

Sentencing and Juries (other than Capital Cases)

Gabriel T. Thornton, 41 Suffolk U. L. Rev. 1001 (2008), Case Comment CRIMINAL LAW—JURY'S SILENCE ON THEORY OF FIRST-DEGREE MURDER NOT AN ACQUITTAL FOR DOUBLE JEOPARDY PURPOSES—COMMONWEALTH v. CARLINO, 865 N.E.2D 767 (MASS. 2007)

Katherine Georger, 43 Gonz. L. Rev. 701 (2007-2008), Note SENTENCING AND ITS DISCONTENTS: CUNNINGHAM V. CALIFORNIA AND THE "UNREASONABLE" EROSION OF THE SIXTH AMENDMENT

Amy Farrell and Daniel Givelber, 33 Law & Soc. Inquiry 31 (2008), Article JUDGES AND JURIES: THE DEFENSE CASE AND DIFFERENCES IN ACQUITTAL RATES

Kirk J. Henderson, 33 U. Dayton L. Rev. 37 (2007), Article MANDATORY-MINIMUM SENTENCES AND THE JURY: TIME AGAIN TO REVISIT THEIR RELATIONSHIP

Laurie Jaeckel, 85 Denv. U. L. Rev. 153 (2007), Comment CUNNINGHAM V. CALIFORNIA: THE SHIFTING BALANCE OF JUDGE AND JURY

Lance Cassak and Milton Heumann, 4 Rutgers J. L. & Pub. Pol'y 411 (2007), OLD WINE IN NEW BOTTLES: A RECONSIDERATION OF INFORMING JURORS ABOUT PUNISHMENT IN DETERMINATE—AND MANDATORY—SENTENCING CASES

Diane E. Courselle, 37 McGeorge L. Rev. 513 (2006), Symposium SLOUCHING TOWARD BOOKER AND BEYOND—THE COURT EMBRACES AND REJECTS THE ROLE OF JURIES AT SENTENCING

Chris Kemmitt, 40 U. Mich. J.L. Reform 93 (2006), Article FUNCTION OVER FORM: REVIVING THE CRIMINAL JURY'S HISTORICAL ROLE AS A SENTENCING BODY

Brian M. Clary, 28 U. Ark. Little Rock L. Rev. (2006), Note CRIMINAL LAW—THE SIXTH AMENDMENT AND THE RIGHT TO TRIAL BY JURY—WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?: THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT EXAMINES THE FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES. UNITED STATES V. BOOKER, 543 U.S. 220 (2005)

Marc S. Raspanti 30 Champion 26 (Sept./Oct. 2006), Feature GETTING TO REASONABLENESS—CRAFTING AN EFFECTIVE DOWNWARD DEPARTURE POST-BOOKER

Amy Baron-Evans, 30 Champion 32 (Sept./Oct. 2006), Feature THE CONTINUING STRUGGLE FOR JUST, EFFECTIVE AND CONSTITUTIONAL SENTENCING AFTER UNITED STATES V. BOOKER: WHY AND HOW THE GUIDELINES DO NOT COMPLY WITH (SECTION) 3553(A)

Gilles R. Bissonnette, 53 U.C.L.A. L. Rev. 1497 (2006), Comment "CONSULTING" THE FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES AFTER BOOKER

Hollyce L. Winters, 44 Duq. L. Rev. 147 (2005) Recent Decisions PREVENTING THE EROSION OF SIXTH AMENDMENT PROTECTIONS: DEFINING THE JURY'S ROLE UNDER THE FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES: UNITED STATES V. BOOKER

Cory Spiller, 83 Denv. U. L. Rev. 613 (2005), Colorado Supreme Court Survey PEOPLE V. HARLAN: THE COLORADO SUPREME COURT TAKES A STEP TOWARD ELIMINATING RELIGIOUS INFLUENCE ON JURIES

Michael T. Cahill, 2005 U. Chi. Legal F. 91 (2005), Punishment and Crime PUNISHMENT DECISIONS AT CONVICTION: RECOGNIZING THE JURY AS FAULT-FINDER

Kristina Walter, 53 Clev. St. L. Rev. 657 (2005-06), Note BOOKER AND OUR BRAVE NEW WORLD: THE TENSION AMONG THE FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES, JUDICIAL DISCRETION, AND A DEFENDANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO TRIAL BY JURY

Don Stemen and Daniel F. Wilhelm, 18 Fed. Sent. R. 7 (2005), FINDING THE JURY: STATE LEGISLATIVE RESPONSES TO BLAKELY V. WASHINGTON

Morris B. Hoffman, 13 Geo. Mason L. Rev. 455 (2005), Articles BOOKER, PRAGMATISM AND THE MORAL JURY

Nancy J. King, David A. Soulé, Sara Steen, Robert R. Weidner, 105 Colum. L. Rev. 959 (2005), Symposium WHEN PROCESS AFFECTS PUNISHMENT: DIFFERENCES IN SENTENCES AFTER GUILTY PLEA, BENCH TRIAL, AND JURY TRIAL IN FIVE GUIDELINES STATES

Paul F. Kirgis 39 Ga. L. Rev. 895 (2005), Articles THE RIGHT TO A JURY DECISION ON SENTENCING FACTS AFTER BOOKER: WHAT THE SEVENTH AMENDMENT CAN TEACH THE SIXTH

M.K.B. Darmer, 56 S.C. L. Rev. 533 (2005), Article THE FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES AFTER BLAKELY AND BOOKER: THE LIMITS OF CONGRESSIONAL TOLERANCE AND A GREATER ROLE FOR JURIES

17 Fed. Sent. R. 175 (2005), PRIOR CONVICTIONS, JURY TRIAL, AND THE BURDEN OF PROOF

Ben Richard, 6 Fla. Coastal L. Rev. 193 (2004), Notes and Comments APPROACHING THE NEXT STOP ON THE SUPREME COURT'S SIXTH AMENDMENT JOURNEY TO "APPRENDI-LAND": THE INVALIDATION OF THE FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES

Teresa R. Nelson, 5 Wyo. L. Rev. 317 (2005), Case Notes CRIMINAL LAW—THE SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO TRIAL BY JURY: A CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE VERSUS THE DEMISE OF SENTENCING GUIDELINES, BLAKELY V. WASHINGTON, 124 S. CT. 2531 (2004)

Nancy J. King, 57 Vand. L. Rev. 885(2004), FELONY JURY SENTENCING IN PRACTICE: A THREE-STATE STUDY

Rachel E. Barkow, 152 U. Pa. L. Rev. 33 (2003), Article RECHARGING THE JURY: THE CRIMINAL JURY'S CONSTITUTIONAL ROLE IN AN ERA OF MANDATORY SENTENCING

Erik Lillquist, 82 N. Car. L. Rev. 621 (2004), Article THE PUZZLING RETURN OF JURY SENTENCING: MISGIVINGS ABOUT APPRENDI

Nancy J. King, 78 Chi.-Kent L. Rev. 937 (2003), Symposium: The Jury at a Crossroad: The American Experience THE ORIGINS OF FELONY JURY SENTENCING IN THE UNITED STATES

Jenia Iontcheva, 89 Va. L. Rev. 311 (2003), Articles JURY SENTENCING AS DEMOCRATIC PRACTICE

Morris B. Hoffman, 52 Duke L.J. 951 (2003), Articles THE CASE FOR JURY SENTENCING

William T. Pizzi, 21 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 51 (2002), The Jury's Role in Administering Justice in the United States DO JURY TRIALS ENCOURAGE HARSH PUNISHMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES?