Values range from 01 to 11. Judges in the
U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia are
assigned numbers beginning with 88. The final three digits
in the number are assigned by the coders, usually in a
chronologically sequential fashion. Judges are assigned a
permanent number the first time that a published decision
is coded.

Because there are approximately 2,300 values for JUDGE as
of January 2016, a full listing would be burdensome and the
values are thus not reported here.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

CRTPOINT – Primary Court Point Number
The city and state in which the case was decided. Note
that New York, NY and Brooklyn, NY have separate numbers.

CRTPOINT values
001 - Aberdeen, MS
002 - Aberdeen, SD
003 - Abingdon, VA
004 - Agana, Guam
005 - Aiken, SC
006 - Albany, NY
007 - Albuquerque, NM
008 - Alexandria, LA
009 - Alexandria, VA
010 - Amarillo, TX
011 - Americus, GA

```
012 - Anchorage, AK
013 - Ancon, CZ
014 - Anderson, SC
015 - Atlanta, GA
016 - Auburn, NY
017 - Augusta, GA
018 - Austin, TX
020 - Baldwyn, MS
021 - Baltimore, MD
022 - Bangor, ME
024 - Baton Rouge, LA
025 - Bay City, MI
026 - Beaumont, TX
027 - Benton, IL
028 - Billings, MT
029 - Biloxi, MS
030 - Birmingham, AL
031 - Bismarck, ND
032 - Bluefield, WV
033 - Boise, ID
034 - Boston, MA
035 - Brattleboro, NV
036 - Bridgeport, CT
037 - Brooklyn, NY
038 - Brownsville, TX
039 - Brunswick, GA
040 - Buffalo, NY
041 - Burlington, VT
042 - Butte, MT
043 - Cairo, IL
044 - Camden, NJ
045 - Carson City, NV
046 - Catlettsburg, KY
047 - Cedar Rapids, IA
048 - Charleston, SC
049 - Charleston, WV
050 - Charlotte, NC
051 - Charlotte Amalie, VI
```

---

052 - Charlottesville, VA
053 - Chattanooga, TN
054 - Cheyenne, WY
055 - Chicago, IL
056 - Christiansted, VI
057 - Cincinnati, OH
058 - Clarksburg, WV
059 - Cleveland, OH
060 - Clinton, NC
061 - Cookeville, TN
062 - Columbia, CT
063 - Columbia, SC
064 - Columbus, GA
065 - Columbus, OH
066 - Concord, NH
067 - Corpus Christi, TX
068 - Dallas, TX
069 - Danville, IL
070 - Davenport, IA
071 - Dayton, OH
072 - Denver, CO
073 - Des Moines, IA
074 - Detroit, MI
075 - Duluth, MN
076 - Durant, OK
077 - East St. Louis, IL
078 - Easton, PA
079 - Eau Claire, WI
080 - El Dorado, AR
081 - Elizabeth City, NC
082 - Elkins, WV
083 - El Paso, TX
084 - Erie, PA
085 - Fairbanks, AK
086 - Fairmont, WV
087 - Fargo, ND
088 - Flint, MI
089 - Florence, SC

```
090 - Freeport, IL
091 - Fort Dodge, IA
092 - Fort Smith, AR
093 - Fort Wayne, IN
094 - Fort Worth, TX
095 - Fresno, CA
096 - Gainesville, GA
097 - Grand Rapids, MI
098 - Great Falls, MT
099 - Greene, IA
100 - Greeneville, TN
101 - Greensboro, NC
102 - Greenville, MS
103 - Greenville, SC
104 - Gulfport, MS
105 - Hammond, IN
106 - Harrisburg, PA
107 - Harrisonburg, VA
108 - Hartford, CT
109 - Hillsboro, IL
110 - Honolulu, HI
111 - Houston, TX
112 - Huntington, WV
113 - Indianapolis, IN
114 - Jackson, MS
115 - Jacksonville, FL
116 - Jefferson City, MO
117 - Juneau, AK
118 - Kalamazoo, MI
119 - Kansas City, KS
120 - Kansas City, MO
121 - Knoxville, TN
122 - Lafayette, IN
123 - Lafayette, LA
124 - Lake Charles, LA
125 - Las Vegas, NV
126 - Lewisburg, PA
127 - Lexington, KY
```

```
128 - Lincoln, NB
129 - Little Rock, AR
130 - Littleton, NH
131 - Los Angeles, CA
132 - Louisville, KY
133 - Lubbock, TX
134 - Lynchburg, VA
135 - Macon, GA
136 - Madison, WI
137 - Malone, NY
138 - Mason City, IA
139 - Maysville, KY
140 - Memphis, TN
141 - Miami, FL
142 - Milwaukee, WI
143 - Minneapolis, MN
144 - Minot, ND
145 - Missoula, MT
146 - Mobile, AL
147 - Monroe, LA
148 - Montgomery, AL
149 - Morganton, NC
150 - Muskogee, OK
151 - Nashville, TN
152 - Newark, NJ
153 - New Bern, NC
154 - New Brunswick, NJ
155 - New Haven, CT
156 - Newnan, GA
157 - New Orleans, LA
158 - Newton, NC
159 - New York, NY
160 - Nome, AK
161 - Norfolk, VA
163 - Oklahoma City, OK
164 - Omaha, NE
165 - Orlando, FL
166 - Oshkosh, WI
```

