***BIZARRE SUPREME COURT CASES***

***Bond v United States (2011)***

**Background of the case**



Carol Anne Bond worked for the chemical manufacturer Rohm and Haas.

She learned that her friend Myrlinda Haynes was pregnant. She also found out her husband was the father.

She used her connections with the chemical company to obtain the means for revenge. She stole and purchased highly toxic chemicals that she applied to Haynes' doorknobs, car door handles, and mailbox. She tried this 24 times, but because the substance turns bright orange when it touches metal, Haynes was able to avoid touching it most of the time.

Haynes suffered a minor burn on her thumb, and after contacting a federal investigator, Bond was identified as the perpetrator. She was charged with several violations of the Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act of 1998 (Act). A section of this Federal law prohibits the possession or use of any “toxic” chemical that can cause death or temporary or permanent harm to another if not intended for a peaceful purpose

According to the law, a “toxic chemical” is “any chemical which through its chemical action on life processes can cause death, temporary incapacitation or permanent harm to humans or animals. Use of the chemical not prohibited by this law is defined as “any peaceful purpose related to an industrial, agricultural, research, medical, or pharmaceutical activity or other activity.

Bond sued the US government for prosecuting her, claiming that enforcing domestic prosecutions through an international treaty violates the 10th Amendment. The 10th Amendment clarifies that the federal government has no power other than what the constitution explicitly assigns it; other powers belong to the states or to citizens.

How would you rule on this?