



# The Scrivener

Scribes — The American Society of Legal Writers

*The Scrivener* is published three times per year and can be delivered electronically or in print.

## In This Issue

The President’s Column:  
Lessons from Fiction ..... 1

The 2013 Annual Meeting  
in San Francisco: A  
Celebration of Great Writing .... 3

2013 Scribes Best-Brief  
Writing Award ..... 5

Writing Tip: Writers Block ..... 6

Grammar Tip: *It’s* and *Its* ..... 6

Internet Research Tip:  
American Law Sources  
On-Line (ALSO!) ..... 7

Research Tip ..... 7

Sustaining Members ..... 9

Life Members ..... 10

Member News ..... 10

New Members ..... 11

## Submission Deadlines

- Issue 1 January 15
- Issue 2 May 15
- Issue 3 September 15

Please send items for upcoming issues of *The Scrivener* to Jane Siegel at siegelj@cooley.edu.

## To Subscribe

Go to [scribes.org](http://scribes.org), complete an application, and submit it to Rebecca McAlpine at [mcAlpin@cooley.edu](mailto:mcAlpin@cooley.edu).

## Lessons from Fiction

We can draw lessons about good writing from many sources. Below are five quick lessons from giants of the literary world.

### Kurt Vonnegut

*“Use the time of a total stranger in such a way that he or she will not feel the time was wasted.”<sup>1</sup>*



Dean Darby Dickerson, president of *Scribes*

Lawyers write for strangers. We write for the appellate panels assigned after our briefs are submitted, for judicial law clerks, and for lawyers who may handle the case at later stages.

For lawyers to write successfully for strangers, we must strive to inspire trust and confidence. We can do this by using facts and law accurately, drawing only reasonable inferences, adopting a professional tone, following court rules, including adequate and accurate citations, and editing scrupulously to avoid errors.

To avoid wasting our readers’ time, our writing must have a purpose, and it must effectively convey that purpose. If we can resolve a matter without drafting motions and briefs, we should. If we can present our client’s position under the page or word limit, we should. We should avoid making every possible argument and focus on the strongest. And we should ensure that our positions and relief sought are clear and straightforward.

### Kurt Vonnegut

*“Give your readers as much information as possible as soon as possible. To heck with suspense. Readers should have such complete understanding of what is going on, where and why, that they could finish the story themselves, should cockroaches eat the last few pages.”<sup>2</sup>*

Readers are not mind readers, nor should they have to be. Readers should not have to struggle to figure out what happened to whom, what’s at issue, and what you’re trying to achieve. Nor should they have to wait several pages to put the puzzle together. The more quickly and concisely you can convey your client’s story and position, the more persuasive you will be. And remember to support your work with facts and law. It’s not enough to just show the answer; instead, you must show your reasoning too.

And while I hope cockroaches won’t eat the last few pages of your work, busy judges and attorneys simply may not have time to read your entire document or to read the entire document carefully from front to back. So lawyers have even less time than fiction writers to convey our main points.

*(continued on page 2)*

---

(The President's Column *continued from page 1*)

## Elmore Leonard

***“Try to leave out the part that readers tend to skip.”***<sup>3</sup>

We know the worst offender: block quotes. No. One. Reads. Them.

Other items that fall into this category include “thick paragraphs” with too many words,<sup>4</sup> string citations, substantive footnotes, and boilerplate — especially if written in all capital letters.

Don't take the lazy way out. Take time to paraphrase. Being concise and clear is a skill. Words are the tools of our craft, so we should use them as effectively as possible.

Reading the document out loud — including those string cites you've left in — can help you identify where readers are likely to grow weary and start skipping. After hearing your words out loud, you might decide the delete key is the best option.

And take time to view the document from the reader's perspective. This includes viewing it in the format they will read it in. So if the reader will read a hard copy, print it out, and work in that format. If you're not sure, then assume they will read it in both print and online and ensure both forms are pleasing to the eye.

## Neil Gaiman

***“Put it aside. Read it pretending you've never read it before. Show it to friends whose opinion you respect and who like the kind of thing that this is.”***<sup>5</sup>

The best writers I know spend more time editing than writing. Their work is crisp, error-free, and a joy to read. The words and thoughts flow effortlessly, and I want to read more. I understand their arguments without struggling. Their positions are transparent and thus believable.

But editing takes time and should be a team sport.

