No More Reading (Room)
Study Space To Close For Renovations

By Nate Kurtis

Last Tuesday, Dean Caminker announced in a 12:51 a.m. e-mail message to the Law School community that the Reading Room will be closed for renovations beginning after exams this term. Renovations to the lights in the Reading Room, which are part of a larger plan to update the lighting and wiring in the Law School, will “improve energy efficiency, brightness and evenness,” according to Dean Caminker. The fifty-foot vaulted cathedral ceiling will also be restored, and the study tables will be refinished.

“The lighting in the Reading Room is in desperate need of renovation,” said Hadi Husain, 3L and LSSS President. “If you compare our Reading Room to that of peer institutions –Yale’s reading room is similar—you can see the need for refurbishment. Of course, none of this would be possible without the incredibly generous gift from Mr. Munger,” added Husain.

Charlie Munger, a founder of the law firm Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP, gave $3 million for the renovations. Mr. Munger was an undergraduate at the University of Michigan for a year and a half before he was drafted into World War II.

In an e-mailed response to questions on the renovation, Dean Caminker noted that “[t]he idea of upgrading the lighting (and the accompanying electrical infrastructure) was Charlie Munger’s. In his words, he likes ‘fixing things that are broken and that no one else will fix.’ Well, the lighting is ‘broken’ in the sense that it is not very functional and is energy inefficient and relies on decaying wiring, and no one else is likely to come along with an interest in investing in our infrastructure. So the lighting project fits nicely his description of his philanthropic interests.”

During the planned renovations, the Reading Room will be closed to studiers and unnecessary foot traffic, though professor offices and the elevators will remain open. Law Students will be able to study in the Smith Addition, the underground part of the Law Library, which will remain open until the Reading Room’s
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Let There Be Light!
Reading Room Renovations

A late-night e-mail is sent by the Dean to the entire student body outlining various administrative matters having to do with a grand plan to revamp the Law School’s lighting. Buried somewhere near the end of paragraph two is the mention that the beloved Reading Room is slated to be closed for a full semester – the final semester for about 250 law students who will thereafter never again have the pleasure of sitting on uncomfortable wooden chairs while trying to make out the text of the case book before them in the green lamplight. Despite the strong cloak-and-dagger undertones of the e-mail, we’re fully behind the Dean’s plan to close up shop for renovations, for the same reason some are troubled: the Reading Room is one of the most visible and visited features of the Law School, and having it look and feel its best for years to come is worth the inconvenience of having to find another place to study for a few months.

When it comes right down to it, we all know that denizens of the Reading Room are almost all undergrads or those looking to pick up undergrads (surprisingly similar to Rick’s in that respect, and in the interests of keeping that the only similarity we shouldn’t let the lighting level stay at the Rick’s norm). Yes, the average law student may occasionally go there to do some serious studying once in awhile, but face it – the “halls of knowledge” schtick wears off after the first few months of law school, and the belabored law student is in search of three things: comfortable chairs in which to sit for hours on end, a quiet atmosphere in which to zoom through pages of reading without needless interruption by cadres of giggling undergrads, and good light by which to read so as to minimize the deleterious effect law school is already having on our collective vision. None of those is currently available in the Reading Room. At least after these renovations, one of them will be.

Granted, for those who seriously rely on the Law Quad as primary studying grounds, quarters are bound to get a little tight in the Subs. But maybe it was time to branch out anyway – the Harlan Hatcher Graduate Library is just across South University and boasts individual carrels with doors that actually close (though the efficacy of the noise barriers created by said doors is another matter). In addition, Weill Hall, our new neighbor to the south, boasts a nice little reading room of its own, on the third floor, which we’re sure they’d absolutely hate to see law students begin to occupy – but don’t tell us they won’t feel free to avail themselves of the newly refurbished Reading Room once it’s done. And, of course, if you’re still looking to troll for undergrads, you might try either the reading room at Hatcher, one of the reading rooms in the Union, or else the old standby - the Shapiro Undergrad Library, just across the street.

Of course, the most important piece of this cost-benefit analysis is still a little uncertain: will the new lighting scheme actually make any difference to the quality of life in the Reading Room? While it’s impossible to know for sure, we have confidence that the beneficial effects of the renovations will prove at least enough to outweigh the minor inconveniences posed by a semester of construction.
New Campbell Board to Create Permanent, Transparent Scoring System

By Austin Rice-Stitt

The Campbell Moot Court competition has tested the oral and written advocacy skills of Michigan Law students for over 80 years. Unfortunately, delays and an opaque, ever-changing scoring system in past years have tested the patience of competitors as well.

But this year’s changes to the Campbell Moot Court brief and oral argument scoring system may be the last, according to Director of Student Affairs Christine Gregory, whose office oversees the competition. This year Ms. Gregory gave the Campbell Moot Court Executive Board “a different assignment: to establish a scoring system that would, hopefully, become the permanent scoring system.” Ms. Gregory hopes this year’s board will be “as transparent as possible and create a scoring system that everyone understands and that doesn’t change much from year to year.”

The Executive Board, a group of current UM Law students charged with administering the competition, seems to have gotten the message. Board members Bradley Moore, chair, and Meghann Dunlap agree that “one of our mandates is to create a new permanent scoring system.” Though previous Boards were not required to explain their scoring methodology, Bradley emphasized this Board’s focus on “transparency.”

The Board handed out information packets to prospective competitors at informational meetings on September 17 and 18 that included detailed scoring sheets that will be used to evaluate briefs and oral arguments. “It was important to release the scoring packet at the first information session,” Bradley explained, “to show everyone exactly what they will be evaluated on.”

“It’s important to be transparent, especially when students put so much work in,” explained Meghann. “Competitors want to feel like they’re given a fair shake.”

To develop this year’s scoring methodology, “the Board put a lot of effort into talking to people at other schools who are involved with running moot court competitions,” Meghann said. The Board also drew on the expertise of its own members, many of whom have experience as moot court competitors. “The chance to develop a new scoring system is a challenge, but it’s also an opportunity,” said Bradley. “When you get this involved with something, you want to see it be successful.”

This Year’s Board

While six students all had equal voice in last year’s Board, this year’s Board has seven members, including a designated chair. “It’s been great,” Meghann said when asked about having a chair. “It’s nice to have someone setting the agenda for the meetings and making snap decisions when necessary.” Chair Bradley Moore sees his role as being that of a facilitator: “I’m surrounded by great people, and everyone is stepping up and taking care of the things that they’ve been assigned. I’m just making sure that everything gets done.”

In addition to creating a chair position on the Board, Ms. Gregory emphasized that the criteria used to select this year’s Board was also a little different. “I think in the past the recruiting might have focused more just on GPA and faculty recommendations,” Ms. Gregory explained, “and now we’re taking a more holistic approach. The idea was to recruit board members that are comfortable with their classmates, have a good rapport with the student body, and who have experience in moot court competitions.”

Indeed, this year’s Board includes two semi-finalists from last year’s competition, Liz Polizzi and Stephen Oertle, and another board member, Sam Zun, participated in the competition last year as a timekeeper. Bradley confirmed that “it’s been really helpful this year to have input from Liz and Stephen, who did the competition last year, and also to have board members who bring a fresh perspective.”

First Round Scoring

Most of the delays and scoring irregularities in past competitions have occurred in the first round, when volunteer alumni judges are asked to score and return briefs by mail. This year’s Board hopes to avoid problems by starting early and by communicating with volunteer judges. Bradley, Meghann, and Ms. Gregory all emphasized that this year’s Board is focused on getting things done early, and the Board hopes to send first round briefs out, and get them back, sooner than in years past. Meghann also believes that the Board can urge scorers to return briefs on time through “constant communications with scorers to check in.” Bradley confirmed that the Board will rely on “consistent, professional follow-up” to get briefs scored and returned.

This year’s Board also plans to ask slightly less of each first round volunteer brief scorer. While scorers last year were asked to read and score six briefs, Bradley says that this year’s Board would like to keep each reader’s assignment to four or fewer briefs. Also, while last year’s Board tried to get each brief read six times (before eventually settling on four), this year’s Board is soliciting only three scores per brief.

The Campbell Moot Court competition is open to second- and third-year UM Law students. Registration closed on October 1st. The Board can be reached at campbellcompetition@umich.edu.
Winter 2008
Registration and Drop/Add Calendar

Application Process for the Clinic Programs occurs before Round One
The link to the Live Client Clinic Programs Application:
http://www.law.umich.edu/currentstudents/registration/registration-introduction.htm
The application deadline: No later than Friday, October 19 at NOON

Early Registration Period uses the Law School’s Priority Registration System (PRS) to temporarily reserve law classes

Round One for selecting seminars and practice/simulation courses:
Begins Monday, October 29 at 8:00 AM
Ends Friday, November 2 at 5:00 PM
Round One results e-mailed to students on Friday, November 9.

Round Two for selecting upper-class courses. Students can select open seminars and practice/simulation courses and/or add their name to the bottom of a waitlist for closed seminars and practice/simulation courses:
Begins Monday, November 12 at 8:00 AM
Ends Friday, November 16 at 5:00 PM
Round Two results e-mailed to students on Friday, November 30.

Students must have financial holds removed by: Monday, November 19
If you have a financial hold (a negative service indicator) on your student record when the PRS data is loaded into M-Pathways, your temporarily reserved law classes will not load, your class schedule will bounce out, and you will not be “officially” enrolled at the Law School or University!

Drop/Add Period uses the University’s Wolverine Access System

Law appointments begin Saturday, December 22 @ 8:00 AM and end Thursday, January 17 @ 5:00 PM.

Winter 2008:
Drop/Add begins Saturday, December 22 at 8:00 AM
Students can add their name to the bottom of a waitlist for open or closed seminars, practice/simulation courses, and clinics through Wednesday, January 2. Starting Thursday, January 3, students will have to e-mail Amy Bishop (albishop@umich.edu) to have their name added to the bottom of a waitlist.

Winter 2008:
Waitlist Drop/Add begins Wednesday, January 9 at 8:00 AM
Starting Wednesday, January 9, permission codes will be entered each morning for seminars, practice/simulation courses, and clinics that meet that afternoon. Permission codes for Prof Pick (footnote #9) for seminars, practice/simulation courses, and clinics will be entered as received.

Winter 2008:
ALL Drop/Add activity ends Thursday, January 17 at 5:00 PM
As always, we will be available for questions during business hours in Room 300 Hutchins Hall or you can contact us by email at http://www.lawrecords@umich.edu.

Amy Bishop, Curriculum Coordinator, 10/01/2007
“Between the Briefs”

Killjoys of Toys

Ala. Code § 13A-12-200

By Rooks

It was a big week for sex and the law, what with the suicide this past Friday of the Asst. US-Attorney caught soliciting a child for sex, and the Oklahoma judge whose conviction for multiple counts of public indecency was upheld this week. (His Honor was using a penis pump while hearing trials – if that's the reason those robes are so voluminous, I really prefer not to know.)

Though y'all can imagine how extraordinarily tempting it was to write on character, fitness, and sex offender registries this week, one particular news item got my metaphorical panties in the proverbial twist. Last Monday, the U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear Williams v. King, a case challenging the constitutionality of an Alabama ban on the sale of sex toys.

Don’t panic – $3 over on South U. isn’t going to shut down Michigan-state-government style.

Thankfully we don’t live in one, but there are still some states in the union where helping folks get their jollies can carry a penalty of up to a year in jail and a $10,000 fine (mind you, that’s just for the first offense). Georgia, Texas, Mississippi, and Alabama all have laws that prohibit the sale of sex toys. (Louisiana struck down their similar statute some time ago, realizing that no one in New Orleans was paying any attention anyway, and thus preventing some sort of Deep South Anti-Orgasm Belt quinfecta.) Many of these statutes also technically restrict the purchase of vibrators, dildos, and even ribbed condoms by designating that possession of more than (in Texas at least) six sex toys constitutes an intent to distribute.

The women of Alabama, naturally, refused to take this one lying down, and soon after the law passed in 1998, a group of toy purveyors and users sought to challenge the statute. After their second trip to the 11th Circuit yielded what was, in this columnist’s opinion, a mindblowingly moronic 2-1 decision which, among other things, likened the sale of sex toys to prostitution, the plaintiffs sought a hearing with the Supreme Court to assert that the law unconstitutionally infringes on sexual privacy rights. (The 11th Circuit opinion is Williams v. Morgan, 478 F.3d 1316, for those playing along at home, and was, in a mild piece of irony, filed on Valentine’s Day of 2007.)

Now, I don’t want to picture the Justices talking about Pocket Rockets any more than the next person old enough to have seen Thomas’s confirmation hearings, but I do think that the ban is at least an issue worth examining. The Court’s decision, or rather, lack thereof, seems a far cry from the assertions of sexual liberty advocated in the Lawrence, Griswold, and Casey opinions, and frankly, makes my little sex-positive heart incredibly sad.

All is not lost, however. The plaintiffs say they will seek to bring suit again, under free speech this time, and folks from Alabama can still buy a buzz in neighboring dens of iniquity across the state lines in ... wait, not Mississippi, not Georgia, ummm ... Florida! Sex toy sales remain delightfully legal in Florida. And, though hysteria hasn’t been a fashionable diagnosis since the Teapot Dome scandal, Alabamans can still purchase in-state sex toys ... ohem, personal massagers ... “for medical purposes.”

Though I doubt that RG has a significant readership in say, Huntsville, I thought we could do our part for the parts of the people of Alabama, not to mention any Michigan law students who might’ve felt a wee bit left out by all the sex their classmates are having, by adding a note on online vibrator shopping, and detailing a couple of great resources for one’s erotic device needs.

There are a number of things to consider when purchasing a sex toy, but they can essentially be boiled down to four: style, volume, material, and cost. Stylistically speaking, when you’re shopping online (not during class, we hope), bear in mind that the essential differences between a dildo, a vibrator, and a plug are that a dildo doesn’t vibrate; a vibrator, euphemously enough, does; and a plug is generally meant for one’s rear entrance. Also, toys are designed differently for a reason – think about what area of your body you enjoy having stimulated (and how) before plunking down your hard-earned loan money on the first thing that looks serviceable.

Volume and power issues can be a real killjoy, so pay attention to whether your toy, if electric, requires batteries or an outlet, and be sure to read the reviews to find out what other shoppers did (and didn’t) like about your toy. (Are you ok with something that, when on, sounds like a cross between an outboard motor and a buzz saw? Perhaps more importantly, is your roommate ok with it?)

Like any other bed partner, toys run the gamut between high and low maintenance – there are sex toy materials out there that take longer to clean than your apartment after finals (cyberskin leaps to mind here). The well-being of your new little friend is important, so be conscientious of what kinds of lubricant to buy as well. Silicone lubricant is generally to be avoided with a silicone toy, and oil-based lubricants should not be used with latex ... anything. (Hopefully I don’t need to tell anyone that if they’re using sex toys with a partner they should also use a condom.)

If that just sounds like a bit too much
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Looking For A Public Interest Job?
Tools and Advice For Your Job Search

Submitted by MaryAnn Sarosi,
Office of Public Service

Why can't the government and public interest job search be as easy as the firm job search?

If you want to know the answer to that question, Grasshopper, you're better off foregoing this article and going straight to the horoscopes. If you want some pointers for the summer job hunt, read on.

First of all, you don't need to have a job in hand now. The public service job hunt schedule is NOT the same as the law firm hiring schedule. Students often secure jobs well into March! Having said that, you do have to do some homework before applying for jobs. The homework should include:

• Checking out the OPS Student Toolkit web page, http://www.law.umich.edu/currentstudents/PublicService/toolkit.htm, the practice area pages and downloading the Making a Difference Guide on the OPS website and checking Jobnet regularly.

• Studying Last Year's Summer Employment List. Find out where other students worked this past summer. Get ideas and tips from a student who has already worked at the summer job of your dreams. The OCS web site lists students who are willing to speak with other students about their summer jobs with public interest organizations and state, local, and federal agencies. You can access the information by clicking on "Student Summer Employment List - Geographic by Employer Location" (PDF document) or "Student Summer Employment List - Alphabetical by Employer Name" (PDF document).

• Looking at the job summaries written by past Dean's Public Service Fellows http://www.law.umich.edu/currentstudents/PublicService/funding/deans-fellowship.htm

• Looking at the SFF list of funded jobs to see where fellow students worked last summer. This list is on the OPS website http://www.law.umich.edu/currentstudents/PublicService/funding/sff.htm and a hard copy can be found in the career resources library in room 210 HH. After looking at these resources, call Jackie Julien at 647-3256 to make an appointment to see MaryAnn Sarosi.

• Checking the jobs listed on PSLawNet.org http://www.pslawnet.org/. After registering for a password, you can search for "opportunities," which are job descriptions for positions already listed and/or by "organization," i.e. type of employer. Opportunities with numerous government agencies as well as prosecutors' and public defenders' offices are listed.

• Familiarizing yourself with the Office of Career Services website; of particular interest is the "useful links" section http://www.law.umich.edu/currentstudents/careerservices/usefullinks.htm.

• Studying our federal government employment resources. We have a list of agencies along with deadlines for applying. Also, we have links to other resources that list government employment opportunities that you should checkout. Examples include: www.law.arizona.edu/career/honorshandbook.cfm - Government Honors and Internship Handbook (For 2007-2008, the username and password are oreo and cookie) and http://www.nalp.org/assets/859_0708federalempguide.pdf (a wealth of information that offers job seekers an in-depth look at the government's myriad functions and roles, as well as a glossary of terms unique to the federal application process, and tips on landing a government job. Particularly helpful is the "Appendix: Federal Departments and Agencies: What They Do and Who Does It.")

The student group, OPIS, has set up a mentorship program for 1Ls and 2Ls interested in talking to 3Ls with experience in government or public interest. If you're a 3L, I encourage you to sign up to provide assistance to 1L and 2Ls. If you're a 1L or 2L, take advantage of this wealth of experience. Please contact Kate Pomper at kpomper@umich.edu to sign up.

My office will also underwrite some of your costs to go to job fairs such as the upcoming Equal Justice Works Job Fair (October 6th and 7th in Washington, D.C.) OPS will reimburse $75 toward housing/travel and we will pay for registration IF you submit receipts within 3 weeks after the event. For a list of other public interest career fairs, go to http://www.law.umich.edu/currentstudents/PublicService/conferences.htm

That's the general advice I can provide in the confines of an 800 word article. Of course, if you're seriously considering pursuing a summer job in government or public interest, you should make an appointment to see me or one of the OCS attorney advisors. We can then tailor our discussion to your interests and needs.
Looking For A Law Firm Job?  
Expert Advice and Suggestions

By Sarah Rizzo

The 2L’s quest for a prized summer associate position with a firm and beyond often feels like navigating an obstacle course. Anxieties are fever pitch, questions can resemble curve balls, and exhaustion is frequent. Naturally, no one could provide 2Ls with more relief and guidance than those who have successfully reached the finish line. Michigan Law welcomed two speakers, with the great advantage of hindsight, to explain what they wish they knew when they were in our shoes.

