Shepard’s Citations

Shepardizing a case will:

- Identify every federal or state case that has cited your case since your case took place – and tell you if those subsequent courts still consider the opinion of your original case to be good law
- Identify law review articles that cite your case
- Identify legal briefs of other decisions that cite your case.
Shepardizing a Case the Short Way
Click on the symbol in the upper right and that will take you to Shepards. It might be a yellow caution sign, a red X sign, etc.
To use *Shepard’s* Citations in LN Academic the long way: click on “Search By Content Type” on the LN Academic homepage.
Then under **Legal**, click on **Shepard’s Citations**
Let’s Shepardize 483 U.S. 203 (South Dakota v Dole) Then type in the citation of your case and click on Check
This case was cited 2604 times. Including 1651 times in law reviews – and 551 in Court Documents which are usually briefs. However a case being cited in a law review article or brief is not the same as a law review article or brief about that case.
South Dakota v. Dole has been cited by 378 cases. Clicking on the court citation’s page number will take one to the place in the case where South Dakota v. Dole was cited.
One can get to the law reviews and/or briefs that cited this case by changing the **Restrict By** box in the upper left of the start of the Shepard’s entry to **Narrow – Restrict by**
Then at the Restrict by box, check **Court Documents**
and then click on the red Apply over on the far right of the page.
That will take you to 467 briefs that cite your case. Again these are only briefs that cite your case – not briefs on your case. Click on the first brief.


Then that will take usually take you to the place in the citing brief that cites your case. The brief may only contain a short paragraph about your case – but sometimes those short law review or brief entries can help provide context to your case.


If the Court were to apply RLUIPA without meaningful deference to state prison officials, there would be very real questions about RLUIPA's constitutionality under the Spending Clause. See Cutter, 544 U.S. at 732 (Thomas, J., concurring) (explaining that "RLUIPA may well exceed the spending power"); Charles v. Verhagen, 348 F.3d 601, 608 (7th Cir. 2003) (holding RLUIPA constitutional because it gives each State "the freedom to tailor compliance according to its particular penological interests and circumstances").
And one can use a similar approach to find Law review articles that cite one’s case. Just go back to the Restrict By menu in Shepard’s and choose **Law Reviews** instead of Court Documents. Click on Apply.
Then clicking on a particular law review article will take you to the place in the law review article that cites your case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW REVIEWS AND PERIODICALS</th>
<th>1651 Citing References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
That will usually be in the footnotes section at the end of the article. In this article, footnotes n.7 and n.8


n7. **South Dakota v. Dole, 483 U.S. 203 (1987)**.

n8. See, e.g., **New York v. United States, 505 U.S. 144 (1992)** (citing the holding in South Dakota v. Dole that conditional spending is a permissible


n10. Early drafts of this essay prescribed that the Court decide Douglas as narrowly as possible. The Court decided Douglas in this manner late in the estate.

One can then scroll up into the article to see the sentences where footnotes n7 and n8 appear.

On the other hand, the United States expressed a broad view of federal power when it expanded Medicaid to everyone up to 133% of the federal poverty level in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA). This is a major philosophical shift for Medicaid that partially federalizes a program historically deemed an exercise in cooperative federalism. The Court heard oral arguments March 26 through 28, 2012, in Florida v. Department of Health and Human Services, and though much of the media and scholarly conversation has focused on the constitutionality of the minimum services provision, the first question in the states' petition was whether the Medicaid expansion constitutes impermissible coercion under the South Dakota v. Dole test for constitutional conditions on federal spending. Thus, the greatest change to the Medicaid program since its inception could be nullified by the Supreme Court as a matter of Spending Clause interpretation, even though the federal government has exercised power to influence the states within the known bounds of the Court's spending jurisprudence.