Chapman’s 2014-2015 Dialogue Series Presents:

TOM GOLDSTEIN

“Perspectives on Finding Your Niche and Personalizing Your Path in Law”
If you are anything like me, and you probably are because you are in law school, you feel like your purpose in life is about more than just self-service.

Sure, a lot of us law students are A-type personalities, we love to prove a point and the hope for a future payoff motivates us to endure school.

What I am talking about, though, is an innate and genuine desire to make the world a better place. Maybe that looks like fighting for the rights of the underprivileged, or helping kids escape an abusive situation, or putting bad guys behind bars.

Whatever that looks like for you, I encourage you to figure it out sooner, rather than later, and make that your reason for going to class everyday, for staying up late to read for class, and for putting your best effort into that seemingly inconsequential paper.

While law school may not mimic exactly law practice, we are here to learn information and practice skills that turn us into valuable, analytical lawyers, not legal robots. Figure out what is going to make you happy, and then go and do it. Settling for a big firm job in a field that doesn’t interest you because it pays well will eventually make you miserable.

I can tell you from my own experience that family law doesn’t suit me, and I don’t want to spend my time helping big companies sue eachother. Entertainment law, though, makes me happy. I can talk about it all day, to anyone who asks. And that’s how I know its my passion.

Find yours, and law school will be that much easier to swallow. Have a great year, and don’t get bogged down in the details!

- **Ryan Anderson, Editor-in-Chief**
Get the winning edge and sail away with higher grades on your law school examinations. Don’t set sail for your legal exams at half mast. Sign aboard for the Exam Solution® now and learn first-hand why it’s superior to any other learning aid on the market. It’s an adventure in learning that will exceed all your expectations!

**What THE EXAM SOLUTION® Will Do For You...**

- Review specific areas of Law through Outlines designed for each area covered. *(This material is not available in published form.)*
- Provide Exam Approach and Checklist for each area covered.
- Provide Writing Technique for each area covered.
- Develop Outline Organization techniques for each area covered.
- Structure Adversary Arguments within the IRAC format.
- Provide Exam Analysis and Issue Spotting for each area covered.
- Outline and Analyze two final exam hypotheticals for each area covered.
- Most of all, THE EXAM SOLUTION will help train you to Write Superior Answers.
- Provide Excellent Review for Multistate Examinations.

**Fall 2014 Schedule of THE EXAM SOLUTION® Classes...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Class Name</th>
<th>Class Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, November 14, 2014</td>
<td>6:00 pm to 10:30 pm</td>
<td>Real Property I°</td>
<td>Ayres Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, November 18, 2014</td>
<td>5:30 pm to 9:45 pm</td>
<td>Contracts I - U.C.C.°</td>
<td>National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 19, 2014</td>
<td>5:30 pm to 9:45 pm</td>
<td>Torts I°</td>
<td>National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, November 21, 2014</td>
<td>6:00 pm to 10:30 pm</td>
<td>Civil Procedure I°</td>
<td>Ayres Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, November 22, 2014</td>
<td>1:00 pm to 5:30 pm</td>
<td>Constitutional Law I°</td>
<td>Ayres Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, November 23, 2014</td>
<td>Noon to 6:00 pm</td>
<td>Evidence°</td>
<td>Fleming’s Corporate Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short Term Bar Review

Preparation for February 2015 Bar Exam

Classes Meet Saturday, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, Sunday, 9:00 am to 5:30 pm and Monday & Tuesday, 6:00 pm to 10:30 pm

For more information, call us at 1-800–LAW EXAM or find us on the web at www.lawprepare.com

facebook.com/lawprepare twitter.com/lawprepare
SUSAN G. KOMEN RACE FOR THE CURE
SEPTEMBER 28, 2014

Three Fowler Law students and one alumna teamed up to fight cancer and raise awareness. 3Ls Hannah Passano, Michelina Perani and Ravyn Rowland, joined by 2014 Alum Stephanie Lincoln and a local lawyer, completed the 5k course in support of the Susan G. Komen Foundation’s education and fundraising event, “Race for the Cure.”

Since it’s founding in 1982, the name Susan G. Komen has been synonymous with raising breast cancer awareness. In 1991, the Orange County affiliate was created and over the last 23 years fundraising events like Race for the Cure and the Pink Tie Ball have brought in millions of dollars towards the goal of providing life-saving services for uninsured men and women in the community. According to their website, komenoc.org, in 2013 more than $1.2 million in grants were awarded to twelve diverse local organizations throughout Orange County. Seventy-five percent of the $35 million dollars raised goes to local breast health needs and services. The remaining 25% goes to the Susan G. Komen Award and Research Grant Program to fund groundbreaking breast cancer research.

