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Annual Tax Challenge Team Takes Top Honors in Texas

By Sharon Ceresnie

Second year students Erika Andersen and Jeremy Dardick earned First Place Honors at the American Bar Association’s Second Annual Tax Challenge on January 24. They prevailed over teams from Southern Methodist University, University of Connecticut and Stetson University.

The Tax Challenge, which is essentially a moot court for tax related issues, required the teams to analyze a problem regarding a partnership merger and to submit a brief on the various tax implications. The competition in San Antonio involved two rounds; the first was a hypothetical partner meeting at a law firm and the second a hypothetical client meeting. The two rounds required the teams to conform their advising skills and advocacy skills to these two distinct audiences.

Judges for the competition included Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, B. John Williams, and the Deputy Secretary of Treasury for Tax Policy, Pam Olson.

After having prepared for a month rather than the allotted two months, Andersen and Dardick were skeptical that they would make it to the semi-finals, let alone win the competition. “It was unexpected to win this year,” said Andersen. Both said that they entered the competition because they were interested in the subject matter and had no expectation of winning the competition, although they were pleasantly surprised.

The second round was especially fun, they both said. Because the second round involved counseling clients, the team had to figure out how to explain the tax problems in ways that clients would understand, without the tax legalese that lawyers use when talking to each other. Andersen said she was surprised at how non-technical they had to be during the client counseling round.

The team is glad that they took part in the competition and said that they learned a lot. “I think it was a really good experience,” said Dardick. Andersen and Dardick say that participating in the competition has helped them understand their classes better, especially tax and corporate classes.

Both hope to practice in the area of tax law after law school. They cite the problem solving and litigation involved in tax law as some of the things that have attracted them to the field. “There is a huge amount of litigation,” said Andersen. “But you can play to the judges. It’s a different aspect of litigation.”

Andersen, who, before coming to law school was a CPA, felt that practicing in the area of tax was a logical next step in her career. But Dardick, who majored in Philosophy in college, did not come to law school with the idea that he would pursue tax law, but has found that he really enjoys the problem solving involved.

If other students are thinking about participating in the Tax Challenge next year, Andersen and Dardick encourage students to go for it. “Just do it,” said Andersen. “It can’t hurt. The very worst is that you don’t move on. The potential upside is really good.”

Special: Extended Moot Court Coverage; RG Congratulates All Participants
WLSA Members Urge Input on Faculty Hiring

By Andy Daly

You saw the e-mails earlier in the semester. They informed you that some faculty candidate, whose name you were probably not familiar with, would be meeting with students later that afternoon. In all likelihood you didn’t do anything about it. That’s because, according to WLSA members Bill Novomisle and Jamie Brown, only two or three students, if any, usually attend these talks. It is a situation they would like to see changed.

Novomisle, a member of WLSA’s Faculty Hiring Committee, explains that the afternoon meetings represent the end of an important visit for the prospective faculty members. During this visit the candidate meets with administrators, faculty and students throughout the day. It is a day that is central to the Law School’s hiring process.

The afternoon meetings are the second opportunity for students to observe the faculty candidates. The first is an opportunity offered through LSSS, which allows students to enter upon the hallowed ground of the faculty lounge for a lunchtime meeting during which the candidate will present a paper and answer queries from the faculty. This discussion runs between 35 and 45 minutes in length, followed by the faculty pressing the candidate on the weak points of his or her paper, testing the candidate’s academic grit. Student groups are invited to observe this academic discussion in small numbers, but generally do not participate directly.

Brown, who is one of two WLSA co-chairs on faculty hiring, points out that LSSS, WLSA and OUTLAWS consistently send representatives to these faculty presentations. She attributes this participation to a desire to “make the faculty aware that we are there and are not going away.” WLSA’s participation in particular, she adds, is to make sure that proper consideration is given to potential hires that are sensitive to women’s issues. In fact, students do have a voice in the process as LSSS holds one of the votes on the Law School’s hiring committee.

