* Facts:
  + A 1975 revision to Texas education laws allowed the state to withhold funds intended for local school districts, if they were educating children who had not been “legally admitted” to the US.
* Procedural History:
  + US District Court (Eastern District of Texas)
    - Judgment for the plaintiff Plyler
  + US Court of Appeals 5th Circuit
    - Judgment Affirmed
  + Appeal to US Supreme Court
* Issue:
  + Did the TX education law violate the 14th amendment’s Equal Protection clause?
* Holding:
  + Yes; the regulation did not further a “compelling state interest”.
* Judgment: Affirmed
* Legal Reasoning:
  + Majority (Brennan)
    - Equal Protection clause was intended to abolish “caste-based and invidious class-based legislation”
    - “Within its jurisdiction” extend to anyone, citizen or stranger who is subject to the laws of the state, regardless of their illegal or legal entry into the state.
    - Classifications that disadvantage a “suspect class”, the state must prove that the classification has been precisely tailored to serve a compelling government interest.
    - Public education is not a “right” ranted to individuals by the constitution, but is necessary to preserve our democratic form of government.
  + Concurrence (Blackmun)
    - Classifications involving non constitutional interests generally are not subject to special treatment under the Equal Protection Clause, because they are not distinguishable in any relevant way from other regulations in "the area of economics and social welfare."
  + Dissent (Burger)
    - Doesn’t believe that it is the court’s place to be making decision about “social policy”
    - Illegal aliens are definitely covered under the 14th but, believes the state has the right to make decisions regarding the allocation of funds while taking into account the legal status of those receiving the funds.
* Relation to Other Cases/Precedent:
  + Using Yick Wo v. Hopkins as precedent
  + SD UH
* Narrow
* Broaden ✖
  + Plyler broadens Yick Wo. Together they expand the are of impermissible actions.
* Source of Law:
  + 14th Amendment, Equal Protection Clause
    - “No state shall…deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to *any person within its jurisdiction* the equal protection of the laws.”
* Interpretation Style:
  + The court interpreted this case using an originalist view of the constitution because they took a very literal interpretation of the 14th amendment with regards to “equal protection of the laws”