167 - Owensboro, KY
168 - Paducah, KY
169 - Parkersburg, WV
170 - Pendleton, OR
171 - Pensacola, FL
172 - Peoria, IL
173 - Philadelphia, PA
174 - Phoenix, AZ
175 - Pittsburgh, PA
176 - Portland, ME
177 - Portland, OR
178 - Providence, RI
179 - Quincy, IL
180 - Raleigh, NC
181 - Rapid City, SD
182 - Reading, PA
183 - Reno, NV
184 - Richmond, VA
185 - Roanoke, VA
186 - Rochester, NY
187 - Rock Hill, SC
188 - Rutland, VT
189 - Sacramento, CA
190 - Salt Lake City, UT
191 - San Antonio, TX
192 - San Diego, CA
193 - San Francisco, CA
194 - San Jose, CA
195 - San Juan, PR
196 - Santa Fe, NM
197 - Savannah, GA
198 - Scranton, PA
199 - Seattle, WA
200 - Shelby, NC
201 - Sherman, TX
202 - Shreveport, TX
203 - Sioux Falls, SD
204 - South Bend, IN

```
205 - Spartanburg, SC
206 - Spokane, WA
207 - Springfield, IL
208 - Springfield, MA
209 - Springfield, MO
210 - Statesville, NC
211 - Steubenville, OH
212 - St. Joseph, MO
213 - St. Louis, MO
214 - St. Paul, MN
215 - St. Thomas, VI
216 - Tacoma, WA
217 - Tallahassee, FL
218 - Tampa, FL
219 - Tarboro, NC
220 - Texarkana, AR
221 - Toledo, OH
222 - Topeka, KS
223 - Trenton, NJ
224 - Tucson, AZ
225 - Tulsa, OK
226 - Tyler, TX
227 - Utica, NY
228 - Waco, TX
229 - Walla Walla, WA
230 - Washington, DC
231 - Wausau, WI
232 - Westbury, NY
233 - Wheeling, WV
234 - Wichita, KS
235 - Wilkesboro, NC
236 - Williamsport, PA
237 - Wilmington, DE
238 - Winston-Salem, NC
239 - Yakima, WA
240 - Yazoo City, MS
241 - Youngstown, OH
242 - Guam, Guam
```