AIDS WALK LOS ANGELES
OCTOBER 12, 2014

For the second consecutive year Chapman’s OUTlaw team, consisting this year of 3Ls Ravyn Rowland, Michelina Perani, and ’14 alumna Marissa McDonald participated in LA’s annual AIDS walk.

The first official AIDS Walk was developed in 1984 during the peak of the AIDS epidemic, and it is affiliated with AIDS Project Los Angeles (APLA). This year was the 29th AIDS Walk, which has become the largest AIDS fundraising event in California, drawing over 30,000 participants together annually to fight HIV/AIDS. Since 1985, AIDS Walk LA has brought together over a half-million participants to collectively raise over $75 million to run preventative programs and to provide vital services for those living with AIDS.

- Michelina Perani
“It’s a beautiful day, don’t let it get away.”

Well at least it was a beautiful day until many iPhone users became outraged that Apple was giving away free access to U2’s newest album *Songs of Innocence* because it suddenly appeared in their music library.

This was far from “the miracle” for which most people hope. When iPhone user’s virtual storage was occupied, it put them in a place called “Vertigo”.

So why all this outrage over free stuff? After all, Chapman students love free stuff, as evidenced by the highlighter hungry crowds swarming promotional tables during lunch.

This, however, is not “The First Time” U2 and Apple have teamed up.

Flash back to 2006. The bar exam is nothing more than a mythological drinking game, the television plays idly in the background, and suddenly the new iPod commercial with U2 playing in the background promoting a customized U2 version of the iPod.

The consensus however, is not so much anti-U2, but instead the feeling of people’s privacy being invaded when Apple forced something into their phones.

Now, flash back to less than a year ago. Every iPhone user is familiar with the tedious process of updating their Apple product. After what seems like an infinite number of steps and clicking “agree” and “continue”, users finally come to the glorious finished window.

It doesn’t take a contracts law professor to know that despite not reading a word, by upgrading their product, users have just agreed to all of Apple’s terms. These terms include giving Apple the ability to automatically download content for you.

While some consider it a horrific madness, tech savvy users know that there is a simple remedy…left swipe, delete. Despite the easy fix, Apple has received such harsh criticism by accessing user’s private virtual cloud, that it is very unlikely they would try again in this way to force content onto its users.

Regardless of how protestors feel, it is clear that both Apple and U2 will do just fine, “with or without you.”

- Arthur Kamali
Following grand jury charges of reckless or negligent injury to a child by a Montgomery County, Texas, grand jury, Adrian Peterson, running back for the Minnesota Vikings, was indicted on Sept. 12, 2014.

The incident in question allegedly occurred last May 18, when the boy — who lives with his mother — was visiting Peterson at his home north of Houston. The prosecution in the case alleges that Peterson used a tree branch to beat his young son repeatedly on his back, buttocks, genitals, ankles, and legs.

After the indictment, the Vikings deactivated Peterson for one game, but later altered course by suspending the 2012 NFL MVP with pay until the case is resolved. Photos posted on TMZ.com revealed the four-year-old boy’s legs with slash-like wounds.

As of Oct. 13, 2014, the only upcoming court date for Peterson was an appearance scheduled Nov. 4. If convicted, Peterson faces two years in prison for the felony.

Under Texas law, parents have a fundamental right to make decisions concerning the care, custody, and control of their child or children. However, this right is not absolute.

While a “parental justification” of administering reasonable disciplinary punishment exists, the Texas penal code states that a parent is guilty of felony child abuse if he or she intentionally, knowingly, recklessly, or with criminal negligence causes to a child “serious bodily injury” or “bodily injury.”

Further, the “parental justification” only applies if a reasonable person would have believed the force was necessary to discipline the child or to safeguard or promote the child’s welfare. This is an objective standard.

Moreover, under Texas and California law, questions of excessiveness of punishment inflicted by parent on child are...
issues of fact for the trial judge or jury to solve.

A 2010 Texas case held that a mother was not entitled to a parental justification defense when she whipped her child with a belt, causing bruises, cuts, and a significantly swollen hand.

And another Texas case in 1994 held that a mother was guilty of aiding and abetting child abuse by failing to report her husband’s actions of spanking their children with a metal rod. The spankings had caused knots and bumps on the children’s heads, fractured eight ribs in total, and left red marks on their faces.

California’s excessive punishment law is very similar to Texas in this regard. In California, while parents may administer reasonable punishment of their children, a parent who exceeds that limit of “reasonability” commits a battery and can be held civilly or criminally liable for the consequences.

To be justified, there must be a reasonable occasion (“a genuine disciplinary motive”) for a parent’s punishment of their child and the punishment must be reasonable in kind and degree.