A friend in a Master of Fines Arts program recently told me about writers' workshops, using the Iowa model, where a student-writer posts a piece online and all other students in the class then post critiques. Once the critiques are posted, the student-critiquers can discuss the piece amongst themselves. What works, what doesn't work, and why? The student-author can observe the discussion but can't participate.

The process is meant to simulate how editors are likely to discuss that work when deciding whether to publish it.

A similar exercise could prove valuable to attorneys because it would provide insights about how opposing counsel or judges will respond to a particular document, such as a motion or brief. After preparing a document, gather a trusted group of attorneys; and, in some cases, knowledgeable non-attorneys; post the draft; ask for individual critiques (as opposed to line edits); and after the critiques are all in, ask the group to read and discuss the others' critiques.

At the end of the process, the attorney-author might pose questions to help him or her continue editing. For example: Half of you found the second argument persuasive, but half did not. If I changed it in this way, would that change the way any of you react to it?

Our writing, and our profession, would benefit from attorneys using this process, which is similar to how trial lawyers use jury focus groups. If the process works correctly, the finished product will be more focused, polished, and clear.

## Roddy Doyle

***“Do change your mind. Good ideas are often murdered by better ones.”***<sup>6</sup>

How many times have we completed, or almost completed, a project only to think of a better idea or a better way to explain an idea?

And how many times have we trudged on with our original idea or explanation because we felt trapped: deadlines were looming, other projects beckoned, or we simply couldn't find it in ourselves to kill what we had created.

We often don't find the best ideas or words until near the end, when we are most familiar with the law and facts and we've had time to reflect. To paraphrase something I recently overheard, the only way we never improve as writers is to believe that our written ideas are perfect gems exactly the way we conceived them.

<sup>1</sup> Kurt Vonnegut, *Bagombo Snuff Box* preface (G.P. Putnam's Sons 1999).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> Elmore Leonard, *Elmore Leonard's Rules for Writers*, theguardian.com, <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2010/feb/24/elmore-leonard-rules-for-writers> (Feb. 24, 2010).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ten Rules for Writing Fiction*, theguardian.com, <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2010/feb/20/ten-rules-for-writing-fiction-part-one> (Feb. 20, 2010).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

## The 2013 Annual Meeting in San Francisco: A Celebration of Great Writing

The Scribes 2013 annual meeting and luncheon was held in San Francisco, August 9, 2013, during the annual meeting of the American Bar Association. Thirty-six Scribes members and guests attended the meeting at the Hotel Nikko.

The event celebrated excellent legal writing with presentations of the Scribes Book and Brief-Writing Awards. Scribes also presented, for just the second time in the history of its book award, a special legal-publisher's award, to the Carolina Academic Press. Editor at Carolina Press Keith Sipe accepted this award.

Judge Michael Hyman, chair of the book-award committee, presented those awards. First-place winner was John Fabian Witt for *Lincoln's Code: The Laws of War in American History*. Second-place winner, who accepted his award in person, was Allan A. Ryan for *Yamashita's Ghost: War Crimes, MacArthur's Justice, and Command Accountability*.

Scribes board member Charles Dewey Cole, Jr. presented the Brief-Writing Awards; the chair of the committee, Judge Kenneth Gartner, could not attend. First-place winners were Ashley Brucato and Nathan Lennon from Northern Kentucky University, Chase College of Law. Second-place winners were Katherine Harrington and Michael Hodge from South Texas College of Law. Their dean, Helen Jenkins, accepted that award. Third-place winners were Sarah Boshears and Grant Buckner from Elon University School of Law.



Allan A. Ryan, runner-up for the Book Award

President of Scribes Dean Darby Dickerson introduced the meeting's keynote speaker, the Honorable William Fletcher, Judge of the Ninth Circuit, United States Court of Appeals. Scribes also hosted a featured guest, Robert Brun, Q.C., president of the Canadian Bar Association.

Several deans from member law schools attended: Gary Myers, Dean of University of Missouri School of Law; Niels Schaumann, Dean of California Western; Rachel VanCleave, Dean at Golden Gate; Dean Helen Jenkins of South Texas; and Amy Timmer, Dean at Thomas Cooley Law School. Dean VanCleave also brought as a guest Dean Anthony Crowell of New York Law School. Kirsten Adams and Jennifer Tindall from Stetson also attended.

Past Scribes president and past Dean of California Western Steven Smith attended the meeting, along with current board member Mark Wojcik of John Marshall Law School, and current Scribes Executive Director Norm Plate of Thomas Cooley Law School.