As Chief Executive Officer of Greenberg Traurig, Cesar L. Alvarez makes it his job to know the ins and outs of the legal market. However, this information is relevant to more than just law firms. Alvarez broke down the trends to help 2Ls distinguish between law firms and make better career choices now.

Location, Location, Location

The U.S. provides ample choices for places to practice law, and many law students choose a location based on family, hobbies, or even the weather. Alvarez highlighted another factor to take into consideration: future population growth and movement. According to Alvarez, it is often easier to establish a career in areas with growth and movement. Data shows that in the future, the three fastest growing states will be California, Texas, and Florida. Also, he pointed out that key financial and governmental centers witness high growth rates. Not sure where you want to go? Take advantage of the dynamic trends in growth areas and your career will benefit.

Diversification

Alvarez likened choosing a law firm to diversifying one’s financial investment portfolio. “It is like investing in one stock versus a mutual fund.” Diversified law firms, in both practice areas and locations, will be able to withstand industry slumps. A downturn in one economy or practice is less likely to hurt a diversified firm. As such, Alvarez advised law students to “invest” wisely!

Play Matchmaker

Law firms have cultures and personalities. Alvarez advised matching your personality and your goals with the firm that will get you where you want to go. First, this requires taking a personal inventory of your goals. Then, instead of asking the “What is the firm’s culture?” question, take a more indirect approach to assessing a firm. He advised looking at its governance and management mechanisms. Is the firm business-oriented or political? How are decisions made internally? What is the function of committees? What changes have they made in response to the advancements of the last 20 years?

Does the Firm have 20/20 Vision?

Alvarez stressed the importance of joining a firm that can articulate its future. Today, firms are more business-oriented. Although businesses have long realized the importance of an organizational vision, not all law firms have reached the same conclusion. As such, he recommended asking a few people at the firm to describe its vision and compare responses. If the answers are too diffuse and unfocused, the firm may lack a strong common identity. Today, according to Alvarez, it is important for any enterprise to have shared goals. Candidates may find it helpful to talk to individuals about the firm’s leaders. Is management bottom-up or top-down? What is the attitude of the leaders? Does the firm have bureaucratic elements? Is there decision by indecision?

So you’ve decided the location and type of law firm that fits your needs. Now it’s smooth sailing, right? Not quite. For many 2Ls, the transition from law school to the law firm is overwhelming, but it doesn’t have to be.

Mark Hermann, a partner at Jones Day in Chicago, is no stranger to working with summer and new associates. Indeed, his book, The Curmudgeon’s Guide to Practicing Law, highlights the frequent mistakes and blunders he has witnessed firsthand. His message to rising associates: all hope is not lost. Delivered with a comedic punch, Hermann’s advice can help 2Ls avoid common pitfalls—and save partners a lot of frustration.

Don’t Be Part of the Crisis

When Hermann smells roses now, he looks for the coffin. Throughout the years, he has come to expect associates to deliver materials at the last minute. Making a partner needlessly have to take home work at night or over the weekend does not impress. The Curmudgeon’s rule of thumb: “If humanly possible, send the draft to a partner/senior associate three days before it needs to be delivered to a court/client.”

Most importantly, Hermann said don’t forget that the legal market is a free market. Sloppy work will soon lead to no work at all. Make the senior associates’ or partners’ lives easier by delivering your best work well in advance. For those who make the partners’ lives easier, the reward will be more work.

Keep it Smart and Captivating

Hermann stressed that associates should decide intelligently the cases to use to support their arguments in briefs. For example, cases where the appellate court reversed the trial court in a similar situation are the strongest.
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Champion House:
For a Fratastic Family Outing

By Adam Dubinsky, '07

If you associate family establishments and acrobatic juggling with popped collars and sake bombs, read no further. You already know what I have to say. This review is of no use to you -- you are a frat boy, you are drunk, and you have accidentally stumbled over into the Law School. Put the newspaper down, turn around, cross the street, and go back to Beta, your beach volleyball game, and your gutted, sticky-floored dens of misogyny.

If you do not yet make this association, but would like to experience the seamless and shameless unification of children screaming and frat boys pounding tables, then have your next dinner at Champion House, located at 120 E. Liberty. You might find that you have a passion for participating in the bizarre sociological pastiche, though Champion House is such a caricature of an imitation of a simulacrum of an already mythical notion of authenticity that, by the time you leave, you risk losing any grasp of reality. (Eat your heart out, Phillip K. Dick.) No, really—the sodium content of the food is enough to make me worry about hypertension, and my blood pressure is only around 90/46 (measured during Trusts & Estates).

It is true that high sodium content, grotesque stereotypes, and awkward juxtapositions are part of the perverse charm of teppanyaki Japanese steakhouses. The average trip to Benihana will sit you next to four obnoxious strangers, whose loud “private” divulgences are not particularly appetizing, and feature a Chinese chef putting on a fake “Asian” accent while pretending to be Japanese, making onion-ring volcanoes, and sending twirling cascades of salt over everything. Don't get me wrong—I love teppanyaki. My favorite restaurant in Worcester, MA is the irredeemably mediocre Sakura Tokyo, where they never give you enough mustard sauce (“for steak, chicken, and everything”) but overload you with ginger sauce (“for seafood, vegetable, and everything”). I can't get enough of the food and the flames. I eat and eat and, a half hour after I'm done, I am hungry again. Even the authenticity of my hunger's satisfaction is illusive.

But, if teppanyaki is the culinary equivalent of the mind-fuck film genre, Champion House is the Blade Runner of teppanyaki, especially if you include Harrison Ford's ridiculous voice-over from the production cut. The ridiculous voice-over in my head began as soon as my lovely companion and I encountered the maitre d'. After we asked to be seated at a teppanyaki table, he eyed us, leafed through his reservations, eyed us again, flipped another page, eyed us, looked at the page, eyed us again, paused, eyed us once more, and finally gestured for us to follow him. He led us to the end of an empty table for eight, across from a table occupied by a family of five.

While we debated what to order, my ears picked up the thud of approaching footfalls and the irreverent banter of the sort of group that actually seems to appreciate the aesthetic qualities of tube tops and ruffle skirts. Peeking from behind the menu, I saw four large, good-looking gentlemen in polo shirts approach our table. The waiter recognized them immediately: “let me guess— you all want the scallops? The sake bombs will be right over.” Indeed, the boys wanted the scallops and the sake bombs came quickly. The little girls from the family across from us watched in amazement while the boys filled their glasses with beer and perched their sake cups precariously above it with their chopsticks. The fists came down like so many hammers of Thor; the sake fell. The boys chugged. I wiped a few drops of splattered beer from my forehead. The boys slammed their glasses down and cheered.

Meanwhile, at the other table, the youngest daughter began screaming. The middle child, one noodle-draped chopstick in each fist, lowered far too much pasta into her mouth from above her head. The oldest daughter, around thirteen, shrank with embarrassment into her chair. Meanwhile, their Caucasian chef pushed around a flaming onion-ring volcano. My companion tapped my shoulder to show me the cart carrying the ingredients their chef would prepare. The raw beef had spilled over the side of its container and collected in the corner.
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From SCOTUS to POTUS, A Roundup

By Eric Reed

On October 2nd, the Law School chapters of the American Constitution Society and the Federalist Society hosted the annual Supreme Court Roundup. This year, professors Joan Larsen, Richard Primus, and Christina Whitman joined moderator Dean Evan Caminker in discussing the Court’s upcoming docket.

Professor Joan Larsen began the Roundup by addressing the challenge to voter identification law that the Court will hear this term. Larsen described the Indiana law that requires residents to present a state-issued photo ID in order to vote as “the most restrictive voter ID law in the country.”

Proponents of the law argue that requiring voters to show a state-issued ID will prevent voter fraud. Opponents point out that there is no evidence that significant voter fraud has occurred in Indiana. Opponents also feel that the law is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to vote. They argue that the law was intended to, and in fact does, disenfranchise large, predominantly Democratic voting blocs.

“These laws look fishy,” Larsen conceded. “All of them are passed by Republican legislatures. There isn’t a single Democratic legislature which has passed a voter ID law....”

Potential voters who don’t have a state issued ID are not allowed to vote, but the law does require the state to provide free IDs to residents who can’t afford them.

“This isn’t, at least technically, a poll tax,” Larsen said, “so we’re not talking about money. But we are talking about time.”

As long as opponents of the voter ID law lack proof that the Indiana state legislature enacted the law for a reason besides preventing voter fraud, Larsen does not expect the Supreme Court to strike it down. “There’s no split here. All the Courts of Appeals have upheld voter identification laws,” Larsen noted. “The Court has never suggested that the states or Congress must make it maximally convenient [to vote]. If they were to apply something akin to strict scrutiny here, I think they would open the floodgates.” Instead, Larsen expects that the Court took the case in order to further clarify up voting issues in advance of the 2008 elections.

The talk continued with Professor Richard Primus, a man immortalized in turkey and horseradish at Zingerman’s Deli. Primus spoke about a suit brought by political parties in the state of Washington against the state for forcing candidates to compete in what is known as a “blanket primary.”

Primus began by detailing three types of primaries. In a closed primary, only members of the relevant political party may vote. This ensures, for example, that only members of the Green Party have the opportunity to nominate or eliminate perennial candidate Ralph Nader before the general election begins. In an open primary, a voter may choose to vote in any one party’s primary. The third system, blanket primaries, throws the doors wide open, allowing anyone to vote for any candidate and holding all primaries simultaneously. Voters in a blanket primary are not restricted to voting only in one party’s primary like they are in an open primary.

“States tend to want [blanket primaries],” Primus said, explaining that blanket primaries usually reward moderate candidates. Because non-party members can vote, blanket primaries dilute the votes of hard-line partisans and prevent them from controlling elections as much as they do in closed primaries.

But political parties, particularly small ones, oppose blanket primaries. “Every election has some small chance of randomness in the voting,” Primus said, explaining that around one percent of voters mark ballots mistakenly or at random. Because small party candidates often receive one percent or less of the votes in the crowded closed primary, “that randomness has a chance to swamp your election,” explained Primus.

Political parties are challenging Washington’s closet primary law based on free speech and freedom of association grounds, arguing that the blanket primary substantially impacts their ability to elect a representative candidate.

“At a deeper level,” Primus said, “what’s at stake is the idea of states as laboratories of democracy.” The case, he continued, raises the fundamental question of just how much latitude states get in structuring their own elections, and at what point the courts will say that the experiment has gone too far. The question, for this term of the court, remains to be answered.

The final remarks of the afternoon came from Professor Christina Whitman, speaking on one of the most politically charged issues of the day: the Guantanamo Bay detentions.

“One of the nice things about the Bush administration is that we have issues of presidential power coming up every term,” Whitman joked during her opening remarks. The upcoming case on this issue, she explained, once again addresses the limits of presidential power over detainees of the United States, as well as the power and limits of the federal courts.

“The question has to do with the access to judicial review of [the detainees’] status,” Whitman said, “whether or not they’re enemy combatants.”

“One of the interesting things about this case,” Whitman said, “is that the court originally denied cert[iorari] back in April.” This earlier denial means that at least two justices have changed their
MLCC Presents: The Best of Ann Arbor

These are the venues that the Culinary Club’s members voted for as the best restaurants, pubs, bakeries, and more!
Culinary Club Editors’ Choice(s) in bold.