By stark contrast to the high-pressure environment of the lunchtime presentation, the afternoon student forum is a much more informal affair. There is no paper to be presented, nor a prepared speech; instead, it is an opportunity for students to interact on an intimate basis with the would-be professor. Novomisle underscores, however, that while informal, the discussion is certainly important to the hiring process. He explains that the meeting allows law students to explore the views and personality of the professor. Further, it gives an opportunity to the candidate to gauge the level of engagement of the student body and the caliber of students at the school.

Brown is particularly concerned that lack of student participation will be equated with apathy.

Novomisle and Brown note that, for prospective hires that are not currently teaching at the Law School, the student session is the last impression the candidate gets before leaving campus. Seeing as these are often highly sought after individuals, the WLSA members insist that this impression is crucial and urge students to attend.
Sports Law Team Makes “Final Four”

By Marc Edelman

As a rookie squad in this year’s 32-school field, the Michigan Sports Law Society team of Kristin Neilson, Marc Edelman and Monica Dorman reached the semifinals in the 13th annual Tulane Mardi Gras Invitational.

This year’s moot court problem addressed whether the New York Yankees could state a claim against Major League Baseball (MLB) executives for breach of their good-faith fiduciary duty, after having been informed that MLB executives agreed to a revenue sharing plan, which disparately impacted the Yankees.

As part of the competition, the Michigan Law team was required to submit a brief on behalf of the New York Yankees. Team members Kristin Neilson and Marc Edelman then argued this brief against rival schools at the Eastern District of Louisiana Federal Courthouse. The team also argued the other side of this same issue—in favor of Major League Baseball.

On Wednesday, February 26, the Michigan team faced two preliminary rounds of competition. Although neither participant had argued orally since first-year legal practice, the team learned during the evening’s banquet that they performed well enough to reach the “Sweet Sixteen.”

Having shaken off early-round jitters, the team proceeded on Thursday, February 27 to argue past New York Law and Connecticut Law School. The competition stiffened in these two rounds, as Michigan faced questions from judges that had a greater understanding of labor, contract and antitrust law.

Along the road to the “Final Four,” Michigan Law had the opportunity to meet judges with a range of experience, including one judge that sat the Florida Court of Appeals bench. The Michigan Law team was also invited by Tulane Law School to enjoy the nightlife of New Orleans, partying atop one of the city’s many bars/balconies in downtown Bourbon Street.

That Friday, Michigan Law returned to the courtroom for a final time, eventually suffering defeat to Loyola University—the tournament’s champions. Nevertheless, as first-time competitors in the field, the Michigan Law team enjoyed the opportunity to develop writing and oral advocacy skills, as well as the chance to meet other law students interested in sports.

Sports Law Moot Court is a great opportunity for students to address issues that cut across various fields of law. It was also a fun time. The team wishes to thank Charlotte Johnson, Trudy Feldkamp and the Law School Student Senate for helping to fund the team’s competition expenses.

Law School Advances in International Moot Court Competition

By Jessie Grodstein

The Law School’s team competing in the Jessup International Moot Court Competition will be among many University of Michigan representatives gathering on the nation’s capital this week. The 2003 International Round of the Jessup Moot Court competition coincides with the April presentation of oral arguments for the University’s affirmative action case. Michigan’s team successfully secured a spot in the international competition after winning the regional round in Madison, Wisconsin this February, and will now join nearly 300 other teams from nearly 80 different countries in final round in Washington, D.C.

Only 12 American law schools actually advance to the international competition, and Michigan has consistently advanced. This year’s success is due largely to the strength of team members Una Kim, 2L, Paul Hood, 3L, Francis Franze, 3L, Anthony Gill, 2L, Stacy Spain, 3L, Roger Stetson, 3L, and Suzanne Besette, 1L.

The topic of this year’s competition combines issues related to civil war and rape, trafficking in women, and adoption, which Kim described as a “really cool, really complex problem.” To prepare, the team spent hours pouring through international law treaties and sorting through reams of Westlaw printouts.

The team gathers at least three times a week, averaging about nine to twelve hours of formal practice time. Apart from this preparation, Kim estimated that she averaged 35 to 40 hours researching and preparing for her oral argument. The competition is structured so that there are two teams of two students who work together to write a brief and prepare oral argument. Each student argues for twenty to twenty-two minutes, an extraordinary amount of time considering that many moot court competitions cap arguments at ten minutes.