Brief-Award Co-winner Nathan Lennon



Luncheon guests

(continued on page 4)

(The 2013 Annual Meeting *continued from page 3*)



*Scribes President Dean Darby Dickerson*



*Scribes President Dean Darby Dickerson and Book-Award Chair Judge Michael B. Hyman present a publisher's award to Publisher Keith Sipe of Carolina Academic Press.*



*Helen B. Jenkins accepts the second-place brief award on behalf of South Texas College of Law from Charles Dewey Cole, Jr.*



*Scribes Treasurer Mark Wojcik*



*Judge William A. Fletcher of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals*



*Scribes Executive Director Norman E. Plate, Scribes President Dean Darby Dickerson, Canadian Bar President Robert Brun, and Scribes Treasurer Mark Wojcik*



*Publisher Keith Sipe of Carolina Academic Press*



*Current Scribes President Dean Darby Dickerson presents a President's Award to Past President Steven R. Smith.*

# 2013 Scribes Best-Brief Writing Award

Remarks of Nathan Lennon  
Northern Kentucky University, Salmon P. Chase College of Law

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Nathan Lennon, and my moot court partner, and partner in this award, is Ms. Ashley Brucato. First allow me to say that we are both honored to receive the 2013 Scribes Best-Brief Writing Award. Ashley and I have had some time recently to reflect on our shared experience in law school generally, and as moot-court teammates in particular. And we agree that this award is truly the capstone of our collective accomplishments in law school. As far as I know, although Northern Kentucky University has received a second-place award in this competition before, we have never had the great honor to win this award outright. Ashley and I are both honored and humbled to be in such prestigious company today.

This year was not the first time that Ashley and I have competed together; we have been moot-court partners for the last two years, and before that we both wrote onto moot court at Northern Kentucky during the same semester in 2011. Our competition career began in New York at the 2012 Robert F. Wagner National Labor and Employment Law Moot Court Competition. Looking back now after all the work that Ashley and I have put into this project, it is only fitting that our moot-court career began on one side of this great country in New York and will end on the other side today in San Francisco.

When we returned to New York this year, the 2013 Wagner competition presented us with two “hot topic” issues in labor-and-employment law: first, whether workers’ time spent donning and doffing personal protective equipment could be excluded from compensable time under the Fair Labor Standards Act; and second, whether internet social-media posts were considered protected activity under the National Labor Relations Act. Just as law-review articles are sometimes the academic springboard for changes in legal philosophy, moot-court competitions often reflect brewing controversies in the litigation world. This year was no exception, and I am excited to say that the Supreme Court will address in the coming term the Fair Labor Standards Act issue contemplated by the Wagner competition this year. The case is *Sandifer v. U.S. Steel Corporation*, and this demonstrates the relevance not only of the moot-court programs around

this country in general, but of the academy’s emphasis on legal writing in particular. I think everyone here will agree with me that in today’s world, where so few cases require trials, effective legal writing is not just important to the practice of law—legal writing *is* the practice of law. With that in mind, I cannot stress enough how important Scribes is in its mission to further the development of effective legal writing. Ashley and I are honored to receive this award today, but the members of Scribes are really the ones who deserve recognition.

To conclude, I would like to take a moment to recognize and thank some individuals who could not be here with us today but who played important roles in preparing us for success. Our success would not have been possible without the Chase College of Law’s strong focus on effective advocacy skills. Without Chase and our Advanced Appellate Advocacy professor Dean Lawrence Rosenthal, we surely would not be standing here today. Additionally, I would like to thank my 1L legal-writing professor, Richard Graves, who has continued to give generously with both his time and advice the last several years. Finally, I would like to thank all my friends and co-workers at the Reminger Company in Cincinnati, Ohio. I’ve had the pleasure of working there for the last three years as a full-time law clerk by day and a part-time law student by night. I could not have developed the skills needed to win this award without the many opportunities for professional development that Reminger has extended to me.

Once again, thank you to Scribes for this award.



Brief-Award winners Ashley Brucato and Nathan Lennon, Scribes President Dean Darby Dickerson, and Charles Dewey Cole, Jr.

---

## New Benefit for Scribes' Members

Scribes is pleased to announce a new benefit for members: Scribes now offers e-mail tips to improve legal research and writing skills. The tips fit into four categories: research, internet research, grammar, and writing. Tips vary widely in nature and content. Some examples include writing on a computer, internet sources for some 850 codes of ethics and rules of professional conduct, paragraphing, research reports available from the U.S. Government Accounting Office, Uniform Laws, and practical citation rules. Members will also receive tips about what to do when you think you are done with a writing assignment, when the U.S. Code is only prima facie evidence of the law, and how to proof. These tips will be e-mailed to the address or addresses you have provided to Scribes, so please let us know about any changes to your addresses. We encourage our institutional members to forward the Scribes' tips to their students and employees.