A 2013 California case held that a mother’s action of striking her daughter on buttocks with a wooden spoon as punishment was protected under the parental disciplinary privilege.

In contrast, a 1961 California case convicted the father of a seven-year-old boy for slapping the boy three times about the face and head, knocking him to the floor, and striking his back with a boot, only because the boy refused to spell the word ‘the’ at the dinner table.

Examined by a physician later that same evening, the boy was found to have severe bruises on his left face and jaw, reddened ears, a mild swelling over the left cheek, and a bruised, swollen and abraded area on the small of his back.

The sobering news of the Adrian Peterson indictment underscores what could be a frightening truth in America today: excessive parental punishment may be a real and growing problem.

- Boyd Johnson
As part of the roll-out of President Obama’s Affordable Care Act, in 2011 the Dept. of Health and Human Services (DHHS) issued the contraception mandate, which required employers to provide, free of charge, 20 different contraceptives and abortifacient drugs to their employees as part of their comprehensive health care coverage.

Literally hundreds of employers and religiously affiliated organizations filed lawsuits against the DHHS challenging the constitutionality of the mandate, including the closely held for-profit corporation, Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.

Hobby Lobby’s owners, the Green family, objected on religious grounds to four of the 20 preventive contraceptives required by the DHHS mandate. The Greens argued that the DHHS mandate violated the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) by substantially burdening their free exercise of religion without passing RFRA’s strict scrutiny test.

On June 30, 2014, the Supreme Court of the United States issued a landmark decision by ruling in favor of Hobby Lobby. The Court held that a “person,” within the meaning of RFRA, includes for-profit corporations, and that the DHHS contraception mandate violated RFRA.

Sarah Johnson, a 3L at Fowler Law, expressed her agreement with the Court’s decision: “I do agree with the decision. It was less about the Affordable Care Act and more about the whether the entirety of the First Amendment extends to corporations. The Court extended the same speech rights that it had given in cases such as Citizens United and Bank v. Bellotti.”

Three days later, the Supreme Court again ruled that another religiously affiliated organization — Wheaton College — was entitled to an injunction by informing DHHS in writing that it is a nonprofit organization that holds itself out as religious and has religious objections to providing coverage for contraceptive services.

Just hours after the Hobby Lobby decision, several federal circuits granted preliminary injunctive relief to the religiously affiliated organizations challenging the DHHS mandate.

Brandon Willms, a 3L at Fowler Law and founding author of www.theconlawguy.com, reflected on Hobby Lobby’s place in American jurisprudence: “Birth control was simply a vehicle to get to the issue of whether a closely-held corporation could, in fact, exercise religion. As Justices Alito and Kennedy both pointed out during oral arguments, the Constitution cannot limit closely-held corporations from running their business according to their morals. Justice Alito used the example of a Jewish business owner being prohibited from operating a...
kosher slaughter-house because Congress thought such slaughter was inhumane.”

However, the Hobby Lobby decision only provided a temporary guidepost for the 100 or more non-profit and for-profit organizations challenging older versions of the DHHS mandate.

On August 22, 2014, the Obama administration responded to the Hobby Lobby decision by promulgating its eighth revision of the mandate, an “augmented” accommodation for “non-exempt” religious objectors. This revision provides that if a non-profit or for-profit employer like Hobby Lobby has a religious objection to providing or facilitating contraception coverage, the employer can write a letter to HHS informing them of such objection. The government will then direct the employer’s insurance company or third-party administrator to cover the objectionable drugs, devices, or services.

Despite this “accommodation,” 53 religiously affiliated non-profit organizations and 49 for-profit companies continue to argue that DHHS’ newest “accommodation” violates RFRA and constitutionally protected rights.

Specifically, these organizations argue that being compelled to notify DHHS of their objection causes them to indirectly promote, facilitate, and even show complicity with providing contraceptive access to employees. Instead of an “accommodation,” these organizations seek complete “exemption” status from the mandate.

These organizations further argue that DHHS’ latest contraception mandate, the “accommodation” provision, is substantively indistinguishable from the prior DHHS accommodations against which the Supreme Court has already granted injunctive relief.

On July 30, 2014, Ave Maria University, one of the dozens of religiously-affiliated organizations challenging the mandate, sent DHHS a notice in the exact same format as deemed sufficient by the Supreme Court to warrant preliminary relief in Little Sisters and Wheaton.

In response, DHHS refused this notice and insisted that Ave Maria continue litigating its religious liberty claims under the looming November 1st deadline (when the Obama administration will compel all religiously-affiliated organizations and for-profit companies to comply with its latest revision of the mandate).

Megan Moghtaderi, a 2L at Fowler Law, commented on the accommodation provision: “Religiously-affiliated for-profit and non-profit organizations are now required to explain their objections to contraceptive coverage in writing and as a result there is no change in their employees’ access to contraceptives. This ‘accommodation’ would still render these organizations an unwilling accomplice in facilitating something counter to their faith.”

Currently, it appears that the slough of litigation against DHHS’ most recent “accommodation” will continue unabated.

Of course, before the administration’s November 1st deadline, the Supreme Court may grant or deny certiorari to address the new “accommodation” and “complicity” issues.

If certiorari were granted, administration supporters would likely argue that an exemption from the DHHS mandate for religiously-affiliated organizations would radically broaden the scope of religious exemptions.

On the other hand, religiously-affiliated organizations would argue that the DHHS’ administrative “accommodation” still substantially burdens their religious conscience.

For now, one thing is certain: almost 225 years after the ratification of the First Amendment’s Establishment and Free Exercise clauses, the tug-of-war conflict between preventing “Establishment” and enabling “Exercise” rages on.

- Boyd Johnson
There’s a common saying that there is no such thing as a free lunch. Through many of its lunchtime programs, including the Chapman Dialogue Series, Chapman’s Fowler School of Law tends to prove that saying wrong.

The Dialogue Series kicked off this year on September 22, with a free catered lunch, and of course, its first speaker of the year, Tom Goldstein, the founder of the SCOTUSblog website. The event attracted students and faculty alike who were enthralled by Tom Goldstein’s story and how he reached where he is today.

Goldstein’s lecture, like many of the Dialogues, not only gave insight to the professional world of the legal field, but also personalized what it is to be a lawyer and how each journey is so specific. Amazingly, Mr. Goldstein was initially rejected from all the law schools to which he applied. Despite that record, he has gone on to argue over 30 cases in front of the Supreme Court of the United States.

For any law student currently worried about how to get through their Con Law or Fed Tax reading, all while jumping from one OCI interview to another, the idea that “anything is possible” is such an important lesson.

This installment of the Dialogue Series gave a reminder that even prominent members of the profession all started somewhere, did not know what they wanted to do, and somehow made it back to a law school to tell the new generation they can somehow make it too.

The next installment of the Chapman Dialogue series will feature Melanie Wilson, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor of Law at the University of Kansas Law School. Her topic will be The Moral Impediment to Justice: How the Multiple Occupational Identities Embedded in the Role of Prosecutor Impede Prosecutors from Complying with their Ethical Obligation to “Do Justice.”

- Nisa Farhangi & Wendy Lei
Medical errors are the third leading cause of death in the United States. Each year, up to half a million Americans die from completely preventable medical errors. Additionally, countless people have their lives changed forever by these mistakes.

Over the last 30 years, many people have been shocked to learn that if medical negligence causes the death of a loved one, their recovery has been capped at $250,000 in the State of California.

In the eyes of the law, the loss of a five-year-old child is equal to the loss of a 30-year-old spouse or a cherished parent. That same $250,000 cap applies for an injury if caused by a health care provider, even if that injury is ongoing and life changing, like paralysis or brain damage.

Proposition 46, a California initiative found on this year’s mid-term ballot, aims to remedy this disparity in medical treatment making it easier for health care professionals to limit wrongful death and medical malpractice suits by giving patients the necessary medical attention that they deserve.

The result of Prop 46 would be a significant decrease in avoidable death of patients by giving medical professionals more resources to better treat their patients; and, if there is a medical malpractice lawsuit, the patient’s loved ones would be able to recover in excess of $250,000.

According to a website in support of the initiative, www.yeson46.org, a “yes” on Prop 46 means more protection for patients through random drug and alcohol test on doctors; a requirement for the mandatory use of prescription databases; and, of course, and increase in the current medical negligence damages cap to make up for the previous 39 years of inflation.

Many healthcare professional are hired to care for elderly in nursing homes, but the negligence and abuse that takes place in these homes is horrific. For example, when medication is not given as prescribed, it leads patients to blindness, when oxygen tanks are not refilled in time, elder patients need to be rushed to the emergency room to fight for their lives.

More commonly, nurses and doctors forget to assist patients out of their bed, they leave them laying in the same position for over twelve hours at a time, which can cause bed sores, then infections, and in many cases leads to the body going into septic shock.

Taking these cases to trial can be so expensive; at times, they can cost an upwards of $150,000. With the noneconomic damages capped at $250,000, this makes it very difficult to find an experienced attorney to assist in the case.

The proposed solution to this egregious problem, Proposition 46, the Pack Patient Safety Act raises the cap placed on medical malpractice cases. The cap has been placed at $250,000 for over the past 39 years and this Proposition will increase the current cap according to the inflation that has occurred since its creation in 1975.