243 - Sioux City, IA
244 - Uniondale, NY
245 - Gainesville, FL
246 - Syracuse, NY
247 - Allentown, PA
248 - West Palm Beach, FL
249 - Ft. Lauderdale, FL
250 - Laredo, TX
251 - Akron, OH
252 - Galveston, TX
253 - Rome, GA
254 - Jonesboro, AR
255 - Pierre, SD
256 - Big Stone Gap, VA
257 - Opelousas, LA
258 - London, KY
259 - Covington, KY
260 - Old San Juan, PR
261 - Durham, NC
262 - Midland, TX
263 - Evansville, IN
264 - Catlettsburg, KY
265 - Wilmington, NC
266 - Oxford, MS
267 - Ann Arbor, MI
268 - Danville, VA
269 - Huntsville, AL
270 - White Plains, NY
271 - West Long Branch, NJ
272 - St. Croix, VI
273 - Beckley, WV
274 - Fayetteville, NC
284 - Ashland, KY
285 - Pikeville, KY
286 - Alton, IL
287 - Saipan, Guam
289 - Marshall, TX
290 - Rockford, IL

```
291 - Santa Ana, CA
292 - Helena, MT
293 - Jackson, TN
294 - Binghamton, NY
295 - Asheville, NC
296 - Lansing, MI
297 - Greenville, NC
298 - Johnstown, PA
299 - Hato Rey, PR
300 - Worcester, MA
301 - Casper, WY
302 - Texarkana, TX
303 - Albany, GA
304 - Greenbelt, MD
305 - Pasadena, CA
306 - Bennington, VT
307 - Abbeville, LA
308 - Hauppauge, NY
309 - Oakland, CA
310 - Port Huron, MI
311 - Eugene, OR
313 - Broadway, NY
314 - Frankfort, KY
315 - Ft. Myers, FL
316 - Green Bay, WI
317 - McAllen, TX
318 - Del Rio, TX
319 - Urbana, IL
320 - Riverside, CA
321 - Las Cruces, NM
322 - Hattiesburg, MS
323 - Newport News, VA
324 - Central Islip, NY
325 - Panama City, FL
```

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

NUMJUDGES – Number of Judges

The number of judges presiding at the court point (variable CRTPOINT) when the case was decided. Data base users are cautioned that the values in this variable are inconsistent and, therefore, are somewhat unreliable. The data vary as judges die and are no longer counted, additional judges are added, etc.

NUMJUDGES values

00
01
02
03
04
05
06
07
08
09
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

```
28
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
41
42
47
48
50
```

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

CIRCUIT – Federal circuit
Federal circuit in which the case was decided

CIRCUIT values
01 – First CIRCUIT
02 – Second Circuit
03 – Third Circuit
04 – Fourth Circuit
05 – Fifth Circuit
06 – Sixth Circuit
07 – Seventh Circuit
08 – Eight Circuit
09 – Ninth Circuit
10 – Tenth Circuit
11 – Eleventh Circuit
88 – Washington D.C.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

STATE – State
State/territory in which the case was decided

STATE values
01 - Alabama
02 - Alaska
03 - Arizona
04 - Arkansas
05 - California
06 - Colorado
07 - Connecticut
08 - Delaware
09 - Florida
10 - Georgia
11 - Hawaii
12 - Idaho
13 - Illinois
14 - Indiana
15 - Iowa
16 - Kansas
17 - Kentucky
18 - Louisiana
19 - Maine
20 - Maryland
21 - Massachusetts
22 - Michigan
23 - Minnesota
24 - Mississippi
25 - Missouri
26 - Montana
27 - Nebraska
28 - Nevada
29 - New Hampshire
30 - New Jersey
31 - New Mexico
32 - New York
33 - North Carolina
34 - North Dakota

35 - Ohio
36 - Oklahoma
37 - Oregon
38 - Pennsylvania
39 - Rhode Island
40 - South Carolina
41 - South Dakota
42 - Tennessee
43 - Texas
44 - Utah
45 - Vermont
46 - Virginia
47 - Washington
48 - West Virginia
49 - Wisconsin
50 - Wyoming
51 - Puerto Rico
52 - Virgin Islands
53 - Canal Zone
54 - Guam
55 - Washington, D.C.
56 - N. Mariana Islands

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

STATDIST – District in the State
Judicial district in the state in which the case was
decided. Note that due to changes in judicial districts
within state boundaries as a result of Congressional
action, some district numbers change over time.