---

### Writing Tip: Writers Block

Everyone knows what it is and what it feels like. It's not the end of the world, however, unless you've waited to start writing until there isn't enough time remaining before the written product is due.

- Writer's block may mean that you don't understand the subject as well as you thought you did. You may need to research more to get a better grasp of the material.
- There probably is something you can write. If it's a brief, for example, you can start by setting up the caption, drafting the opening sentences and the conclusion and signature lines. The factual statement or procedural history shouldn't be too hard. Maybe by this point, some other section will be clearer—burden of proof, or the portion on one cause of action even though you haven't figured out how to address a different cause of action. Don't focus on the whole brief and all the arguments that must be made; instead, focus on the segments that are clear. While you are working on those segments, the back of your mind will be working on the rest.
- You don't have to start at the beginning. Sometimes it makes sense to start with the end. If you are preparing a motion, write up what you want the court to grant. Each element of the order your client needs can then become the working caption of a section of the brief.
- If getting the words on paper is hard, try explaining what you need to write about to your roommate or spouse. Once the words loosen up, give writing another try.
- Think of the "W" words—who, what, when, where, why—and see what you can write about

these topics. A paragraph explaining who is involved is likely to be needed in whatever writing you need to produce, so getting that paragraph written gives you a head start. Then turn to the next W that you know something about.

- You don't need to be perfect in the first draft. Before computers, writer's block often arose because the whole page had to be retyped if there was a flaw. No longer. Word processing allows arguments to be moved up or down, sentences to be revised, and changes to be made with minimum pain. Don't hesitate to start writing with the comfort of knowing you can change your work easily once you have a draft in progress.

### Grammar Tip: *It's* and *Its*

Many people who didn't get the rule drilled into their heads as children are confused by *it's* and *its*. Either one might be right, depending on the circumstances. The one that can never, ever be correct is *its'* (unless it's a very strange sentence referring to the possessive of the word *its*).

The simple truth is that there is no choice but to learn these words. If you did not learn these in grammar school, then learn them today. Those who know the rule and use the words correctly do not think highly of those who do not. One mistake might be overlooked; two mistakes ensure that your letter, article, brief or paper is dismissed as the product of a poorly educated individual.

- *It's* is the contraction or shortened form for *it is* or *it has*.
- *Its* is the possessive pronoun (parallel to *his* or *her*).

- *Its* ' is not a word at all and is always incorrect.

If you can replace the term in your sentence with *it is* or *it has*, then the word you need to use is *it's*; otherwise, your word is *its*.

Similarly, if you can replace the word in your sentence with *his* or *her*, then the word you need is *its*.

Your computer will provide answers and examples in abundance. Just search for *its it's* to find them.

### Internet Research Tip: American Law Sources On-Line (ALSO!)

American Law Sources On-line (ALSO!) provides a comprehensive, uniform, and useful compilation of links to all on-line sources of American law that are available **without charge**: <http://www.lawsource.com/also/> The source documents are *not* maintained by ALSO! but are stored, in various file formats, in many separately maintained databases located in several countries.

For United States law, ALSO! provides links to U.S. Supreme Court decisions from multiple sources, with searching capability, plus many recent briefs and audio files of oral arguments. Court of Appeals and BAP decisions are available from the courts themselves and other sources, covering varying time periods. District-court decisions are available under the listings for individual States. Multiple links are provided for the U.S. Constitution and related materials. Bills, Public Laws, the U.S. Statutes at Large, popular-name table, and the United States Code are available through links. There are links to the various Federal Rules and to the Rules of the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeals, and other courts. Model jury instructions and Rules of Conduct for United States Judges and others are linked. Many links to international treaties and administrative-law sources are provided, including executive orders, the Code of Federal Regulations, Attorney General Opinions, and a wide variety of other federal executive-branch materials.

A similar set of materials is provided for each State in the United States and the U.S. Territories. The exact nature of each State's materials depends on what is available in that State. Every State's Attorney General Opinions can be accessed through the ALSO! links. Additionally, the interstate, multistate and boundary compacts, uniform laws, and model acts are linked.

Canadian and some Mexican legal materials are also linked.

