

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Bennett v. Arkansas, 485 U.S. 395 (1988)

U.S. Supreme Court papers, Justice Blackmun

3-21-1988

03-21-1988 Correspondence from Kennedy to Rehnquist

Anthony M. Kennedy

US Supreme Court Justice

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/bennettvarksansas>



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kennedy, A.M. Correspondence from Kennedy to Rehnquist, Bennett v. Arkansas, 485 U.S. 395 (1988). Box 367, Harry A. Blackmun Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

This Conference Note is brought to you for free and open access by the U.S. Supreme Court papers, Justice Blackmun at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bennett v. Arkansas, 485 U.S. 395 (1988) by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

7113
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE ANTHONY M. KENNEDY

March 21, 1988

Re: Bennett v. Arkansas, No. 86-6124

Dear Chief,


As you may recall, petitioner's counsel informed us at oral argument that because Shelton did not complete a necessary IFP affidavit, his petition for certiorari was not filed by the clerk. Johnson was a party in the proceedings but did not seek certiorari. In view of the jurisdictional deficiencies, do you still wish the per curiam to cover Shelton and Johnson?

The Bennett case squarely raises the proper interpretation of 42 U.S.C. 407(a) and the per curiam is comprehensive and quite correct as to that claim.

I recognize that if you excise Shelton's claim, you cannot squarely reach 38 U.S.C. §3101, though it seems to me that in the course of distinguishing Rose v. Rose we could make our views on the subject sufficiently clear.

Please let me know if I am missing something or if you would like more specific comments.

Sincerely,



The Chief Justice

Copies to the Conference