STATDIST values
011 - Alabama Northern District
012 - Alabama Middle District
013 - Alabama Southern District
014 - Alabama District of AL
021 - Alaska District of AK

```
031 - Arizona District of AZ
041 - Arkansas Eastern District
042 - Arkansas Western District
043 - Arkansas District of AR
051 - California Northern District
052 - California Southern District
053 - California Eastern District
054 - California Central District
061 - California District of CA
071 - Connecticut District of CT
081 - Delaware District of DE
091 - Florida Northern District
092 - Florida Middle District
093 - Florida Southern District
094 - Florida District of FL
101 - Georgia Northern District
102 - Georgia Middle District
103 - Georgia Southern District
111 - Hawaii District of HI
121 - Idaho District of ID
131 - Illinois Northern District
132 - Illinois Southern District
133 - Illinois Central District
141 - Indiana Northern District
142 - Indiana Southern District
151 - Iowa Northern District
152 - Iowa Southern District
153 - Iowa District of IA
161 - Kansas District of KS
171 - Kentucky Eastern District
172 - Kentucky Western District
173 - Kentucky District of KY
181 - Louisiana Eastern District
182 - Louisiana Middle District
183 - Louisiana Western District
191 - Maine District of ME
201 - Maryland District of MD
211 - Massachusetts District of MA
```

```
221 - Michigan Eastern District
222 - Michigan Western District
223 - Michigan District of MI
231 - Minnesota District of MN
241 - Mississippi Northern District
242 - Mississippi Southern District
243 - Mississippi District of MS
251 - Missouri Eastern District
252 - Missouri Western District
253 - Missouri District of MO
261 - Montana District of MT
271 - Nebraska District of NE
281 - Nevada District of NV
291 - New Hampshire District of NH
301 - New Jersey District of NJ
311 - New Mexico District of NM
321 - New York Northern District
322 - New York Southern District
323 - New York Eastern District
324 - New York Western District
331 - North Carolina Eastern District
332 - North Carolina Middle District
333 - North Carolina Western District
334 - North Carolina District of NC
341 - North Dakota District of ND
351 - Ohio Northern District
352 - Ohio Southern District
353 - Ohio District of OH
361 - Oklahoma Northern District
362 - Oklahoma Southern District
363 - Oklahoma Eastern District
364 - Oklahoma Western District
365 - Oklahoma District of OK
371 - Oregon District of OR
381 - Pennsylvania Eastern District
382 - Pennsylvania Middle District
383 - Pennsylvania Western District
384 - Pennsylvania District of PA
```

391 - Rhode Island District of RI
401 - South Carolina Eastern District
402 - South Carolina Western District
403 - South Carolina District of SC
411 - South Dakota District of SD
421 - Tennessee Eastern District
422 - Tennessee Middle District
423 - Tennessee Western District
424 - Tennessee District of TN
431 - Texas Northern District
432 - Texas Southern District
433 - Texas Eastern District
434 - Texas Western District
441 - Utah District of UT
451 - Vermont District of VT
461 - Virginia Eastern District
462 - Virginia Western District
471 - Washington Eastern District
472 - Washington Western District
473 - Washington District of WA
481 - West Virginia Northern District
482 - West Virginia Southern District
483 - West Virginia District of WV
491 - Wisconsin Eastern District
492 - Wisconsin Western District
501 - Wyoming District of WY
511 - Puerto Rico District of PR
521 - Virgin Islands District of VI
531 - Canal Zone District of CZ
541 - Guam District of GU
551 - Washington DC, District of DC

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

MONTH – Month
Month of the year in which the case was decided

MONTH values
01 - January
02 - February
03 - March
04 - April
05 - May
06 - June
07 - July
08 - August
09 - September
10 - October
11 - November
12 - December

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

YEAR – Year
Year in which the case was decided

YEAR values
1927
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941

```
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
```

1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

LIBCON – Decision Ideology
The ideological direction of the decision. The specific
coding logic for each case type is detailed below in the
discussion of the CASETYPE variable.