### Research Tip

Do you have the true text of the relevant federal law? Maybe not. The United States Code is legal evidence of the law only if enacted into positive law. If not so enacted, the Code is only *prima facie* evidence of the law, and the Statutes at Large are legal evidence of the law.

Important Titles are not yet enacted into positive law. E.g., Title 12 (banks and banking), Title 15 (antitrust, securities, investment regulation, etc.), Title 20 (education), Title 29 (labor), Title 42 (health & welfare, Medicare, civil rights, etc.).

#### 1 U.S.C. § 112

The Archivist of the United States shall cause to be compiled, edited, indexed, and published, the United States Statutes at Large, which shall contain all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during each regular session of Congress; all proclamations by the President in the numbered series issued since the date of the adjournment of the regular session of Congress next preceding .... The United States Statutes at Large shall be legal evidence of laws, concurrent resolutions, treaties, international agreements other than treaties, proclamations by the President, and proposed or ratified amendments to the Constitution of the United States therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

#### 1 U.S.C. § 204

In all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home or abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States—

(a) United States Code.—The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of Laws of the United States current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, establish prima facie evidence of the laws of the United States, general

(continued on page 8)

(Scribes Tips *continued from page 7*)

and permanent in their nature, in force on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included: Provided, however, That whenever titles of such Code shall have been enacted into positive law the text thereof shall be legal evidence of the laws therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

### **United States Code Titles Enacted as Positive Law**

Title 1, General Provisions—Act July 30, 1947, c. 388, § 1, 61 Stat. 633.

Title 3, The President—Act June 25, 1948, c. 644, § 1, 62 Stat. 672.

Title 4, Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States—Act July 30, 1947, c. 389, § 1, 61 Stat. 641.

Title 5, Government Organization and Employees—Pub.L. 89-554, Sept. 6, 1966, § 1, 80 Stat. 378.

Title 9, Arbitration—Act July 30, 1947, c. 392, § 1, 61 Stat. 669.

Title 10, Armed Forces—Act Aug. 10, 1956, c. 1041, § 1, 70A Stat. 1.

Title 11, Bankruptcy—Pub.L. 95-598, Title I, § 101, Nov. 6, 1978, 92 Stat. 2549.

Title 13, Census—Act Aug. 31, 1954, c. 1158, 68 Stat. 1012.

Title 14, Coast Guard—Act Aug. 4, 1949, c. 393, § 1, 63 Stat. 495.

Title 17, Copyrights—Act July 30, 1947, c. 391, § 1, 61 Stat. 652, as amended in its entirety by Pub.L. 94-533, Title I, § 101m, Oct. 19, 1976, 90 Stat. 2541.

Title 18, Crimes and Criminal Procedure—Act June 25, 1948, c. 645, § 1, 62 Stat. 683.

Title 23, Highways—Pub.L. 85-767, § 1, Aug. 27, 1958, 72 Stat. 885.

Title 26, Internal Revenue Code—Act August 16, 1954, c. 736, 68A Stat. 1; see Pub.L. 99-514, § 2(a), Oct. 22, 1986, 100 Stat. 2095

Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure—Act

June 25, 1948, c. 646, § 1, 62 Stat. 869.

Title 31, Money and Finance—Pub.L. 97-258, § 1, Sept. 13, 1982, 96 Stat. 877.

Title 32, National Guard—Act Aug. 10, 1956, c. 1041, § 2, 70A Stat. 596.

Title 34, Navy—See Title 10, Armed Forces.

Title 35, Patents—Act July 19, 1952, c. 950, § 1, 66 Stat. 792.

Title 36, Patriotic and National Observances, Ceremonies, and Organizations—Pub.L. 105-225, § 1, Aug. 12, 1998, 112 Stat. 1253.

Title 37, Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services—Pub.L. 87-649, § 1, Sept. 7, 1962, 76 Stat. 451.

Title 38, Veterans' Benefits—Pub.L. 85-857, § 1, Sept. 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1105.

Title 39, Postal Service—Pub.L. 86-682, § 1, Sept. 2, 1960, 74 Stat. 578, as revised Pub.L. 91-375, § 2, Aug. 12, 1970, 84 Stat. 719.

Title 40, Public Buildings, Property, and Works—Pub.L. 107-217, Aug. 21, 2002, 116 Stat. 1062.

Title 41, Public Contracts—Pub.L. 111-350, Jan. 4, 2011, 124 Stat. 3677.

