

The issue is whether the plaintiff (P) has standing to assert her claim in federal court. To have standing, P must satisfy the case-or-controversy requirement of Article III. Doing so requires P to show that: (1) she suffered an injury-in-fact; (2) the defendant's (D's) acts caused the injury-in-fact; and (3) the injury-in-fact would be redressed by the relief P seeks in court.

To satisfy the first element, P must show \_\_\_ [explain what's required to show injury-in-fact]. Favoring P's case are \_\_\_ [explain what facts help her case and why, using logical arguments]. P's case is also supported by \_\_\_ [describe any helpful case law you covered in class and why it helps P], as well as by the \_\_\_ policy [if any; explain why the policy helps P]. On the other hand, D might show that P does not satisfy the injury-in-fact element because [describe contrary facts, logic, cases, policies, and explain why those help D and/or rebut something P said]. Weighing the parties positions, a court would probably conclude that P can/cannot show injury-in-fact because [describe why P or D has the stronger position, including by reference to any dispositive fact, case, or policy].

As for the second element, P must show \_\_\_ [explain what's needed to show causation]. Favoring P's case are \_\_\_ [facts/explain]. In addition, P's case is like \_\_\_ [case] where the court found causation because [explain]. The \_\_\_ policy also supports P's position because [explain]. On the other hand, D may show that P does not satisfy the causation requirement because [describe contrary facts, logic, cases, policies and explain why they help D and/or refute the relevance of what P cites]. Overall, a court would likely decide P can/cannot show causation because [explain].

To show element 3, redressability, a P must show that \_\_\_ [explain]. Because of \_\_\_ [facts/explain], P can show redressability. P's case is also helped by \_\_\_ [cases/explain] and policy \_\_\_ [explain]. Alternatively, D can try to show P does not show element 3 because [describe contrary facts, logic, cases, policies, etc.]. Overall, a court should hold for P/D because [explain].

Overall, a court should/should not decide P has standing because \_\_\_ [synthesize court conclusions from above].

Extras You Might Add:

1. Is there a fact that, if different, would change the conclusion?
2. Would you have concluded differently if the case were at a different time in history?