Michigan’s team is also unique in that it is entirely student-run. There is no formal advisor for the Jessup team; Spain and Stetson serve as coaches. Further help comes from Professors Reimann, Kritsotis, and Hathaway, who have critiqued the team’s arguments and style.

According to Kim, one of the most interesting aspects of the Jessup competition is that students litigate international law. “We get to interact with professors on an intimate level,” said Kim. “The competition is so much fun.”

---
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Putting the Hammer Down For Charity:  
SFF Auction A Big Hit!
Students Compete in National Environmental Moot Court Competition

By John Fedynsky

Every year, Pace University in White Plains, New York hosts the National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition. This year, Andrea Delgadillo, 1L summer starter, Erica Soderdahl, 2L, David Alderson, 3L, and their faculty advisor, clinical law professor David Santacroce, represented the Law School and traveled to New York on the weekend of February 20-22. They advanced to the quarterfinal round.

About 40 teams with two or three persons per team competed. Each team had to submit an appellate brief, which was due on December 3. The Law School’s team began working in October. Sarah Bickler, 2L, and Michael Bowling, 3L, former competitors, assisted the competing students. “We worked so hard,” said Delgadillo. “I was researching a lot of stuff from scratch,” she said. The team submitted a 60-page brief before the deadline in early December. Substantive argument comprised 35 pages of the brief.

The team wrote a brief on behalf of an intervening party under the fictitious facts of the case outlined in the problem. The case arose under the Clean Air and Water Act. One of three main issue areas was whether the Act’s definition of navigable water included arroyos, dry riverbeds predominantly in deserts in the Southwest that fill with water only periodically. The second issue was whether congressional power under the Commerce Clause extends to the regulation of arroyos. Finally, there were issues of federalism and EPA preemption of state law.

After the team submitted its brief, Professor Santacroce began helping them with their oral arguments. “We practiced so much,” said Delgadillo. At the competition, the team did oral arguments for the intervenors and for the other parties for whom the students did not prepare a brief. The judges were primarily practicing lawyers. In two rounds, Soderdahl was named best oralist. Delgadillo earned that distinction in one round as well. “Oral argument was a little nerve-wracking,” said Delgadillo, who had not had practiced public speaking since taking a course in her sophomore year of college.

According to Delgadillo, the Environmental Law Society paid for the bulk of the students’ travel expenses. The workload was significant. “It was like taking another course, especially the brief writing,” she said. Though not advancing past the quarterfinal stage was “disappointing,” said Delgadillo, “the experience was well worth the work.”

What Am I Bid? More SFF!

SFF Pledge Drive and Phonathon

March 31 to April 3
Tables HH 100 and on Your Phone

“A Day’s Pay Goes a Long Way”

Don’t pay until summer when checks start rolling in.
79th Annual Henry M. Campbell Moot

Federal Judges Guido Calebresi, Henry T. Edwards and Marsha Berzon

Origin of the Henry M. Campbell Moot Court Competition

Henry Munroe Campbell, in whose honor this competition is named, was a distinguished lawyer who served as legal counsel to the University of Michigan's Board of Regents for several years.

Mr. Campbell was born in 1854, the son of famed Michigan Supreme Court Justice James V. Campbell. He graduated from the University of Michigan in 1876 and later from the University of Michigan Law School. In 1878, he established a law partnership in Detroit with Henry Russell. Over the years, the firm prospered and continues today as the Detroit-based firm of Dickinson Wright PLLC.

Mr. Campbell became an attorney of considerable eminence in Michigan and was widely regarded as a scholar on constitutional law. He helped draft the Michigan Constitution in 1908 and served as chief counsel to the delegates who petitioned the Michigan Supreme Court to secure early submission of the document to the electorate.

Mr. Campbell maintained a keen interest in the affairs and growth of the University of Michigan. In the case Board of Regents of the University of Michigan v. Auditor General (1911), he successfully argued to establish the principle of constitutional autonomy for the University and its governing body.

Mr. Campbell was well-liked and an inspiring teacher. One of the young lawyers he trained recalled years later that "he created and foster a sense of loyalty, cooperation and uncompromising integrity that must endure. To him the law was a science, its profession a service."

Following Mr. Campbell's death in 1926, his law partners met with then University of Michigan Law School Dean Henry M. Bates to discuss a fitting memorial. It was decided to establish, in his honor, a case club competition to foster training for law students in appellate advocacy. The first Henry M. Campbell competition was held in the 1927-28 academic year.

A trust fund was established in 1927 and has been periodically augmented with gifts from Dickinson Wright PLLC. Each year prizes are paid from the income of the trust fund to the finalists in the Henry M. Campbell Moot Court Competition.

Text Courtesy of Campbell Moot Court Board

Courtesy of Dickinson Wright PLLC
Summary of the Facts of the Problem

After the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, Congress passes the Stop Terrorism at Home Act (“STAHA”), which aims to weed out terrorist cells in the United States by creating special registration and monitoring provisions for all aliens living in United States from nations considered “suspect.” Along with these registration requirements, “suspect aliens” are required to disclose details regarding their personal lives, including all of their educational, employment, and financial activities. The F.B.I. will use information gathered pursuant to the Act in its counter-terrorism efforts. Suspect aliens are also subject to domestic and international travel restrictions, and must submit to an interview. Following the passage of STAHA, the F.B.I. issues a criminal profile, based largely on ethnic and racial characteristics, to be used by local law enforcement in their counter-terrorism efforts.

The petitioner, Muhammad Saad, is a citizen of Syria but has resided as a lawful permanent alien in the United States since he was a child. The state of Hutchins police pulled Saad over on the basis of the criminal profile. The police officer possessed probable cause to pull over the vehicle under the Fourth Amendment because Saad was traveling above the posted speed limit. However, the officer admits that he pulled Saad over because he fit the F.B.I.’s profile. Upon searching the vehicle, the officer discovered evidence of illegal gambling and money laundering. It was also discovered that Saad failed to register as a “suspect alien” under STAHA.

Saad’s first claim is that the registration and monitoring requirements of STAHA are unconstitutional under the equal protection component of the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause. Saad’s second claim is that the stop and search of his vehicle violated the Fourteenth Amendment Equal Protection Clause, because he was targeted on the basis of criminal profile based on ethnicity/race. He argues that because the stop of the car was unlawful, all evidence seized must be suppressed.

The District Court dismissed the Fifth Amendment challenge to STAHA’s registration provisions, holding that the Act is within Congress’ power to regulate immigration and is therefore not subject to judicial scrutiny. The District Court found that the stop based on the criminal profile did violate the Fourteenth Amendment, but that suppression of evidence is not required for violations of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The Circuit Court affirmed the District Court in all parts, and the U.S. Supreme Court granted the writ of certiorari to determine whether the Stop Terrorism at Home Act’s immigration registration requirements and criminal penalties codified at 8 U.S.C. §§ 451-57 and 18 U.S.C. § 968 violate the equal protection component of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment; and whether police reliance on a generalized criminal profile, containing racial and ethnic components, in conducting an otherwise lawful traffic stop and search, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and whether evidence obtained therefrom must be suppressed.

Text Courtesy of Campbell Moot Court Board
Guido Calabresi

Judge Calabresi was appointed United States Circuit Judge in July 1994, and entered into duty on September 16, 1994. Prior to his appointment, he was Dean and Sterling Professor at the Yale Law School where he began teaching in 1959. He continues to serve as a member of that faculty as Sterling Professor Emeritus and Professorial Lecturer.

Judge Calabresi received his B.S. degree, summa cum laude, from Yale College in 1953, a B.A. degree with First Class Honors from Magdalen College, Oxford University, in 1955, an L.L.B. degree, magna cum laude, in 1958 from Yale Law School, and an M.A. in Politics, Philosophy and Economics from Oxford University in 1959. A Rhodes Scholar and member of Phi Beta Kappa and Order of the Coif, Judge Calabresi served as the Note Editor of the Yale Law Journal, 1957-58, while graduating first in his law school class.