Prop 46 also creates a database where doctors will be able to search what prescription medications have been given to patients, aiming to decrease prescription drug abuse. As shocking as it is, more than 100,000 healthcare workers in the nation currently abuse prescription drugs, and this Proposition’s goal is to decrease those numbers.

Whether voters think this Proposition is a good idea or not, they should take the time to educate themselves on the outcomes. Educated voters don’t rely on false advertisements that are aimed to confuse the public into thinking that this proposition is brought forward out of greed. It’s brought forward for the safety of others and to deter further misconduct from healthcare professionals.

Voters are encouraged to educate themselves on this issue, the benefits of Prop 46, and then make an informed decision in November.

- Hilda Akopyian
Fowler law students, faculty and visitors were privileged to hear from not one, but two drone experts at the Chapman Air and Space Law Society and Chapman Federalist Society’s recent panel discussion focused on the U.S.’s use of drones on Oct. 29th.

The panel discussion, led by Fowler’s own Dean Donald Kochen, featured Michael Toscano, President and CEO of the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International (AUVSI) and Dr. Greg McNeal, Associate Professor of Law at Pepperdine Law School.

What is drone law and why is it important, you may ask?

“[Drone law] was something we thought would drive interest and really needs to be discussed. Drone law is a new topic and there needs to be more law,” Sarah Johnson, 3L and President of the Chapman Federalist Society, said. “Promoting the topic will get more young lawyers in the field.”

Titled “Domestic Drones, Privacy and the Future of Aerial Surveillance,” the discussion focused on privacy and accountability concerns that have been raised by the government and private citizens alike. Loud opposition to the technological development of these unmanned aerial systems (UASs), or drones, came from Senator Diane Feinsten’s (D-CA) own story about how a drone invaded her privacy when it appeared right outside her window and was looking at her.

After sharing this story, McNeal was quick to point out that this drone was actually a Pink Patrol helicopter, which is about six inches tall and one foot long and a private citizen flew it. It was not nearly the threat to national security that Feinstein, the American Civil Liberties Union and many American news outlets made it out to be, McNeal said. Yet, McNeal continued, because of the ACLU, Feinstein and her friends, small remote control helicopters like the Pink Patrol are regulated by drone legislation.

Lorin Herzfeldt, 2L and one of the inaugural Executive Board members of the Chapman Air and Space Law Society (CASLS), believes that students should be more interested in this area of law because it is so pervasive.

“The Air & Space Law Society,” said Herzfeldt, “has the primary goal of providing a forum for law students to explore what really is a diverse and large number of future career options. It isn’t a limited subject matter as some people might expect. It incorporates IP law, contract law, property law, administrative law, regulatory work and lobby work, and much more. Tonight’s presentation did just that, it showed where young lawyers can be involved in shaping the future of the legal system to make room for technological advances.”

Much of the focus of the night was on how current drone legislation misses the mark and is overinclusive as to what a drone is and how to deal with Fourth Amendment concerns. “As Americans,” explained Toscano, “the question is, what is our expectation of privacy?”

Image courtesy of coolhunting.com

Thanks to the Federalist and Air and Space Law Societies, Fowler Law Students learned the topic of Drone Law isn’t just for Trekkies and Star Wars fans.
The problem with the word “drone,” explained Toscano, is that eighty-percent of the public associates it with a $12 million drone, which is about the size of an F-22 war plane, used by the military to conduct focused surveillance from miles above the earth and to conduct targeted missile strikes with reasonable accuracy.

The Bureau of Investigative Journalism reports that of the 3,136 people killed by drones as of May of 2013, only 17% of those deaths were civilian. In conventional warfare situations, civilian deaths can account for between 30% and 80% of the deaths, which makes these drones relatively quite accurate.

McNeal then went on to explain that other than being perceived as scary killing machines, opposition to the use of drones evolves around the Fourth Amendment right of privacy, which is why Feinstein’s story was so popular in the media.

Both McNeal and Toscano were clear this public fear of personal privacy violation is more fear-mongering by the ACLU and Feinstein than a legitimate concern, as a drone with a camera is no different than a photographer with a telephoto lens, a police officer in a helicopter, or even a traffic light camera. Furthermore, Toscano explained that drones are most useful in non-public areas, such as checking the structural safety of oilrigs or collecting soil and water samples in the middle of 1,000-acre farms.

Even if there were privacy concerns, argued McNeal, “the great thing about technological advances is that technology can evolve in a way to protect privacy in a much more effective way than the bureaucratic process.”