### Best Restaurant Around
1) Eve, 2) Zingerman’s Roadhouse, 3) Grizzly Peak, 4) Common Grill

### Best Happy Hour Nosh
1) Rush Street, 2) The Earle, 3) Metro Café, 4) Weber’s Grill

### Best Breakfast
1) Café Zola, 2) Angelo’s, 3) Afternoon Delight, 4) Frank’s, 5) The Broken Egg (tied with) 5) Northside Grill, 7) Auto Bar (Sundays only), 8) Zingerman’s Roadhouse

### Best Burger
1) Red Hawk, 2) Side Track Bar and Grill (Ypsilanti), 3) Crazy Jim’s Blimpie Burger, 4) Ashley’s

### Cheap Meals Near Campus
1) BTB, 2) Za’s, 3) Pita Kabob Grill, 4) Potbelly’s, 5) Le Dog, 6) Red Hot Lovers, 7) NYPD, 8) Rich JC Korean

### Best Italian
1) Gratzi, 2) Bella Ciao, 3) Palio, 4) Argiero’s, 5) Silvio’s, 6) Paesano’s, 7) Olive Garden, 8) Romano’s

### Best Sandwich/Deli
1) Zingerman’s, 2) Amer’s, 3) Ali Baba, 4) Maize and Blue Deli, 5) Potbelly’s, 6) Pita Kabob Grill, 7) Jimmy John’s, 8) Great Harvest, 9) Panera, 10) Cosi, 11) Quizno’s, 11) Subway

### Best Ice Cream
1) Washtenaw Dairy, 2) Stuci’s, 3) Ben and Jerry’s, 4) Kilwin’s

### Best Bakery
1) Zingerman’s, 2) Great Harvest, 3) Big City Small World, 4) Panera

### Best Donuts/Pastries
1) Zingerman’s, 2) Cake Nouveau, 3) Washtenaw Dairy

### Best Splurge Dinner
1) Eve, 2) Common Grill (tied with) 2) Real Seafood, 4) West End Grill, 5) Vinology, 6) Chop House, 7) Gandy Dancer, 8) Amadeus, 9) Cherry Blossom

### Best Sushi/Japanese Food
1) Sodako, 2) Miki, 3) Totoro, 4) Godai, 5) Cherry Blossom (tied with) 5) Makkara, 7) Sushi Corne

### Best Thai
1) No Thai, 2) Marnee Thai, 3) Lotus Thai, 4) Sivathai

### Best Korean
1) Seoul Garden, 2) Bewon, 3) J&C Rich, 4) Kosmo’s

### Best Chinese
1) TK Wu, 2) China Gate, 3) Middle Kingdom, 4) Dynasty Buffet (Ypsilanti), 5) Asian Legend (tied with) 5) Evergreen

### Best Indian
1) Temptations (Ypsilanti), 2) Shahmar, 3) Madras Masala, 4) Raja Rani

### Best Latino
1) Pilar’s Tamales, 2) Sabor Latino, 3) Prickly Pear, 4) Chipotle, 5) BTB, 6) Qdoba, 7) Taqueria La Loma, 8) The Burrito Joint, 9) La Fiesta Mexicana, 10) Banditos

### Best Vegetarian
1) Seva (tied with) 1) Earthen Jar

### Best Middle Eastern
1) Ali Baba’s, 2) Jerusalem Garden (tied with) 2) Ayse’s Café (Turkish), 4) Pita Kabob Grill, 5) Oasis Café, 6) Mediterranean (William’s)

### Best Pub
1) Ashley’s, 2) Leopold Brothers, 3) Grizzly Peak, 4) Arbor Brewing Company, 5) Conor O’Neill’s, 6) Brown Jug, 7) The Rathskeller, 8) Rick’s

### Best Wine Shop
1) Morgan & York, 2) Bello Vino Marketplace, 3) Trader Joe’s, 4) Everyday Wine

### Best Dive Bar
1) Alley Bar, 2) The Rathskeller, 3) Eight Ball

### Best Pizza

### Bulk Foods
1) Whole Foods, 2) By the Pound, 3) People’s Food Co-op

### Best Grocery
1) Trader Joe’s, 2) Busch’s, 3) Hiller’s, 4) Whole Foods, 5) Bello Vino, 6) Kroger, 7) People’s Food Co-op, 8) Arbor Farms

CONTINUED on Next Page
CONTINUED from Previous Page

Best Coffee Shop
1) Sweetwater’s, 2) Espresso Royale, 3) Zingerman’s Next Door, 4) Caribou, 5) Café Ambrosia, 6) Beaner’s, 7) Starbucks, 8) Café Verde, 9) Primo Coffee

Best reasons to find a ride to Ypsi:
Red Sea (Ethiopian), Dalat (Vietnamese), Side Track (burgers, Irish style rolls), Taqueria La Loma or Fiesta Mexicana (Mexican), Tuptim (Thai), Banh Na (Thai and Laotian)

And don’t forget these one-of-a-kind places!
Farmer’s Market: Ann Arbor Farmer’s Market, Westside Farmer’s Market (near Zingerman’s Roadhouse)
Specialty Markets: Hua Xing Grocery (diverse Asian foods in Ypsilanti), Sunshine Mart (Middle Eastern)
Jamaican: Jamaican Jerk Pit
Leopold Brothers: Small-batch distillery

RENOVATIONS from Page 1
normal 2 a.m. closing time, according to Law Library Director Margaret Leary. Ms. Leary believes that there will be enough space in the underground Law Library to accommodate students who wish to study. While the Reading Room is open to the public to use, the Smith Addition will remain off limits to non-law students.

Student reaction to the announced closing of this popular study space has been mixed. “I’m disappointed,” said Emily Breuker, a second-year MBA who came to study in the Reading Room to study between classes. She notes, “It’s actually just more convenient. You don’t have to walk all the way down and find a quiet space. . . . Here, you just grab a table and work and it’s easy. During the day, the lighting here is pretty good, so it’s useful.” Siddiqi adds: “I’m not sure, seat-wise, how [everyone studying in the Smith Addition] is going to work out because, while it appears that there are a lot of carrels, at least on Sub-2 quite a few of them belong to my journal. . . . On Sub-3 a lot of those carrels are reserved for journal work as well, so my biggest concern is seating. Maybe not on a daily basis, but there will be crunch times when it will be hard [to find a seat].”

The Reading Room is not only used for studying. This jewel of the Law Quad, which was ranked 94th in a recent American Institute of Architect’s survey of the best-loved American architecture (See “Law School Is Not A Beauty Contest … Or Is It?” in the February 20, 2007 issue of the RG), is featured on admissions tours of the Law School and is the site of at least one event each Preview Weekend. “I predict nothing less than the decline and fall of Western civilization as a result of the cleaning of the lamps in the Reading Room,” cautioned Sarah Zearfoss, Dean of Admissions, sarcastically. Dean Zearfoss went on to explain that she does not “think the cleaning of the Reading Room lamps will affect either [admissions] yield or our ranking. Last time I checked, USNWR had taken the lumens per wattage category out of its calculus. The Admissions Office staff, being rather clever, will re-route the tour so that we don’t actually have to wear hard hats—and we have already planned something new for Preview Weekend. Finally, because every single member of our community is as charming and engaging as the Reading Room is beautiful, I think we will be able to make up for the temporary loss of the space.”

The Reading Room was chosen as the first step in this infrastructure upgrade because the work in that space will take the most time. The renovations will then continue into Hutchins Hall and the 9th floor of Legal Research, where work is scheduled to begin in the summer of 2008.

At present, there are no plans to update the wiring or lighting of any classrooms as part of this project.

“On the whole,” concluded Dean Zearfoss, “I think a one-semester cleaning and upgrade once a century is a fairly small inconvenience.”

FIRMS from Page 7
With an implicit threat built into the case, judges will be hard-pressed to decide otherwise. He bemoaned briefs that have actually cited cases that hurt the client. Finally, never underestimate a strong introduction. A litany of chronological facts will put the reader to sleep. Hermann urged associates to avoid the generic and strive for a gripping and powerful opening sentence. Often, the additional effort will pay off.

Don’t Forget Administrative Excellence
All too often, Hermann has had to spend time deciphering cryptic billing time entries like “SOL research.” Don’t be an annoyance to the partner; write down “statute of limitations research” on your time entries and check grammar. Indeed, Hermann explained that time entries are more likely to be seen by the CEO than any other work for the client. Bottom line: don’t skip corners when it comes to the small stuff.

Publications and Building a Practice
“Each article is a pain in the neck to write.” Nevertheless, Hermann highlights the importance of publications for building a practice. In his experience, publications beget more publications, and in time the rewards can be great for one’s practice. Speaking engagements and scholarly recognition will bring you to the forefront of clients’ minds. Further, the firm will be delighted to highlight your expertise for its “beauty contests” in the legal market. Hermann advises associates to start by picking something they know; critically, it need not be revolutionary. By keeping at it over the years, you will build the practice you want to have in the future.
“Twenty years from now you will be more disappointed by the things that you didn’t do than by the ones you did do. So throw off the bowlines. Sail away from the safe harbor. Catch the trade winds in your sails. Explore. Dream. Discover.” Join the staff of Res Gestae. You’ll be glad you did.

Res Gestae
rg@umich.edu

Swing by our office at 116 Legal Research and have a chat about how you can get involved. We’ll see you then.
Party Like
It’s Friday
The 13th!

Submitted by Adriel Sanders and Sarah Gleich

Last year many students cried foul when the Law School Student Senate sponsored Halloween Party sold out in a record 16 minutes. Despite LSSS’s attempts last year to measure demand we were shocked ourselves at how popular the event was. In response, we have decided to expand the party threefold.

We have moved from the Links to a new location at Whitmore Lake, Barnstormers, which will be able to accommodate up to 750 costumed law students and their friends. Also, unlike the previous venue, there is a giant airplane hanging from the ceiling, but please resist the urge to ride it; it’s strictly for decoration purposes only. Another cool aspect of this venue is that it has a sole form of transportation. And, to expand the party threefold.

Partiers will be able to compete to win prizes and prove their awesome-ness to the whole student body. Also, unlike the Links, there will be setting up video screens and game entertainment. Our awesome spinmaster, DJ Graffiti, is back for another year and is bringing some new features. He will be setting up video screens and game players from Rockstar games for those who are not interested in dancing. Partiers will be able to compete to win prizes and prove their awesome-ness to the whole student body.

As always buses will be provided as the sole form of transportation. And, food and refreshments will be provided, too! This is the 1L coming out party to the law school so make sure you’re there in spirit and costume.

TOYS from Page 5

work, you can go the cheap date route and snag a less expensive knock-off (the sex toy industry is a giant IP lawsuit waiting to happen, seriously), but you risk sacrificing quality; think of it as an investment in happiness. Websites like babeland.com (previously Toys in Babeland) and goodvibes.com have just about everything one could think of (and some things one couldn’t even imagine), in a variety price ranges, so you can feel free to shop with confidence (and minimal guilt about how you’re spending Uncle Stafford’s money). So buy a sex toy for Alabama, and use it however you please . . . though I will say that, if you’re headed to court in Oklahoma, we recommend you leave the plugs and pumps at home.

To submit a question or idea for Res Gestae’s new sex columnist, please feel free to e-mail rg@umich.edu, or, if you’d prefer greater anonymity, deposit your question under cover of night in the RG student group pendants outside Legal Research 116.

CHAMPION HOUSE from Page 8

of the cart. One piece had fallen onto the floor. That’s when we decided to change our filet order from medium rare to medium well.

My attention returned to our table with another round of slamming fists and drizzling beer. Our chef had arrived, and my companion sighed with relief—he was Asian. I wasn’t prepared to relax yet. During his performance, he dropped his knife three times and burned his hand on the stove trying to catch a low-falling spatula. He nearly singed my eyebrows off when he lit the oil on fire, another first in my vast teppanyaki experience. More fist slams. A drop of beer slid down my nose and fell onto my zucchini.

Honestly, most of the food wasn’t awful. The vegetables were more or less the same as at any teppanyaki table—over-salted and over-sauced onion and zucchini that I just can’t get enough of. The filet was a bit chewy at medium well, but still tasty. The lobster tail was delicious, though perhaps it is difficult to ruin lobster. The mustard sauce, however, was too thin. And the calamari sauce were actually awful. They lacked flavor and had the texture of a tempurpedic mattress. All in all, even ignoring the omission to offer a complimentary scoop of coconut ice cream with each meal, Champion House is by far the worst teppanyaki I have ever had. But it’s not any cheaper.

The family across from us had been replaced by a group of four boys in polo shirts. They were setting up their sake bombs. When my companion and I stood up, I looked across the restaurant. There were four frat boys at every other table. At some, the fists were coming down. At others, the cups we being set up. At the third set, the boys had abandoned the chopsticks altogether and just dropped their cups into the beer. In between them all were nuclear families with young children in various states of tantrums.

So, if you like sake bombs and absurdity, Champion House may very well your ultimate dining experience. If not, it still might be better than a trip to the circus. You should have heard what our frat boys were talking about. My companion and I pretended to be mesmerized by the fried rice to disguise our eavesdropping. Sociological studies aside, though, Champion House is a loser.
SCOTUS from Page 9

opinion of the case, according to Whitman, as it requires one more justice to reconsider a case (five) than to grant certiorari (four).