Following graduation, Judge Calabresi clerked for Justice Hugo Black of the United States Supreme Court. He has been awarded more than thirty honorary degrees from universities in the United States and abroad, and is the author of four books and over eighty articles on law and related subjects.

Source: http://www.ca2.uscourts.gov/

The 2002-2003 Final Round Judges

Marsha S. Berzon

Court: United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Appointed by: President Clinton, March, 2000
Born: April 17, 1945 in Cincinnati, Ohio.
Education: BA, Radcliffe (1966); JD, UC Berkeley (1973).
Law Practice: Clerk, Ninth Circuit Judge James Browning (1973-74); Clerk, United States Supreme Court Justice William Brennan (1974-75); Woll & Meyer (1975-77); Altshuler, Berzon, Nussbaum, Berzon & Rubin (1978-99); Associate General Counsel, AFL-CIO (1987-99).
Judicial Appointments: Ninth Circuit (2000-present)

Source: http://www.appellatecounselor.com

Some Recent Winners and Their Accomplishments:

Tracy Gonos - Pro Bono Students America, NYU
Randi Vickers - clerk for Alaska Supreme Court

Some Recent Campbell Final Judges:

Dennis Archer, Michigan Supreme Court, 1990
Antonin Scalia, U.S. Supreme Court, 1992
Patricia Boyle, Michigan Supreme Court, 1992
Anthony Scirica, ’65 alum, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, 1994
Shirley Abramson, Supreme Court of Wisconsin, 1995
Avern Cohn, (J.D. U of M ’49), US District Court-Eastern District Michigan, 1996

Stephen Reinhardt, U.S. Court of Appeals-Ninth Circuit, 1996 and 2002
Julian Cook, U.S. District Court-Eastern District Michigan, 1997
John Feikens, (J.D. U of M ’41), U.S. District Court-Eastern District Michigan, 1999
Louis Pollak, U.S. District Court-Eastern District Pennsylvania, 2001

Some Recent Winners and Their Accomplishments:

Matt Roskoski - clerk for Judge Higginbotham, 5th Circuit
Eric Olsen - clerk for Justice Stevens, US Supreme Court
Paul Diller - clerk for Judge Becker, 3rd Circuit
Benjamin Mizer - clerk for Judge Rogers, D.C. Circuit; clerk for Justice Stevens, U.S. Supreme Ct, 2003

This year, each winner will receive a $400 award and each runner-up will receive $300 from the Campbell trust fund.

Harry T. Edwards

Judge Edwards was appointed to the U.S. Court of Appeals in February 1980 and served as Chief Judge from September 15, 1994, until July 15, 2001. He graduated from Cornell University in 1962 and the University of Michigan Law School in 1965. Judge Edwards practiced law in Chicago from 1963 to 1970. He was then a tenured member of the faculties at the University of Michigan Law School, where he taught from 1970 to 1975 and 1977 to 1980, and at Harvard Law School, where he taught from 1975 to 1977. He also taught at the Harvard Institute for Educational Management between 1976 and 1982. He served as a member and then Chairman of the Board of Directors of AMTRAK from 1978 to 1980, and also served as a neutral labor arbitrator under a number of major collective bargaining agreements during the 1970s. Judge Edwards has co-authored four books and published scores of law review articles on labor law, higher education law, federal courts, legal education, professionalism, and judicial administration. Since joining the court, he has taught law at Harvard, Michigan, Duke, Pennsylvania, Georgetown, and, most recently, NYU Law School.

Source: http://www.cadc.uscourts.gov
## Grade Curves: Get 'em While They're Hot!

