The newest 1Ls (including summer starters, top right, and fall starters, above and opposite page) and LLM students (top left) join the Michigan Law family. The 1Ls have the highest median undergraduate GPA ever for an entering class (3.78), and they attended 155 undergraduate institutions. They include military veterans, alumni of Teach For America and the Peace Corps, as well as Fulbright and Truman scholars and a Soros fellow.
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1. “They got up early so I could have more time to dream.” (p. 12)

2. “Imagine you’re the president of the United States and you wake up every day saying, could I have done more to prevent another 9/11?” (p. 23)

3. “You sort of go through life accruing debts and obligations, and I do not have a greater debt or obligation to anyone than Doug Kahn.” (pictured at right) (p. 38)

4. “The fellowship will memorialize a remarkable woman and help replace a little bit of what we all have lost.” (p. 54)

5. “It’s rare for any of us to have the opportunity to be trial teammates with our law school colleagues.” (p. 62)

A Sense of Belonging

When we ask students why they chose Michigan Law (and we do ask), they immediately point to the academic reputation of the institution—a reputation that we all continue to shape and grow. Next on the list are two factors: career opportunities and student life.

They chose well on both counts, of course. As for career opportunities, Michigan is a name that opens doors around the world. Our employment statistics tell part of that story. Ninety-seven percent of the Class of 2015 was employed or continuing their education 10 months after graduation, and the Class of 2016 is on equal pace. Michigan also is a name that opens many different kinds of doors—from the most prestigious global law firms and highest levels of government, to small nonprofits and startups. We train people to be smart, creative, analytical problem solvers in whatever kind of practice they pursue, or if they choose never to practice at all.
As for student life, Michigan is a different kind of law school. I felt the difference as I interviewed with multiple law schools for my first faculty position nearly two decades ago. The Michigan group was the one that I wanted to follow home—despite never having been to Michigan. Students feel it, too, before they’re even students. Countless times I have heard people say that they were on the fence about law school until they came to our Preview Weekend—a powerful experience that offers a glimpse into their future lives. Our student life is bursting with a rich array of activities, and the culture that accompanies it is based on a genuine respect for and interest in each other.

As alumni, you epitomize these qualities. The reputation of our institution stems, in part, from your professional success and the impact you have made in so many different aspects of our society. The alumni in this issue of the Law Quadrangle demonstrate the intellectual horsepower for which our students have long been known, as well as the value of the training that Michigan Law provides. It should come as no surprise that Michigan Law graduates are working on all sides of the issue. Our law school always has thrived on congenial discourse, the ability to examine problems through multiple lenses, and an eagerness to bring differing opinions together in pursuit of a common goal.

A 1L recently wrote, “… nothing compared—even remotely—to the way I felt when, on a snowy January morning, I opened up an envelope with two simple words written in maize and blue on a piece of cardstock: You Belong.” Thank you for leading by example and for demonstrating the endless possibilities that accompany that acceptance letter from Michigan Law.

Mark D. West
Dean
Nippon Life Professor of Law
Will Lin-Manuel Miranda Transform the Supreme Court?

—Headline on article in The Atlantic, written by Richard Primus, the Theodore J. St. Antoine Collegiate Professor of Law.

“I’m proud to be one of the first trainees selected from the Caribbean, and to have had something inspiring to share with these students who came from similar backgrounds and circumstances as I did.”

Chaka Laguerre, ’14, about being chosen as a trainee for the International Court of Justice.

A Chinook helicopter flew over the Law School as a special thank-you from the son of a Veterans Legal Clinic client.

18

Number of students in the Michigan Innocence Clinic who worked on the case of Lorinda Swain, who was exonerated in May.
NUMBER OF MLAW GRADUATES TO CLERK FOR CURRENT OR FORMER U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICES SINCE 1991, including Caroline Flynn, ‘13, who will clerk for Chief Justice John Roberts Jr. in the 2017 term.

“FEAR AND ANGER TELL YOU THAT YOU CARE, SO TURN THOSE EMOTIONS INTO ROCKET FUEL.”

Brad Meltzer, AB ’92, a No. 1 New York Times bestselling author and host of two shows on The History Channel, told the Class of 2016 at Senior Day.

“PRETTY MUCH EVERY MORNING I GET UP AND THINK ABOUT HOW WE CAN DO BETTER WORK IN DETROIT’S NEIGHBORHOODS.”

—Sonya Mays, JD/MBA ’08, president and CEO of the nonprofit real-estate development startup Develop Detroit, in a Crain’s Detroit Business article.
Students, faculty, staff, and visitors are taken in by the Law School’s Collegiate Gothic architecture, the lushness of the Quad, and both the large expanses and the small details. Many have added their snapshots to the photo-sharing service Instagram, creating a tableau of stone and glass, of sunny days and moody dusks. Here are some of our favorites. And when you’re on campus, remember to tag #umichlaw!

SEE P. 71 FOR PHOTO CREDITS
IN PRACTICE

Gregory, ’78: Chief Judge in Fourth Circuit

By Katie Vloet

When teachers bring their students to visit Judge Roger Gregory’s chambers in Richmond, Virginia, he lets the students sit in the judge’s chair “to see what they might become,” he says. Those students also have the opportunity to see how far Gregory has risen—recently to the position of chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit—in a building that was constructed three years before the start of the Civil War and that housed one of the offices of the president of the Confederacy.

“The historical significance is not lost on me,” says Gregory, ’78. “Who would’ve thought that this little boy from Petersburg [Virginia] would be the first African American on this court, and its first African American chief judge?

“It’s not about me. It’s about so many people who came before me, about the people for whom ‘hope unborn had died,’” he says, referring to the lyrics of Lift Every Voice, considered the Black American national anthem. “If I ever see the ghost of Jefferson Davis walking around the courthouse, perhaps we’ll talk about how much America has changed.”

Judge Gregory has played a significant role in that changing America. He began his career as an associate in the Detroit office of Butzel Long PC and in the Richmond firm of Hunton & Williams LLP. In 1982, he formed the law firm of Wilder & Gregory, alongside L. Douglas Wilder, who later served as governor of Virginia. Then, in 2000, President Bill Clinton nominated Gregory to a seat on the Fourth Circuit. The Senate declined to take up the nomination, so Clinton appointed him during a congressional recess.

“It is unconscionable that the Fourth Circuit has never had an African American appellate judge,” President Clinton said during an Oval Office ceremony. “It is long past time to right that wrong. Justice may be blind, but we all know that diversity in the courts, as in all aspects of society, sharpens our vision and makes us a stronger nation.”

Newly elected President George W. Bush then renominated Gregory for the same position in 2001, and he was confirmed on a near-unanimous vote in the Senate. He never planned on becoming a judge, he says, but “I was pulled along by the rope of destiny, a rope that was woven by the generations before me and stained with their blood, sweat, and tears.”

Now, as chief judge, he leads the court’s 14 other judges and two senior judges. He also has taken on immense administrative duties for the circuit, which includes Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia. Additionally, he chairs the circuit’s judicial council and has administrative responsibilities for the 160 judges in the other federal courts throughout the five states.

His education at Michigan Law formed a solid basis for his career as an attorney and a judge, Gregory says. He cites Professors L. Hart Wright, Yale Kamisar, John Reed, and J.J. White among those who influenced him the most. Still, after starting his own small practice in Virginia, he learned that the University of Michigan Law School didn’t yet carry the same cachet with some of his clients. But he was always happy to have the opportunity to prove his skill and value to those clients, he says. “Michigan taught me that. It isn’t about your rootage, it’s about your fruitage.”

Gregory also credits much of his success to his parents, who adopted him. “I was born with asthma. I had some scars and rickety legs. Who would’ve picked me? My parents must have answered in their heart, ‘We’ll take him,’” he says. Both workers in a tobacco factory, his parents had little formal education but taught their son a great deal about faith, humility, common sense, and a strong work ethic, and he thinks they would be pleased by his success. “They got up early,” he says, “so I could have more time to dream.”
IN PRACTICE

Liu, ’97: Foreseeing Growth in Cross-Border M&A

By Amy Spooner

In a global market that grows evermore interconnected, national economic interests and national security interests can be barriers to free enterprise. But for Greg Liu, ’97, that’s part of the excitement.

As a partner in the corporate department of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP, based in the firm’s Beijing office, Liu has worked on a variety of cross-border transactions, representing foreign investors in China as well as Chinese entities seeking to make investments and/or acquisitions overseas.

Liu has been involved in several high-profile deals, including Chinese Internet giant Baidu’s $3.4 billion share exchange transaction with Ctrip—a Chinese version of Expedia. In addition, he worked on Tencent’s joint venture with Group in China, and the subsequent merger with Groupon’s rival, FTuan. He also represented Shanghai Shendi Group in a joint venture with Disney to build Shanghai Disney Resort—a $7 billion project that opened in June 2016. “Every deal is different, and that’s what energizes me about my work,” Liu says. “There are always common problems to solve, but each matter also brings new questions and new risks.”

Some of those new questions are driven by outside influences. In 2000, while working for Sullivan & Cromwell LLP in Hong Kong, Liu was part of the team that prepared the U.S. and Hong Kong IPOs and dual listings of China Telecom and China Unicom, riding the wave of Chinese companies entering the U.S. market. With the passage of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, the landscape shifted—as did the nature of Liu’s work. “At the same time that the regulatory burden in the United States was increasing, other capital markets were becoming more sophisticated with increased liquidity, so a listing only in Hong Kong was sufficient. As the U.S. IPO volume declined, many American firms in China, including Paul Weiss, have focused more on mergers and acquisitions,” says Liu.

And with ongoing U.S.—China tensions surrounding issues ranging from fair trade to currency manipulation to cyberwarfare, Liu notes that many Chinese companies—and their investors—have had a rough ride in the U.S. market. “With the exception of major players like Alibaba, Chinese companies generally don’t have good valuations on the U.S. market,” Liu says. “That’s why the trend in the last several years has been for Chinese companies to seek delisting in the U.S., as opposed to an IPO.”

The Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States (CFIUS) also plays a big role, says Liu. CFIUS, an interagency committee chaired by the Department of Treasury, reviews the national security implications of foreign investments in U.S. companies or operations. Although the committee is not new, it has ramped up its investigations since 2007, when Congress broadened the scope of areas with national security implications. As a result, Chinese companies often face a closed door to the U.S. market. “The CFIUS approval process is unpredictable and opaque. And because it’s centered on national security, it can be particularly challenging for the Chinese companies to navigate,” Liu says. He points to the recent attempt by a Chinese consortium to buy a lighting-products business that was being spun off by Dutch conglomerate Koninklijke Philips NV. The deal fell apart when CFIUS refused approval. “That shows what can happen with light bulbs, which aren’t something that most people associate with national security concerns.”

Liu says that both sides’ interests can be preserved if the CFIUS process becomes more transparent, and he believes such change is coming. “Many countries have some kind of national security review process. But those processes need to have clearly defined parameters that are the same for buyers from all countries. Free capital movement is generally a good thing. Taking a nationalistic view of capital and trade flow is not good for anyone.”

On the flip side, regulators in China, especially foreign exchange regulators, are known to add their own wrinkles when Chinese companies seek to acquire interest in American companies. “When companies are exchanging Yuan for U.S. dollars, it puts pressure on the government’s effort to prevent further currency depreciation against the dollar,” says Liu.

Despite the challenges, and after more than 15 years practicing corporate law in Asia, Liu is an optimist. “I see more and more opportunity for cross-border M&A activities between the U.S. and China. The China market is too large for foreign companies in any industry to ignore, and Chinese companies won’t be content with just staying in China, especially with intense competition and excess liquidity at home,” Liu says. “Despite all the regulatory issues, M&A volume increases every year, and I think it will continue to do so. The private economy will find a way to overcome the hurdles.”
TENSION

PRIVACY VS. NATIONAL SECURITY IN THE DIGITAL AGE

BY KATIE VLOET
ILLUSTRATIONS BY ALEXANDER LEE
Cindy Cohn, ’89, was in her office at the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF), interviewing a job candidate, when a staff member knocked on her door. Cohn initially said she couldn’t step away from the interview, but her colleague persisted. It was June 5, 2013—the day that would change everything.

Cohn and her colleagues huddled around a computer monitor in the EFF office in San Francisco as the story unfolded; The Guardian newspaper had published an article saying that the National Security Agency (NSA) was collecting telephone records of millions of U.S. customers of Verizon. So began a series of news stories based on leaked information; the leaker would turn out to be Edward Snowden, and the documents he released would bolster the arguments EFF had been making about warrantless surveillance of U.S. citizens.

For the previous seven years, Cohn—as the legal director of EFF and later its executive director—had been serving as counsel in a case initially filed against AT&T that evolved into Jewel v. National Security Agency. In that case, EFF says it “is suing the NSA and other government agencies on behalf of AT&T customers to stop the illegal, unconstitutional, and ongoing dragnet surveillance of their communications and communications records.” Other cases followed, as EFF became one of the go-to organizations for individuals and groups that sought legal representation in digital-rights suits against telecommunications carriers and the government.

“We were slowly making our way through the courts,” Cohn says, noting that many people (including some judges) initially didn’t believe the government was engaged in warrantless surveillance. “I think Mr. Snowden has done a tremendous favor for Americans in terms of being able to make informed decisions. We’ve got a stake in this. It’s our data. … After 2013, people began to get what was happening, and that certainly helped support the arguments we had been making since 2006.”

The way that Jewel v. NSA has progressed—with more momentum in the past couple of years than in the first several—illustrates this evolution as it has played out in the courtroom. While some rulings through the years have favored the government, others, including one earlier this year, have gone EFF’s way. In February 2016, EFF won a significant victory when the Hon. Jeffreyy White of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California authorized EFF, on behalf of the plaintiffs, to conduct discovery against the NSA. EFF had been barred from doing so since the case was filed in 2008, “which meant that the government was able to prevent us from requesting important information about how these programs worked,” Cohn says. The ruling marked the first time a party has been allowed to gather factual evidence from the NSA in a case involving the agency’s warrantless surveillance.

Cohn’s involvement in these cases puts her at the center of a critical national debate and discussion about the proper balance between national security and individual privacy. Michigan Law alumni are prominent on all sides of the conversation and legal battles surrounding the proper role of surveillance in the digital age, and one alumnus is even at the midpoint of the debate, as he pushes for more transparency and civil liberties from within the federal intelligence sphere.

For Cohn and EFF, the legal battles are expected to continue for many years. Recent successes fuel them throughout the long journey. In addition to Jewel, EFF has filed another case against the NSA on behalf of the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles and 22 other organizations raising right-of-association concerns; another, where EFF is working in conjunction with the ACLU, is brought on behalf of a woman in Idaho who is challenging bulk collection of phone records; and EFF also appears as amicus curiae in several other cases involving bulk collection of Internet and phone data (see p. 21 for more details).

The stakes, Cohn says, have never been higher.

“We have two problems: The NSA is doing too much, and it’s doing it too secretly,” she says. “Unless we can fix both of those problems, I think we’re in danger of losing our democracy.”
Or, perhaps, our democracy works precisely because of the government’s efforts to create a balance between national security and individual privacy.

So says Alexander W. Joel, ’87, chief of the Office of Civil Liberties, Privacy, and Transparency in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. That lengthy job title means that it is Joel’s job to help ensure that an appropriate middle ground is achieved between the two priorities.

“It’s fair to say that the intelligence community that I have grown to know over my years doing this job is very much committed to doing the right thing,” says Joel, who has been in his current job for 11 years and previously worked in the general counsel’s office in the CIA. “By that we mean both the national security mission that is expected of us, as well as protecting people’s individual liberties and operating in a way that would make Americans proud.”

Joel uses the metaphor of a scale to explain what he and others who work in civil-liberties positions in intelligence agencies aim to achieve. “We’re trying to give equal weight to both sides of the scale,” Joel says. They ask what is the intended result of a particular intelligence measure, as well as what impacts it may have and what needs to happen to restrain the activity to make sure individual privacy remains intact. “The answer is, let’s not choose one—national security or privacy,” Joel says. While there “are obviously tensions” between the two priorities, he says, they can and do coexist.

Joel is just one of the Michigan Law alumni working in the upper ranks of the federal government on issues that involve gathering data and other information as a means of protecting U.S. citizens. Chief among those is Benjamin C. Mizer, ’02, the principal deputy assistant attorney general for the Civil Division of the Department of Justice. While he cannot speak publicly about these issues because of ongoing litigation, by the nature of his job he has become one of the leading defenders of the government’s point of view.

Someone who can more openly address the government’s perspective is Mizer and Joel’s boss, President Obama. He has made impassioned remarks about why U.S. intelligence officials must have access to some telephone and computer data as a way of keeping citizens safe. For instance, after 14 people were killed in San Bernardino, California, in December 2015, the FBI tried to compel Apple to create new software that would enable the FBI to unlock the iPhone of one of the shooters. If phones and other devices are made to be impenetrable, he said, “how do we apprehend the child pornographer? How do we solve or disrupt a terrorist plot?”

He also has spoken more broadly about national security issues. “All of us value our privacy, and this is a society that is built on a Constitution and a Bill of Rights and a healthy skepticism about overreaching government power,” President Obama said during a conversation at the South By Southwest Interactive Festival in March 2016. “The Snowden issue vastly overstated the risks to U.S. citizens when it comes to surveillance, Obama said, but he added that they did reveal “excesses” in surveillance overseas, many of which have been curtailed in the years since.
"We’re going to have to make some decisions about how we balance these respective risks," President Obama said. "I anguish a lot over the decisions we make in terms of how we keep this country safe. . . . [But] this notion that somehow our data is different and can be walled off from those other trade-offs we make, I believe is incorrect."

After the Snowden documents were released, many changes took place in the collection of data—either by the decision of the Obama administration, because of congressional action, or due to court rulings. In 2015, Congress passed the USA FREEDOM Act, which called for the government to end its bulk collection of phone records under Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. It also increased the transparency of the Federal Intelligence Surveillance Court, or FISA Court, and established a panel of amicus curiae to present the court with legal arguments that advance the protection of individual privacy and civil liberties. Many people and organizations from within and outside the government are critical of the Freedom Act—mostly for not doing enough to protect individual privacy, though for some critics it doesn’t do enough to safeguard national security. But others believe it strikes the right balance and further advances a checks-and-balances process that means all branches of the government have some oversight.

"The court is working hard to get it right, the Congress is working hard to get it right, the administration is working hard to get it right," says Jeffrey Smith, ’71, who heads Arnold & Porter LLP’s national security practice. He is a former general counsel of the CIA and currently serves on the Department of Defense Legal Policy Advisory Board. Smith also has worked in the Pentagon, the State Department, and the U.S. Senate, so his perspective is based on vast and diverse experience. "In terms of the big picture, the congressional oversight system works quite well. I’m very comfortable that we’re doing the right thing," Smith says. "Electronic surveillance is probably the single most important source on what our adversaries are doing that could cause us great harm."

He adds that the public may not understand the limited reach of the data-gathering conducted by the NSA and other agencies. "Edward Snowden said he was able to tap any phone in the country that he wanted to. That’s just not true. He said a lot of things that just aren’t true," Smith says. "He also disclosed detailed information on U.S. collection of foreign government communications. I don’t know what the consequences are of his disclosure" in terms of losing sources and compromising U.S. citizens. "As we used to say at the CIA: ‘Never do anything that would give a KGB officer a medal,’” he says, referring to Snowden’s actions as “treacherous.”

Daniel Gallington, LLM ’73, was in the Pentagon on Sept. 11, 2001, when terrorists slammed a plane into the building, around the corner from his E Ring office. He stayed around the clock in the burning building for several days, working as the special assistant for policy to Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. That experience—along with decades in the intelligence sector—ensure that national security is often at the top of his mind. "As the Pentagon was burning," he says, "we were debating what was our authority to interrogate a person."

Perhaps it is not surprising, then, that Gallington co-signed a letter to President Obama calling the release of documents by Edward Snowden an act that has done “grievous harm” to U.S. national security. The letter also said that Section 215 of the U.S. Code, which governs intelligence collection inside the United States, is indispensable in keeping Americans safe from terrorism. “The National Security Agency should continue to store the data, under existing tight controls and oversight,” the 2014 letter stated.

Gallington points out that the public-opinion pendulum swings toward national security during wars and after attacks such as Sept. 11. "Our nation and society abhor surveillance. But when we’re threatened or we’re at war, we don’t look the other way; we just swallow hard and say there are some things we’re going to have to do to keep us from being blown up," says Gallington, who also served in a senior national security policy position in the Department of Justice and as bipartisan general counsel for the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Still, Gallington emphasizes how important it is for civil-liberties organizations to be part of the conversation. "I used to call the ACLU as witnesses in the Senate, and I’ve worked with them for years," he says. "They give articulation to the silence of the people who are represented here.”
EFF, the ACLU, and other organizations still see the bulk collection of data as an unacceptable invasion of individual privacy, even with the post-Snowden modifications. And they worry about content gathered with programs such as PRISM and Upstream, which collect large swaths of Internet data. While those programs do not directly target people in the United States, content from Americans’ communication does get picked up through the program; Cohn points to a Washington Post analysis of collected information that revealed that nine out of 10 account holders “were not the intended surveillance targets but were caught in a net the agency had cast for somebody else.” But many who work in the intelligence field contend that government agencies do a good job of not overstepping. They also point out that the United States is unique in its willingness to have such conversations about civil liberties in relation to national security interests.

“We’re not perfect, but I have never doubted that the intelligence professionals I work with have always tried to figure out what the right thing is to do,” Joel says. “With enough transparency, my hope is that the American people will see” that he and his colleagues work hard to keep the public safe with as little treading on individual privacy as possible.

“‘As the Pentagon was burning, we were debating what was our authority to interrogate a person.’”
—DANIEL GALLINGTON

Smith also was part of a process 40 years ago that led to oversight of intelligence activities still in place today. As a lawyer with the State Department in the 1970s, he worked with the Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, known as the Church Committee, which recommended an elaborate series of laws and regulations to oversee the conduct of U.S. intelligence activities. Based on these recommendations, President Ford issued Executive Order 11905, later replaced in 1981 by President Reagan’s Executive Order 12333, which the American intelligence community has utilized as a document authorizing the expansion of data collection activities.

Jeffrey Smith, ’71
Head of Arnold & Porter’s national security practice and former general counsel of the CIA

EFF, the ACLU, and other organizations still see the bulk collection of data as an unacceptable invasion of individual privacy, even with the post-Snowden modifications. And they worry about content gathered with programs such as PRISM and Upstream, which collect large swaths of Internet data. While those programs do not directly target people in the United States, content from Americans’ communication does get picked up through the program; Cohn points to a Washington Post analysis of collected information that revealed that nine out of 10 account holders “were not the intended surveillance targets but were caught in a net the agency had cast for somebody else.” But many who work in the intelligence field contend that government agencies do a good job of not overstepping. They also point out that the United States is unique in its willingness to have such conversations about civil liberties in relation to national security interests.

“We’re not perfect, but I have never doubted that the intelligence professionals I work with have always tried to figure out what the right thing is to do,” Joel says. “With enough transparency, my hope is that the American people will see” that he and his colleagues work hard to keep the public safe with as little treading on individual privacy as possible.

“We’re the good guys,” he adds, “and we’re trying to do the right thing.”
This debate represents an oddity in current societal issues in the United States: It does not divide along party lines or between liberals and conservatives. The Obama administration has continued many George W. Bush-era policies. Many of the government staffers making day-to-day decisions have worked for Democratic and Republican presidents. And litigants against the NSA include organizations at the left of the spectrum (ACLU, EFF) and the right (Judicial Watch).

“Certainly the Obama administration has taken a more restrained approach to some aspects than the Bush administration, but in some cases has continued or expanded” the previous administration’s programs and efforts, says Hugh Handeyside, ’07, staff attorney in the ACLU’s National Security Project. “It’s not something that can be indexed to a particular political party or ideology. Every administration seems to defer to national security concerns.”

Joel, from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, points out that he and many of his colleagues in the intelligence community are career civil servants. Unlike presidential appointees, they stay in their jobs from one administration to the next and are not necessarily divided by party lines. “There’s a lot of continuity,” he says.

Gallington, too, worked for Democrats (including former Attorney General Janet Reno) and Republicans (including former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld). Gallington also points out that the real tensions are not between political parties, but rather between the president and Congress. “Congress would say that FISA is the exclusive means by which a president can order the collection of digital information. But when I was at

the Justice Department, we would say FISA is a legal way that the government can collect digital information. Big difference,” he says. One notable example of the latter philosophy is President George W. Bush’s Terrorist Surveillance Program, under which the NSA was authorized by executive order to monitor phone calls, Internet activity, and other communication involving people believed to be outside of the United States—even if part of the communication lay within the United States. The Bush administration, under public pressure, said in 2007 that it had stopped the program and returned to a system in which the FISA Court reviewed surveillance requests. The following year, Congress passed the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, which relaxed some of the original FISA Court requirements. “They amended FISA to allow what the president had been doing anyway,” Gallington says.

Meanwhile, more recent efforts in Congress, such as the passage of the Freedom Act, have drawn widespread bipartisan support. Those who haven’t always supported such national-security-oriented legislation include left-leaning Democrats and libertarian-leaning Republicans such as U.S. Rep. Justin Amash, ’05, of Michigan. He and Democratic Rep. John Conyers of Michigan proposed an amendment to the 2014 National Defense Authorization Act that would have de-funded the NSA bulk-collection program. The measure was narrowly defeated—but, notably, the Aye votes were split between Democrats and Republicans, as were the Nay votes.

One thing that everyone quoted in this article agrees on, regardless of their place of employment or their political leanings: We don’t have to choose national security or individual privacy. This is not a binary issue. “We push back on reducing the question to whether we should be safe or we should be free. We think you should be safe and free,” says the ACLU’s Handeyside. “Freedom and security are actually quite complementary.”

“Privacy and national security are not mutually exclusive,” says Smith, the former CIA general counsel. “You can do both. You can design systems in such a way that privacy is protected, but at the same time we can look for information that is critical to national security.”

Continued p. 22
Some of the key cases in which the ACLU and EFF have sued the federal government in relation to the wiretapping program.

**ACLU v. National Security Agency (NSA):** In 2006, in the first federal challenge ever argued against the NSA’s “warrantless wiretapping program,” the ACLU defeated the Bush administration when a district court declared the program unconstitutional. But in July 2007, the Sixth Circuit overturned that decision. The ACLU asked the Supreme Court of the United States to consider the ruling, but in February 2008, the Court declined to review the challenge.

**United States v. Muhtorov:** In January 2014, the ACLU joined a challenge to the FISA Amendments Act’s (FAA) constitutionality in United States v. Muhtorov, on behalf of the first criminal defendant to receive notice that he was surveilled under the FAA. The ACLU argues that the FAA violates both the Fourth Amendment and Article III of the Constitution because it permits the government to intercept the international communications of U.S. residents without obtaining a warrant or any kind of individualized court review.

**Jewel v. NSA:** A judge in 2015 upheld a part of the government program against a Fourth Amendment claim. But in February 2016, the same judge—the Hon. Jeffrey White of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California—authorized EFF to conduct discovery against NSA on several statutory claims.

**First Unitarian v. NSA:** In 2013, EFF filed a lawsuit in another case based on the recently published Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court order requiring Verizon to turn over to the NSA all customer phone records. This metadata, especially when collected in bulk and aggregated, allows the government to track the associations of various political and religious organizations—in violation of the First Amendment right to association, EFF contends.

**Klayman v. Obama:** In a case in which EFF appeared as amicus curiae, a federal judge ordered in 2015 that the NSA must cease collecting telephone records of an individual and his business. The case involves a conservative activist challenging the legality of bulk collection of phone and Internet metadata.

**Smith v. Obama:** In September 2014, EFF and the ACLU joined the legal team for Anna Smith, an Idaho emergency neonatal nurse, in her challenge of the government’s bulk collection of the telephone records of millions of Americans. This case argues that the program violated her Fourth Amendment rights by collecting details about her familial, political, professional, religious, and intimate associations. The case focuses on challenging the applicability of the third-party doctrine—that is, the idea that people have no expectation of privacy in information they entrust to others. The case was dismissed in U.S. District Court, but Smith is appealing to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
Civil libertarians hear that question often. And they respond: Yes, you absolutely should be worried about the bulk collection of data, even if you are a law-abiding citizen with nothing to hide from the government. “First, the government does make mistakes. They easily misconstrue statements or associations,” says Handeyside. “Innocent people are targets of investigations quite frequently. It’s not true that just because you have nothing to hide you won’t necessarily become the target of investigations or surveillance.”

Additionally, he says, the existence of surveillance leads people to edit themselves. “Surveillance causes self-censorship. That can include self-censorship of discourse that is so critical to a vibrant democracy,” he says. And while many of us believe that we have nothing to hide, we may not know what is happening with other people in our communications networks. “People don’t realize how far their contacts and associations really go. They may be connected with someone the government is interested in. The government is interpreting its authority very broadly.”

Cohn echoes many of those same messages, and she adds that we shouldn’t think of this in terms of individual privacy alone. “It is necessary for a functioning democracy for people to have conversations and voice opinions that may be unpopular at the time,” she says. “Someone once had to turn to someone else and say, ‘I don’t think slavery is a very good idea.’ That conversation would not have happened if the government could be listening in.”

It is just as important for people to be able to discuss political and societal issues of today, without fear of the government having access to what they are saying, Cohn says—though many in the intelligence community would counter that the government for the most part isn’t gathering the content of people’s phone conversations in the United States, just the data about who/when/where. But, of course, simply knowing who you talk to, when, and how often can reveal much about the content of your communications.

“In my lifetime,” Cohn points out, “it was not a safe thing to say that gay people should be able to marry. If the only things you can say are what the government in power wants you to say, social change really doesn’t happen.

“Yes, individual rights are important, but to me, the democratic values are as important or even more so.”
For better or worse, and with modifications along the way, the United States has established a process for gathering data about individuals’ phone calls. This is done with the stated goal of protecting U.S. citizens from people who may want to do us harm, say the officials who support such data collection. But that raises the question: Does it work? Are we safer because of bulk collection of telephone data?

Indeed, the answers to this question vary dramatically, depending on whom you ask. “The collection of phone records was done at significant damage to our privacy. When the information was finally revealed and the government had to come clean, it was demonstrated that there wasn’t a single terrorist act stopped, which surprised even me,” Cohn says. “The program that got implemented in the name of national security didn’t make us any safer.”

Handeyside agrees that “bulk surveillance programs have not been demonstrated to be effective. The government is leaning very heavily into the realm of prevention and stopping violence or terrorism before it happens. To some extent, that’s understandable. The Department of Justice and the FBI aren’t just there to punish someone after the fact,” Handeyside says. The problem, he argues, is that there is no single pathway or “conveyor belt” that leads to acts of terror. With no empirical way to identify terrorists ahead of time, “they end up using protected speech or religion as proxies and disproportionately target minority communities, especially Muslims and people of Arab heritage.”

Many in the intelligence community have a far different perspective. Senior officials in the Obama administration have said the bulk collection of phone data is one tool that helps them to learn about and stop terrorist attacks. Others say data collection has helped to prevent actions by foreign nationals who want to harm people in the United States, even if specific terrorist plots haven’t been uncovered. “It isn’t just about terrorism,” Smith says. “It’s also about the development of weapons of mass destruction. Much of what we learned about Iran, for instance, we acquired through electronic surveillance.”

Bulk data collection must be allowed to continue because it is a vital and singular tool, Smith says. “The vast powers of the United States to collect and analyze information are not designed to satisfy some prurient interest. They are designed to protect us against people who want to kill Americans, to find spies in our own midst, to find people who are making weapons of mass destruction.

“Imagine you’re the president of the United States and you wake up every day saying, ‘could I have done more to prevent another 9/11?’” Smith says. “You want to have this tool at your disposal.”
INTELLIGENCE LEGALISM
AND THE NSA’S CIVIL LIBERTIES GAP


BY MARGO SCHLANGER

Since June 2013, we have seen unprecedented security breaches and disclosures relating to American electronic surveillance. The nearly daily drip, and occasional gush, of once-secret policy and operational information makes it possible to analyze and understand National Security Agency (NSA) activities, including the organizations and processes inside and outside the NSA that are supposed to safeguard Americans’ civil liberties as the agency goes about its intelligence-gathering business. Some have suggested that what we have learned is that the NSA is running wild, lawlessly flouting legal constraints on its behavior. This assessment is unfair. In fact, the picture that emerges from both the release of documents leaked from the agency by Edward Snowden and official disclosures is of an agency committed to legal compliance, although both minor and major noncompliance is nonetheless frequent. A large surveillance compliance apparatus is currently staffed by hundreds of people in both the executive and judicial branches. This infrastructure implements and enforces a complex system of rules, not flawlessly but with real attention and care. Where an authoritative lawgiver has announced rights or rights-protecting procedures, the compliance apparatus works—to real, though not perfect effect—to effectuate those rights and to follow those procedures. Of course errors, small and large, occur. But even if perfect compliance could be achieved, it is too paltry a goal. A good oversight system needs its institutions not just to support and enforce compliance but also to design good rules. Yet the offices that make up the NSA’s compliance system were, until recently, nearly entirely compliance offices, not policy offices; they worked to improve compliance with existing rules, but not to consider the pros and cons of more individually protective rules and try to increase privacy or civil liberties where the cost of doing so is acceptable. The NSA we learn about from the Snowden leaks thought of civil liberties and privacy only in compliance terms. That is, they have asked only “Can we (legally) do X?” and not “Should we do X?”

This preference for the can question over the should question is part and parcel, I argue, of a phenomenon I label “intelligence legalism,” whose three crucial and simultaneous features are imposition of substantive rules given the status of law rather than policy; some limited court enforcement of those rules; and empowerment of lawyers. Intelligence legalism has been a useful corrective to the lawlessness that characterized surveillance prior to intelligence reform, in the late 1970s. But I argue that it gives systematically insufficient weight to individual liberty, and that its relentless focus on rights and compliance and law has obscured the absence of what should be an additional focus on interests, or balancing, or policy.

To strengthen civil liberties, more laws may be useful, but they are not enough. Additional attention should be directed both within the NSA and by its overseers to surveillance policy, weighing the security gains from surveillance against the privacy and civil liberties risks and costs. The attention will not be a panacea, but it can play a useful role in filling the civil liberties gap that intelligence legalism creates. As one way of bringing that attention to bear, we need more—and more empowered—insiders who are attuned to civil liberties.

In most activities of government, outside scrutiny and accountability can promote good policy. In the secret world of the intelligence community, however, these methods are largely unavailable—there is simply too much the public does not, and cannot, know. That is why it is important to designate in-house officials to prioritize privacy and civil liberties—values that otherwise lack advocates within the intelligence community’s governance structure. Such officials have recently been placed within the NSA and in the president’s national security staff; new public advocates in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (often referred to as the FISA Court) are being asked to play a similar role.

Insider civil liberties offices face twin dangers: impotence on the one hand, and capture or assimilation on the other. Begin with impotence: Any internal governmental office whose mission is to constrain its agency (I have in other work given such shops the generic title “Offices of Goodness”) runs the risk of losing influence and being ignored, whether by being excluded from internal processes or by having its attempted contributions rebuffed. Institutional design should take account of these difficulties. So for example, it is vital that the NSA’s civil liberties office have a mandate from the NSA’s director that includes a stable set of situations in which it can gain access and opportunity to comment without needing sharper elbows than it is likely to have.
Other types of institutionalized access also can bolster insider civil liberties offices’ influence. For example, at NSA, perhaps the agency could be required to report every year to its civil liberties office how, precisely, each type of surveillance authority that touches American citizens and residents has contributed to the NSA’s foreign intelligence mission—intelligence requirements satisfied, leads generated, and so on. The office could use those reports to do an annual assessment of the costs and benefits of various programs for the NSA’s director. This could be shared with Congress and perhaps even in some limited form with the public. And certainly, one would want to ensure that the new office receives notice and an opportunity to comment on all changes that potentially affect privacy or civil liberties. Processes like these would legitimate the new office’s inquiries and its recommendation role, protecting it from accusations by NSA personnel of self-aggrandizement.

These all address the problem of impotence; but what about capture? The danger that accompanies all the access that insider civil liberties staffers have is a special kind of administrative capture—not, as the term usually indicates, by outsiders, but by colleagues. For example, the more involved in NSA decision-making the civil liberties office is, the more pressure it will get to go along, to ratify whatever program is being discussed. What counters that pressure, if anything, is the new officials’ commitment to their assigned values—to privacy and to civil liberties. Maintaining commitment means resisting both collegial and careerist pressures, born of normal desires to get along with colleagues and to earn their approbation. This can be countered by multipronged efforts by those officials and staffers to maintain ties to a professional privacy and civil liberties community that can serve as a highly salient reference group. Such efforts should include a combination of hiring, networking, and fostering of career paths that value privacy and civil liberties expertise and commitment.

The development of intelligence legalism has been a major and salutary change in American governance over the past 35 years. Rights enunciation and compliance serve crucial rule-of-law values, and also sometimes further civil liberties. And yet they are insufficient to ensure appropriate civil liberties policy. In his 2014 opinion for the Supreme Court in Riley v. California, holding that, absent exigent circumstances, the Fourth Amendment forbids warrantless searches of cell phones, Chief Justice John Roberts Jr. poked some mild fun at internal government processes as sufficient safeguards of constitutional rights. “[T]he Founders did not fight a revolution to gain the right to government agency protocols,” he wrote. But he continued, and I agree, that such protocols are nonetheless “[p]robably a good idea.”

In this post-Snowden moment, Congress can and should protect Americans’ privacy and civil liberties by clamping down on bulk surveillance, creating legal rules that can then be enforced by the courts and the intelligence community’s large compliance bureaucracy. But Congress and the president should not be limited by intelligence legalism. They should also follow the quite different strategy of amplifying voices inside the surveillance state who will give attention in internal deliberations and agency operations to civil liberties and privacy interests. Institutional design is important; civil liberties offices need deliberate and careful arrangements to safeguard their influence and commitment. If civil liberties and privacy officials inside the NSA, at the White House, and at the FISA Court can walk the tightrope of maintaining both influence and commitment, they might well make a difference—both in debates we now know about and others that remain secret. And they may help create documents useful for public oversight, too, flagging issues for congressional overseers and creating reports subject to public disclosure.

Intelligence legalism has proven unequal to the task of opposing the “collect everything” mindset. We need to add civil libertarians inside the surveillance state to nurture its civil liberties ecology. If that ecology doesn’t improve, the next big leak, in five or ten or twenty years, may reveal invasions of Americans’ privacy that dwarf anything we have heard about so far.

Margo Schlanger, the Henry M. Butzel Professor of Law, is a leading authority on civil rights issues and civil and criminal detention and is the founder and director of the Civil Rights Litigation Clearinghouse at the Law School. She has served as the presidentially appointed officer for civil rights and civil liberties, and as counsel to the secretary, at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.
Friends, Fellowship, and Football
For decades, members of the Michigan Law faculty have been sitting together in Section 22 at Michigan Stadium. The tradition continues today, with emeritus and active faculty members watching the reinvigorated Wolverines from their perch above the 35-yard-line.

“This is our legacy...and our future,” announces the booming voice of Darth Vader during a hype video before the Michigan-Colorado game. As 110,000 fans settle into their seats, the narration of James Earl Jones, BA ’55, HLHD ’71, signals that the game is about to begin.

On this day, a muggy September afternoon, Colorado gets off to a strong start with two quick touchdowns. Professor Emeritus Tom Kauper, ’60, sitting in Section 22, shakes his head in frustration. A couple of seats away, Professor Emeritus Jerry Israel’s son Dan Israel, ’93, yells over the din of the crowd that Michigan needs a solid punt return to put things back on track.

Something even better happens: Michigan blocks the Colorado kick, and, after a manic hot-potato sequence, runs in for a score. Behind Israel and Kauper, Professors Adam Pritchard and Joan Larsen (a married couple) high-five each other and kiss.

Some version of this scene has played out in the Big House for several decades. Faculty members from the Law School long have sat together in Section 22, basking in the strong seasons and grousing together during the lean years. The names are legendary in Hutchins Hall: Bill Bishop, Olin Browder, Paul Carrington, Sam Estep, Bill Pierce. Allan Smith, whose seats later went to Israel. Yale Kamisar, who transferred his seats to Pritchard and Larsen. These days, Israel, Kauper, Pritchard, Larsen (a state Supreme Court justice and adjunct professor), and Larry Waggoner, ’63, sit in a cluster, while Doug Kahn and J.J. White, ’62, sit farther back in the section.

State Supreme Court Justice Joan Larsen—an adjunct professor at Michigan Law (left, wearing all maize)—and Professor Adam Pritchard flank Simon Lorne, ’70, vice chairman and chief legal officer at Millennium Management, during the fight song. In front of Larsen and Pritchard are Shirley and Tom Kauper, ’60, a professor emeritus. Next to Pritchard is Lynne Waggoner, wife of Larry Waggoner, ’63, a professor emeritus.
And it’s not just the faculty members and their spouses in these seats. There is a long history of prominent alumni and other guests joining them, and of kids and grandkids turning into the next generation of Wolverine superfans. Israel’s and Kauper’s children often attended games together, and maintain friendships to this day. Even the relatively new faculty in the section are passing the love of the game down to their children, who often sit with them at games. “Shirley and Tom [Kauper] bought my daughter her first Michigan cheerleading outfit when she was a baby,” says Pritchard, the Frances and George Skestos Professor of Law. “She’s 16 now.”

The faculty members’ children play a vital role at the games. “We always needed a source of quick information—who is number 22, where does he come from (questions primarily asked about some non-starter who gets into the game in the fourth quarter),” says Israel, the Alene and Allan F. Smith Professor of Law Emeritus. “For many years, my son, who started attending at age 7, was that source. Then it became my grandsons, and as the last one will be off to college next year, I anticipate Adam and Joan’s son will take on that role.”

To borrow from the James Earl Jones narration before the game, SECTION 22 IS OUR LEGACY ... AND OUR FUTURE.
One of the highlights of those early years was the faculty potluck that was held after early games and before the (rare) late games. “People went home after the game and put on suits for the potluck, if you can believe it,” says Waggoner, the Lewis M. Simes Professor of Law Emeritus.

In some ways, those were the glory days. “When I first got here, everybody was going to football games,” Israel recalls. Faculty members and their families bonded over their love of the game—or, in some cases, their love of being with this group of people in spite of the game. Doug Kahn’s wife, Mary, brought her knitting to many games. Ted St. Antoine’s wife, Lloyd, solved her crosswords. Aside from the camaraderie, though, the mid-century games presented some challenges for the law faculty and other fans. “I got here when Bump Elliott was still the coach. We had some good teams, and we had some bad teams,” Israel says. One particularly bad year was 1962, when Michigan finished with a dismal 2-7 record.

Those years, says Kauper, explain the pessimism that he vocalizes during the games. “You can’t have sat through the Bump Elliott era,” he says, “and be an eternal optimist.”

As the quality of football improved through the years, particularly during Bo Schembechler’s tenure as coach, the stadium grew more and more crowded. Waggoner vividly remembers Anthony Carter’s last-second touchdown catch in 1979 for a win over Indiana. He also recalls that Kamisar left early that day to beat traffic and wasn’t in his seat to see one of the great moments in Michigan Football history. “He now claims, however, that he saw the pass from the top of the aisle as he was leaving,” Waggoner says.

The Lloyd Carr years bring back generally good memories for the group, but they don’t have much good to say about the Rich Rodriguez or Brady Hoke eras. “I didn’t go to any of the games during Hoke’s last year,” says Waggoner (who, incidentally, now lives in a condo formerly owned by Schembechler).

Israel has only missed one season since he started attending games. Unfortunately, it was the 1997 season, when he was living in Florida—and when Michigan was the co-national champion. “It’s OK. I got to see plenty of Big Ten Championships,” Israel says. “Aside from that season, I’ve only missed a half-dozen games.”

The occupants of some of these seats have changed through the years, and they are likely to change again, possibly by next season. After struggling with the crushing crowds and with walking up and down the steps, Kauper and his wife think they may have attended their final Michigan game. “Of course I’ll miss it,” he says of being in the stadium. “It’s a big, colorful spectacle.” They will watch the games at home, and Tom may even yell at the TV from time to time. But his colleagues in Section 22 will miss them, as they still miss all the other faculty who have come and gone from these seats.

“It just won’t be the same. If I don’t have Tom complaining, I don’t know what I’ll do,” Pritchard says. “I don’t even want to contemplate it.”
Along with more than 300 others, I was a member of the Class of 1966 at the Law School. Academic year 1963–1964 was our first year inhabiting the William W. Cook Law Quadrangle and Ann Arbor.

A visit to Ann Arbor from then U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson indirectly led to the first Senior Day. The University announced that the commencement speaker for all persons graduating from the University of Michigan in May 1964 would be President Johnson. Though I was two years away from my anticipated graduation, I was bothered by the scheduling.

What troubled me was that the commencement was being held one week before Law School finals concluded. That seemed inconsiderate. Wouldn't many parents, grandparents, and others want to attend commencement and listen to the president of the United States give the address? Would the Law School seniors have to take time away from studying for their finals to host their families and friends?

Okay. I was not graduating in 1964. I did not have standing to object. Even if I did object it seemed unlikely the University would tell the U.S. president that there was a change of plans. So I set out to do what many attorneys do when they feel things need to change: I became annoying.

I decided to seek a separate commencement for the Law School. To request our own ceremony, I went to the dean of the Law School, Allan F. Smith. He was a kindly gentleman who later became a vice president and interim president of the University.
Knowing there is strength in numbers, I recruited some fellow students to accompany me on what became several meetings with Dean Smith and his successor, Acting Dean Charles W. Joiner. I wish I could remember all of my friends who accompanied me. They included, I believe, Sidney A. Brockley, George L. Jenkins, Thomas D. Geil, and Lawrence Backus. (I apologize to any friends I have excluded.)

That first meeting with Dean Smith was met with courtesy and ... well, not exactly cynicism ... an attitude of "Why would you want to do that?" To his credit, he listened and did not close the door on continuing the dialogue.

To a certain extent we had to repeat our request and the reasons for it when Acting Dean Joiner replaced Dean Smith. It was like having a new judge take over during a trial.

Eventually our request was granted. Our ceremony would be held after final exams were completed, and we could invite a speaker. There were some modifications to what I had envisioned. Instead of being labeled commencement, our special day would be called Senior Day. Instead of receiving our diploma, we would be handed a Certificate of Lawyer Membership in the Lawyers Club.

What about the speaker? This consumed quite a bit of discussion. Many names were mentioned. Among them was Richard Nixon, a former U.S. vice president and then a partner in a New York City law firm. He had come to Ann Arbor that year to interview law school students for his firm.

Another possible speaker was James Reston, the highly respected Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist with The New York Times. Whether too focused on studying or just plain ignorant, I embarrassed myself when Mr. Reston's name came up because I did not recognize it.

Eventually it was decided to invite James Britt Donovan to speak at Senior Day, and he accepted. Yes, that James Donovan, the one portrayed by actor Tom Hanks in the 2015 film Bridge of Spies.

In 1957 Mr. Donovan defended Soviet spy Rudolf Abel. In 1962 Mr. Donovan was the lead negotiator with the Soviets in obtaining freedom for captured American pilot Francis Gary Powers. In a "what goes around comes around" scenario, Mr. Donovan negotiated with the Soviets to release Mr. Powers if the United States would release Mr. Donovan's former client, Rudolf Abel. It led to the famous exchange on the Glienicke Bridge. That same year, Mr. Donovan traveled to Cuba, met with Fidel Castro, and began negotiations for the release of more than 1,000 prisoners held by Cuba. Those negotiations culminated in the 1963 release of nearly 10,000 men, women, and children—the prisoners, as well as their relatives and others.

On May 12, 1966, Mr. Donovan traveled again. He ventured to Ann Arbor and observed the release of more than 300 law school graduates. Obviously Mr. Donovan could not challenge us to do exactly what he did. That had been done. What he did was to challenge us to see the opportunities and challenges to come in our careers, to make the best of them, and to serve society.

As young lawyers do in the presence of senior attorneys, we listened. We did not negotiate, though some of us had done that previously with Dean Smith and Dean Joiner.

It was a special time in a special place.

Frank Hill was drafted into military service upon his graduation from Michigan Law and served more than five years in the Army and the Air Force. He joined a law firm in Michigan, eventually went in-house in the law division of the Lincoln National Corp, in Fort Wayne, Indiana, retired from Lincoln, and practiced law for several more years in Indiana before semi-retiring. He now teaches Commercial Law at Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne and is the attorney for a six-county real estate association and multiple listing services.
A lawyer walks into a bar and tells the bartender, “I’m moving to L.A. to be a comedy writer…”.

It’s not the setup for yet another lawyer joke.
It’s Akilah Green’s career path, which has pointed toward Hollywood for decades.

Green, ’06, is a writer on Chelsea Handler’s Netflix show, Chelsea. Before landing this job in August, she was a researcher for Chelsea, a sketch writer for Kevin Hart’s production company, and a consultant for Real Time with Bill Maher. Before that, she practiced law as a lobbyist at a firm in Washington, D.C., for seven years.
Weeks after quitting her firm and moving to Los Angeles to pursue a comedy writing career in 2013, Green landed her first show business job, working for comedian Greg Fitzsimmons, the brother-in-law of Green’s friend and Michigan Law section mate Molly Kovel, ’06. Kovel offered to connect Green with Fitzsimmons years earlier, but Green wanted to prove herself first. “I didn’t want to be a person who says, ‘I’ve got this dream.’ There are a bunch of people with dreams. If I were him, I’d want to talk to someone with a plan.” So she didn’t reach out to him until she already had relocated to L.A.

Soon after they met, Fitzsimmons was hired as a showrunner for a VH1 late-night show, and he invited Green to the production company’s offices for what she thought was an interview. As it turns out, it was more of a “here’s-your-desk situation,” Green says. “Greg never formally made me an offer; he just escorted me to HR and told them I needed a key card.”

Green quickly proved her worth in an industry where many people have to earn their stripes by fetching lattes and walking famous people’s dogs. “I showed up game for whatever they threw at me and was hired as a writer’s assistant. Because there was an empty desk, I even got to sit in the writers’ room. It felt like a sign that I hadn’t made a huge, gaping mistake.”

The career switch always was part of Green’s plan. As a latchkey kid, she grew up watching sitcoms such as Mad About You and Golden Girls after school. “I loved TV, and I knew that I wanted to make shows like those,” she says. Not knowing how to get from loving TV shows to making TV shows, however, Green came to Michigan Law. “I didn’t see a clear path to Hollywood, but I knew how to get to law school. You take the LSAT. You apply to school. There’s no mystery to it.”

Fascinated by politics, Green moved to D.C. to work as a lobbyist after law school, but gradually suffered from what she calls “going-through-the-motions sickness.” She already had been orchestrating her move to L.A. when she was heading to Capitol Hill for congressional new-member receptions at the beginning of the 113th Congress. It was a see-and-be-seen occasion for lobbyists, but Green “told the cab driver that I was over it. I was moving to L.A. to be a writer.” He replied, “Life is once,” and three months later, she moved.

Now in her fourth year in Los Angeles, Green is attacking her Hollywood bucket list. Be a staff writer on a Writers’ Guild TV show? Check. Write a movie? Check. (Last year, she co-wrote and produced Scratch, an indie horror film shot entirely on iPhones. The project currently is in post-production.) But for all the years of planning, what is perhaps Green’s breakout moment was brief. Cast to sit between two characters having an argument as part of a sketch in Chelsea’s inaugural episode, Green improvised funny faces—and Handler took notice. Then Green was asked to submit writing samples. Next she was invited to be a part of Handler’s team at the Democratic National Convention. Soon after, she was offered a position as a staff writer.

Green’s friends and family noticed, too. “I graduated from a top-10 law school and passed two bar exams, yet no one has ever been as excited about anything I’ve accomplished as they were about me being on Netflix for five seconds,” she says.
A company called SkySpecs needed venture capital to get its drone business off the ground. The software the company created would allow drones to be used to inspect infrastructure that can be dangerous for humans—such as the blades of 200-foot-tall wind turbines.

SkySpecs began working with Venture Investors, a venture capital firm with offices in Ann Arbor and Madison, Wisconsin, that focuses on identifying and commercializing technologies that emerge from top research institutions. One of the people who worked on the investment was Sabrina Hadinoto, ’15, an associate at Venture Investors who identifies and analyzes prospective investments.

Though Hadinoto is still in the early stages of her career, she was well prepared for her work at Venture Investors. At Michigan Law, she was a student in the Zell Entrepreneurship and Law (ZEAL) Venture Capital Lab, which offers students the opportunity to work on investment deals. They conduct market research, write investment memos, and sit in on investment calls and meetings, with the goal of aiding the venture capitalists at Detroit Innovate and Mercury Fund with their investment decisions.

“I got a lot of exposure to deal work through the program, analyzing different companies’ business plans,” Hadinoto says. “It gave me the building blocks to get to where I am now, and helped me get exposure to the investment and startup community here in Ann Arbor and in Detroit.”

“The bread and butter is that law students actually function as venture capitalists in assessing potential investments for the funds,” says Clinical Assistant Professor Bryce Pilz, ’00, who initially oversaw the Law School’s involvement in the lab, which launched in 2014. “They review pitch decks and financial documents, and they meet with the entrepreneurs to learn more about their businesses. Along the way, we make sure the students learn the nuts and bolts of venture capital deals, how venture funds work, and startup business basics. Like our other experiential education programs at U-M, they are learning the most from their actual work.”

The Venture Capital Lab was created at the suggestion of Adrian Ohmer, ’13, a principal at Detroit Innovate, who wished that similar hands-on venture capital experience was available to him as a law student. He mentioned his idea to Adrian Fortino, BSME ’00, MBA ’10, with whom he was working at the time. They approached Pilz about the opportunity, and now serve as mentors for the students.

Hadinoto’s time in the lab provided her with experience and helped her build her network in the entrepreneurial ecosystem. In her position at Venture Investors, she has had the opportunity to work with companies in a variety of sectors, including health care. Venture Investors recently invested in a Wisconsin-based company called Elucent Medical, a deal on which Hadinoto assisted. The company has developed a wireless breast tag and detection system that helps surgeons locate breast abnormalities and identify margins during surgical excision, eliminating an invasive hook-wire procedure. “The variety of companies I get to work with is one of the best parts of this job,” she says, “from a company that is revolutionizing how drones can be used to keep people from being in danger, to a company that could make a tremendous difference in the lives of people who have breast cancer.”

Hadinoto, also a fellow with the Michigan Venture Capital Association, hopes her current work will help to propel her career to the next level. “In 10 years, I hope to leverage the skills I’ve learned from my mentors to start my own venture capital fund.”
Off the Ground
Professors Daniel Halberstam and Gil Seinfeld have been appointed associate deans of the Law School by Dean Mark West. As of July 1, Halberstam is the associate dean for faculty and research and Seinfeld is the associate dean for academic programming. They replaced Professors Daniel Crane and Monica Hakimi, whose three-year Regental appointments ended in June. In addition, David Santacroce has been reappointed as the associate dean for experiential education.

As associate dean of faculty and research, Halberstam, who is also the Eric Stein Collegiate Professor of Law, will advance the faculty’s individual and collective projects, plans, and goals beyond the classroom. He will, for example, organize tenure support committees for junior faculty, chair the faculty research and scholarship committee, and help oversee disbursements for research faculty from the William W. Cook and the Marguerite and Julian A. Wolfson trusts, which provide support to faculty for research and professional activities. He also will explore broader initiatives related to faculty development and engagement within and beyond the Law School.

“I hope to promote even further the faculty’s rich intellectual environment, our engagement on current events, our dialogue across the outstanding departments and schools of this University, and our national and global presence—indeed, our leadership—at the cutting edge of legal academia,” Halberstam says. “I look forward to working with my colleagues, to building on our many current strengths, and to helping—even if only in a small way—to shape the future of Michigan Law.”

Seinfeld’s primary responsibility as associate dean for academic programming is to oversee the delivery of the educational product to the students. He will help build the course schedule each year, which includes determining the courses offered by the Law School, ensuring that faculty are in place to teach those courses, and mapping out class schedules and locations. In addition, he will work with Assistant Dean for Student Life David Baum, ‘89, and Director of Student Life Darren Nealy to ensure the Law School remains compliant with American Bar Association standards, support student organizations, and ensure that students receive the guidance and support they need. Seinfeld also will aid Assistant Dean for International Affairs Theresa Kaiser-Jarvis in her role overseeing the LLM and international programs.

“My first goal is to do everything I reasonably can to enhance the students’ experience at Michigan Law,” Seinfeld says. “I want them to get an excellent education, both in the classroom and out, and I want them to enjoy themselves and feel supported in the process. Because we have an excellent faculty, exceedingly talented students, and a supportive institutional culture, those things tend to happen in the ordinary course of business. But there are always things we can do better. My second goal is to help faculty play the roles they want to play in providing all of this for our students, and to pull the institutional pieces together that will help the faculty move forward with their ideas and execute their plans.”

Professor Alicia J. Davis has been named associate dean for strategic initiatives, a new role at the Law School. Read about her plans in the spring issue of the Law Quadrangle.
Ban the Box Leads to Increase in Employer Racial Discrimination

“Ban the Box” legislation seeks to open doors to employment for people with criminal records by barring employers from asking about records on employment applications. More than 20 states and more than 100 municipalities have passed such laws in recent years, some of which govern private employers.

But a major study by researchers at Michigan Law and Princeton University points to a serious unintended consequence of these laws: While they may indeed improve the prospects of people with records, this gain comes at the cost of encouraging a substantial increase in racial discrimination by employers.

“This consequence is clearly unintended—in fact, Ban the Box is often presented as a strategy for increasing black men’s access to employment,” says Sonja Starr, professor of law at Michigan. “Unfortunately, we think our results strongly suggest that when it comes to this goal, it has backfired.”

Starr and coauthor Amanda Agan, an economist at Princeton, conducted a large-scale field experiment. Over the course of a year, the authors (and their large team of U-M student research assistants) sent nearly 15,000 fictitious online job applications to entry-level, low-skill positions in New York City and New Jersey, varying the applicants’ race and criminal record. The applications were sent in black/white pairs in two waves before and after each jurisdiction’s adoption of Ban the Box.

Agan and Starr first found support for the basic premise of Ban the Box: When companies ask about them, criminal records are a substantial obstacle to employment. Applicants without records received 63 percent more callbacks than similar applicants with records. Agan and Starr found high rates of compliance with Ban the Box, meaning that the law effectively removes this obstacle—at least at the earliest stages of the hiring process, which is what Ban the Box seeks to affect.

But the law has a serious downside: It appears to dramatically increase racial discrimination by affected employers. When employers asked about criminal records, Agan and Starr found that white applicants had a relatively slight advantage: They received about 7 percent more callbacks than equally qualified black applicants. After Ban the Box was adopted, this gap ballooned to 45 percent. This change was not seen among employers whose applications were unaffected by the law because they never asked about records in the first place.

The researchers theorize that the reason relates to a phenomenon known as “statistical discrimination.” If employers don’t have information about criminal records, they are more likely to rely on their assumptions—including race-based assumptions. Specifically, employers may assume that black applicants have criminal records (even when they don’t), and that white applicants do not.

“Our results don’t necessarily definitively argue against Ban the Box,” Starr says. “It clearly has benefits for people with records, and policymakers might decide that those benefits are important enough to justify the law. But our results are very worrisome in terms of the effects for black male applicants, especially those without criminal records.”

“When you take criminal record information away, some employers seem to simply assume that black men are likely to have criminal pasts,” Agan says. “So black men without conviction records, who won’t be able to reveal that fact to employers, may be the ones who bear the costs of Ban the Box. This is especially troubling because black male unemployment levels are already more than twice the national average.”

Read the full study at quadrangle.law.umich.edu.
By Jordan Poll

In honor of the Law School’s longest-teaching professor, and one of its most influential, the U-M Board of Regents has approved the creation of the Douglas A. Kahn Collegiate Professorship. Professor Kyle Logue has been named the inaugural chairholder.

Much has changed since Kahn first joined the faculty in 1964, but his fervent support for students has remained constant for more than half a century. With the help of faculty mentors L. Hart Wright and Al Polasky, Kahn developed a new, problem-based approach to teaching tax, and quickly earned a reputation as a devoted teacher.

“He would invest energy, time, and attention into his students. It wasn’t a distant relationship. He really wanted to get to know them, wanted to spend time with them. He took great pleasure from it himself,” says Dennis Ross, ’78. “He was always a positive, encouraging person, and not just for me, but for so many of his students.” Ross has paid tribute to his former professor and longtime friend by making the lead gift to establish the Kahn Professorship. “It was the least I could do,” Ross says. “You sort of go through life accruing debts and obligations, and I do not have a greater debt or obligation to anyone than Doug Kahn.”

Teri Threadgill McMahon, ’87, benefited from Kahn’s devotion to students before she had even applied, and was likewise eager to honor him. “I would not have gone to Michigan Law School if it had not been for Professor Kahn’s enthusiasm about the school and his interest in me,” explains McMahon, who first met Kahn when he visited Duke University to recruit students. “He has a wonderful sense of humor and a joy of learning that is contagious.”

A collegiate professorship represents one of the greatest honors the alumni community can bestow upon a retired faculty member: the recognition and continuation of his or her name and legacy by the committed teachers who follow.

The professorship was tentatively announced at Kahn’s faculty retirement dinner in March, where his son Jeffrey Kahn, ’97, presented a special memento: a framed cover of the spring issue of Michigan Business & Entrepreneurial Law Review, which was dedicated to Kahn. The special edition features personal essays written by Barrie Loeks, ’79, Robert Pelinka Jr., ’96, Terrence Perris, ’72, Burt Rosen, ’79, Dennis Ross, ’78, Kelli Turner, ’97, and Patricia White, ’74.

Kahn says he is overwhelmed by these honors, but finds the greatest satisfaction in the success of his students. “I look back at my life now and realize how extraordinarily fortunate I have been. I have loved my career and still find a thrill from the classroom,” says Kahn. “I not only enjoy the teaching of classes but also the friendships that I formed with some of my students. I take pride and pleasure in their achievements and whatever little role I may have had in helping them. All in all, it has been a great life.”

The effort so far has inspired gifts totaling more than $570,000, including contributions from the following individuals:

- Prof. Phillip Adams, ’72
- Kenneth Alperin, ’76
- Richard Burns, ’71
- Joan Churchill, ’62
- Samuel Dimon, ’85
- Stuart Finkelstein, ’85
- Jeremy Gibson, ’87
- Prof. Robert Hirshon, ’73
- Alexander Joel, ’87
- Meredith Jones, ’97
- Jan Kang, ’87
- Lydia Barry Kelley, ’89
- Jon Lipshultz, ’87
- Barrie Loeks, ’79
- Diana Lopo, ’81
- Teri Threadgill McMahon, ’87
- Barbara Mendelson, ’81
- Melinda Morris, ’63
- John Nannes, ’73
- Steven Pepe, ’68
- Terrence Perris, ’72
- Burt Rosen, ’79
- Dennis Ross, ’78
- Allan Sweet, ’73
- Suzann Threadgill
- Dana Trier, ’74
- Prof. Stefan Tucker, ’63
- Prof. Lawrence Waggoner, ’63
- Prof. James J. White, ’62
- Patricia White, ’74

If you are interested in making a gift in support of the Douglas A. Kahn Professorship or to the Douglas A. Kahn Scholarship Fund, please contact the Office of Development and Alumni Relations at 734.615.4500.
Carroll, Price, and Rauterberg Join Michigan Law Faculty

By Lori Atherton

Three tenure-track professors with expertise in civil procedure, health innovation, and capital markets began teaching at the Law School this fall, each as an assistant professor of law.

Maureen Carroll came to the Law School from the University of California, Los Angeles, where she was a visiting assistant professor and the Bernard A. and Lenore S. Greenberg Law Review Fellow. Her research focuses on civil procedure, civil rights litigation, and the dynamics of the legal profession, and her scholarship has appeared in the Duke Law Journal, the Cardozo Law Review, and the Temple Law Review. She is particularly interested in how procedure, substantive law, and the structure of the legal profession interact to define the scope of access to justice for identity-based discrimination and other broadly shared injuries.

“I look forward to helping students understand the role of procedure in mediating the relationship between the law on the books and the law on the ground,” says Carroll, who is teaching Civil Procedure and Complex Litigation.

Carroll received her BS in electrical engineering, magna cum laude, from Princeton University and her JD from UCLA School of Law, where she was ranked first in her class. She was an articles editor for the UCLA Law Review and the Dukeminier Awards Journal of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Law, and received the Benjamin Aaron Award for the best piece of legal scholarship in a UCLA law journal by a graduating student. She also served as a judicial extern to the Hon. Margaret M. Morrow of the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. Following law school, Carroll clerked for the Hon. Stephen Reinhardt of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and worked as a staff attorney in impact litigation for Public Counsel in Los Angeles.

W. Nicholson Price II teaches Patent Law and Health Law. He writes about incentives and innovation in the life sciences, including the pharmaceutical industry and precision medicine. His research interests also include health law, patents, trade secrets, and regulation.

Prior to joining the Michigan Law faculty, Price was an assistant professor of law at the University of New Hampshire School of Law. Before that, he was an academic fellow at the Petrie-Flom Center for Health Law Policy, Biotechnology, and Bioethics at Harvard Law School.

His articles have appeared in legal, scientific, and ethics journals, including Nature, Science, the Boston College Law Review, the Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, Nature Biotechnology, the Hastings Center Report, and the Iowa Law Review.

Price holds an AB, cum laude, in biological sciences from Harvard College; a PhD in biological sciences from Columbia University; and a JD from Columbia Law School, where he was a James Kent Scholar. Following law school, he was a judicial law clerk for the Hon. Carlos T. Bea of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and a visiting scholar at the University of California, Hastings College of the Law.

Michigan Law “is a group of extraordinary people in a magnificent space, and I’m excited to be a part of it,” Price says.

Gabriel Rauterberg is teaching Contracts and Enterprise Organization. His research areas include capital markets, corporations, contracts, and securities regulation, which he studies from a theoretical and empirical perspective.

Rauterberg’s scholarship has been published in numerous journals, including the Michigan Law Review, the Duke Law Journal, and the Yale Journal on Regulation. His current projects include assessing the role of high-frequency trading in the modern stock market, an empirical investigation into corporations’ waivers of the duty of loyalty, and a series of related projects studying the intersection of market microstructure and regulation.

Before joining Michigan Law, Rauterberg was a post-doctoral research scholar and lecturer-in-law in the Program in the Law and Economics of Capital Markets at Columbia Law School, where he coauthored research on equity markets and co-taught Capital Markets Regulation. Prior to that, he was an associate at Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP and Cooley LLP, where he represented institutions and individuals in a variety of complex civil disputes, ranging from class action and mass action securities fraud suits to breach of contract and defamation.

Rauterberg received an honours BS with high distinction in 2006 from the University of Toronto and a JD in 2009 from Yale Law School, where he was an editor of the Yale Law Journal and the Yale Journal on Regulation.

“The faculty at Michigan Law have a longstanding tradition of rigorous, interdisciplinary thought, and of close collaboration with their students. It is an exciting place to be thinking about the future of our financial markets and of practicing corporate law,” he says.
Clap-Out for Cooper

Colleagues and students honored Edward Cooper, the Thomas M. Cooley Professor of Law, with the traditional MLaw clap-out during his last class on August 11. “The man who put the ‘pro’ in Civ Pro!” raved one alum who read about the final class on the Michigan Law Alumni and Friends Facebook page. “Thank you Professor Cooper! Still remember (and use!) your teachings 30 years later!” wrote another.

“This facile assumption that more antitrust means greater equality and wealth is just way overbroad.”

Daniel Crane, Frederick Paul Furth Sr. Professor of Law and an expert on antitrust law. The article from which the quote was taken was cited in a New York Times story that referenced analyses linking market power and inequality.

Two Junior Faculty Present at Forum

Of the 16 papers presented at the annual Yale/Stanford/Harvard Junior Faculty Forum, Michigan Law was the only school with two papers by faculty members. Gabriel Mendlow presented “Thought Crime,” and Veronica Santarosa presented “Financial Intermediation Before Modern Deposit Banks.” The goal of the forum is to encourage the work of scholars recently appointed to a tenure-track position by providing experience in the pursuit of scholarship and the nature of the scholarly exchange.

Three Big Wins for Child Welfare Appellate Clinic

The Law School’s Child Welfare Appellate Clinic this spring won three separate victories within a week—victories for individual families that could have far-reaching effects. “We’ve won cases every year,” says Clinical Professor Vivek Sankaran, ’01, director of the clinic. “But this year’s victories will have a far bigger impact on the child welfare system.”

The first case overturned a provision of the juvenile code that allowed the state to terminate parental rights on the sole basis of a prior termination. The clinic’s second victory addressed the intersection between disability and child welfare. The third win reaffirmed that an incarcerated parent can provide proper care by arranging for someone else to care for a child during the parent’s sentence. Read more at quadrangle.law.umich.edu.—AH

Gov. Signs Foster Care Bills

“The real world cannot be controlled in the way that a traditional law school classroom can,” notes Don Duquette, ’75, clinical professor emeritus of law, “but that is both the charm and the bane of real-world clinical work.” Charm won out over bane when Governor Rick Snyder, ’82, signed two bills into law on June 20 to improve the lives of families affected by Michigan’s foster care system.

Three years ago, students in Michigan Law’s Legislation Clinic began working on a bill that would change a small but significant part of the foster care system: sibling placement. “Up to 75 percent of all foster children are separated from a sibling,” explains Andrew Bronstein, ’14, who worked on the bill as a student in the clinic, which was offered in the Fall 2013 and Winter 2014 terms.

That new law will make it more likely that siblings will be placed in foster homes together whenever possible. The second law will prevent children’s visits with parents from being terminated unless the visits would cause the child harm.—AH
Early Interview Week

The Law School welcomed back more than 220 alumni to the Law Quad to participate in Early Interview Week 2016. Employers from more than 500 offices conducted 4,656 interviews with Michigan Law students over the course of the four-day event. Nearly 60 percent of all interviewers were returning alumni. “Having interviewed at Early Interview Week several times as an employer myself, I understand that returning to interview is a sizable investment of time by people who already have extraordinarily busy schedules,” says Ramji Kaul, ’05, assistant dean for career planning. “We appreciate our returning alums, and we are excited to welcome them back in February for our annual Meet the Employers event, which we will be holding at the Big House this year.”

Grads Secure Equal Justice Works Fellowships with Support from Firms

During the next two years, Kyla Moore, ’15, and Diana Peloquin, JD/MSW ’14, will be working at dream jobs of their own creation thanks to their Equal Justice Works (EJW) Fellowships.

EJW is the nation’s largest post-graduate public-interest fellowship program, receiving nearly 500 applications for 60 fellowships each year. The two-year program matches recent graduates who are passionate about public-interest work with organizations that are in need of their talents. Applicants develop project proposals in conjunction with potential host organizations. Then EJW operates as a matchmaker that secures funding for top applications from sponsoring law firms, corporations, and foundations. Sponsors pay the fellows’ salaries, often as part of their pro bono programs, and frequently also support the fellows’ work by providing pro bono assistance and other resources to help increase their impact.

“It’s a huge commitment on the part of a firm to pay for the services of a lawyer who will never work at their firm,” says Mia Sussman, ’07, associate director of fellowships, who left Latham & Watkins LLP to join EJW five years ago. “But it shows that firms are committed to public interest and pro bono practice, and it’s a model that’s beneficial for all parties involved.”

Through the fellowship, Moore will explore her interest in economic rights as civil rights by working with Start Small Think Big in New York, a nonprofit that helps low- and middle-income entrepreneurs grow and sustain their businesses. Her project is sponsored by Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP. Peloquin’s fellowship at the Children’s Law Center in Washington, D.C., is sponsored by the Morrison & Foerster Foundation. Her project’s goal is to leverage a medical-legal partnership to promote the physical and mental health of children experiencing homelessness.—AS

Andrias Wins L. Hart Wright Award

Assistant Professor Kate Andrias, who was described by one law student as a “quintessential example of the Michigan Difference,” was named the 2016 recipient of the L. Hart Wright Award for Teaching Excellence, an award managed by the Law School Student Senate and voted on by students. “Anyone who meets Professor Andrias can’t miss her incredible passion for labor law and social justice and equality,” says Megan Pierce ’16, who took two of her classes.

An expert in the fields of constitutional law, labor law, and administrative law, Andrias joined the Law School in 2013. She previously served as special assistant and associate counsel to the president and as chief of staff of the White House Counsel’s Office. The L. Hart Wright Award is named after the Michigan Law professor who was widely influential in the law and deeply revered by the students he taught.—LA
By Jordan Poll

Dr. Mary Frances Berry Named 2016 Distinguished Alumna

Michigan Law has named Dr. Mary Frances Berry, PhD ’66, JD ’70, HLLD ’97, as a recipient of the 2016 Distinguished Alumni Award, the Law School’s highest honor. Berry is one of the nation’s leading activists for civil rights, gender equality, and social injustice. Her extensive career spans four decades and includes leadership roles in both higher education and government service. “We all have a responsibility to try and do something to make the world a little better place than it was when we came into it,” Berry said during her visit to Ann Arbor to accept the award in September.

Berry came to Michigan not to study law but, rather, to study history, specifically that of slavery during the Civil War. It was during this pursuit that she took a course in legal and constitutional history with Professor William R. Leslie—the man who inspired Berry to attain her JD in addition to her PhD. “He thought that people who taught legal history should have both degrees. He said, ‘If you are a lawyer and you don’t know history, you won’t be very good at it. If you know history and know nothing about the law, you won’t be very good at that either,’” said Berry. While she was a law student, Berry not only taught American history at Central Michigan University but also was a founder of the Black Law Students Association.

“I never imagined when I was a small child that I would ever be a lawyer or a person with a PhD or any of the things that people call accomplishments,” said Berry. “Being at Michigan was beyond my wildest dreams.”

Berry went on to become chancellor of the University of Colorado, making her the first black woman to head a major research university. She then became the principal education official of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where she worked to improve access to and quality of K-12 education. She later served on the U.S. Civil Rights Commission over four presidential administrations, including as chair under President Bill Clinton.

In 2013 she received the Nelson Mandela Award from the South African government for her role in organizing the Free South Africa Movement, which helped to end apartheid. Today, Berry teaches American legal history at the University of Pennsylvania. She also has authored 12 books on subjects ranging from the history of constitutional racism in America to child care and women’s rights.

“As a champion of civil rights and devoted civil servant, Mary embodies the high ideals of our Law School. She has dedicated her career to fighting for equality and challenging the status quo while also inspiring others to do the same. We are so proud to call her one of our own,” said Dean Mark West as he presented Berry with the Distinguished Alumni Award.

Theodore St. Antoine, ’54, the James E. & Sarah A. Degan Professor of Law Emeritus, introduced Berry during the ceremony in Aikens Commons. “Of the 8,000 or so students I have had in my career, three stand out as persons whose exact seat in class I can remember. Sitting slightly to my left, maybe one or two rows back, was Mary Berry,” he recalled fondly. “When she spoke, let me tell you, it was in a quiet but firm and committed voice. The ideas were always provocative, unconventional, and inspiring. I came to the conclusion that she didn’t really come to law school to learn about the law, in the usual sense of the term. She came to use the law, and has she ever done that in her career.”
**Reunited**

The first reunion weekend in September featured Friday-night class dinners, a pre-game picnic, post-game party, and, after a shaky start, a triumphant Michigan football game. Clockwise from top left: Ron Dalman, ’58, and Jessie Dalman (front row) enjoy Dean Mark West’s talk. Professor Emeritus Whit Gray, ’57, and George Cameron III, ’61, share a laugh with other alumni. Arnold Nemirow, ’69, and his wife, Sharon, take in the donor wall in South Hall. Bob Dinerstein, ’66, makes a new friend, Alice, the daughter of Professor Bridgette Carr, ’02. Francesca Hammer, wife of Michael Hammer, ’66, observes the august Reading Room ceiling. Mark Luscombe, Will McLeod, and Vance Fried, all ’76, share memories during the tailgate on the Quad.
THE NEXT GENERATION OF VICTORS NEEDS VICTORS LIKE YOU
SUPPORT THE LAW SCHOOL FUND

A scholarship supported by the Law School Fund has helped 3L Sam Edandison pursue a dual degree in law and business. Because a dual degree means another year of tuition and deferred income, scholarship support is important. “My scholarship has allowed me to take risks and pursue a more entrepreneurial path,” says Sam. He spent his 2L summer working for the University of Michigan’s Office of Technology Transfer, where he helped U-M engineering and medicine faculty commercialize research discoveries. “I feel confident that in a few years, if I were to go run a company, I could. Thinking critically at the Law School, combined with this position, has been influential,” he says. Sam is a former Nannes 3L Challenge committee member, was editor-in-chief of the Michigan Telecommunications & Technology Law Review, and is a chair for the Black Law Students Association’s Butch Carpenter Memorial Scholarship Gala—three organizations that receive Law School Fund support. Without the fund, “the Law School would be a less intellectual place,” Sam says. “The Law School Fund allows student organizations to put on events where we engage and disagree with each other. It enables the Law School to be a more innovative place and prepares students for careers on and off the traditional path.”

Be a Victor for Michigan Law
www.law.umich.edu/campaign
Student support is the top priority in the Victors for Michigan campaign. Launched in fall 2013, the Victors for Michigan campaign at the Law School is a comprehensive effort to support the people and programs that make Michigan Law one of the world’s best law schools.

Why do we need student support?

The share of the Law School’s funding provided by the State of Michigan is less than 4%. 

Learn more at law.umich.edu/campaign
U-M is the only public university in Michigan that covers 100 percent of all in-state students’ demonstrated financial need.

TUITION INCREASES, AND INVESTING HEAVILY IN FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS.

Scholarship Matching Program

1:2

An endowed gift of $100,000 will grow to $254,847 (Estimated market value) over 20 years generating $130,805 for students in that time PLUS: it keeps growing in perpetuity.

What Your Endowed Gift Can Do for Michigan Law

Giving Level | Generates About | The Possibilities
---|---|---
$1,000,000 | $45,000/year | Pays 85% of tuition for one of Michigan Law’s best and brightest students OR Funds summer public service fellowships for 9 2L students

$250,000 | $11,250/year | Nearly covers the median financial aid award of $15,000 per student OR Sponsors 2 MLaw graduates in the Debt Management Program

$100,000 | $4,500/year | Reduces an MLaw student’s loan burden by 10% OR Funds travel to job interviews for 6 MLaw students

Amount U-M will match endowed student support gifts through the Third Century Matching Initiative (for first-time donors making a gift of $50,000 to $250,000) and the Bicentennial Opportunity Matching Initiative (for scholarship and fellowship gifts of $50,000 to $1 million).
Why did you want to go to law school, and why did you choose Michigan?

HAL

My father was a lawyer who put himself through law school. I admired him greatly and wanted to follow the same career path. I was predestined to go to U-M. Growing up in Detroit and knowing the reputation of the University, it was always my only pick. My family was middle class, and a Michigan resident could attend at a reasonable cost. After a great undergraduate experience, it was a natural transition to also go to the Law School.

ANGELA

I have always wanted to attend law school because I truly admire the way that lawyers think. As someone who values logical reasoning, I saw my legal education as something that will allow me to channel that particular way of thinking into helping those who are legally underrepresented in society. For me, there is truly no better place to do that than Michigan. It is humbling and gratifying to go to a school where I know I am receiving the best legal education.
What class/professor has impacted you the most, and why?

The class I enjoyed most was Professor L. Hart Wright’s tax course. He always had a twinkle in his eye, and he was the master of using the Socratic method to unmask the mysteries of tax law for us. I also remember Professor Alan Polasky, who taught Evidence. He loved turning to a student and saying, “You don’t believe that for a minute, do you?”

I enjoyed Constitutional Law with Professor Richard Primus immensely. It was the most intellectually challenging and thought-provoking class I have taken in my entire academic career.

Favorite place to study and/or socialize?

I generally studied in my room. I recall one late evening hearing a ruckus outside my window in the B Section of the Lawyers Club. It was then Senator John F. Kennedy making some remarks on the steps of the Michigan Union. Occasionally, I would go to the Law Library to get a change of scene and check out the female undergrads who hung out there. As for socializing, some of us went bowling in the basement of the Michigan Union now and then. And of course everyone went to the Pretzel Bell.

The Reading Room. It is incredibly picturesque and the best place to be for a long day of studying. Also, Ashley’s is pretty great for a few beers with friends after class and exams.

Craziest thing you’ve done in law school?

I was never a wild guy. I tend to be a more decorous individual.

Well, I moved outside of New York for the first time to attend Michigan. For me, it’s pretty crazy considering that I’m a city person.

Why do you give in support of scholarships?

During my second year, my family had some financial difficulties. I went to Dean Roy Proffitt, JD ’48, LLM ’56, to inquire if any financial aid was available. Without fanfare or embarrassment, he provided some needed assistance. Having experienced how helpful financial aid can be in easing the burden of completing one’s studies, I vowed that, when I was able, I would try to give others help similar to that which I had received. It is a great satisfaction to know that I am helping qualified individuals realize their goals.

What does receiving the Barron Scholarship mean to you?

The Barron Scholarship means being able to attend a law school where I feel truly inspired and challenged every day. On a more personal level, it means being able to become the first person to hold a graduate degree in my family.
Tsiang, ’23, and Chiang: A Grandfather’s Legacy; A Grandson’s Gratitude

By Amy Spooner

William Yat San Chiang never met his grandfather, Pao Li Tsiang, ’23. Chiang didn’t attend the University of Michigan, and he has only visited campus once, so that he could see the place that helped shape his grandfather. But Pao Li’s legacy is important to Chiang, and he credits the University with securing that legacy. So Chiang recently made a $2.5 million gift to endow the Pao Li Tsiang Professorship Fund at the Law School—a fitting way to honor them both.

“My grandpa had a tough childhood. Without his education at the University of Michigan Law School, he would not have become a well-known lawyer, and my childhood would have been quite different,” says Chiang. “The impact we leave on future generations through emphasizing a good work ethic and education is far greater than passing on wealth. That is why I want to give back to the community and especially the University of Michigan, which has made a memorable impact on my life.”

With automobiles and airplanes still in their infancy in the early 1920s, it might seem unlikely that a former post office clerk in Shanghai would travel around the world to attend law school. But when Tsiang arrived in Ann Arbor, the University had strong ties with China dating back to when U-M President James B. Angell served as the U.S. minister to China in 1880 and 1881. In the ensuing years, U-M became a top U.S. destination for Chinese students, and the esteemed Soochow Law School (the Comparative Law School of China) in Shanghai, began sending its most elite law students to Michigan.
Pao Li Tsiang was one of them. Wanting to improve himself, Tsiang took evening classes while working at the post office in order to be admitted to Soochow Law School, where he earned a bachelor of laws. Soochow Law School Dean William Wirt Blume—who later earned JD and SJD degrees from Michigan Law and joined the faculty—recommended Tsiang to Michigan Law Dean Henry Bates. "I take real pleasure in sending Mr. Tsiang to you…. He not only led his class in scholarship during his three years with us, but was also one of our outstanding student leaders," Blume wrote. After Tsiang graduated from Michigan and returned to Shanghai to practice law, Bates sent him several $10 checks to help him get his start.

As Tsiang’s law practice grew in the 1930s and 1940s, so did his stature. He became a professor at Soochow Law School and was a chief justice for the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, sentencing Japanese officials for war crimes perpetrated during World War II. He also became an adviser to Chiang Kai-shek and fled to Taiwan with the Nationalist government during the Communist revolution, leaving his wife and children behind.

Shortly after Chiang was born in 1951, his parents divorced, so he was raised by his grandmother (Tsiang’s wife), Zulan Zhang. With the outbreak of the Cultural Revolution, Chiang was forced to quit school and perform hard labor. “Grandma and I lacked food and clothes. It couldn’t have been more devastating, especially for a young man,” he says.

In 1979, Chiang immigrated to Hong Kong and apprenticed in a plastic mold shop. He leveraged his newfound expertise to launch his own business, which by the mid-1990s exported plastic products to the United States and Europe. Today he is the founder and chief executive of a baby care products business that enjoys distribution all over China, and he credits the lessons from the grandfather he never met with much of his success. “Grandpa was a disciplined person, and his emphasis on education inspired me. His values helped transform me.”

By endowing a professorship at the Law School, Chiang says he is supporting the root of his grandfather’s values. “Good education must come from great professors, just as a beautiful garden has to rely on the hard work of its gardener.”
In July, Fiske Fellows gathered in Washington, D.C., to celebrate the 15th anniversary of the program that helped them get their starts, and the man who made it possible (photo above). In 2001, Bob Fiske, ’55, HLLD ’97, created the Robert B. Fiske Jr. Fellowship Program for Government Service to encourage recent Michigan Law graduates to pursue positions as government lawyers. The fellowship pays both college and law school debt for three years plus a stipend; it has supported 49 fellows to date. Fiske, who is senior counsel at Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP, has spent large portions of his career in public service and says the synergy between public service and private practice makes people who do both better at each. “I want graduates to reap the life-changing benefits of government service without having to worry about their debt.” As evidenced by the tributes presented to Fiske at the celebration, he has more than accomplished that mission.

**2016 Fellows Continue Fiske Legacy**

Pictured with Bob Fiske, ’55, HLLD ’97, are 2016 fellows (left to right) Caroline Flynn, ’13, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel; Ben Clark, ’14, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; John Broderick, ’13, environment and natural resources division of the U.S. Department of Justice; and Megan DeMarco, ’16, New York County District Attorney’s Office.
Harrison, ’66: Supporting Equal Opportunity Through the Program in Race, Law & History

Michael Harrison, ’66, has a deep-rooted sense of fairness. His grandfather, Glenwood Fuller, LLB 1913, always said women and people of color should have the same rights as white men. “He was ahead of his time,” Harrison says of the former Kent County (Michigan) Circuit Court judge. Harrison’s mother proudly told how she walked with an African American student on her college campus in an era when that just wasn’t done.

Throughout Harrison’s career, those values stuck with him. “My husband truly believes in equality for all,” says his wife, Deborah. “He has seen how equal opportunity has empowered so many people.”

Harrison is especially passionate about equal opportunity in education. He and Deborah recently endowed a fund at the Law School to support its Program in Race, Law & History. The Michael and Deborah Harrison Fund will assist students pursuing yearlong research projects related to the intersection of race, law, and history by providing travel costs to symposia and conferences, as well as research-related expenses. The Harrisons also have endowed a scholarship fund for minority students at Albion College, Michael’s undergraduate alma mater.

“We know how having access to a quality education can change someone’s life. And those who are in a position to help others gain that access, should do so,” Harrison says.

Harrison served as a judge of the 30th Judicial Circuit of Michigan (Ingham County) for nearly 25 years, and was chief judge for almost half of his tenure. Later, as an arbitrator and mediator, he was widely known for his belief in the power of alternative dispute resolution. Seeking common ground, however, was not just a professional exercise. Harrison is a past president of the Greater Lansing Urban League and was honored by Michigan State University for rallying local attorneys to support Libyan students who risked losing visas in the wake of 2011’s Arab Spring. Earlier in his career, Harrison campaigned for Mary Sharp, ’39, who championed open housing laws as a member of the East Lansing City Council. He later spearheaded the effort to create a public sculpture in her honor. “Racial issues are social issues,” he says, “and education is the key to solving so many of our problems.”

The Program in Race, Law & History was created in 2011 to help students and faculty rethink the role of race at the Law School in the wake of Proposal 2, which was passed by the state’s voters in 2006 and banned the consideration of race and gender as admissions factors at public universities. The Program in Race, Law & History continues the Law School’s commitment to social justice and racial equality by “making race a part of the everyday conversation,” says Martha Jones, co-director of the program and Presidential Bicentennial Professor. “Students take away a much deeper and informed capacity to become leaders in the law.”

“We believe that when you feel strongly about something, you should do what you can to help,” says Harrison. “Supporting diversity at the Law School is important to us, so it is an honor to make this gift and hopefully make Michigan even more inviting.”

The honor lies with the program, stresses Jones. “I can’t think of a more meaningful endorsement than to have a distinguished alumnus like Judge Harrison support our work. This gift means we can continue to think about what’s next for the Program in Race, Law & History and continue moving forward from Proposal 2.”—AS
Youth Law Fellowship Honors Fiza Quraishi, ’07

By Amy Spooner

For young lawyers with a passion for helping disadvantaged children, pursuing such a career is limited by scarce job opportunities. A new fellowship will offer a gateway by bringing Michigan Law students to the National Center for Youth Law (NCYL)—while honoring a woman who left an enormous legacy at both institutions.

As a student and lawyer, Fiza Quraishi, ’07, was a tireless advocate on behalf of disadvantaged children. After her death in February 2016, colleagues at NCYL and classmates at Michigan Law (from which her husband, Adil Haq, also graduated, in 2006) united to create the Fiza Quraishi Youth Law Fellowship.

Through the fellowship, each year a Michigan Law student will represent vulnerable youth at NCYL, one of the country’s preeminent public-interest law firms. As a permanently endowed fund, the Fiza Quraishi Youth Law Fellowship will forever honor Quraishi’s dedication and indelible spirit. Her story will inspire other students to pursue their dreams, and in so doing, at-risk youth will receive the advocacy and opportunities they need to thrive. “When Fiza died, the world was prematurely robbed of an amazing lawyer,” says Sarah Zearfoss, ’92, senior assistant dean for admissions, financial aid, and career planning, who admitted Quraishi as a 1L in 2004 and maintained a friendship with her after graduation. “The fellowship will memorialize a remarkable woman and help replace a little bit of what we all have lost.”

To support the fellowship, mail a check (payable to the University of Michigan and referencing the Fiza Quraishi Youth Law Fellowship) to: University of Michigan Law School, Office of Development and Alumni Relations, 701 South State Street, Fourth Floor, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-3091. You may give over the phone by contacting Michael Dubin, assistant dean for development and alumni relations, at 734.615.4510.

Plan Your MLaw Legacy

Support the education of future law students, increase the impact of your philanthropy, and save on taxes by including Michigan Law in your estate plan. A simple bequest, or designating Michigan Law as a beneficiary of your IRA or life insurance policy, helps the Law School and reduces your taxable estate. Establishing a charitable remainder trust or charitable gift annuity gives you an immediate tax deduction, provides income to you and your family during your lives, and ultimately provides a meaningful gift for the Law School. Make a difference and include Michigan Law in your legacy.

LEARN MORE by contacting Erica Munzel, ’83, director of leadership gifts and planned giving, at 734.763.0414 or lawplannedgiving@umich.edu.
Recent Gifts

Elizabeth S. “Betty” Bishop, AB ’72, has documented a $75,000 bequest, to accompany a $100,000 charitable remainder annuity trust, which establishes the William, Mary, and Elizabeth Bishop Family Travel Fund. The fund honors her father, William Bishop, a professor and pioneer in international law at Michigan Law between 1948 and 1976. Betty’s parents met while working in the Department of State during World War II, an origin for their interests in international law. The Bishop Fund will enable Michigan Law students to pursue their passion for international law by supporting travel costs for externships, clinical experiences, conferences, and coursework abroad. Betty, a licensed psychologist, recently retired from her private practice, located in Ann Arbor.

Liz and Richard Burns, ’71, of Carefree, Arizona, have made a $100,000 gift to the Law School Fund in celebration of Richard’s 45th reunion. He is co-chair of the Class of 1971 reunion committee. To further honor Richard’s reunion, the couple made an additional $100,000 gift to the Richard and Elizabeth Burns Debt Management Fund, which offsets student-loan debt for Michigan Law graduates who pursue lower-paying jobs in the public or private sector. Liz and Richard are deeply committed to assisting graduates with their debt; in addition to endowing the Burns Fund, they previously documented a significant bequest to the Loan Repayment Assistance Program.

Stu Finkelstein, ’85, and his wife, Beth, have made an additional gift in support of the Finkelstein Family Debt Management Fund, which they established through a bequest originally made last year. The Finkelsteins say they understand the importance of the Loan Repayment Assistance Program at Michigan Law and the role it plays in assuring that students are able to have the pleasure of working somewhere they love without being dissuaded by the cost of pursuing a quality legal education. Stu is the co-head of the global tax group of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP in New York City, where he has spent his entire career.

David M. Rubin, ’76, has documented a $50,000 bequest to the Law School Fund on the occasion of his 40-year class reunion. David is a partner at Golenbock, Eiseman, Assor Bell & Peskoe LLP in New York City. “My gift is in honor of my fond memories of Michigan and in thanks for a great legal education that has served me well for 40 years. I could not imagine a better environment in which to have studied law,” says David. “Forty years later, I still remember with fondness and appreciation the great professors I was fortunate to have.”

A bequest to the Law School Fund is one of several ways to leave a lasting legacy at the Law School. Learn more at michigan.giftlegacy.com.
And Equality for All

By Lara Zielin

Denise Brogan-Kator, ’06, fought in the trenches in the battle for marriage equality, planning and editing amicus briefs that would help get section three of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) overturned in 2013, and that later helped influence the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2014 landmark Obergefell v. Hodges ruling in favor of same-sex marriage. But she soon realized that those victories unleashed a different set of problems altogether.

“When marriage equality started happening around the country, we started recognizing that family laws in the states were written in gendered terms like husband and wife, or mother and father,” she says. For example, hospital forms for new parents asked for the names of the mother and father, and would now exclude legally married same-sex parents.

So Brogan-Kator, the state policy director for Family Equality Council, a national family rights organization, hit the road to speak to governors, attorneys general, and departments of health around the country, to impress the importance of gender-neutral language. “If it says husband and wife, interpret it to say spouse. If it says mother and father, interpret it to say parent. Then we’ll have the spirit and letter of the Supreme Court decision,” she says.

The result of her work was overwhelmingly effective. “Many states have seen the logic and have changed policies accordingly,” Brogan-Kator says. And even those that didn’t, like Florida, have been successfully sued.

It’s just one victory in Brogan-Kator’s storied legal career, which began when she graduated from Michigan Law at age 51. She was inspired to go to law school after losing two jobs because of her transgender identity, which she acknowledged in 1993. The Navy veteran then lost her home and declared bankruptcy. When her children’s mother divorced her, her parental rights were threatened for no reason other than the fact that she was transgender.

She was the first openly transgender student to matriculate at the Law School, and later would be the first openly transgender professor when she was a lecturer here in 2013. She was an integral part of the successful effort to get the University of Michigan to adopt new bylaws protecting transgender people from discrimination in employment, financial aid, student registration, and more.

In law school, Brogan-Kator met her now wife, Mary Kator, ’84, on Match.com. After graduation, the pair started a law firm together in Michigan that served the LGBT community. Brogan-Kator was the chairperson of the board for the Triangle Foundation, which later became Equality Michigan. She then served as that organization’s executive director before going to work for the Family Equality Council.

In her current role, Brogan-Kator is focused on “taking the mission of the Family Equality Council to the state level.” She does that through policy—“working with elected officials to try and get them to either interpret or pass law in a way that is fair to LGBT-headed families”—or through programs across the country that give LGBT families “access to a lawyer and to fundamental family protections for free.”

Many of the families with the most need for such services are in the rural South, where Brogan-Kator cites another recent victory. Mississippi was the last state in the nation that banned gay couples from adoption. Brogan-Kator and the Family Equality Council helped sue to get the ban lifted in April 2016. “Now, there is no place left in the country where a gay couple or individual can’t legally adopt,” Brogan-Kator says.

Wood R. Foster Jr. authored a seven-part article entitled “A Profession on Edge” for *Bench & Bar*, the monthly magazine of the Minnesota State Bar Association (MSBA). He practiced law in Minneapolis from 1968 to 2013, most of it as a litigator with the firm now known as Siegel Brill PA. He was president of the MSBA in 1999–2000. He conceived and edited “For the Record: 150 Years of Law and Lawyers in Minnesota,” which was distributed to all lawyers and libraries in Minnesota in 1999. He also was a founder, past president, and 30-year board member of Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights.

Joe Kimble received the 2015 John W. Reed Lawyer Legacy Award from the State Bar of Michigan. The award is given periodically to a Michigan law school educator “whose influence on lawyers has elevated the quality of legal practice in our state.” He is a distinguished professor emeritus at Western Michigan University–Cooley Law School.

The Hon. Lawrence M. Glazer was reappointed to the State Board of Ethics by Governor Rick Snyder, ’82. He is a retired Ingham County Circuit Court judge.

The Hon. Steven Rhodes, a retired U.S. bankruptcy judge well known for helping guide the City of Detroit out of municipal bankruptcy, was named by Michigan Governor Rick Snyder, ’82, as the transition manager of Detroit Public Schools. Judge Rhodes oversees the school district’s finances and operations. The Detroit Public Schools face a financial emergency, with about $515 million in operating debt.
Enjoying a 30-Year “Twilight” Career

By Amy Spooner

Michigan Law is full of iconic settings, but unless you’re Maureen Taylor, ’89, a bathroom in Legal Research probably isn’t one of them. Then again, many aspects of Taylor’s path as a lawyer have been unconventional.

Taylor’s study group (all female) met in the 10th floor bathroom because it was off the beaten track and included a large table and chairs. Although space reconfigurations have rendered the bathroom obsolete, she recalls it fondly. “It was the perfect place to study, unless you caught someone not washing her hands.”

Like many Michigan Law alumni, Taylor is a double Wolverine, having earned a bachelor’s degree from U-M Flint. However, she might be the only one with a 26-year gap between the degrees. Taylor was in her early 40s as a 1L; her older son was an undergraduate at U-M at the same time. Greg also was a manager of the basketball team—NCAA champions in 1989—and family outings to the home games were Taylor’s primary stress reliever. (Of course, she brought a law book to study at halftime.)

Taylor, who also holds a master’s degree from Michigan State University and an EdD from Western Michigan University, had a 23-year career teaching writing. Tired of grading essays, and seeking a more intellectual challenge, she decided to take the LSAT—and scored in the 99th percentile. She didn’t apply to law school, however, until her husband, also an English teacher, abruptly announced he was retiring at 55. No longer tied to Kalamazoo, she decided law school was possible at last.

They moved to Ann Arbor, where, Taylor says, “I knew I wanted to be a law student but wasn’t sure I wanted to be a lawyer.” Summer clerkships changed her mind and launched a career that is going strong nearly three decades later, at the age of 74. She is a member at Conliffe, Sandmann & Sullivan PLLC in Louisville, Kentucky, and recently earned lifetime membership in the Kentucky Bar Association.

After graduation, Taylor practiced in Louisville, and then practiced construction law at Bricker and Eckler LLP in Columbus, Ohio. There, she founded and edited ohioconstructionlaw.com, harking back to her Michigan Law Review days and her years of teaching college writing courses. In 2007, after her husband’s death, she returned to practice in Louisville. When the managing partner’s death led to her office closing in 2014, she gave no thought to retiring. “I like to feel I’m accomplishing things,” she says. “If at the end of the day all I can say is that I’ve let the dogs out 17 times, that’s not enough.”

At Conliffe, Sandmann & Sullivan, Taylor represents the State of Kentucky, primarily in a huge bid dispute about Medicaid contracting. She also does appellate work, which she loves because “the mistakes have been made. You know what you have to work with; it’s a matter of presenting it most effectively.” Recently, she coauthored a cover story about ethics in settlement negotiations for the magazine of the American Bar Association’s Tort Trial and Insurance Practice Section.

And at an age when most of her contemporaries are male, she recalls her first visit to the Law Quad, with her high school Latin class, and relishes having bucked the trend. “I remember our teacher saying in a hushed tone, ‘This is where men come to learn to be lawyers.’ I always saw that as a challenge.”
1974

David W. Clark, partner at Bradley Arant Boult Cummings LLP in Jackson, Mississippi, serves as the chair of the American Bar Association’s Standing Committee on Gun Violence. The committee addresses, on behalf of the ABA, what has been and can be done under the law to address the epidemic of gun deaths and injuries in the United States, and it works with medical, public health, and other organizations in this effort. He also serves as Mississippi’s state delegate in the ABA’s House of Delegates.

1975

Walter Mugdan received the Presidential Distinguished Rank Award, the highest for civilian government executives. He serves as director of the Division of Emergency & Remedial Response at Region 2 of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and has worked for EPA since 1975.

Michael Murray has been ordained a Catholic priest for the Diocese of Lansing, Michigan. He is assigned to Saint Thomas Aquinas/Saint John the Evangelist Parish in East Lansing.

1976

Paul Griffin, partner at Winston & Strawn LLP in San Francisco, was named the 2016 Antitrust Lawyer of the Year by the Antitrust, Unfair Competition Law, and Privacy Section of the State Bar of California. For the past 10 years, he has served as a member and adviser of the executive committee of the antitrust section. He was vice chair of publications, is a coauthor of the treatise California Antitrust and Unfair Competition, and has served a record four times as master of ceremonies for the section’s annual Antitrust Lawyer of the Year dinner.

1980

G.A. Finch was appointed by Governor Bruce Rauner to the Illinois Civil Service Commission. He is an attorney at Hoogendoorn & Talbot LLP in Chicago, where he practices employment, corporate, and real estate law.

Randall E. Mehrberg is rejoining Jenner & Block LLP in the Chicago office. He has more than 35 years of experience in private practice and as chief legal counsel and a strategic business leader for multibillion-dollar public companies. He will support the firm’s corporate, litigation, and restructuring and bankruptcy practices. He also will help grow the firm’s energy and regulatory industry groups.

Gary C. Robb and Anita Porte Robb, ’82, founding partners of Robb & Robb LLC in Kansas City, Missouri, were proud to witness their son, Andrew C. Robb, ’16, win first place in April in the 91st Annual Henry M. Campbell Moot Court Competition. Andrew also served as a note editor on the Michigan Law Review, and is clerking for the Hon. William Duane Benton on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

1981

The Hon. Kenneth C. Mennemeier was appointed to the California Superior Court in Sacramento. Before his appointment, he practiced for more than 18 years at Mennemeier, Glassman & Stroud LLP, a litigation boutique he founded in 1997.


1982

Daniel J. Bergeson is the founder of the firm Bergeson LLP, which was featured in Above The Law’s article “The White Sandal Elite: The Go-To Law Firms of Silicon Valley.” The article notes that “founder Dan Bergeson is renowned throughout Silicon Valley for both his expertise and cost-effectiveness in all aspects of business litigation.”

Peter Silverman, partner in the Toledo office of Shumaker, Loop & Kendrick LLP, has been appointed to the International Institute for Conflict Prevention & Resolution (CPR) Panel of Distinguished Neutrals, and to three CPR specialty panels: Bio-Tech, Franchise and Trademark, and the Ohio General Commercial At Large Panel.
A Reunion and a Tribute

Five Michigan Law alumni had an informal reunion in March while attending a celebration of the life and work of Charles Wilkinson, distinguished professor and the Moses Lasky Professor of Law at the University of Colorado Law School. Wilkinson’s scholarship, law practice, writing, and mentoring have been pivotal to the development of modern Federal Indian Law and Federal Public Lands Law, both areas in which he taught while visiting Michigan Law in the spring of 1986.

Robert Fischman, ’87 (Indiana University Law School), Jeremy Firestone, ’86 (University of Delaware), Sandra Hoffmann, ’86 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service), Melody McCoy, ’86 (Native American Rights Fund), and Matthew L.M. Fletcher, ’97 (Michigan State University Law School, not pictured), were profoundly influenced by his sweep of knowledge, his vision of the law and legal practice, and his humanity.

William “Bill” Ellis joined Akerman LLP as a partner in the real estate practice group in Los Angeles. He has more than 30 years of transactional real estate experience, handling workouts and restructurings, leasing, acquisitions, dispositions, financings, joint ventures, and developments across the United States.

Nancy Fredman Krent was awarded the Council of School Attorneys (COSA) Lifetime Achievement Award by the National School Boards Association’s COSA, in recognition of her outstanding service to public schools, the profession, and the mission of COSA to “improve the practice of school law…by providing leadership in legal advocacy for public schools.” She recently retired from Hodges, Loizzi, Eisenhammer, Rodick & Kohn LLP, where she was a partner.

Anita Porte Robb and Gary C. Robb, ’81, founding partners of Robb & Robb LLC in Kansas City, Missouri, were proud to witness their son, Andrew C. Robb, ’16, win first place in April in the 91st Annual Henry M. Campbell Moot Court Competition. Andrew also served as a note editor on the Michigan Law Review, and is clerking for the Hon. William Duane Benton on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Lawrence Savell’s fourth published law-related short story, “The Bequest,” was a winner of the 2016 New York State Bar Association Journal Short Story Contest, and appears in the May 2016 issue. He is counsel at Herbert Smith Freehills LLP in New York.

Michael Lied, member at Howard & Howard PLLC in Peoria, Illinois, was appointed to serve as an ex-officio of the Labor & Employment Law Section Council and also was reappointed as a member of the Standing Committee on Continuing Legal Education of the Illinois State Bar Association.

Henry Udow was presented with the Directors Roundtable’s world honor for a general counsel in London in May. He is general counsel of RELX Group (formerly Reed Elsevier), a global provider of information and analytics for professional and business customers.

Joel D. “Woody” Woodcock recently retired and was recognized for his service to the Mississippi Department of Transportation and the State of Mississippi with the passage of a resolution by the Mississippi Transportation Commission. His 30 years of service in Mississippi included 12 years as special assistant attorney with the Mississippi Office of the Attorney General.

Cliff Curry has been named president of Alta Lodge Company in Alta, Utah. He serves as an elected member of Alta Town Council.

H. Kurt von Moltke has joined Jenner & Block LLP as co-chair of the firm’s mergers and acquisitions practice and a partner in the Chicago office. He also joins the firm’s securities, corporate finance, and corporate practices. He focuses his practice on mergers and acquisitions, both hostile and negotiated, as well as private equity transactions, complex corporate debt restructurings, corporate finance and securities transactions, and counseling public company boards of directors.
A Groundbreaking Legal Career

By Lori Atherton

In the 2016 whistleblower case Haas v. CooperRiis, Inc., a jury in Asheville, North Carolina, awarded a $3.65 million verdict to plaintiff Laura Haas, who claimed she was fired for reporting patient neglect to the mental health company CooperRiis. It was the largest jury verdict for an individual in a wrongful termination case in North Carolina history. For Harold Kennedy III, who brought Haas to trial in February, it was another groundbreaking case in his legal portfolio.

Kennedy, ’77, is a partner at Kennedy, Kennedy, Kennedy, and Kennedy LLP in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, a family firm started by his parents. The practice, which includes Kennedy’s twin brother, Harvey, focuses on termination from employment, sexual harassment, medical malpractice, and wrongful death.

When Kennedy and his brother joined the firm in the late 1970s, they decided to focus on employment law because, as Kennedy notes, “there was a real need for lawyers, especially in the South, to take civil rights cases.” One of his first major lawsuits was Hogan v. Forsyth Country Club Co. (1986), the first sexual harassment case in North Carolina. Kennedy’s client was a waitress at a country club who contended that she had been sexually harassed at work by the executive chef.

“We had to go to the North Carolina Court of Appeals to get the right to proceed in the case, because the country club took the position that women should not have a right to sue for sexual harassment in North Carolina,” says Kennedy, who, under North Carolina common law, sued on his client’s behalf for intentional infliction of mental and emotional distress. “We tried the case in 1986, and the jury came back with a $900,000 verdict for our client, which was then the largest jury verdict in my county in North Carolina. The case opened the door for women throughout North Carolina to sue in state court for being sexually harassed on the job.”

Another of Kennedy’s cases that impacted North Carolina law was Amos v. Oakdale Knitting Co. (1992). When Kennedy started practicing in 1978, employees in North Carolina could not sue for wrongful discharge in violation of public policy. That changed with Amos, when the North Carolina Supreme Court ruled in favor of Kennedy’s clients—three women who were fired from their jobs for refusing to work for less than the minimum wage. “The court ruled that the employees had a right to sue for wrongful discharge in violation of public policy, because they said that firing an employee for refusing to work for less than the statutory minimum wage violated the public policy of North Carolina.”

Then there was Patterson v. McLean Credit Union (1989), a U.S. Supreme Court case concerning the interpretation of 42 U.S.C.S. § 1981, a civil rights statute that was passed by Congress after the Civil War. In Patterson, the Supreme Court unanimously held that it would not overrule its prior precedents that prohibited racial discrimination in the making and enforcement of private contracts. However, in a 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that 42 U.S.C.S. § 1981 did not apply to racial harassment on the job, but only applied to the formation of a contract. The Patterson case is one of several that led to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, which broadened the legal remedies available to victims of employment discrimination. Under that act, victims of racial harassment on the job now can sue for damages. Kennedy was part of a team of attorneys that represented appellant Brenda Patterson before the Supreme Court.

Kennedy is humble about his legal victories but admits it’s thrilling when a jury returns with a large verdict. “It has to be one of the most exciting days in one’s practice,” he says. He cites an interest in helping people get justice, especially those who have been wronged in some way by big corporations and the government, as motivation for his work.

Also influential have been his parents—dad, Harold Kennedy Jr., who practiced law until his death in 2005, and his mom, Annie, who is now 92. “My brother and I learned a great deal about being good lawyers, especially in the early years, by practicing with our parents,” Kennedy says. “Working with them every day was a real honor.”

“The country club took the position that women should not have a right to sue for sexual harassment in North Carolina.”
The MLaw Classmates Behind a $3B Jury Verdict

When Hewlett-Packard found itself in a multibillion-dollar contract dispute, HP General Counsel John Schultz decided that the case called for a team with “an all-star at every position.” When the case finally went to a jury trial in May and June this year, HP’s all-star team included 1983 Law School classmates Camille Olson, of Seyfarth Shaw LLP, and Mark Ferguson, of Bartlit Beck Herman Palenchar & Scott LLP.

Both Olson and Ferguson had long represented HP in other matters, but they had not worked together previously. “Other than a reunion or two, I don’t think Camille and I had seen each other since law school,” says Ferguson. “It was great to work with her in such an enjoyable and successful collaboration, and I think we’ll both look for other opportunities to work together again.”

Olson shares the sentiment: “The trial was special in many ways—and working with Mark was a highlight. It’s rare for any of us to have the opportunity to be trial teammates with our law school colleagues. Mark’s trial work was exceptional, ensuring that the entire trial team had the benefit of his unique insights into both our case as well as our opponent’s. Like Mark, I’m hopeful this was the first of a number of winning trial teams we’ll be on together.”

Olson has been with Seyfarth Shaw since 1986, and splits time between the firm’s Los Angeles and Chicago offices. Although she represented HP as plaintiff in its case against Oracle Corporation, cross-examining software engineers and other techies, her usual focus is defending class action and other employment law litigation.

Ferguson was one of the founding partners of Bartlit Beck, working in the firm’s Chicago office. His practice focuses on a wide range of complex commercial litigation matters, with an emphasis on technology.

Olson and Ferguson, together with lawyers from Gibson Dunn & Crutcher LLP and Choate Hall & Stewart LLP, tried the case over six weeks and won a jury verdict of $3.014 billion in the Superior Court of Santa Clara County, in San Jose, California. In addition to Olson and Ferguson on the outside counsel side, HP’s in-house litigation manager on the case was Patti Kim, ’00.

The dispute, which had been pending since 2011, involved a contract under which Oracle agreed to continue developing software for HP’s Itanium processor-based line of mission critical servers. In March 2011, Oracle announced that it intended to cease all such software development, leading HP to eventually sue for breach of the contract as well as of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing. After the trial was bifurcated, and following a first-phase HP win on contract interpretation and an unsuccessful interlocutory appeal by Oracle, the jury trial focused on the issue of breach and damages. The verdict reflected a complete victory for HP.
1986

Robert S. Bick, a shareholder at Williams, Williams, Rattner & Plunkett PC in Birmingham, Michigan, received the All-Star Attorney of the Year award from the Association for Corporate Growth. His practice focuses on corporate law, mergers and acquisitions law, private equity law, corporate governance, and business planning.

Kachen Kimmell was elected mayor of the Village of Gambier, Ohio, for a four-year term that began in January. Gambier is the home of Kenyon College.

Jack Van Coevering joins Foster Swift PC as a shareholder in the administrative and municipal practice group, working primarily in the Grand Rapids, Michigan, office. His practice focuses on state and local tax, and he assists municipalities with complex property tax cases and taxpayers in state business tax disputes. Previously, he served as chief judge and chairman of the Michigan Tax Tribunal.

1987

Robert B. Jobe has been selected to receive the 2016 American Inns of Court Professionalism Award for the Ninth Circuit. He is in private practice in San Francisco, specializing in immigration litigation. He has litigated at all levels of the federal court system, including the Supreme Court of the United States, and testified before the U.S. House of Representatives about the need to enact legislation to implement the UN Convention Against Torture.

J. Adam Rothstein, partner in the Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP office in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, has been recognized as a BTI Client Service All-Star for 2016, awarded by the BTI Consulting Group. To earn a place on the list, an individual attorney must be singled out by a corporate counsel for client service that exceeds all other attorneys used by the organization. He is a partner in and vice chair of the firm’s real estate department, as well as the leader of Honigman’s practice groups for retail and hospitality and lodging.

1988

Mark Bernstein joined Akerman LLP as a partner and a member of the litigation practice group in Chicago. His commercial litigation practice focuses on financial services litigation and class action defense.

Melissa H. Maxman, partner at Cohen & Gresser LLP, led the opening of the firm’s fourth office in Washington, D.C. She has decades of litigation experience at both the trial and appellate levels, primarily in the areas of antitrust, RICO, environmental law, complex commercial disputes, and white collar defense, as well as extensive experience advising domestic and foreign corporations about global antitrust issues.

1989

J. Danielle Carr has joined Polsinelli PC as the firm’s first director of diversity and inclusion, based in the St. Louis office. She spent the first 13 years of her career as a practicing commercial litigation attorney, then gained experience in diversity roles with law firms and global recruiting firms, including six years as executive director of the Chicago Committee on Minorities in Large Law Firms.

Nancy L. Little has opened a new law firm, Buhl, Little, Lynwood & Harris PLC, along with three other partners, in East Lansing, Michigan. She practices in the fields of estate planning, trust and estate administration and litigation, and estate and gift tax.

1990

The Hon. Michael Roche was appointed by Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper to serve as a judge on the Arapahoe County Court. He is a founding partner of the Denver office of Lathrop & Gage LLP, with a practice devoted to civil litigation.

1991

Thomas G. Pasternak has joined Akerman LLP as a partner in the Chicago office. He has more than 20 years of experience in patent litigation, licensing, and prosecution.
Roshunda Price, a former director and clinical assistant professor at Michigan Law, has joined Jaffe Raitt Heuer & Weiss PC as a partner in the firm’s corporate and real estate practice groups in Southfield, Michigan. She focuses on advising clients on a variety of corporate and real estate matters. She also has experience in health care law and is a certified public accountant.

Ann-Marie Anderson, partner with Phoenix-based Wright Welker & Paoule PLC, was elected by her lawyer peers to be chair of the State Bar of Arizona Securities Regulatory Board and reelected to the Administrative Regulatory and International Law boards. She focuses her practice on the representation of large airports, airlines, aviation interests, educational entities, and publicly traded corporations in litigation, complex transactions, and regulatory matters. She also was elected chair of the Phi Beta Kappa Academic Society of the Western United States and is in her sixth term as president of the U-M Club of Phoenix.

Peter D. Hardy joined the white collar defense/internal investigations group of Ballard Spahr LLP as a partner in the firm’s Philadelphia office.

Rebecca Ross Haywood was nominated by President Obama to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. She is an assistant U.S. attorney in the Western District of Pennsylvania, where she has served as chief of the appellate division since 2010.

Mitzi Hill has been named a partner at Taylor English Duma LLP in Atlanta. She has worked for more than 20 years on issues involving entertainment, technology, and the IP and compliance questions that come out of those two fields. She leads the firm’s data security and privacy practice.

Ariella (Nasuti) Cohen’s debut novel, *Sweet Breath of Memory* (Kensington, 2016), tells the story of a woman who is grieving the loss of her husband in the Iraq war with a Holocaust survivor and other women who lost loved ones during World War II. The novel has received numerous positive reviews, including one from the *New York Journal of Books* that says it is “so well written it is unfathomable that this is a debut novel.”

Noah Hall was appointed special assistant attorney general for Michigan, joining the special counsel team for the Flint water investigation. An associate professor of law at Wayne State University, he founded the Great Lakes Environmental Law Center and was an attorney with the National Wildlife Federation.

Sungjin Kang has been named the general counsel for the Korean company Gymworld. It is a Korean franchisee of the Gymboree program, which specializes in the education of kids up to age 6. The company makes the magnetic building toy Magformers.

Edward (Jed) Gordon joined McDermott Will & Emery LLP as a partner in the Boston office. A leading patent attorney, he has experience with patent prosecution and strategy work in the electrical and medical device fields.
Building Support for Military Spouses

By John Masson

Let’s start with this: Being in the military is hard.

There are tough hours of training. There are repeated, seemingly endless deployments. And yes, there is danger. Then, every two or three years—and sometimes more frequently than that—orders marked “Permanent Change of Station” arrive. That’s when you and your family pack up all your possessions and move across the country or around the world. To wherever your country needs you.

Soldiers, sailors, airmen and women, and Marines all know this. They all signed up for it.

But their spouses didn’t. And while the military life can be hard, so can the lives of military spouses—especially when it comes to their careers.

That’s why efforts like those of Angela Allen, ’07, are so important. Allen, a partner at Jenner & Block LLP, knows firsthand the rigors of life as a military spouse. Her husband joined the Michigan National Guard after the September 11 attacks. Deployment to Iraq quickly followed, with Pvt. Linden Allen working in a transportation unit, crisscrossing a war-ravaged land.

“He was driving all across the country when roadside bombs were one of the biggest problems that our troops faced,” Angela Allen says. She says this without self-pity. Her family has a history of military service; she knows what the job entails.

But she also knows that much of the career difficulty faced by military spouses is a side effect of needlessly restrictive state licensing laws. For military spouses whose work requires a license—doctors, nurses, teachers, electricians, accountants; altogether, an estimated 35 percent of military spouses—transferring to another state traditionally has meant paying hefty fees to reapply for licensing, taking expensive classes, re-sitting for board exams, and, frequently, waiting. In many cases, by the time spouses became licensed in the new state, it was almost time to move on again.

An Obama administration effort begun in 2011 has improved licensing reciprocity for many military spouses by streamlining laws in all 50 states. But reciprocity is different for lawyers, for whom state bar associations are key. And that’s where the Military Spouse JD Network (MSJDN) comes in.

Also founded in 2011, MSJDN advocates for licensing accommodations for military spouses, including recognizing existing bar memberships across state lines without additional examination or delay. When Allen heard about the organization, she had two kids, a husband (by then a captain, serving in the Illinois National Guard), and a Big Law job in Chicago. And even though Guard and Reserve members don’t have to transfer across state lines, she joined MSJDN right away because she knew she could help.

“I kind of felt like I was the only military-spouse lawyer in the world. Then I looked on the MSJDN website, and here is a whole community of military-spouse lawyers,” she says of the group, which now numbers more than 1,000. “I immediately got plugged in.”

In her position at Jenner & Block, Allen was well positioned to lend a hand, and she decided to concentrate her efforts on Illinois. Jenner & Block consistently is rated a top pro bono firm, and the leadership there had always encouraged her own pro bono efforts, often in support of military families. So she asked around, and one partner suggested she discuss the situation with Jeff Colman, another partner and a member of a commission appointed by the Illinois Supreme Court to improve access to justice. She set up a preliminary meeting with him.

“He said, ‘Oh, yeah, we should definitely try to do this. I have a call with the chief justice in 10 minutes. Why don’t you stay here and explain the situation to him?’” she recalls.

Despite the short preparation time, Allen sat in on the call. Chief Justice Thomas Kilbride agreed that change was needed and urged her to draft a proposed rule, get the various stakeholders to sign off on it, and submit it to the Access to Justice Commission for its possible recommendation to the Supreme Court. “Within a week we had drafted a rule protecting the interests of military-spouse lawyers,” Allen says. Then, “in only two months, it was approved by the Access to Justice Commission, the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, and the Illinois Supreme Court.”

Allen deflects credit to Jenner & Block, whose support and legal connections made the prompt change possible. She’s pleased with MSJDN’s progress, though. When she joined the group, only four states and territories had approved special reciprocity rules for lawyers with military spouses; now that number has swelled to 19. The addition to that list of a state with as much legal horsepower as Illinois may help prod other state bars to grant more flexibility to military spouses, Allen hopes. Efforts are under way for a military spouse rule accommodation in Michigan. (If you would like to assist MSJDN’s efforts, contact your Michigan state representative.)

“It’s a retention tool for the military,” Allen says. “If we can ease the burden for other spouses who might have career goals, it’s not as tough a decision for the servicemember to stay in. And it’s helping our military spouses, who serve their country too.”

Learn more about MSJDN at www.msjdn.org.
Markeisha Miner, dean of students at Cornell Law School, was named to *The Network Journal*'s 40 Under Forty list. She previously served as assistant dean of career services and outreach at the University of Detroit Mercy School of Law.

Emily Tait, a partner in Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP's IP litigation practice group in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, was elected treasurer of the Michigan Intellectual Property Inn of Court.

2003

Gerard Filitti published his first novel, *Frozen Tide*, an international thriller that confronts terrorism on American soil and poses questions regarding what it might take to keep our country safe. The novel has been featured in the *Panama City News Herald*'s “The Beach's Best Bookish Bets.”

Julie Rusczek is a health care attorney at the newly launched boutique firm Health Sciences Law Group LLC, which is based in Fox Point, Wisconsin.

2004

Sarah E. Doerr has been elected shareholder at Moss & Barnett PA in Minneapolis. She is a member of the firm’s creditors’ remedies and bankruptcy practice area.

2005

Joshua M. Kalb was promoted to counsel at Hunton & Williams LLP in Atlanta. He joined the firm in 2005, and his practice focuses primarily on IP litigation and creating and preserving value in IP assets through aggressive enforcement and protection of IP rights.

2006

Nicholas Bronni was appointed deputy solicitor general of Arkansas in April. Previously, he was senior litigation counsel in the Appellate Litigation Group of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

Paul J. Cambridge has joined Armstrong Teasdale LLP as a St. Louis-based member of the firm's corporate services and financial and real estate services practice groups. He counsels clients in all aspects of mergers and acquisitions, corporate matters, and lending transactions, and also has significant experience handling matters related to entity formation and planning, corporate governance, contract negotiation, and more.

Darcy Down has been elected to partner at Baker & McKenzie. She is based in Chicago and focuses on international tax planning, routinely advising U.S., multinational, and foreign-owned clients on cross-border tax issues, including internal reorganizations, structuring of outbound and inbound investments, cross-border mergers and acquisitions, and spin-off transactions.

Julia Skubis Weber has been elected to partner at Baker & McKenzie. She is based in Chicago and focuses on international tax planning, routinely advising U.S., multinational, and foreign-owned clients on cross-border tax issues, including internal reorganizations, structuring of outbound and inbound investments, cross-border mergers and acquisitions, and spin-off transactions.

Azadeh Shahshahani received the 2016 Georgia W AND (Women's Action for New Directions) Peace and Justice Award. She is legal and advocacy director at Project South in Atlanta.

Jonathan H. Claydon has been elevated to shareholder in the Chicago office of Greenberg Traurig LLP. He is a member of the litigation practice and focuses on complex commercial litigation in federal and state courts.

2009

Julia Skubis Weber has been elected to partner at Baker & McKenzie. She is based in Chicago and focuses on international tax planning, routinely advising U.S., multinational, and foreign-owned clients on cross-border tax issues, including internal reorganizations, structuring of outbound and inbound investments, cross-border mergers and acquisitions, and spin-off transactions.

Azadeh Shahshahani received the 2016 Georgia W AND (Women's Action for New Directions) Peace and Justice Award. She is legal and advocacy director at Project South in Atlanta.

Jonathan H. Claydon has been elevated to shareholder in the Chicago office of Greenberg Traurig LLP. He is a member of the litigation practice and focuses on complex commercial litigation in federal and state courts.

2005

Joshua M. Kalb was promoted to counsel at Hunton & Williams LLP in Atlanta. He joined the firm in 2005, and his practice focuses primarily on IP litigation and creating and preserving value in IP assets through aggressive enforcement and protection of IP rights.

2009

Julia Skubis Weber has been elected to partner at Baker & McKenzie. She is based in Chicago and focuses on international tax planning, routinely advising U.S., multinational, and foreign-owned clients on cross-border tax issues, including internal reorganizations, structuring of outbound and inbound investments, cross-border mergers and acquisitions, and spin-off transactions.
Christian Grostic has been named partner at Kushner & Hamed Co. LPA in Cleveland, which is now Kushner, Hamed & Grostic Co. LPA. He practices civil and white collar criminal litigation and appeals, appearing in the Supreme Court of the United States, the U.S. Court of Appeals, and trial courts. He also is an adjunct professor at Case Western Reserve University School of Law.

Richard C. Kim joined Greenberg Traurig LLP in the New York office. He represents private equity sponsors, public and private borrowers, lead arrangers, and lenders in connection with syndicated and bilateral loan financings.

Jenny Lee has joined Dorsey & Whitney LLP’s Washington, D.C., office as a partner. She represents banks and other financial services firms in government investigations, congressional inquiries and litigation matters involving federal or state consumer financial statutes, and implementing regulations. She previously spent several years as an enforcement attorney at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Matt Nolan, senior counsel at Dow Corning in Midland, Michigan, was named one of the winners of the Top 30-Somethings awards given by the Association of Corporate Counsel.

Katherine Lacy Crosby has been elected a member of Tachau Meek PLC in Louisville, Kentucky. She represents businesses, financial institutions, and individuals in commercial matters involving a variety of topics.

Nicole Trudeau has joined Stradley Ronon LLP’s Washington, D.C., office. She joins as a partner in the investment management practice group, where she represents open- and closed-end funds and exchange-traded funds, other pooled investment vehicles and their independent board members, and investment advisers on matters relating to U.S. federal securities laws.

2008

Christine Neuharth received the 2016 Access to Justice Award at the ACLU of Southern California’s 22nd Annual Luncheon for her pro bono work as co-counsel on Alfaro Garcia v. Johnson. The team working on this case defeated the government’s motion to dismiss and won certification of a nationwide class of detained asylum seekers, securing a settlement agreement that will ensure the timely processing of detained asylum seekers’ cases.

Scott Wilcox, an associate at Davis Polk LLP in New York, was presented with the Federal Bar Council’s Thurgood Marshall Award for Exceptional Commitment to Pro Bono Service in June. The award celebrates attorneys in private practice who have demonstrated an exemplary commitment to providing or facilitating pro bono legal services in federal courts or agencies within the Second Circuit. Wilcox, who has devoted more than 1,600 hours to pro bono legal services during his time in private practice, was presented with the award by senior counsel Robert B. Fiske Jr., ’55, HLLD ’97 (pictured here with Wilcox; photo courtesy of Federal Bar Council).

2011

Samir Hanna has joined the Michigan Unemployment Insurance Clinic at Michigan Law as a clinical teaching fellow. He previously served as an administrative law judge for the State of Michigan.

Aruna Prabhala, staff attorney with the Center for Biological Diversity’s strategic litigation group, was honored with a California Lawyer Attorney of the Year (CLAY) award from the Daily Journal and California Lawyer magazine. She and two other attorneys from the center were recognized for a case that resulted in a 2015 California Supreme Court decision that will force state officials to reconsider threats to protected wildlife and the climate posed by a mega-development.

Imran Syed, clinical assistant professor of law and assistant director of the Michigan Innocence Clinic at Michigan Law, has been named the recipient of the 2016 Regena Myrick Outstanding Young Lawyer Award from the State Bar of Michigan Young Lawyers Section.

2012

Gautam Hans joined the Entrepreneurship Clinic at Michigan Law in August 2016 as a clinical teaching fellow, with a focus on intellectual property and technology. He previously served as policy counsel and director, CDT-San Francisco at the Center for Democracy & Technology.
**LETTER TO THE EDITOR**

**Professor Emeritus John H. Jackson, ’59—A Deferred Greeting**

In 1956 I arrived in Akasaka in Tokyo on assignment to a quiet part of the U.S. Army Counter-Intelligence Corps (the “CIC”) called the Third Operations Group. I had graduated from college, received a commission as a military intelligence officer, and completed training at the intelligence school at Fort Holabird in Maryland. I had applied to and was accepted at the University of Michigan Law School for the year 1956, and Michigan graciously deferred my entry for two years and let me work for the CIC in Japan. Such a deal!

My job in Tokyo was to study and gather intelligence on the operations of Japanese labor unions, with an eye on the Japanese Communist Party. I occupied the “union desk,” a position previously held by one John Jackson, who, like I, was working for the famous intelligence captain, Luke Moore. By the time of my arrival, Jackson was back in the United States. I did not meet him. He left Japan with a marvelous and sterling reputation. I had a terrific time in Tokyo and from there went to Taiwan in 1958 to help establish an intelligence school for the Chinese Nationalist Army.

After my 1956–58 Far East stint, I never saw any of my intelligence co-workers again, with two exceptions. Jackson Frost, with me at Fort Holabird, was in my 1958–61 law school class. And—small world—when I returned to Ann Arbor in about 1968 to interview law students for my firm McDermott Will & Emery LLP, I discovered that a John Jackson was on the law faculty. Common name, could it be the same Jackson? (Note also that Frost was a “Jackson.”)

At the end of a long day of Michigan Law interviews, I climbed Stason’s Tower to seek out this Professor Jackson, bursting into his office, describing my Tokyo labor desk, finding that it was indeed a small world and he did indeed remember Capt. Luke Moore and our wonderful unit. The professor was busy and I was exhausted, so we had no time for small talk or to reminisce, but we agreed that it was most unlikely that we should meet for the first time on the grounds of the Law Quad.

It saddened me to read John Jackson’s obituary in the Law Quadrangle. I noted another coincidence—that John was born in Kansas City and earned his undergraduate degree at Princeton, same as my friends and 1961 law classmates Jim Adler and Irv Hockaday. I imagined that John’s penchant for international trade and treaty was sparked by his time in Japan. He was a good man, and I was happy to have had the chance to meet him.

*James “Mack” Trapp, ’61*
## IN MEMORIAM

### 1930s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Brooks Smith, '38</td>
<td>2/21/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George H. Good, '39</td>
<td>2/20/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1940s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Ferguson, '41</td>
<td>5/13/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph R. Brookshire, '46</td>
<td>5/2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald H. Sharp, '47</td>
<td>5/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen H. Gross, '48</td>
<td>5/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude M. Pearson, '48</td>
<td>6/7/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David S. Baker, '49</td>
<td>3/20/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Bauckham, '49</td>
<td>9/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas P. Chapekis, '49</td>
<td>5/4/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Drake, '49</td>
<td>8/19/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles T. Hammond, '49</td>
<td>4/12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent B. Hampton, '49</td>
<td>7/23/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin H. O’Leary, '49</td>
<td>6/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph E. Schroeder, '49</td>
<td>3/1/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1950s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ralph C. Smith, '50</td>
<td>8/21/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey L. Weisberg, '50</td>
<td>6/24/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert M. Balin, '51</td>
<td>1/9/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Dessecker, '51</td>
<td>3/3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas W. James, '51</td>
<td>5/18/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert J. Ortenzie, '51</td>
<td>4/17/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry H. Snyder, '51</td>
<td>6/18/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George S. Wolbert, '51</td>
<td>12/13/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O. Allen, '52</td>
<td>7/5/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varskin Baydarian, '52</td>
<td>7/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Brod, '52</td>
<td>1/20/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Hoffman, '52</td>
<td>5/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol Mix, '52</td>
<td>4/26/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward H. Owlett, '52</td>
<td>4/7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Sandblom, '52</td>
<td>4/11/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John G. Hayward, '53</td>
<td>4/27/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kirby Hendee, '53</td>
<td>3/11/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard C. Stavoe, '53</td>
<td>6/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter H. Weiner, '53</td>
<td>5/5/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard A. Cole, '54</td>
<td>3/3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David D. Dowd, '54</td>
<td>8/4/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1960s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warren F. Krapohl, '54</td>
<td>6/20/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Libner, '54</td>
<td>6/20/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James K. Miller, '54</td>
<td>3/3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Alkema, '55</td>
<td>3/20/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Baker, '55</td>
<td>8/29/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo R. Cancio, '55</td>
<td>5/2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack D. Rowe, '55</td>
<td>8/13/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl S. Vasiloff, '55</td>
<td>3/20/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Danton, '56</td>
<td>11/2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman E. Gaar, '56</td>
<td>5/27/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt W. Green, '56</td>
<td>5/7/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John P. Kasseebaum, '56</td>
<td>2/28/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard B. Madden, '56</td>
<td>6/25/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles A. Nelson, '56</td>
<td>8/19/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger H. Oetting, '56</td>
<td>4/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan K. Parker, '56</td>
<td>4/12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glynn D. Barnett, '57</td>
<td>8/16/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip C. Broughton, '57</td>
<td>4/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel F. Coughlin, '57</td>
<td>3/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger C. Markhus, '57</td>
<td>8/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome K. Walsh, '57</td>
<td>8/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Brown, '58</td>
<td>6/20/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Campbell, '58</td>
<td>8/19/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton T. Eldridge, '58</td>
<td>5/25/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph S. Georgiana, '58</td>
<td>2/20/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Higgins, '58</td>
<td>8/5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Logan, '58</td>
<td>10/1/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Babcock, '59</td>
<td>8/10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald E. Carowicz, '59</td>
<td>7/16/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Fromberg, '59</td>
<td>9/7/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert E. Grinton, '59</td>
<td>4/17/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George S. Tulloch, '59</td>
<td>8/23/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1970s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph D. Whiteman, '60</td>
<td>4/12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard J. Behm, '61</td>
<td>7/27/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton L. Steuben, '61</td>
<td>3/7/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce D. Woflang, '61</td>
<td>1/2/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry M. Carter, '62</td>
<td>5/17/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon D. Kortering, '62</td>
<td>1/17/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Bachrach, '63</td>
<td>3/18/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman T. Guthrie, '63</td>
<td>4/5/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George B. Heffteran, '63</td>
<td>5/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlin D. Lucksted, '63</td>
<td>7/12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John J. Lynch, '63</td>
<td>10/25/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian M. Whitcomb, '63</td>
<td>2/5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence L. Eads, '64</td>
<td>10/4/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard F. Gerber, '64</td>
<td>8/28/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry L. Kline, '64</td>
<td>1/15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declan J. O’Donnell, '64</td>
<td>10/1/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard B. Rogers, '64</td>
<td>5/2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Michael Wilk, '64</td>
<td>3/3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy H. Batista, '65</td>
<td>7/9/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul L. Brown, '65</td>
<td>1/2/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl F. Erickson, '67</td>
<td>2/29/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James C. Ausum, '68</td>
<td>4/11/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. McCarthy, '68</td>
<td>7/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen V. Moulton, '69</td>
<td>8/5/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1980s and 1990s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Peters, '80</td>
<td>8/20/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul K. Villaruel, '80</td>
<td>7/6/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Val Strehow, '82</td>
<td>6/29/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson C. Bagby, '89</td>
<td>6/6/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip S. Stamatakis, '93</td>
<td>4/15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan E. Sladek, '94</td>
<td>2/19/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did you ever walk to class at the Law School with a spring in your step? Or jump for joy after acing an exam? Summer starter Lori Interlicchio takes it to the next level by traveling through the Quad on her high-flying pogo stick.
Come home to the Law Quad in 2017! Reunion planning is underway; if you would like to help, contact Lara Furar, director of alumni engagement and programming, at lfurar@umich.edu.

SAVE THE DATE
March 24-26, 2017

For the most up-to-date information visit:
LAW.UMICH.EDU/A3REUNION