

The united states supreme court essay

[Law](#), [Constitution](#)



The United States Supreme Court marks the highest court in the US. The court offers the final appellate jurisdiction and has the overall powers over other courts in the United States. The court consists of the chief justice and other eight associate justices within the framework. These justices are appointed by the president then effectively confirmed by the senate.

However, this number depends on how the congress can fix the number that seems convenient in service delivery. Formed in 1789 marking the highest federal court in the US history, the court handles all matters including the federal matters regarding the different cases presented to the judges.

The court derives its authority from Article III of the U. S. Constitution. This is clearly illustrated by the statue set within the jurisdiction of Title 28 of the U. S code. With these powers on its side, the court itself promulgates the rules overriding the presentation of the cases that are presented before it on a regular basis (Haerens, 2010). Hence, based on these jurisdictions presented before it, the court has the power to hear and rather determine the different cases presented before the appellate review.

Hence, based on the United States of America constitution, which clearly stipulates the different jurisdictions, this grants the court several powers over the different cases that it should hear and decide. Hence, the Supreme Court of the United States jurisdiction originates from the US constitution.

The constitution limits the jurisdictions of the federal courts to the territory of the nation. Article III, section 2 of the US constitution grants the powers to the court to hear and decide the various cases surrounding it. This is through stating, " The court has original jurisdiction over several small but important categories of cases" (Haerens, 2010). This means that different parties can

bring their cases and other petitions to the court in a direct manner.

Through the set jurisdictions, relatively few original cases come to the court directly. Instead, they pass through the lower courts before being submitted to the Supreme Court for a ruling. The master appointed in the court hears and through the presented evidences and facts over the case pending the decisions are made. Through the well balanced constitutional document, it clearly stipulates the jurisdictions of the court in a manner that determines what is right for the general public (Haerens, 2010). These jurisdictions aim at protecting and rather guaranteeing the rights of the citizens on all dynamics regarding the different cases that are presented to the court.

Through the jurisdictions set within the constitutional framework, the court can effectively deliver its verdicts through an explicitly open manner that seems democratic and stresses a periodic approach of the various regulations that enable the cases ruled out in an open and fair manner. The power of "judicial review" in the constitution has effectively given the court a crucial responsibility in ensuring each right are upheld (Thompson et al. 2009). In addition, the maintenance of the 'living constitution' within the set jurisdictions that needs to be applied to diverse, complex situations uprising on a periodic view.

Hence, through the judicial review, the Supreme Court effectively ensures that the will of the people is clearly represented. This is through clearly reflecting the legislative view whose statutes have to express the general opinion of the people.

In addition, the jurisdiction can be made limited or rather expanded. This depends on the different types of the jurisdiction the Court has and the

certiorari process by which the court grants a case an oral hearing. Based on the expanded view, "The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases" this is through the view of law and equity that is clearly stipulated within the constitutional structure.

Hence, the Supreme Court's original jurisdictions can only be changed by a constitutional amendment. The congress does engage in the jurisdictional stripping over the various appellate matters through general legislation. The US federal judiciary can strip the Supreme Court the number of authorities regarding the various cases that it can hear and rule out. This includes the different classes of claims and jurisdictions set (Thompson et al. 2009).

However, the original jurisdictions of the court streams directly from the constitution, this makes the court self-executing without further action by the congress expect through a constitutional amendment. These amendments may originate from the House of Representatives or rather the senate. In addition, the amendment must pass a set percentage acclaimed by the states that aim at ratifying the amendment before adoption.

Nevertheless, the congress foresees the various actions performed by the court through the various regulations to ensure that it reflects justice to all the people. Through this, the sovereignty sentiments are proposed and ratified through the various amendments that guarantee the original flow of the original jurisdictions.

The court has, Appellate jurisdiction granted by article III of the constitution. The Original jurisdiction that has been granted by the constitution. Through the petition for certiorari before judgment and writ of certiorari, the court grants each party a 30 minutes hearing for an oral presentation that ensures

the court effectively chooses to hear and issue a ruling. Through the Rule of Four, it defines the convention for a certiorari to be granted by the court to be able to vote in favor of the grant to help in the deciding of the case.

References

Haerens, M. (2010). *The U. S. Supreme Court*. Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press.

Thompson, David C. Wachtell, Melanie F. (2009). *An Empirical Analysis of Supreme Court Certiorari Petition Procedures*