### Grade Summary - Part

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Section</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Grade Distribution</th>
<th>Number Receiving Each Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>781.001</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSY 201</td>
<td>Hobel</td>
<td>A+ A A- B+ B B-</td>
<td>14 12 8 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782.002</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>CHE 101</td>
<td>Heiss</td>
<td>A+ A A- B+ B B-</td>
<td>14 12 8 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783.003</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>HIST 201</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>A+ A A- B+ B B-</td>
<td>14 12 8 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784.004</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 201</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>A+ A A- B+ B B-</td>
<td>14 12 8 6 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Section</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Grade Distribution</th>
<th>Number Receiving Each Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>781.001</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSY 201</td>
<td>Hobel</td>
<td>A+ A A- B+ B B-</td>
<td>14 12 8 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782.002</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>CHE 101</td>
<td>Heiss</td>
<td>A+ A A- B+ B B-</td>
<td>14 12 8 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783.003</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>HIST 201</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>A+ A A- B+ B B-</td>
<td>14 12 8 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784.004</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 201</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>A+ A A- B+ B B-</td>
<td>14 12 8 6 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cursive - The Ugly Organ

By Steve Boender

Cursive - The Ugly Organ

The bronze medalist of the Saddle Creek Records roster (behind The Faint and Bright Eyes), Cursive, returns with their first LP since Cursive's Domestica, released in 2000. Domestica, hailed by many as one of indie-rock's best of the year, firmly established Cursive's image as a cross between Fugazi and the Cure. However, with The Ugly Organ, the band has changed the formula considerably, incorporating carnival organs, a full-time cellist, and choirs into their already unique sound. On top of that, The Ugly Organ is of all things, a concept album!

Okay, perhaps it's a bit of a stretch to call it a concept album. Sure, the liner notes include stage directions and character dialogue, the songs meld into one another, and the album has a coherent overarching theme, but I still don't think it is fair to label it that. The theme of the record deals with the trials and tribulations (mostly the trials...ok, it's only the trials) of both being in a band, and being in a relationship. That's why it's not a concept album. Concept albums are supposed to be about differently-abled pinball players and walls and stuff, not about the very things that pop music is based upon. Plus, concept albums are by and large really, really, really, ridiculously dorky by today's standards (Operation: Mindcrime, anyone?). I wouldn't expect a Cursive laser light show anytime soon.

Concept or not, the music will have you jumping off the walls, and the lyrics will have you jumping out the window. This is the type of record that can push an already-depressed person right over the edge. Which is why I like it...a lot. In "Art is Hard," Cursive frontman Tim Kasher sings of the listening audience's desire to hear about his misery, "You gotta' fake the pain, you better make it sting, you're gonna break a leg when you get on stage and they scream your name, 'Oh, Cursive is so cool!'" He definitely don't like them can get a seven-figure deal from major labels eager to scoop up the Hot Topic crowd. Cursive could have cashed in on the phenomenon by putting out a simple, verse-chorus-scream-verse emo record, but they opted out of that one. Instead, the record is densely layered with organs, choirs, strings, and some of the most complex guitar-playing on a rock record in some time. Most impressive is the newly-added cellist, Gretta Cohn. One section of the album's opening track, "Some Red-Handed Sleight of Hand" has got an amazing cello part that has to be heard to be believed. It sounds like the Kronos Quartet on trucker speed.

The album's Mogwai-influenced big finish is perhaps its finest moment, a swirling build up of drums, effects-laden guitars, and Kasher's drunken voice climax, then fade away, leaving only the cello and the choir singing, "the worst is over," leaving the listener wishing that Kasher's misery would last for one more song, but the record ends. At the close, I felt kind of guilty. After listening to Kasher bemoan the fact that he has to be miserable in order to make good art, here I was wishing more misery upon him. However, he's in a great band and I'm in law school so if he's a little sad from time to time, he'll just have to deal with it.
ACROSS
1. Dunces
6. Owns
9. 1986 Pulitzer-winning composer
14. Skirt type
15. Egg
16. Pivotal
17. Fuzzy
18. Nothing
19. Catarrh
20. Disturb
22. Pleats
23. Over, poetically
24. Fly high
26. Hippie phrase
30. R. Kelly hit
34. Love in Paris
35. Proclamation
36. Due
37. Skier's lift
38. Mark
39. Sequence of 8 bits
40. Cyst
41. Hillock
42. "Sold" homophone
43. Armories
45. Burns
46. Kid's toy piece
47. "Gotcha!"
48. Chocolate
51. Models have these
57. Plant louse
58. Kind
59. "___ but goodie"
60. Archaic for "peas"
61. Ocean
62. Shut
63. Finished
64. Heavy weight
65. Go-cart