For instance, McNeal explained if a drone was used by law enforcement to conduct surveillance, it would have a recorded flight plan easily accessed for accountability purposes. To the contrary, McNeal gave an example that no one would know if a police officer in a piloted helicopter chose to inappropriately turn his camera toward the window of a sorority house rather than toward the marijuana plants in a backyard he was supposed to be surveilling.

Toscano touted the effectiveness and need for drones, stating that there are two things drones do very well: deliver a payload (such as a package ordered online) and provide situational awareness (such as going into a building on fire to provide rescue and safety information).

Humans and drones can and do work well together, said Toscano, “because drones supply good information and when you give good information to smart people, they make good decisions.”

- Ryan Anderson

Left Top: Developed in 2003, the Epson micro Flying Robot is the smallest flying unmanned aerial vehicle. Left Bottom: The MQ-9 Reaper, considered to be a deadly surveillance and hunter unmanned aerial vehicle currently in use by the US Air Force. Below: Members of the Chapman Federalist and Air and Space Law Societies pose with their panel guests (far right) Prof. Gary McNeal and (to his left) Michael Toscano.
The second semester of my 1L year, the chaos began—along with all the other 1Ls, I started my quest to find a summer internship.

I secured one fairly quickly through one of my old contacts at the law firm I worked at before starting law school. He connected me with a firm that did a lot of civil litigation work, and they assured me they would be in touch right after my finals.

However, after finals when I contacted the law firm, they told me they no longer needed my help for the summer. I was devastated and told my contact that my internship fell apart. He quickly put me in contact with a different firm—one that practiced employment law. I knew nothing about employment law, but I needed an internship.

I interviewed with the firm, and they hired me. After the summer, I realized that this was a huge blessing in disguise.

Employment law involves issues regarding (but not limited to) workplace harassment, disability accommodation, human resource policies and practices, wage and hour issues, workplace investigations, disciplinary action and termination, at-will employment and wrongful discharge, employment agreements, restrictive covenants and confidentiality agreements, severance agreements, unemployment compensation claims, and more.

I worked nearly full-time, and I don’t recall a single day that I was bored with my workload. I interacted with clients on a daily basis (usually over the phone). I felt as though I was investigating each case, and the clients were normally cooperative.

I really appreciated the fact that employment law involved that specific “human” component that is lacking in a lot of other types of litigation. I also spent a good amount of time calculating damages for clients (great for those who enjoy doing math, like I do) and drafting various pleadings.

In employment law, each client’s case is unique, which keeps the work from becoming redundant. All in all, I feel as though employment law has a great balance.

And the best part: Employment law is booming and seems to usually be recession-proof. The takeaway: look into employment law.

But, if you know without a doubt that employment law is not your thing, then take the chance when you have the opportunity to try diving into some unknown territory the way I did. You never know when or where you might discover a new passion in law.

- Susie Grigorian
KAPLAN BEATS BARBRI – AGAIN*!
In July 2011 and July 2013 bar exam exit surveys, examinees who took Kaplan rated Kaplan higher than BARBRI students rated BARBRI in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exam-Like Practice Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essay Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*K*Based on exit survey of 1,973 July 2011 bar examinees and 1,250 July 2013 bar examinees who took bar review. Surveys conducted at 24 randomly selected locations in states where Kaplan offers full service bar review. Each respondent rated his/her primary bar review course. 2013 survey conducted by MMR Strategy Group.
There are most likely a number of new law students out there wondering if it’s possible to survive this thing called 1L year of law school. You probably will. On the other hand, if someone could have given me advice during my 1L year, I would like to have seen the following on the list:

1) Do NOT procrastinate! Utilize an effective time management system. Keep every aspect of your life thoroughly organized. (I suggest both a paper and electronic calendar)

2) “Find a physical outlet to channel your stress, because there will be a lot of it.” Joshua Strand (J.D. ’16)

3) When taking notes in class, pay attention to what the professor says. Think big picture, and place the material in the larger context of the class.

4) Do not rely on supplements. They are there to reinforce black letter law, but it will not provide the specific details your professors expect come discussion and exam time.

5) Don’t go on social medial, a.k.a. Facebook or Pinterest, during class. I know it is hard and tempting, but you will thank me later.

6) Study groups can be a good tool or a big distraction. If all group members come in with an understanding of the material, it will be AMAZING!

7) Take advantage of all the resources this law school provides. You should see Professor Faulkner for practice test materials, your Academic Fellows, as well as reaching out to your Law School Librarian for tips on legal research. Don’t be afraid to ask for help.

8) You may feel like a tribute in The Hunger Games when you experience the constant grade comparisons, but remember: everyone does things in their own way. Instead of getting caught up in the chaos, do whatever is right for you.

