I. INTRODUCTION

Jan 11: Why do They Get to Decide?
   “Agencies”: 1 – 9; FDA v. Brown & Williamson (641-56, skim);
   Mass v. EPA, skim (734-43); Sackett v. EPA (TWEN)

Jan 13: What is ‘Administration’?
   “Functions”: 10-25 (Dickinson, Fuchs; Londoner, Bi-Metallic, Yesler)
   “Theories of Behavior”: 34 - 40 (esp. Landis, Bernstein, Noll, Wilson)
   A.V. Dicey, Law of the Constitution (excerpt, TWEN)

Jan 20: Does Administration Transcend Separation of Powers?
   “Concepts”: 41 – 59 (Landis, Strauss, Burns, McCutcheon)
   “Rights & Remedies”: 810 - 16 (Cold Storage, Phillips)
   “Tort Actions”: 942 - 45 (Little); Ives v. South Buffalo Ry. (TWEN);
   American School of Magnetic Healing v. McAnnulty (TWEN)

II. THE CONSTITUTIONAL SETTING OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

Jan 25: Agencies and Article I: Before the New Deal and After
   59 - 107 (Aurora, Wayman, Field, Hampton; Panama, Schechter, Mistretta, I.U.D)

Jan 27: Controlling Delegation
   96 – 140 (Am. Trucking, Chadha)
Feb 1: Agencies and Art. II
140 – 50; 159- 216 (Buckley, Morrison, Free Ent Fund)
Myers v. U.S., Opinions of Early Attorneys General (Excerpts, TWEN)

Feb 3: Art III and Separation of Powers
217 – 55 (CFTC, Stern, Withrow)
NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel (excerpt, TWEN)

III. CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND DUE PROCESS

Feb 8: Earlier Views
803 – 10; 818 – 33 (Bailey, AntiFascist Com’tee, Cafeteria Workers)

Feb 10: The Due Process Revolution
834 - 871 (Goldberg, Bell, Roth, Sinderman, Thompson)

Feb 15: “Due Process of Law”
895 - 929 (Mathews, Cleveland, Gilbert)

Feb 17: Constitutional Standing
989 – 1021 (Lujan, Friends of Earth, Kansas City Power)

IV. STATUTORY CONSTRAINTS: CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE APA

Feb 22: The APA and Formal Rule-Making
256 - 88 (Fla. East Coast Ry.)
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Rwy v. Minn (excerpt, TWEN)

Feb 24: Formal Adjudication
288 – 306 (W. Chicago, Seacoast Anti-Pollution, Chem. Waste)
Morgan v. U.S. (I), U.S. v. Morgan (IV) (TWEN)

Feb 29: Informal Rule-making I
306 - 49(Vt. Yankee, Conn. Light, Am Radio)
Mar 2: Informal Rule-making, II  
359 – 97 (Air Transport, U.S. Tel, Prof’s & Patients, Am. Min’g)  
U.S. v. Dean (TWEN)

Mar 14: Informal Adjudication and Choice of RM or Adjudication  
413 - 56 (Overton Park, Pension Benefit, Chenery I and II)

V. SCOPE OF REVIEW

Mar 16: Review of Factual Findings  
Informal Proceedings: 492 - 500 (ADPSO)

Mar 21: Review of Legal Conclusions – Current Practice (i)  
Skidmore: 527- 532; “Quiet Revolution”: 532 – 50 (Chevron, Cardoza)

Mar 23: Review of Legal Conclusions – Current Practice (ii)  
“When Does Chevron Apply”: 551 - 605 (Christopher, Rapaport, Christensen, Mead, Gonzalez)

Mar 28: Review of Clear, Precise, Reasonable  
“How Clear is Clear?”: 608 – 40 (Zuni, Dole, Pauley); Utility Air Reg Group (TWEN); Home Concrete (TWEN); King v. Burwell (TWEN)

Mar 30: Review of Discretion and Policymaking  
“Review of Agency Discr“: 697 -734 (I.U.D., Motor Vehicle, P.R. Sun Oil)

Apr 4: More on Review of Discretion and Policymaking  
“Hard Look”: 763 - 800 (Lemoyne, FLRA, Auto Safety, Matheson); Norton v. So. Utah (TWEN), Mass v EPA (734 – 43)

Apr 6: Executive Review  
Exec Or. 12291: 1184 – 1192; Later E.O.s: 1192- 1215 (skim)  
Sherley v. Sibelius (TWEN); J. Nou, “Agency Self-Insulation” (TWEN)
VI. TIMING and AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW

Apr 11: Preclusion of Review
“Whether”: 955 – 89 (Block, Bowen, Cheney, Lincoln)

Apr 13: Standing
“Whom ... Statutory Standing”: 1024 - 52 (Data Proc., Clarke, Air Courier, National Credit)

Apr 18: Finality and Ripeness
“Finality”: 1069 - 1086 (Standard Oil, Air Brake Systems);
“Ripeness”: 1086 -1105 (Abbott, Toilet Goods, Ohio Forestry)
“Over-ripeness”: 1106 – 16 (FLRA, JEM, Yakus, Adamo Wrecking)

VII. SUMMATION

Apr 20: Boundaries or Work-Arounds?
Michigan v. EPA (TWEN); OCR Guidance Letter (TWEN);
Legal Scholars Amicus Brief in U.S. v. Texas (TWEN)

Apr 21: Review and Conclusion