LIBCON values
0 - Conservative
1 - Liberal

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

CASETYPE – Nature of the Case
The specific issue area the case involves

CASETYPE values
01 - Habeas Corpus-US
02 - Habeas Corpus-State
03 - Criminal Court Motions
04 - Contempt Of Court
05 - (Non)Conv-Criminal Case
06 - Alien Petitions
07 - Native American Rights
08 - Voting Rights
09 - Social Security Case
10 - Racial Discrimination
11 - 14th Amendment
12 - Military Exclusion
13 - Free Of Expression
14 - Free Of Religion
15 - Union V. Company
16 - Member V Union
17 - Employee V. Employer
18 - Commercial Regulation
19 - Environmental Protection
20 - Local/State Economic
21 - Labor Dispute-Govt V Union/Employer
22 - Rent Control, Excess Profits

23 - Womens/Gender Rights
24 - NLRB V Employer
25 - NLRB V Union
26 - Handicapped Rights
27 - Reverse Discrim-Race
28 - Reverse Discrim-Sex
29 - Right To Privacy
30 - Age Discrimination
31 - Sentencing Guidelines Deviation

The coding logic for each of these issue areas is as follows:

(1) Habeas corpus – U.S.
Cases in which a federal prisoner filed a habeas corpus petition. It also includes cases of service men and women who are appealing an adverse decision from a lower-level military court. Likewise it takes in cases dealing with the extradition of a criminal to a foreign nation. The category also includes revocation of parole cases. Finally, if a "freedom of religion" case (often a conscientious objector matter) is filed as U.S. habeas corpus petition, it is coded under "freedom of religion" (Var. # 14) rather than as a U.S. habeas corpus petition. A decision for the petitioner is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(2) Habeas corpus – state
Cases filed by persons imprisoned in state institutions or petitions from those in state criminal proceedings. A decision for the petitioner is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(3) Motions made immediately before, during, and after a federal court trial
Pleas made by prisoners just prior to, during, or after their criminal court trials, such as, motions to suppress evidence, or motions for a new trial. A decision for the petitioner is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(4) This represents a discontinued category

(5) Convictions or Non-conviction of a criminal offense
Cases in which an individual is convicted by a judge in a criminal trial. It also includes cases where the government is seeking forfeiture of money or goods seized during a criminal investigation. A decision for the defendant is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(6) Alien Petitions
All varieties of petitions by aliens to U.S. Government official for a redress of grievances. It might include a request for citizenship status that was denied by U.S. Immigration, or it could include a request by the U.S. Government to deport someone who acquired citizenship under

false pretexts. A decision for the alien petitioner is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(7) Native American rights and laws

This includes suits by Native Americans or by certified Indian tribes for a redress of a variety of grievances. It might include a case by a Native American who was tried for an offense in a state or federal court but who contends that the matter should have been decided by a tribal court. Or, it might be a request by a tribe for an exemption from some tax because the activity in question occurred on land owned by the tribe. A decision for the Native American or the tribe is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(8) Right-to-Vote and Apportionment cases

Cases in which a citizen is contending that his right to vote or to run for political office has been restricted by either state or federal law, for example, someone arguing that the number of signatures required to obtain a place on the ballot is excessive.   The category also includes all cases that deal with reapportionment, for instance, a suit that argues that the one-man-one-vote rule has not been followed in legislative districting. (If the petitioner is a member of a racial minority, the case is still coded under this category rather than under Var. # 10 "Racial minority Discrimination.") A decision for the petitioner is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(9) Social Security disability cases
Appeals by persons who have applied to the Social Security
Administration for disability benefits but who have been
refused such benefits by an administrative law judge. A
decision to grant the petitioner his or her request for
benefits is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(10) Racial Minority Discrimination
Cases in which a member of a racial minority is claiming
that he or she has been discriminated against in violation
of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment or by
any laws passed under the authority of the 14th Amendment.
Most of the petitioners are Afro-Americans, but this
category includes other racial minorities, such as
Hispanics or Americans of Middle-Eastern descent. (This
does not include suits brought by Native-Americans which
are included in Variable # 7.) Suits brought by minority
union members against their union are included in this
category and not under Variable # 16.) A decision for the
racial minority member is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(11) Fourteenth Amendment cases and U.S. Civil Rights Acts cases

A broad category that includes all petitions brought by individuals who are claiming any general violation of the 14th Amendment or of any laws passed by Congress under Section 5 of that Amendment. It also includes all cases in which a variety of pleas are contained in the petition and it is impossible to put them into a more specific category. For example, a petitioner who contends that he or she was being discriminated against because of his/her gender, race, and age would be placed into this more general category because it is not possible to place it into a more precise one such as, age discrimination, or disability discrimination. (Note that in some instances the petition might be brought by the alleged victim of discrimination, or it may be brought by a Government agency in the name of the alleged victims.) Also, when someone claims that he or she is being fired from a government job in violation of his 1st amendment rights, the case is coded here rather than under Var. # 13 on "Freedom of Expression." A decision for the victim of the discrimination is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(12) This represents a discontinued category

(13) Freedom of Expression

Claims by persons who contend that their rights of freedom of speech or freedom of the press have been violated. For instance, a petitioner might argue that a city ordinance restricting solicitation of funds at an airport was excessive, or he or she might contend that a state law restricting the distribution of pamphlets on state property

violated his 1st Amendment rights. (In cases involving
"adult book stores" versus city zoning ordinances, such
cases are coded under 'freedom of expression" and not under
"state and local economic regulation." Likewise commercial
speech cases are coded under this category even though
there are obviously some economic components to the
matter.) A decision for the individual claiming a 1st
Amendment violation is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(14) Freedom of Religion
This category includes both "establishment" and "free
exercise" claims. For instance, a typical "establishment"
claim might be someone who is contending that the presence
of a wall plaque in a court room containing the Ten
Commandments is a violation of the establishment clause.
Or, someone might claim that required vaccinations of his
child prior to enrolling in a public school are a violation
of his free exercise rights. If the court find that a
violation of the establishment clause exists, or that
someone's free exercise right have been violated, the case
is coded as liberal. Furthermore, a vote for an employer
who objects to the Affordable Care Act for religious
reasons because it involves providing birth control
information and/or devices to his employees is considered a
liberal decision under this variable.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(15) Union versus Company
Cases where the adversaries are a labor union and an employer. (Suits between labor unions as to which one has jurisdiction at a particular company are not included in the data set.) A victory for the labor union is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(16) Union Members verse Union, or Employees versus Union
Lawsuits by individual labor union members against the union itself or by individual employees against the union. For example, a union member might be contending that he or she was not allowed to speak at a labor union meeting, or someone might be arguing that the union did not adequately represent their interests in a grievance with the company management. A decision for the (underdog) union member or the employee is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(17) Employee versus Employer
General labor disputes between employees and an employer where there is no more precise issue at stake such as, race, gender, or disability. (If the issue falls into one of these latter categories, the case is placed these more precise slots.) If an employee is suing an insurance company for retirement or disability benefits (with the insurance company being affiliated with the employer) then the cases is coded as "employee versus employer." Likewise if there is a case dealing with a "wrongful death action," often brought by the widow of a worker killed on the job,

such cases are coded under this variable; and a victory for
the widow is coded as liberal. Finally, cases brought
under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 are included
in this category. Initially a dispute between a government
employee and the government was not coded, but during the
early 1990's, it was decided to code those cases under this
routine "employee versus employer" category unless there
was some overt civil rights issues at stake. If the
employee is the victor in the case, it is coded as liberal.

Value
1 - Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 - Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(18) Commercial Regulation by the U.S. Government
Suits brought by independent federal regulator agencies,
such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, and by all
regulatory departments of the U.S. government in attempts
to regulate commercial matters. Typical cases might
include suits by the U.S. Attorney General against a
company for alleged anti-trust practices, or a suit by the
Department of Agriculture against farmers who are in
alleged violation federal agricultural legislation. Also
included in this category are cases in which the question
is whether a particular commercial subject matter legally
can be regulated either by the U.S. Government or by a
state. (This category does not include environmental
protection cases or pure food and drug issues case which
are coded under Variable # 19.) Victories for the federal
regulator or a victory for the federal government over a
would-be state regulator are coded as liberal.