9) Remember watching out for the dreaded Freshman 15 during your first year of undergrad? Well the same applies to law school; do not let yourself get a 1L lump. Respect your body; it is your temple, so put good things in it.

10) Last but not least, take a deep breath and work on OUTLINES throughout the semester. Don’t wait until Thanksgiving to tackle four outlines, because you need that time to review and take as many practice exams as possible. Be sure to also spend some time with your family though.

If you have any other concerns, feel free to come see me at the front desk in the library. Good luck!

- Jennifer Tran
Maintaining a healthy lifestyle while in law school is not only possible, but also advantageous.

Undeniably, lack of time is a primary concern for many law students who commonly attribute their lack of exercise to busy schedules. “I want to make time to exercise,” said Julie Choe, 3L at Fowler Law, “but law school is so demanding it is nearly impossible.” So many students share Choe’s concern.

For law students who struggle to allocate their energy between class, reading, outlining and internships, by default, health becomes their last priority. While it may seem that school must always come first, for some students there is nothing in law school that is more important than maintaining both mental and physical health.

Third-year student Lisa Poladian said, “taking time away from school to workout helps me be more productive during the time when I am doing school work.”

It would seem like now is the perfect time for law students to start making their health a priority and making the time to take care of themselves.

Although it is challenging at first, getting into the habit of exercising weekly, eating nutritious meals, and getting plenty of sleep, will benefit students both personally and professionally.

Studying for hours on end can be exhausting, so exercise is often the perfect mental break.

It’s no secret that exercise helps to relieve stress, improves sleep, and keeps the body in shape, which in turn boosts self-esteem because who doesn’t want to look their best.

Exercise helps people, specifically law students feel refreshed, reenergized, and better equipped to tackle the books when it is time to study.

There are many alternatives to the traditional gym environment; and, at the same time, “going to the gym” does not always equate to exercising.

If all else fails and the stress of law school takes over, which can happen especially during finals, another option is to take class notes or reading material to the gym, like 3L Merritt Cosgrove, who likes to read while she does cardio. Where there is a will, there is a way!

If monotonous gym workouts sound unappealing, try running, biking, practicing yoga or swimming. The great part about our location next door to the undergrad campus means we can use their facilities, including the modern gym, track, soccer/football field, and the Olympic-sized pool.

Other fun alternatives include hiking, dancing or join a recreational sports league.

Eating well is also an integral part of staying healthy and relieving stress. Law students barely have time to go grab food, so often it is easier to live off of fast food delivery and Zito’s pizza, because cooking is completely out of the question.

Not only is this an expensive habit, it is also an unhealthy and counter productive habit, because without the proper nutrition the body and mind will suffer.

The body can’t perform the way it should, meaning that it cannot perform to its fullest potential in all aspects, physical and mental, making those longed for good grades harder to come by. Contrary to widespread belief among law students living on a budget, eating a proper diet is not impossible if it is made a priority. Little changes go a long way. Instead of running to the convenience store, vending machine, or nearest restaurant when hunger strikes, pack healthy lunches and snacks, which saves both time and money.

Law school only lasts three years, but a body lasts a lifetime.

- Keren Serrano
In late September, a United States military coalition launched airstrikes against the self-proclaimed "Islamic State," a terrorist organization also known as ISIS.

While the news media provides daily reports of these recent attacks, most Americans are unfamiliar with the ideological battle that underlies the conflict against ISIS. More than a war of bombs and drones, the conflict against ISIS is a war against radical and distorted forms of Islamic ideology.

In his address to the American people on Sept. 10, Pres. Obama affirmed that ISIS "is not Islamic. No religion condones the killing of innocents, and the vast majority of [their] victims have been Muslim."

At first blush, it appears that Muslims throughout the world, including most Muslim Americans, adamantly agree with the President’s distinction between ISIS and Islam.

On Sept. 24, more than 120 Muslim scholars from around the world joined an open letter to the "fighters and followers" of the Islamic State, denouncing ISIS as "un-Islamic."

Relying heavily on the Quran, the 18-page letter picked apart the extremist ideology of ISIS. The letter was written in Arabic, but a translated 24-point summary of the letter includes the following:

“It is forbidden in Islam to torture”; “It is forbidden in Islam to attribute evil acts to God”; and “It is forbidden in Islam to declare people non-Muslims until he (or she) openly declares disbelief.”

Still, Islam has long faced the challenge of being misunderstood by mainstream America. While the U.S. has taken military action in the Middle East during the last four Presidential administrations, American Muslims face constant pressure to clarify and explain misconceptions about Islam to friends and strangers.