Title 44, Public Printing and Documents—Pub.L. 90-620, § 1, Oct. 22, 1968, 82 Stat. 1238.

Title 46, Shipping—Pub.L. 98-89, § 1, Aug. 26, 1983, 97 Stat. 500; Pub.L. 99-509, Title V, Subtitle B, § 5101, Oct. 21, 1986, 100 Stat. 1913; Pub.L. 100-710, Title I, § 102, Nov. 23, 1988, 102 Stat. 4739; Pub.L. 109-304, Oct. 6, 2006, 120 Stat. 1485.

Title 49, Transportation—Pub.L. 95-473, § 1, Oct. 17, 1978, 92 Stat. 1337; Pub.L. 97-449, § 1, Jan. 12, 1983, 96 Stat. 2413; Pub.L. 103-272, § 1, July 5, 1994, 108 Stat. 745.

Title 51, National and Commercial Space Programs—Pub.L. 111-314, Dec. 18, 2010, 124 Stat. 3328.





---

## Sustaining Members

James W. Adams <i>Houston, Texas</i>	David Dorsen <i>Washington, DC</i>	Thomas B. Lemann <i>New Orleans, Louisiana</i>	Brenda Rossini <i>Winnetka, Illinois</i>
Mitchell E. Abbott <i>Los Angeles, California</i>	Joseph N. DuCanto <i>Chicago, Illinois</i>	Patrick J. Long <i>Buffalo, New York</i>	L. Lane Roy <i>Lafayette, Louisiana</i>
Sam Aucoin <i>Carencro, LA</i>	Bethany K. Dumas <i>Knoxville, Tennessee</i>	Kenneth L. MacRitchie <i>Newark, New Jersey</i>	Rebecca Scalio <i>Boothwyn, Pennsylvania</i>
Coleen Barger <i>Little Rock, Arkansas</i>	Stephen F. Fink <i>Dallas, Texas</i>	Micheal E. Malamut <i>Dedham, Massachusetts</i>	Leslie Shear <i>Encino, California</i>
Florian Bartosic <i>Davis, California</i>	Patrick Flanagan <i>Reno, Nevada</i>	Nancy Bellhouse May <i>Little Rock, Arkansas</i>	Brian D. Sheridan <i>Ishpeming, Michigan</i>
Linda L. Berger <i>Macon, Georgia</i>	Douglas L. Grundmeyer <i>New Orleans, Louisiana</i>	Terry McCall <i>Eastland, Texas</i>	Stuart H. Shiffman <i>Springfield, Illinois</i>
Walter H. Bithell <i>Boise, Idaho</i>	Philip L. Halpern <i>White Plains, New York</i>	Daniel McCarthy <i>Birmingham, Michigan</i>	Steven H. Sholk <i>Newark, New Jersey</i>
Brandon L. Boxler <i>Montgomery, Alabama</i>	David F. Herr <i>Minneapolis, Minnesota</i>	Elizabeth M. McKenzie <i>Boston, Massachusetts</i>	Thomas H. Singer <i>South Bend, Indiana</i>
Turner Williams Branch <i>Albuquerque, New Mexico</i>	Hon. Stephen Hill <i>Topeka, Kansas</i>	John McLaughlin <i>Cleveland, Ohio</i>	Peter Siviglia <i>Terrytown, New York</i>
Shannon R. Burke <i>Chicago, Illinois</i>	Tracy Bishop Holton <i>Old Greenwich, Connecticut</i>	Kevin Millard <i>Denver, Colorado</i>	William Snipes <i>New York, New York</i>
Debbie Dudley Branson <i>Dallas, Texas</i>	Harold Hood <i>Detroit, Michigan</i>	James Moseley <i>Dallas, Texas</i>	David Thomson <i>Denver, Colorado</i>
Lucien B. Campbell <i>San Antonio, Texas</i>	Mont P. Hoyt <i>Houston, Texas</i>	Mark S. Mulholland <i>Uniondale, New York</i>	Richard S. Walinski <i>Perrysburg, Ohio</i>
Nicholas Cardascia <i>Northport, New York</i>	Jeanne Huey <i>Garland, Texas</i>	Christy Nisbett <i>Austin, Texas</i>	Peter G. Walsh <i>Miami, Florida</i>
Bradley Clary <i>Minneapolis, Minnesota</i>	N.E.H. Hull <i>Cherry Hill, New Jersey</i>	Steven Peskind <i>St. Charles, Illinois</i>	Andrew L. Weitz <i>New York, New York</i>
Avern Cohn <i>Detroit, Michigan</i>	Francis V. Kenneally <i>Boston, Massachusetts</i>	John T. Phipps <i>Champaign, Illinois</i>	Cara Schaefer Wieneke <i>Plainfield, Indiana</i>
Peter M. Coyne <i>Boston, Massachusetts</i>	Michael Kiey <i>South Burlington, Vermont</i>	Andrew Pollis <i>Cleveland, Ohio</i>	Christopher Wren <i>Madison, Wisconsin</i>
Muller Davis <i>Chicago, Illinois</i>	Hon. Andrew J. Kleinfield <i>Fairbanks, Alaska</i>	Michael Rikon <i>New York, New York</i>	Richard Wydick <i>Davis, California</i>
Leonard Decof <i>Providence, Rhode Island</i>		Adam L. Rosen <i>Port Washington, New York</i>	
Bethany M. Deere <i>Little Rock, Arkansas</i>			

