

# United States v. Santos: Deciphering the Majority and Taking Lessons from the Plurality

October 01, 2008

By: [Adam Schwartz](#) and Rachel May Zysk Excerpt: *"Notably, there is no majority opinion in Santos. Rather, Justice Scalia penned the five-part plurality opinion. He was joined by Justices Souter and Ginsburg in all parts, and by Justice Thomas except in Part IV. Justice Stevens concurred in the judgment, resulting in a narrow 5-4 majority, but wrote a concurring opinion, thereby limiting the holding of the case. This article examines the plurality opinion and concludes with a discussion of the lessons that can be learned from the Court's holding and the plurality opinion. Section I discusses the factual and procedural history of the case. Section II discusses the plurality's analysis, including the arguments advanced by the government and the manner in which the plurality rejected them. Section III discusses Part IV of the plurality opinion, where Justice Scalia opined on the effect of Justice Stevens' concurring opinion, both on Santos and on future cases. Finally, the article concludes with suggestions on how practitioners may use Santos to benefit their clients."*

## Authored By



[Adam P. Schwartz](#)

## Related Practices

[White Collar Crime & Government Investigations](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.