Value
1 - Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 - Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(19) Environmental Protection cases, Pure Food and Drug
cases, and Consumer Protection cases
This somewhat diverse category includes all cases dealing
with protection of the environment, suits brought under the
Pure Food and Drug laws, and all consumer protection cases
brought by a governmental agency (but not consumer
protection cases brought by private individuals against a
private company). This category also includes all cases
dealing with these same issues brought by state regulatory
agencies. A victory for environmental protection, pure
food and drugs, or consumers is coded as liberal. (In some
cases that are coded "liberal," the government may be the
loser in the case, for example, if an environmental
protection organization sues the Environmental Protection
Agency for doing an inadequate job of protecting the
environment and the Government loses, the case is coded as
liberal. Thus in this instance we code by the substantive
winner of the case and not by which party won.)
Furthermore, if a plaintiff is asserting his or her 2nd
Amendment right to bear arms versus the right of the state
or federal government to regulate firearms, a decision in
favor of governmental regulation is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(20) State and Local Economic Regulation cases
This category is similar to Variable # 18 dealing with
government regulation of commence, but in this instance the
regulators are either state or local governments. A
typical case would be someone challenging the
constitutionality of a local sales tax or a petitioner
claiming that a state law regulating barber shops violated
his 14th Amendment substantive due process rights.   A
decision in favor of the state or local government is coded
as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(21) Secretary of Labor versus either an Employer or a Labor Union (1933-72)

Suits initiated by the Secretary of Labor or the National Labor Relations Board against either a company or a union. Also, in this category are cases initiated by workers under the Fair Labor Standards Act. In 1972 this variable was split into two separate categories (Variables # 24 and # 25) to differentiate the party which was being sued by the Labor Secretary. A court decision for the Secretary of Labor or in favor of the worker under the Fair Labor Standards Act is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(22) Rent Control, Excessive Profit, and Price Control

This category deals with the legality of either federal or state governments to regulate rents, corporate profits, or the price of goods. (Most of these cases stem from periods of economic stress in the United Sates, such as during World War II or during the high inflation years of the Nixon administration.) A decision in favor of the government is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(23) Women's Rights and Legal Status
Lawsuits brought by women, or government agencies (e.g.,
the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) on behalf of
women, seeking to redress some type of discrimination
against them. Typical cases might include a case brought
by a female worker claiming that she was not provided equal
pay for equal work, or, a suit challenging a state law that
gave men a higher legal status than women in some
substantively-important area, such as, inheritance or
employment status.   This category also includes suits
brought under the Violence against Women Act of 1994.
(The category does not, however, include cases dealing with
the subject of abortion which are located in variable # 29,
"the right to privacy."   Also, a case dealing with a male
claiming to be discriminated against because of his gender
would be coded under Var. # 11 "Fourteenth Amendment
cases…..") A decision upholding women's rights is coded as
liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(24) Secretary of Labor (or the N.L.R.B.) versus an
Employer
Lawsuits against corporations brought by the Labor
Secretary or the National Labor Relations Board. It also
takes in all cases in which the Fair Labor Standards Act is
at issue. A typical case would be a suit against an
employer for not paying the minimum wage to a given set of
employees. However, suits brought by the Secretary of
labor against a company under the Occupational Safety and
Health Act (OSHA) are coded under Var. #19 "Environmental
Protection Cases…." A decision for the Secretary of Labor
(or the N.L.R.B.) is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(25) Secretary of Labor (or the N.L.R.B.) versus a Union or Employees

In this groups of cases are suits brought by the Labor
Secretary or the National Labor Relations Board against a
labor union or against a group of employees. A typical
case might be a suit by the Secretary of Labor against a
labor union for conducting an illegal work stoppage. A
decision in favor of the Labor Secretary or the N.L.R.B. is
coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(26)   Rights of the Disabled and Handicapped

