# WEEKLY LEGAL Newsletter PREPARING YOU FOR A FUTURE IN LAW



### COMPILED BY SAMANTHA CHACKO

#### **NOVEMBER 07, 2022**



### **Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta** Federal vs State jurisdiction involving Native land.



Photo from Yahoo News Victor Manuel Castro-Huerta, a non-native, was convicted of child neglect in an Oklahoma state court even though the crime was committed within the Cherokee Reservation.

Castro-Huerta brought his case before the Court using McGirt v. Oklahoma, a 2020 decision which held that states cannot prosecute crimes committed on Native American lands without federal approval. However, the Court ultimately held that the federal and state governments have concurrent jurisdiction to prosecute crimes committed by non-Natives against Natives on Native American land. Read the full decision <u>here</u>.

## Rakas v. Illinois

### Limiting Fourth Amendment protections.

After receiving a robbery report, police officers stopped and searched a car and found a box of rifle shells and a sawed-off rifle. The passengers were arrested and convicted in Illinois state court of armed robbery. They moved to suppress the items found in the search under the Fourth Amendment, but the Court ultimately denied this request as neither the car nor the objects found in the search were theirs. In order to be protected under the Fourth Amendment the Court must determine whether the person who claims the protection of the amendment has a legitimate expectation of privacy in the invaded place. Read the full decision <u>here</u>.



Photo from Attorney Arja Shah

## Woodson v. North Carolina

### **Restricting the Death Penalty.**

Woodson challenged a NC law that made the death penalty mandatory for all convicted first-degree murderers. The Court found that the law violated the 8A for 3 reasons. First, the historical record indicated that the public had rejected mandatory death sentences. Second, the law provided no standards to guide juries in their exercise of "the power to determine which first-degree murderers shall live and which shall die." Third, the statute failed to allow consideration of the character and record of individual defendants before inflicting the death penalty. Read the full decision <u>here</u>.