DOWN
1. Jewel of the East
2. North Carolina, 28660
3. Atomic number 30
4. Existence pre-fix
5. "Doctor Quinn" actress
6. Repute
7. Devoted
8. Store employee
9. Layered dessert
10. Appeal urgently
11. Cambodian unit of money
12. Glorify
13. Some trees
21. Already acquainted
23. One time only
24. Pivotal
26. Islamic scholar's legal opinion
27. Resin
28. Speckled horses
29. Yours and mine
30. Icons
31. Romantic interlude
32. Revealed
33. Necessities
34. Type of biologist
35. Sawyer
36. Not shut
37. Shallow African lake
38. Butter substitute
39. Flapper accessory
40. Massaged
41. Not happy
42. Grouping of Native American language families
43. Cod or Horn predecessor
44. Fictitious inhabitant at The Plaza
45. Not shut
46. Shallow African lake
47. Butter substitute
48. Earthenware pot
49. Smell
50. Coffin
51. Models have these
52. Butter substitute
53. Earthenware pot
54. Smell
55. Coffin
56. Looks
Law School Talent Show  
Friday, April 4, at 8:00 P.M.  
Pioneer High  
Buses Leave from State & Monroe at 7:30

The Asian Pacific American Law Students Association presents its 3rd annual charity basketball tournament!!!!  
When: Saturday, April 5, 6pm  
Where: IM Building  
Who: Anyone!! - there will be both men's and co-ed divisions  
What: 5 on 5 Full Court games  
How Much: $50 — only $10 per person!  
All proceeds will go to Detroit charities  
Sign up via email by sending the name of your team and the names of your players to pechung@umich.edu.

THE HONORABLE GUIDO CALABRESI  
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit  
Thursday, April 3  
12:20pm  
150 Hutchins Hall  
Pizza Lunch Talk with Judge Calabresi is sponsored by The AMERICAN CONSTITUTION SOCIETY

Ticket Sale: Skate For Justice To Benefit Access To Justice Fund  
Event Contact: Brian Schwartz, bschwarz@umich.edu, 734.764.9036  
Michigan law students and lawyers will don their skates on Sunday, April 6, 2003 in downtown Detroit for a very good cause - to help poor people with pressing unmet civil legal needs. A "Skate For Justice" tournament will be held at Joe Louis Arena beginning at 10:00 a.m., with the net proceeds from the event donated to the State Bar of Michigan's Access to Justice Fund to benefit the general operations of civil legal aid programs throughout the state.

Tournament Schedule  
10:00 a.m. Wayne State University v. University of Detroit Mercy  
11:00 a.m. Mich. State University v. Detroit College of Law v University of Michigan / Ave Maria  
1:00 p.m. Consolation Game  
2:00 p.m. Championship Game for the Justice Cup  
Zamboni rides will be offered between games and a skate with the players will be offered from noon until 12:45 p.m. Tickets are $5 each. To purchase tickets contact bschwarz@umich.edu, brehlerp@umich.edu, or call 734.764.9036.

After the tournament, a reception celebrating the efforts and involvement of all participants, organizers and fans is scheduled for 4:00 p.m. at Maverick's Food and Spirits at 630 Woodward Avenue.

Ohio Bar Takers  
The Supreme Court of Ohio requires that students taking their bar exam complete one hour of alcohol & substance abuse training. Diane Nafirnowitz, MSW and Director of the Lawyer's Club will conduct this training on Wednesday, April 16, 2003 from 10:00-11:00 a.m. in the Lawyer's Club Faculty Dining Room. Advanced sign-up is required in the Office of the Registrar, 300 HH or by e-mailing lawrecords@umich.edu.

Send Your Announcements to RG@umich.edu

2003-2004 Financial Aid Deadline Approaches  
The financial aid deadline for the 2003-2004 academic year is Friday, April 18, 2003. Please have your forms submitted by that time if you would like to be processed for financial aid. Complete instructions are available online at: www.law.umich.edu/currentstudents/financialaid/applying.htm. If you have any questions about the application process please contact the Financial Aid Office, 310 HH or 734.764.5289.