

Lexis® Advance

Legal Issue Trail

An aerial view of a city skyline, likely New York City, with a large, semi-transparent silhouette of a person's head in the foreground. The silhouette is filled with a grid pattern, suggesting a focus on research or data. The city buildings are in shades of grey and white, with some taller buildings in the background.

The strongest defense
is having the right
research tool in
your corner

Lexis® Advance

www.lexisnexis.com/advance

 LexisNexis®

Exclusive Lexis Advance Legal Issue Trail

You told us you could leave no stone unturned.

With Legal Issue Trail you can be confident you have the critical information to your case strategy or issue. It is a whole new way of providing you with a comprehensive view of the universe of case law.

Today when you search for a case, your results are only as good as the search query you run. With **Legal Issue Trail**, when you find a relevant case of interest and drill down to a particular legal issue you can click on **Legal Issue Trail** to find additional cases that have similar passages that you may not have found through a traditional search method. This helps you navigate the universe of cases and identify those most clearly on the point of law most relevant to you.

Let's see how this works

Once you have done your search on Lexis Advance and found a case of interest and the point of law relevant to your search, you can click the Activate Passages button to highlight the passages within the case.

Clicking on the passage of interest will return the following results:

- Additional cases that cite to your case for the legal issue in the passage you selected
- Supporting cases your case cites to support the selected passage

Legal issue trail allows you to efficiently analyze how an issue has evolved over time by quickly finding all the connections between cases.

How does Legal Issue Trail find these relevant connections?

Legal Issue Trail uses proprietary Lexis Advance search capabilities to validate cases displayed that have a citing relationship and include extremely relevant passages to your original point of interest. This patented tool will help transform the way you conduct legal research.

Legal Issue Trail illustrates relationships among legal issues that delivers an entirely new and more efficient way to verify and feel confident about your research.

Research Analyze Client: None My Workspace Help Sign Out Feedback

Lexis Advance employment discrimination Search Search Options

All Content Types U.S. Federal All Practice Areas & Topics Shepard's®

employment discrim... Swierkiewicz v. Sor...

Shepard's® Tools About this Document

Reporter 534 U.S. 506 page Navigate Passages Jump to...

[508]

JUSTICE THOMAS delivered the opinion of the Court. [LEdHN\[1A\]](#) [1A] [LEdHN\[2A\]](#) [2A] This case presents the question whether a complaint in an employment discrimination lawsuit must contain specific facts establishing a prima facie case of discrimination under the framework set forth by this Court in [McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green](#), 411 U.S. 792, 36 L. Ed. 2d 668, 93 S. Ct. 1817 (1973). We hold that HN1 an employment discrimination complaint need not include such facts and instead must contain only "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." [Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 8\(a\)\(2\)](#).

[509]

Following his demotion, petitioner contends that he "was isolated by Mr. Chavel . . . excluded from business decisions and meetings and denied the opportunity to reach his true potential at SOREMA." App.

[508]

JUSTICE THOMAS delivered the opinion of the Court. [LEdHN\[1A\]](#) [1A] [LEdHN\[2A\]](#) [2A] This case presents the question whether a complaint in an employment discrimination lawsuit must contain specific facts establishing a prima facie case of discrimination under the framework set forth by this Court in [McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green](#), 411 U.S. 792, 36 L. Ed. 2d 668, 93 S. Ct. 1817 (1973). We hold that HN1 an employment discrimination complaint need not include such facts and instead must contain only "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." [Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 8\(a\)\(2\)](#).

Research Analyze Client: None My Workspace Help Sign Out Feedback

Lexis Advance employment discrimination Search Search Options

All Content Types U.S. Federal All Practice Areas & Topics Shepard's®

employment discrim... Swierkiewicz v. Sor... Swierkiewicz v. Sor...

Selected Passage JUSTICE THOMAS delivered the opinion of the Court. [LEdHN\[1A\]](#) [1A] [LEdHN\[2A\]](#) [2A] This case presents the question whether a complaint in an employment discrimination lawsuit must contain specific facts establishing a prima facie case of discrimination under the framework set forth by this Court in [McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green](#), 411 U.S. 792, 36 L. Ed. 2d 668, 93 S. Ct. 1817 (1973). We hold that HN1 an employment discrimination complaint need not include such facts and instead must contain only "a short and plain statement of [5] the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." [Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 8\(a\)\(2\)](#). [7]

The following case(s) cited [Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A., 534 U.S. 506](#) for this issue

Sort by [Relevance]

<input type="checkbox"/>	Document Title	Jurisdiction	Court	Date
The following case(s) cited Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A., 534 U.S. 506 for this issue				
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Goldings v. United States , 98 Fed. Cl. 470 ... more...than...a statement of facts that merely creates a suspicion [of] a legally cognizable right of action", on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true (even if doubtful in fact), see, e.g., Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A. , 534 U.S. 506, 508 n.1, 122 S. Ct. 992, 152 L. Ed. 2d 1 (2002) ("Rule 12(b)(6) does not countenance...dismissals based on a judge's disbelief of a complaint's factual allegations"); Scheuer v. Rhodes , 416 U.S. 232, 236, 94 S. Ct. 1683, 40 L. Ed. 2d ...	U.S. Federal	Court of Federal Claims	May 06, 2011
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Skinner v. Switzer , 131 S. Ct. 1289 ... prevail" on his procedural due process claim, see Scheuer v. Rhodes , 416 U.S. 232, 236, 94 S. Ct. 1683, 40 L. Ed. 2d 90 (1974), but whether his complaint was sufficient to cross the federal court's threshold, see Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N. A. , 534 U.S. 506, 514, 122 S. Ct. 992, 152 L. Ed. 2d 1 (2002). Skinner's complaint is not a model of the careful drafter's art, but Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a complaint need not pin a plaintiff's claim for relief to a precise legal ...	U.S. Federal	Court of Federal Claims	March 07, 2011
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Sys. Fuels, Inc. v. United States , 65 Fed. Cl. 163 ... a claim upon which relief may be granted "is necessarily a limited one. The issue is not whether a	U.S. Federal	Court of Federal Claims	April 20, 2005

www.lexisnexis.com/advance

LexisNexis, Lexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Copyright 2011 LexisNexis. All rights reserved. LNL01020-0