---

### Would you rather receive this newsletter by e-mail?

If the answer is “yes,” please take just a minute to let us know. Send your “yes” to Rebecca McAlpine at [mcAlpinb@cooley.edu](mailto:mcAlpinb@cooley.edu). Don’t bother if the answer is “no.” And if you’ve already told us your preference, thank you!

## Life Members

David L. Abney <i>Phoenix, Arizona</i>	Anthony Gair <i>New York, New York</i>	Mark Levine <i>Denver, Colorado</i>	Keldon K. Scott <i>Lansing, Michigan</i>
Glen-Peter Ahlers <i>Orlando, Florida</i>	Bryan A. Garner <i>Dallas, Texas</i>	Molly Lien <i>Traverse City, Michigan</i>	Alexander M. Selkirk <i>San Antonio, Florida</i>
Christopher Balmford <i>Fitzroy, Victoria Australia</i>	Donna P. Grill <i>Houston, Texas</i>	Philip K. Lyon <i>Nashville, Tennessee</i>	Steven H. Sholk <i>Newark, New Jersey</i>
Andrew Bender <i>Houston, Texas</i>	Philip M. Halpern <i>White Plains, New York</i>	Robert N. Markle <i>Fairfax, Virginia</i>	Gary D. Spivey <i>Albany, New York</i>
Andrew S. Berkman <i>New York, New York</i>	Warren W. Harris <i>Houston, Texas</i>	Bernard S. Meyer* <i>Minneola, New York</i>	Tina L. Stark <i>New York, New York</i>
Frank L. Branson <i>Dallas, Texas</i>	Timothy W. Hassinger <i>Mandeville, LA</i>	Randy Michel <i>College Station, Texas</i>	Paul R. Steadman <i>Chicago, Illinois</i>
Lee C. Buchheit <i>New York, New York</i>	Judge Lynn N. Hughes <i>Houston, Texas</i>	Steven F. Molo <i>New York, New York</i>	Thomas M. Steele* <i>Winston-Salem, North Carolina</i>
Christopher Camardello <i>Minneapolis, Minnesota</i>	Judge Michael B. Hyman <i>Chicago, Illinois</i>	Richard L. Neumeier <i>Boston, Massachusetts</i>	N. Otto Stockmeyer <i>Lansing, Michigan</i>
Michael J. Collins <i>Dallas, Texas</i>	Emil L. Iannelli <i>Southampton, Pennsylvania</i>	Judge Mark P. Painter <i>Cincinnati, Ohio</i>	Preston Torbert <i>Chicago, Illinois</i>
Judge Deborah Cook <i>Akron, Ohio</i>	Lynne P. Iannelli <i>Southampton, Pennsylvania</i>	K. David Roberts <i>Oklahoma City, Oklahoma</i>	Roger D. Townsend <i>Houston, Texas</i>
Willard H. DaSilva <i>Garden City, New York</i>	Robert John Kane <i>Chatham, Illinois</i>	Lee H. Rosenthal <i>Houston, Texas</i>	Richard S. Walinski <i>Toledo, Ohio</i>
Jeffrey A. Dennis-Strathmeyer <i>Pleasant Hill, California</i>	Joseph Kimble <i>Lansing, Michigan</i>	Stephen Schott <i>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</i>	Daniel Wallen <i>New York, New York</i>
Kathryn E. Diaz <i>New York, New York</i>	Matthew R. King <i>Seattle, Washington</i>	J. G. "Jerry" Schulze <i>Little Rock, Arkansas</i>	
Jennifer Dorsey <i>Henderson, Nevada</i>	J.D. Lee <i>Knoxville, Tennessee</i>	Ann Taylor Schwing <i>Sacramento, California</i>	* deceased