Lawsuits by individuals who are either handicapped or
disabled against a person, state, or corporate entity which
is discriminating against them. Many suits are filed under
the American with Disabilities Act. A typical case might
be a suit by a disabled worked against an employer who was
willfully discriminating against him because of his
handicapped status. Or, a suit might be brought by a
handicapped student who contends that he or she requires
additional time on an exam given at a state university. A
decision in favor of the disabled person is coded as
liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(27) Reverse Discrimination Cases involving Race
Cases dealing with the legality of state or federal
programs that give priority to minorities in terms of
hiring or in terms of admission to state educational
facilities. (This does not include cases where minority
individuals claim they were discriminated on an individual
basis because of their race; such cases are located under
Variable # 10.) A court decision upholding the affirmative
action program is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(28)   Reverse Discrimination for Gender
Cases dealing with the legality of state or federal
programs that give women priority in terms of hiring or in
matters of awarding government contracts. (This does not
include cases where women claim they were discriminated on
the basis of gender; such cases are located under Variable
23.) A court decision upholding the affirmative action
program is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(29) The Right to Privacy
This somewhat diverse category takes in subjects such as
contraception issues, abortion, gay and lesbian rights,
out-of-the ordinary search and seizure cases, and
violations of the Privacy Acts. A decision upholding a
woman's right to contraception devices or information and
her right to an abortion are coded as liberal. A decision
in favor of gay or lesbian rights is coded as liberal.
Likewise a ruling that an unusual search-and seizure was

illegal under the 4th Amendment, and a decision finding a violation of the Privacy Act are coded as liberal. (Freedom of Information Act cases were not coded at all in this research.)

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(30) Age Discrimination cases
Cases in which a worker or a group of employees file suit claiming they were discriminated against on the job because of their age. Many of these cases are brought under the federal Age Discrimination Act. A decision finding that age discrimination had occurred is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

(31) U.S. Sentencing Guidelines cases
This category of cases are suits brought under the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines. (Prior to January 2005 cases dealing with sentencing were coed under Var. # 3 "Motions made Immediately before, during or after a federal court trial, but after that time period such cases have been coded under this more precise category.) If a convicted person is granted a reduction of his sentence in a suit brought under these Guidelines, the case is coded as liberal. Likewise, if a judge denies a prosecutor's request that a prisoner's sentence be extended, the case is coded as liberal.

Value
1 – Decision for the petitioner (liberal)
0 – Decision against the petitioner (conservative)

CATEGORY – Case type category
The general issue area the case involves

CATEGORY values
1 - Criminal Justice case
2 - Civil Liberties/Rights case
3 - Economic Regulation and/or Labor case

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

CASNUM – Case Number
This is a unique eight digit number assigned to each
decision. The number is based upon the publication
location in the *Federal Supplement*, published by West
Publishing. The first digit in CASNUM is the series of the
Federal Supplement – as of 2012 there had been two series
published. The next three digits reference the volume
number within that series. The final four digits reference
the page number within the volume.

For example, a CASNUM value of 20670378 represents a case
in *Federal Supplement* series two, volume 67, page number
378.

In rare circumstances there may be more than one decision
published on a single page. It is thus possible for two
different cases to have the same number, though such
situations are very unusual.

Because there are approximately 111,000 values for CASNUM
as of January 2016, the values are not reported here.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

APYEAR – Appointment Year
The year that the judge was initially appointed to their
position on the U.S. district court bench

<u>APYEAR values</u>
1900
1901
1907
1909
1912
1913
1914
1915
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942

```
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
```

```
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
```

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

APPRES – Appointing President
The U.S. President who appointed the judge

APPRES values
25 – William McKinley
26 – Theodore Roosevelt
27 – William Howard Taft
28 – Woodrow Wilson
29 – Warren Harding
30 – Calvin Coolidge
31 – Herbert Hoover
32 - Franklin D. Roosevelt
33 – Harry Truman
34 – Dwight Eisenhower
35 – John F. Kennedy
36 – Lyndon Johnson
37 – Richard Nixon
38 – Gerald Ford
39 – Jimmy Carter
40 – Ronald Reagan
41 – George H. W. Bush
42 – Bill Clinton
43 – George W. Bush
44 – Barack Obama

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

PARTY – Judge's Party
The political party identification of the judge. In some
instances this will be different than the partisanship of
the appointing president. This data was gleaned from
professional background information on the judge as
obtained by Prof. Sheldon Goldman.

PARTY values
1 – Democrat
2 – Republican
3 – Independent/Other/Unknown

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

GENDER – Judge's Gender
The gender identification of the judge

GENDER values
0 – female
1 – male

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

RACE – Judge's Race/Ethnicity
The race/ethnicity identification of the judge

RACE values
1 – white/Caucasian
2 – African-American/black
3 – Latino/Hispanic
4 – Asian American
5 – Native American

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *