

Major Supreme Court Decisions in 2026 (as of June 30, 2026)

The Supreme Court term began October 2025

6-30-26 **Birthright Citizenship** 6-3

The court [struck down](#) President Trump's [executive order](#) limiting birthright citizenship, reaffirming the long-held principle that children born in the United States are citizens and keeping the 14th Amendment intact.

Birthright citizenship has been a core tenet of American life since the Reconstruction amendments were passed after the Civil War. Mr. Trump's executive order attempted to redefine what it means to be an American and overturn more than a century of precedent.

In a SCOTUS poll, **63%** of respondents said the President's Executive Order violated the Constitution.

6-30-26 **Campaign Finance** 6-3

The court [ruled to lift limits](#) on how much political parties can spend on advertising and other expenses in coordination with candidates, stating that limits violated the First Amendment. The case began in 2022, when JD Vance, then a Senate candidate, sued to challenge the campaign coordination limits. He was joined by Republican groups.

The ruling is a major victory for Republicans and could undercut one of the Democrats' financial advantages in television advertising heading into the midterms. Federal law requires television broadcasters give political candidates low advertising rates, while super PACs are often charged much more. Democratic candidates in recent election cycles have tended to out raise Republicans and could often take advantage of lower TV ad rates. The ruling essentially permits super PACs and national party committees, on which Republicans have been more reliant in recent elections, to take advantage of these lower rates.

In a SCOTUS poll, **79%** of respondents said campaign finance limits **do not** violate political parties right to free speech.

6-30-26 **Transgender Athletes** 6-3

The court [upheld](#) laws in West Virginia and Idaho that bar transgender female athletes from participating in girls' and women's sports teams. Two transgender athletes — Becky Pepper-Jackson, a high school student in West Virginia, and Lindsay Hecox, a college student in Idaho — had challenged the laws their states. The Trump administration, which backed the state bans, and the states' lawyers say transgender female athletes threaten to undermine progress under Title IX, which has led to increased opportunities for women in sports.

The outcome of the two cases has implications for the 25 other states with similar laws and for athletes who compete in school and collegiate sports around the country. A pressing question now is how sports officials will determine if competitors are girls and women, as defined by the opinion.

In a SCOTUS poll, **69%** of respondents felt barring transgender girls from playing on girls' sports teams **does not** violate their rights.

6-29-26 **Fed Reserve Board Firing** 5-4

The court [prevented](#) the president from immediately removing Lisa Cook from the Federal Reserve Board. Ms. Cook sued President Trump after he tried to fire her in August, citing the law that established the central bank that allows presidents to dismiss members but only "for cause." The administration cited an allegation that Ms. Cook had engaged in mortgage fraud. She has not been charged and vigorously denied any wrongdoing.

The ruling blocked the president from immediately ousting Ms. Cook and gives her an opportunity to refute the allegations against her. Former top Fed and Treasury officials and Ms. Cook's legal team warned the Supreme Court that permitting Mr. Trump to fire her while her litigation is underway would spur economic turmoil and undermine public confidence in the central bank.

In a SCOTUS poll, **56%** of respondents said the President may not remove a Federal Reserve Board member.

6-29-26 **Regulator Firings** 6-3

The court [cleared the way](#) for President Trump to fire independent government regulators despite federal laws meant to insulate them from political pressure by allowing presidents to remove the officials only with good cause. Rebecca Kelly Slaughter, a Democratic member of the Federal Trade Commission, sued after Mr. Trump fired her without citing any reason. The court's conservative majority has generally allowed the firings to take effect through temporary emergency orders.

The ruling in Mr. Trump's favor called into question the constitutionality of job protections for leaders of more than two dozen other bipartisan commissions and boards, and it is a major expansion of presidential authority over independent agencies, ending nearly 90 years of legal protection for these jobs.

In a SCOTUS poll, **60%** felt the president **may not remove** a commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission for not sharing policy priorities.

6-29-26 **Mail-In Ballots** 5-4

[The court upheld](#) Mississippi's law, passed in 2020, allowing elections officials to count ballots postmarked by Election Day and received up to five business days later. Republican leaders had challenged the grace-period rule, asserting that federal law requires that ballots must be received by Election Day.

A ruling striking down Mississippi's law had the potential to invalidate not only the state's mail-in ballot rules, but also similar laws in more than a dozen other states. It could also have potentially upended grace periods aimed at allowing military, diplomatic and other overseas voters to participate, along with rural voters and people with disabilities, and disrupted all state laws that allow mail-in voting.

In a SCOTUS poll, **55%** of respondents said states **may count** ballots postmarked on or before Election Day but received later than Election Day.

6-25-26 **Guns on Private Land** 6-3

[The court struck down](#) a Hawaii law that required gun owners to get permission before carrying a firearm onto private property that is generally open to the public. The law was one of several passed in the state in response to a 2022 Supreme Court case that expanded gun rights and set out a new test for evaluating regulations. Three Maui gun owners and a local firearms advocacy group challenged this particular restriction, arguing that it violated the Second Amendment.

The decision could clarify the test for evaluating the constitutionality of gun regulations that the justices set out in 2022 in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen*. Lower courts have struggled to figure out how to carry out the Supreme Court's test, which required that they evaluate the constitutionality of gun laws based on the country's "history and tradition."

In a SCOTUS poll, **62%** of respondents said concealed carry laws **do not** violate the Second Amendment.

6-25-26 **Asylum Policy** 6-3

[The court ruled](#) that the Department of Homeland Security may revive a policy that allowed the government to turn noncitizens away at the border without hearing any claims they had that they qualified for asylum. The policy was in effect during the Obama administration and President Trump's first term but reversed during the Biden administration.

Immigrant advocates say the so-called metering policy violates federal law, which requires officials to "inspect and refer for processing" asylum seekers who are "physically present" in the United States. The Trump administration says the policy is critical for managing the southern border.

In a SCOTUS poll, **56%** of respondents said noncitizens stopped near the border outside of the U.S. **should be allowed to apply** for asylum.

6-25-26 **Deportation Protections** 6-3

[The justices ruled](#) that the president may end deportation protections for hundreds of thousands of Haitian and Syrian migrants. As part of the administration's crackdown on immigration, the president had moved to terminate the program, known as Temporary Protected Status, that allows migrants from certain troubled nations to live and work legally in the United States.

The program was created by Congress with bipartisan support in 1990 to provide temporary legal status to people whose home countries were deemed unsafe because of war, natural disasters or other crises. While the decision clears a path for the potential deportation of 350,000 Haitians and 6,100 Syrians, it has implications for other T.P.S. holders from about a dozen other countries and roughly 1.3 million people in all.

6-23-26 **Religious Rights** 6-3

The [court ruled](#) that Damon Landor, a Rastafarian whose dreadlocks were forcibly shaved while he was in prison, could not sue Louisiana state officials for money. Mr. Landor had sued after guards shaved him bald while he was serving a five-month sentence for drug possession.

At the time, Mr. Landor, whose faith requires him to let his hair grow long, was carrying a copy of a legal opinion that said inmates must be allowed to keep their dreadlocks, under a federal law protecting prisoners' religious freedom. The issue before the justices was whether Mr. Landor could seek monetary damages for his treatment.

The Supreme Court has in recent years repeatedly bolstered religious rights, but during oral argument in Mr. Landor's case the justices seemed to divide along ideological lines, with members of the court's conservative majority suggesting the statute at issue does not clearly permit such lawsuits.

In a SCOTUS poll, **51%** of respondents said prisoners **should be able to sue** officials for money damages.

6-18-26 **Gun Possession** 9-0

The court [narrowed a federal law](#) that banned drug users and addicts from owning or possessing guns. The justices ruled that the law was overbroad, sweeping together recreational drug users with people addicted to drugs who posed a danger to public safety.

The case provided the justices with another opportunity to clarify the test that the majority set out in the 2022 Bruen guns case that expanded the right to carry firearms in public for self-defense. Lower courts have struggled with how to apply the Supreme Court's test that gun regulations must fit within the country's "history and tradition."

In a SCOTUS poll, **70%** of respondents said laws like one that makes it unlawful for illegal drug users to possess firearms **do not** violate the Second Amendment.

Death Penalty —

The justices [decided not to rule](#) in a case dealing with how states should assess whether capital defendants have intellectual disabilities that should require them to be spared the death penalty. Joseph Clifton Smith, an Alabama man, was sentenced to death after a conviction for a 1997 murder. He took multiple I.Q. tests and received varying results but argues he has a mental disability and should not be executed. The court heard oral arguments in the matter but instead of ruling sent the case back to the lower courts.

Two decades ago, the court barred the execution of people with mental disabilities as a violation of the Eighth Amendment ban on cruel and unusual punishment. In deciding not to rule, the court did not provide further guidelines for states to evaluate how to determine who is intellectually disabled and whether defendants can present a full picture of their intellectual functioning beyond test scores.

4-29-26 **Racial Gerrymandering** 6-3

In a blow to the Voting Rights Act, [the court ruled](#) that Louisiana's new congressional district map was an unconstitutional racial gerrymander. The court's conservative majority upheld the constitutionality of the Voting Rights Act itself, but in their dissent, the liberal justices accused them of gutting it. A group of white Louisiana voters had sued state officials over the map, in which state lawmakers added a second majority-Black district, in 2024.

The case challenged Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, the remaining core piece of the legislation aimed at protecting voters from discrimination based on race. It is unclear how the court's decision on the Louisiana map could affect the nationwide redistricting battle that has spiraled already into multiple states.

Voting rights groups had feared that a decision that limited lawmakers from taking race into account in drawing voting maps [could erase](#) majority-minority districts — a move that would most likely benefit Republicans.

In a SCOTUS poll, **51%** of respondents said the Congressional districts designed to be majority-minority **are constitutional**.

4-29-26 **Free Speech** 9-0

[The court ruled](#) that a New Jersey crisis pregnancy clinic should be able to challenge a subpoena issued by state officials seeking donor information. State officials had subpoenaed the clinic in 2023 as part of an investigation into whether it misled donors over its mission. The justices cleared the way for the clinic to bring a First Amendment challenge in federal court as it tries to fight the subpoena.

Although the case involves an anti-abortion clinic, the legal issue is a jurisdictional one, whether the state subpoena can be challenged in federal court. Because of its narrow focus and implications for the First Amendment, the dispute includes unusual alliances. The American Civil Liberties Union filed a brief in support of the anti-abortion clinic's argument, asserting that requests for donor information could chill free speech.

In a SCOTUS poll, **62%** of respondents said the demand that a nonprofit pro-life organization turn over internal records as a part of a state investigation **violates** the First Amendment.

4-17-26 **Environment** 9-0

[The court ruled](#) that energy companies facing lawsuits over environmental damage in Louisiana can move the challenges from state courts into friendlier federal venues. Louisiana state officials are seeking to hold the companies liable for coastal damage linked to oil and gas production, some dating back to World War II.

Although the case focused on a narrow question — whether the lawsuits should be heard in state or federal court — there are major implications for climate-related lawsuits. The decision by the justices to move the case to federal court — seen as friendlier to business interests — could make it more difficult for state and local governments to win lawsuits against companies for environmental damage.

3-31-26 **Conversion Therapy** 8-1

[The court sided](#) with a Christian therapist, rejecting a Colorado law that prohibited mental health professionals from seeking to change the sexual orientation or gender identity of L.G.B.T.Q. minors. Lawyers for the therapist and the Trump administration had said the law impermissibly interfered with free speech. Colorado countered that states have long regulated medical practices to ensure patients are protected from substandard care.

The court's decision will have implications for more than 20 other states that have similar laws prohibiting so-called conversion therapy, which medical organizations say is ineffective and potentially dangerous for young people.

In a SCOTUS poll, 57% of respondents said banning conversion therapy does not violate the free speech and religious freedom of mental health professionals.

2-20-26 Tariffs 6-3

The court ruled that President Trump exceeded his authority when he imposed sweeping tariffs on nearly every U.S. trading partner. Six companies and several states had challenged the policy. The Constitution gives Congress the power to impose taxes, but Mr. Trump is the first president to declare that a 1977 law gives him the power to set tariffs unilaterally during emergencies.

The outcome of the case could significantly affect the global economy and American businesses and consumers, and shape Mr. Trump's foreign policy and economic initiatives for the remainder of his term. The Trump administration had said that a loss at the Supreme Court could force the government to unwind trade deals with other countries and potentially pay hefty refunds to importers. But the president's top trade negotiator said in January that the administration would move quickly to replace any tariffs invalidated by the court with other levies.

In a SCOTUS poll, 55% of respondents said the president **cannot** use the emergency powers law to impose tariffs

1-14-26 Election Law Challenges 7-2

The court held that a Republican congressman from Illinois could challenge the rules governing the counting of votes in his election. The congressman had sued the Illinois State Board of Elections to challenge rules that allow mail-in ballots in the state to be counted up to 14 days after an election provided they are postmarked by Election Day.

Writing for the majority, Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. concluded that political candidates have a direct interest in election rules — an interest that extends to the integrity of the election that gives them standing to sue.

This lawsuit could clear the way for more challenges to state election laws. Some observers also predicted that it could reduce the number of lawsuits filed after elections by allowing courts to deal with more challenges in advance.

Polling data is based on a survey conducted online by YouGov from March 27 to April 1 using a representative sample of 2,195 American adults. It comes from the SCOTUS Poll project by Stephen Jessee, University of Texas at Austin, and Maya Sen, Harvard University. Numbers may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

----- Information in this document was from a New York Times article dated 6-30-26

https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2026/02/20/us/supreme-court-major-cases-2026.html?campaign_id=60&emc=edit_na_20260630&instance_id=177997&nl=breaking-news®i_id=232796398&segment_id=222317&user_id=10f6f1b298da76b3410073161f8479a7