## Member News

**Mark Harrison** received the Charles Kettlewell Legal Ethics Advisor Award from the Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers (APRL). Mark is a past president of APRL and current chair of the board of directors of Justice at Stake. The Kettlewell Award is named for Charles W. (Chuck) Kettlewell, one of APRL's founders and its first president. The association is the nation's largest association of legal ethics practitioners and presents this award to a lawyer who has demonstrated excellence in and dedication

to the field of legal ethics and professional responsibility. Justice at Stake is a nonpartisan, nonprofit campaign working to keep America's courts fair.

Mark is a partner with the Phoenix, AZ, law firm Osborn Maledon PA.



---

## New Members

Kate Anthony (Wellington, New Zealand)  
Tim J. Anzenberger (Ridgeland, Mississippi)  
Jennifer C. Babcock (Palo Alto, California)  
Jamie J. Baker (Lansing, Michigan)  
Sonu Bedi (Lebanon, Hew Hampshire)  
Valerie Borek (Boothwyn, Pennsylvania)  
Amelia Buragas (Bloomington, Illinois)  
Rudy Burshnic (Hillsborough, New Jersey)  
Valerie Caulk (Camarillo, California)  
Brian Clark (San Francisco, California)  
Susan Claybrook (Waco, Texas)  
Joseph E. Coomes (Sacramento, California)  
Nora Coon\* (Portland, Oregon)  
Alexandra D'Italia (Los Angeles, California)  
Richard C. Edwards (Springfield, Illinois)  
Christian A. Fisanick (Scranton, Pennsylvania)  
Amy Flanary-Smith (\_\_\_\_\_, North Carolina)  
Peter Fuiava (Auckland, New Zealand)  
Dustin Gaines\* (Lynchburg, Virginia)  
Thomas L. Geiger (Martinez, California)  
Gabrielle Goodwin (Bloomington, Indiana)  
Kirby Griffis (Alexandria, Virginia)  
Jennifer Hagan (Palo Alto, California)  
Okyeame Haley (New Orleans, Louisiana)  
Mark Hiraide (Torrance, California)  
Abbey Jahnke (New York, New York)  
Jay A. Jerde (Wyoming)  
Kathryn Karcher (Bainbridge Island, Washington)  
Micah Kegley (Arlington, Virginia)  
John Ketcham (Indianapolis, Indiana)  
Edward Kionka (Shiloh, Illinois)  
Justine Kirby (New York, New York)  
Elizabeth Klarin (Middletown, New Jersey)

Brandon Kline\* (Portland, Oregon)  
Jeffrey Knight\* (Boston, Massachusetts)  
Susan Laporte (New Orleans, Louisiana)  
Thomas Lavery (New York, New York)  
Zachary Lee (Houston, Texas)  
Charles Markley (Portland, Oregon)  
Vicki Mayes (Wellington, New Zealand)  
Anna Allen McDonough (Pickerington, Ohio)  
Amy Eileen McGrory (Pottstown, Pennsylvania)  
Laura Lee Medinas (Alexandria, Virginia)  
Phillip Mink (Newark, Delaware)  
Roy H. Odom (Shreveport, Louisiana)  
Matthew Philion (Stillwater, Minnesota)  
Kara Pinetti\* (Alameda, California)  
Charles Price (Cleveland, Ohio)  
Kevin Ross (Minnetonka, Minnesota)  
Markus Rotterdam (Mississauga, Ontario)  
Catherine Rucker\* (Novato, California)  
Dani Alexis Ryskamp (Kalamazoo, Michigan)  
Larry Thompson (Houston, Texas)  
Cathy S. Trent-Vilim (Omaha, Nebraska)  
Catherine Sevchenko (Alexandria, Virginia)  
Michele Snowberger (Belgrade, Montana)  
Brett Stroud\* (Agoura Hills, California)  
Brenda K. Warneka (Laughlin, Nevada)  
David Wilson (Glendale, California)  
Gloria Wolk (Raleigh, North Carolina)

### ***Institutional Member***

Oklahoma City University School of Law  
(Oklahoma City, Oklahoma)

\* Student Editor Member.



Scribes Administrative Office  
Thomas M. Cooley Law School  
P.O. Box 13038  
Lansing, Michigan 48901

[www.scribes.org](http://www.scribes.org)

**ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED**