***Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council, Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency***, [535](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_United_States_Supreme_Court_cases,_volume_535) [U.S.](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Reports) 302 (2002),[[1]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tahoe-Sierra_Preservation_Council,_Inc._v._Tahoe_Regional_Planning_Agency#endnote_citation) is one of the [United States Supreme Court](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supreme_Court_of_the_United_States)'s more recent interpretations of the Takings Clause of the [Fifth](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fifth_Amendment_to_the_United_States_Constitution) and [Fourteenth](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fourteenth_Amendment_to_the_United_States_Constitution) Amendments. The case dealt with the question of whether a [moratorium](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moratorium_%28law%29) on construction of individual homes imposed by the [Tahoe Regional Planning Agency](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tahoe_Regional_Planning_Agency) fell under the Takings Clause of the [United States Constitution](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Constitution) and whether the landowners therefore should receive just compensation as required by that clause. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency was represented by future Chief Justice [John Roberts](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Roberts). Justice [John Paul Stevens](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Paul_Stevens) wrote the opinion of the Court, finding that the [moratorium](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moratorium_%28law%29) did not constitute a taking. It reasoned that there was an inherent difference between the acquisition of [property](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Property) for public use and the regulation of property from private use. The majority concluded that the moratorium at issue in this case should be classified as a regulation of property from private use and therefore no compensation was required.