Table of Contents

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/plr

Part of the Law Commons

Recommended Citation
Available at: https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/plr/vol31/iss1/1

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Saint Louis University Public Law Review by an authorized editor of Scholarship Commons. For more information, please contact Susie Lee.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

A NEW ERA FOR PLEA BARGAINING AND SENTENCING?:
THE AFTERMATH OF PADILLA V. KENTUCKY

FOREWORD ................................................................. Robbie Hinz
Emma Schuering 1

ARTICLES

INTRODUCTION ...................................................... Lynn S. Branham 3

PENALTY AND PROPORTIONALITY
IN DEPORTATION FOR CRIMES ......................... Maureen Sweeney
Hillary Scholten 11

TRANSPORTING PADILLA TO
DEPORTATION PROCEEDINGS:
A DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO THE
EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF
COUNSEL.......................................................... Stephen H. Legomsky 43

TAKING PLEA BARGAINING
SERIOUSLY: REFORMING
PRE-SENTENCE REPORTS
AFTER PADILLA V. KENTUCKY ....................... Gabriel J. Chin 61

THE MYTH OF THE FULLY
INFORMED RATIONAL ACTOR......................... Stephanos Bibas 79
COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES
AFTER PADILLA V. KENTUCKY:
FROM PUNISHMENT TO REGULATION.................................Margaret Colgate Love 87

A PROSECUTOR’S EXPANDED RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER PADILLA ............. Robert M. A. Johnson 129

“COLLATERAL” NO MORE: THE PRACTICAL IMPERATIVE FOR HOLISTIC DEFENSE IN A POST-PADILLA WORLD . . . OR, HOW TO ACHIEVE CONSISTENTLY BETTER RESULTS FOR CLIENTS.............................McGregor Smyth 139

THE IMPLICATIONS OF PADILLA V. KENTUCKY ON PRACTICE IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS.................................................Judge Robert Pratt 169

INCORPORATING COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES INTO SENTENCING GUIDELINES AND RECOMMENDATIONS POST-PADILLA.................................................Michael A. Wolff 183

NOTES

THE FOURTH AMENDMENT AND UNWARRANTED GPS SURVEILLANCE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE D.C. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS’ DECISION IN UNITED STATES V. MAYNARD.............................................Margaret C. Eveker 193

BERGHUIS V. THOMPKINS: THE SUPREME COURT’S “NEW” TAKE ON INVOCATION AND WAIVER OF THE RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT..............................Emma Schuering 221