

Chapter 1

1. The Heart of Atlanta Hotel brought a lawsuit against the United States. The hotel wanted the Court to declare a federal civil rights statute unconstitutional. The hotel argued that Congress had gone beyond its power under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the states. The hotel stated that it only did business in one state. As a result, the federal civil rights act, which was based on Congress's power to regulate commerce among the states, could not be constitutionally applied to it. The government argued that, because at any given time three-fourths of its registered guests were from other states, the operation of the hotel impacted commerce among the states. Therefore, the federal government could regulate its operation under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the U.S. Constitution. Do you agree with the hotel or with the government? Explain your answer. *Heart of Atlanta Hotel v. United States*, 370 U.S. 241 (U.S. Sup Ct.).
2. While undergoing a radiological examination at Flower Memorial Hospital, Barbara Rome was injured because she had not been securely strapped onto the x-ray table by a student intern. She sued the hospital under a state statute that allowed her two years to bring the suit. The hospital claimed that Rome had used the wrong statute. The hospital argued that because this was a medical case, it should have been brought under the state's one-year statute of limitations for medical malpractice claims. In our legal system, who has the job of explaining statutes that are confusing or unclear? *Rome v. Flower Memorial Hospital*, 635 N.E. 2d. 1239 (OH).