

## Lesson plan: Katz v. United States (1967)

Theme: Privacy

Skills: Reading, summarizing

1. Warm up: Elicitation of ideas on privacy, activating background knowledge
2. Guided discovery of the opinion on the Lexhnlology tool
  - a. Students are asked to identify case background and find factual elements with the Setting the Scene filter. Class discussion follows.
  - b. Students are asked to identify the general Court justification using the Analysis filter. Class discussion follows.
  - c. Students are asked to answer targeted comprehension questions requiring textual evidence (about arguments from the parties, sources of authority put forward by the Court, tipping point for the Court). Students may use built-in filters.
3. Concordance and feature noticing
  - a. Students filter the text to show only sentences tagged with “Stating the Court’s reasoning”
  - b. Students look for legal argumentative strategies.
  - c. Students look for specific features and complete a noticing grid (sentence, argumentative strategy, linguistic features). They may request a list of features if they are confused.
4. Contrasting task

Students are given a mixed list of sentences pulled from different steps in the opinion.

- a. They classify each sentence into a step (or at least: “facts”, “arguments of parties”, “reasoning of Court”, “citations”).
  - b. They underline features that helped them decide (lexical signals like “the petitioner argued...”, “the Government contends...”, vs generic 3rd person, modals, contrast markers).
5. Linking argumentative strategies

Still in the platform, students are asked to identify one main idea per *Présenter le raisonnement* block of sentences. They may connect the ideas to specific sources of authority, filtering in Recalling a SCOTUS decision/primary source.

6. Final task = writing the “Reasoning” section of a case brief

Students now their case brief template, where Facts, Issue, Holding may already be partly filled. They write a “Reasoning” section and describe why the Court rejects the “constitutionally protected area” framing, and explain the “reasonable expectation of privacy” logic.