This process can often become frustrating and saddening. At Fowler Law, Madiha Shahabuddin, 3L and the Editor-in-Chief of the Chapman Law Review, explained, "ISIS’s association and 'identification' with Islam is problematic because it places a heavy and unjustified burden upon Muslims to 'explain' themselves and defend their own religion in relation to ISIS. The fact that I, as a Muslim, am even

Continued on page 20.
Traveling is such a positive and rewarding experience because it provides us an opportunity to expand our horizons in ways that a book or classroom could never teach us. It is one thing to see a picture or read a travel memoir of a foreign place, but it's a completely different experience to visit that place in person.

Studying abroad does that; it provides students a unique opportunity to partake in the daily life of a new and foreign place, thus contributing to our understanding and appreciation of the culture in that locale.

It also offers the chance to meet new people and form new friendships. Altogether, it enables us to grow academically, professionally, and personally.

This past summer I had the opportunity to participate in the International Criminal Justice program at The Hague, Netherlands administered by Santa Clara University School of Law.

The Hague is the seat of government in the Netherlands, and the home of the International Criminal Court (ICC), the International Court of Justice (ICJ), and the Peace Palace, among many others.

As part of the program we visited various courts throughout The Hague. These tribunals were established to help hold accountable the persons responsible for the most
confronted with a comparison [with ISIS] is saddening."

Further illuminating the differences between the violence and terror of ISIS and the peace of Islam, Salam Al-Marayati, an American Muslim and President of the Muslim Public Affairs Council, wrote: “While ISIS calls people to death, Islam responds to the Prophet who calls you to life and calls for serving the public interest.”

Al-Marayati also cited verses in the Quran to highlight the differences between Islam and ISIS. “ISIS coerces and punishes Muslims who are accused of not attending prayers. Islam is no compulsion of religion (2:256).”

With an estimated 3 to 6 million Muslims in the United States, Muslims positively contribute in a diverse and pluralistic American society.

In fact, there are many Muslim students at Fowler Law and even a Muslim Law Students Association (MuLSA).

One of these students, Hadeer Soliman, a 3L and President of the MuLSA, opined that America's war efforts against ISIS must focus on eradicating the distorted ideology of radical terrorist organizations, but not necessarily through violence.

“American Muslims have already taken the lead in clarifying that Islam values life, mercy, freedom, and justice, while groups like ISIS value death and compulsion,” said Soliman. “Islam is founded in the Quranic tradition of advancing civilization, not destroying it.”

Indeed, bombs cannot destroy ideas, and thus, American Muslims have taken the lead in setting the record straight: Islam is a theology of life, while ISIS is a cult of death.

Too often, the news media focuses on the violence and terror caused by ISIS. As a result, too many Americans possess bigoted beliefs about the Muslim faith.

This ignorance must change.

In the United States, where “E Pluribus Unum” is minted and printed on our currency, and where the plurality of religious traditions and cultures strengthens and unites us, Americans must energetically engage and encounter Islam, not just tolerate it. This means that each American must actively take the time to learn about the faith and beliefs of Muslim Americans.

In an explanation of “What is Pluralism?” Harvard University Professor Diana Eck teaches, “Today, religious diversity is a given, but pluralism is not a given. Mere diversity without real encounter and relationship will yield increasing tensions in our societies. Pluralism is not just tolerance, but the active seeking of understanding across lines of difference.”

Americans who take the time to dialogue and encounter, speak and listen, and give and take with Muslims will come to discover both common understandings and real differences. Those who choose to do so will learn that Islam is a religion of peace and life, not violence and death. American Muslims and non-Muslims must unite and work together to eradicate the cruel influence of radical terrorist ideologies and explain the real goals of an Islamic society — life, liberty, faith, property, and family.

- Boyd Johnson
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serious crimes in the international community, such as genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes.

At each tribunal, we watched presentations from many speakers varying from practicing attorneys, judges and high ranked officials from all over the world.

Through this amazing program, we also learned about international criminal justice by observing first-hand actual court proceedings. Students were able to analyze procedure and trial tactics at these proceedings.

After a long day at the tribunals, we were free to explore. Fortunately, The Hague is a short train ride away from virtually everywhere. It’s location made it easy for us to travel to the neighboring cities, including Amsterdam, Harlem, and throughout Western Europe.

We relied on public transportation so much that by the end of our trip it became second nature and we did not have to rely on maps to get around.

My summer at The Hague was a memorable one. I truly enjoyed the daily train rides, getting lost in Amsterdam, celebrating The Netherlands’ victory over Spain in the World Cup, sleepless nights spent with new friends, observing court proceedings and everything in between.

This was an experience of a lifetime and I wouldn't trade studying abroad for the world.

- Keren Serrano