

## May 16 Decision in Wine Case Brings to 7-1 Robbins Russell's Record in Supreme Court Merits Cases in Which it Has Participated During the Current Term

On May 16, 2005, the Supreme Court -- agreeing with the main points made in an amicus brief we filed on behalf of several Members of Congress -- ruled by a 5-4 vote that States may not discriminate against out-of-state wineries in deciding who may ship wine directly to consumers. Our brief in the wine case, *Granholm v. Heald* (available [here](#)), was the product of a collaboration between Robbins Russell and Patton Boggs.

Other Supreme Court victories in which we have participated during the current Term include *Wilkinson v. Dotson*, argued by our partner Alan Untereiner (see our brief for respondent Dotson [here](#)); *City of Rancho Palos Verdes v. Abrams* (see our amicus brief for various municipalities [here](#)); *Dura Pharmaceuticals v. Broudo* (see our amicus brief for the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants [here](#); see the May 9, 2005 issues of Law.com or the National Law Journal for an article quoting Larry Robbins about a related matter we are handling); *Koons Buick Pontiac GMC v. Nigh* (see our amicus briefs for banking organizations [here](#) and [here](#)); *Shepard v. United States* (see our amicus brief for the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers [here](#)); and *United States v. Booker* (see our amicus brief for Families Against Mandatory Minimums [here](#)). We were unsuccessful in *Bates v. Dow Agrosciences* (see our amicus brief for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States [here](#)).

Two other cases in which we have submitted merits-stage amicus briefs have been argued and are awaiting decision (see our *Grokster* amicus brief [here](#) and our *Spector v. Norwegian Cruise Line* brief [here](#)). One of our cert. petitions, for Volvo Trucks North America ([here](#)), has been granted, and we will file our opening merits brief May 20 and argue the case next Term. We also have a pending cert. petition for Joseph Scheidler et al. ([here](#)), which asks the Court to instruct the Seventh Circuit to obey the mandate of a favorable Supreme Court decision we obtained in 2003. For a full list of all the matters we have handled or are handling before the Supreme Court during the current Term, see the chart [here](#).