“This is a remarkable change,” she said. “I think there was a previous case, but not in modern times.”

It’s important to remember, Whitman said, that the Supreme Court will adjudicate only the issue of jurisdiction. The central question is whether Congress can strip federal courts of their power to hear habeas corpus cases where the defendant is not an American citizen and is not being held in the United States. “The only question here is whether the court can hear the challenge,” Whitman said, emphasizing that the case is not addressing the constitutionality of holding the prisoners.

Whitman and Caminker agreed that the court is unlikely to decide whether the detention itself is constitutional. “I think they’re going to try to make [the holding] as narrow as possible,” Caminker said.
3Ls Stepping Up to the Nannes Challenge; Only 136 Spots Left!

Submitted by Brian Ferry and Matt Maddox

This year’s Nannes 3L Challenge got off to a fantastic start on Thursday, October 4 at the Happy Hour Kickoff bash. Third-year students flocked to the patio at Bar Louie to enjoy 80 degree weather, drink specials, and free appetizers. Many 3Ls generously pledged their support at the Kickoff and helped the Challenge meet almost 1/3 of its goal in the first day!

The Nannes 3L Challenge is made possible by the generous support of alumnus John Nannes ’73. For the first 200 3Ls who pledge to support the Law School Fund annually for the first three years after graduation, Mr. Nannes will contribute $250 to the Law School student organization(s) of the donor’s choice. The money goes to the student organizations THIS YEAR and it is in addition to any money that the student organizations receive from LSSS and other sources.

The Challenge allows 3Ls to have an immediate impact upon student organizations that directly shape their law school experience. This has proved to forge a powerful connection between the idea of giving back and the ability to make an important difference in the life of the Law School community through philanthropy.

Last year, the class of 2007 filled all 200 spots and cashed in on the full $50,000. It is up to 136 more 3Ls to pitch in this year and continue this great tradition. Students can direct the $250 that Nannes contributes to any one of the many student organizations on campus, or to the Law School Fund or SFF.

Why Nannes?

• The Law School currently receives less than 2% of its budget from the state (in 1953, the state provided 40.9% of the Law School’s budget). Tuition revenue alone is not enough to cover the remaining expenses.
• The Law School Fund supports the debt management program for alumni working public interest jobs, and provides need-based financial aid for current students.
• Do it for the students! The $50,000 available to student groups through the Nannes Challenge is more than LSSS appropriates to all the student groups combined. Through the Challenge, your favorite student groups can double their war chests, paving the way for more activities, better speakers, more food, and more social events!
• Currently, UMLS’ educational programs rank at the top, but our alumni participation in annual giving lags significantly behind our peers.

How You Can Make Your Pledge:

First, get a Pledge form. You can contact a member of the Nannes 3L Committee (listed below), pick one up at the Reading Room desk, or complete a form online at http://www.law.umich.edu/campaign/thirdyearchallenge.htm. Second, fill out the Pledge form and be sure to designate the student organization(s) that should receive the $250 matching contribution.

Third, drop off your Pledge form before October 25, 2007 in the box located in the Reading Room, or submit it to any member of the Nannes 3L Committee.

So 3Ls, step up to the Nannes Challenge and fill the remaining 136 spots before October 25. Your pledge will provide immediate funding to student groups, and you do not have to pay anything until your first year after graduating! Help to make this year’s Challenge another smashing success.

Law School Events

**Tuesday, October 9**

**Movie Night (MELSA)** - The Middle Eastern Law Students Association will show the documentary “Promises,” which follows the journey of one of the filmmakers to a Palestinian refugee camp and to an Israeli settlement in the West Bank, and to the more familiar neighborhoods of Jerusalem where he meets seven Palestinian and Israeli children. Though the children live only 20 minutes apart, they exist in completely separate worlds; the physical, historical and emotional obstacles between them run deep. (106 min./ Arabic, Hebrew, and Eng. dialogue w/ Eng. subtitles). 7 - 9pm; Ann Arbor Art Center, 117 W. Liberty Street.

**Thursday, October 11**

**National Coming-Out Day (Outlaws)** - Outlaws will be tabling in support of National Coming Out Day and in opposition to the Military’s Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell policy. 11:30am - 1:30pm; tables outside 100 HH.

**Bar Exam Information Meeting (Dean of Academic Affairs)** - Informational meeting for third-year students planning to take a state bar exam in February or July. 12:20 - 1:20 pm; 218 HH.

**Women’s Survival Tips Panel (WLSA)** - A panel of upperclasswomen will discuss strategies for success in law school. 12:20 - 1:20 pm; 150 HH.

**“The Art of Fine Wines” (Wolverine Wine Club)** - Wine tasting featuring a selection of 6 wines with distinct varietal characteristics (like a Wine 101, identifying flavors like tannin, fruit, etc.). The event is catered and light hors d’oeuvres will be served. 7 - 10pm; Ann Arbor Art Center, 117 W. Liberty Street.

**Saturday, October 20**

**Client Counseling Competition Workshop (Office of Student Affairs)** - Training workshop for those who signed up to participate in the American Bar Association Law Student Division 2007-08 Client Counseling Competition. 8 am - 1 pm; 120 HH.

**Monday, October 22**

**Bake Sale (Michigan Law Culinary Club)** - MLCC will be selling baked goods and lunch items outside 100 HH. 11 am - 2 pm.

**Managing Partner Panel Presentation - The Future of Law Firms (Dean of Academic Affairs)** - Prof. Karl Lutz will moderate a panel of managing partners of large law firms. Discussion topics include the future of large law firm practice, distinctions among and between firms, advice to students for success in firm practice and how to become a valued member of the firm. 12:15 - 1:30 pm; 218 HH.

**International Law Workshop** - H.E. Judge Bruno Simma, International Court of Justice; Affiliated Overseas Faculty, University of Michigan Law School, will speak about his experiences. 4 - 5:15 pm; 120 HH.

---

**NANNES 3L CHALLENGE**

MAKE YOUR PLEDGE TODAY

HTTP://WWW.LAW.UMICH.EDU/CAMPAIGN/THIRTYYEARCHALLENGE.HTM